

ON OTHER PAGES

Will Curtin Have Power? (Page 2).
Who Controls Bank of Canada? (Page 3.)
Is China a Democracy? (Page 7.)
Conditions in N.Z. (Page 8.)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 7. No. 40 MELBOURNE. FRIDAY, OCT. 10. 1941.

Now, when our
land 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)

THAT "HUSH HUSH" POLICY!

Mr. Langtry M.H.R. on Wheat and Wool Prices

"These amount to dictatorial powers over the primary producers. This 'hush hush' policy has been carried beyond all reason." The Member for Riverina (Mr. J. I. Langtry) declared this the other day when he criticised the silence that the Federal Government has observed in respect of the sale abroad of Australian wheat and wool.

On September 25, in Parliament, Mr. Langtry asked the Acting-Minister for Commerce (Mr. Abbott) the following questions:

(1) What quantity of Australian wool has been re-sold to Japan by the British Government, and at what price? (2) What quantity of Australian wool has been re-sold to the United States of America, and at what price? (3) What quantity of wheat has been sold to Japan?

Mr. Abbott has replied to Mr. Langtry as follows:

(1) and (2)—The whole of the Australian wool clip having become, by purchase in Australia, the property of the United Kingdom Government, it is not in the public interest that information of the nature sought should be divulged. (3) A total of 13,421,000 bushels of wheat have been sold to Japan since the Commonwealth Acquisition Scheme came into force.

Mr. Langtry has also stated that recently he had also inquired the price received for Australian wheat sold to Japan, but the information had been denied him.

Every primary producer had the right to know to whom his product was sold, and at what price, Mr. Langtry claimed. It had been reported that Australian wool had fetched 3/- and 4/- a lb. when re-sold abroad, and that wheat had realised 9/- a bushel in some overseas markets.

ANGLICANS PLEASE NOTE!

The Archbishop of York (Dr. William Temple), in the course of a remarkable article in the "Contemporary Review," said this:

"The trouble is that currency, or money, has been bound up with production, instead of being bound up with the capacity to produce. If you make that change in your mind, the result will be that you want money to be available for members of the community in relation to its capacity to produce. The aim of the New School of Economic Thought is to create demand by the distribution of such purchasing power as will set all the nation's productive plant working . . . The consumer is really the pivot of the situation."

Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson, D.D. Dean of Canterbury, in an article in "Reynold's" newspaper, London, recently wrote:

"We are in a false position. Financially poor. Actually rich. Finance failing to reflect reality. Money obviously at fault.

"Would we in England save de-
(Continued on page 8.)



Mr. J. I. Langtry, M.H.R.

"CARRY ON FIGHT AGAINST ENEMY WITHIN"

MEMBER OF A.I.F. IN MIDDLE EAST PRAISES ERIC BUTLER'S WORK

Mr. Butler has given us permission to publish the following letter, which he received last week:

Signalman Savage, W.F.,
A.I.F., Abroad.

September 15, 1941.
Syria.

Dear Mr. Butler, —As a member of the A.I.F. in the Middle East, I feel it a duty to thank you for the magnificent work you are doing, home in Australia, in the cause of true Democracy.

I have sounded the feelings of many hundreds of my comrades over here, and I feel sure that I am speaking for them when I tell you that we most earnestly desire you to carry on with your splendid efforts in enlightening the Australian people of the causes of the social evils, which are such a blight on our civilisation.

Personally, I feel proud to think that while we are fighting the enemy "outside the gates," you are fighting the powerfully entrenched enemy that exists "within the gates." We want you to fight that enemy relentlessly, so that when the war is won Australia will be a land fit for the young men who will have made so many sacrifices.

My fellow soldiers, each and every one of them, have a burning desire for a better life when they return, but we know that unless

It was rather a pathetic sight to see all the U.A.P. members lined up on one side, all, presumably, in favour of the Budget proposals; and all the Labour members lined up on the other side, all against the Budget proposals.

Surely, one may ask, are there not some U.A.P. members who are not in favour of the Budget proposals; who dislike the Budget proposals; who were not consulted about the Budget Proposals; who realise that the Budget proposals will destroy all small businessmen? Why did these U.A.P. members vote with Mr. Fadden against their principles?

Mr. Fadden said he was going to stand or fall on the principles of the Budget. This is rather a strange stand for Mr. Fadden to

take when he had no majority in the House. Why did not Mr. Fadden consult other members in the House; why did he not consult Mr. Wilson and some of the private U.A.P. members, and some of the Labor members?

Mr. Fadden pushed a Budget in front of the House; a Budget which I am quite certain three-quarters of the House had no hand in the making; a Budget which would do a great deal of damage to those interests which private U.A.P. members are supposed to be protecting.

Mr. Fadden pushed this Budget in front of the House, and took his stand on what he called the principle of the Budget. Why did he do this? Obviously, he did it because he was selected to do it. The Budget was not of his making; it had been put into his hands and he had to push it through Parliament as best he could, if he could.

If there had been free discussion in the House, the private U.A.P. members would probably have made more useful amendments than the Labor members, but they have not been permitted to do so because the Party Bosses of both sides of the House had decided to make a Party issue of the Budget. When any question is made a Party issue, all members of the one Party must vote for it, and (Continued on page 2.)

THOSE MEN AGAIN!

Monday's Melbourne "Age" reports that Professors Copland and Giblin were among the first official callers on Mr. Curtin last Saturday—within twenty-four hours of the defeat of the Fadden Government, to which they were economic advisers.

Common Sense Wanted

Extract from "Economic Tribulation," by V. C. Vickers, Governor of the Bank of England, 1910 to 1919:

"It is commonly felt it is better that ordinary individuals should leave economics to the economists, finance to the bankers, and national policy to the politicians. But, alas, that is exactly what we have for too long been doing. Look at the result! The experts have hopelessly failed. What is needed is a little less economics and a little more common sense. All that is necessary for us ordinary men is that we should make use of the knowledge that is already ours—that is to say, the knowledge of (what is) good and (what is) evil."

W. F. SAVAGE.

P.S.—You may use this in any way you like. —W.F.S.

THE BUDGET DEBATE—Continued

all members of the other Party must vote against it. In this way the wishes of the members of Parliament are ruthlessly swept aside and their criticism is suppressed.

Nothing is more incredible than the way, time after time, the Party Bosses have, between them, forced motions through Parliament which were obviously against the wishes of Parliament and also very detrimental to the interests of the country.

But, as soon as a UAP. member rebels at the action of his Party Bosses he is told: Yes, that's all very well; what you say and believe is quite true, but if you vote against us you put Labor in power, and, what's more, everybody will be told that you put Labor in.

The same argument, of course, is used against Labor members who have the temerity to believe that they should have some real say in Parliament.

Perhaps no greater tragedy has ever been witnessed than the reduction of Great Britain to a third class Power under the rule of Baldwin, when the members of the Government Party were regimented like a lot of school boys and driven in to vote with their Party against their own interests—against the interests of their friends and their country.

If Party politics is not exposed and its great evils removed, then it will destroy this country and make all reasonable reform impossible. People are getting sick of it and will, perhaps, in their desperation, accept any other form of Government, if only for a change. Perhaps that is the purpose behind this game of Party politics.

Parliamentarians are saying: "Is it not ridiculous that one man, Mr. Wilson, should have more power than all the rest put together?" But who gave this man the power? Was it not the men who sacrificed their vote when they handed it to the Party Boss? If these members of the U.A.P. had had the courage to tell Mr. Fadden that they would not vote for his Budget unless he altered it, then that Budget would have been altered.

Evidently there was not an independent member in the U.A.P. yet we know that members of the U.A.P., sitting in Canberra today, know that that Budget of Mr. Fadden's would destroy the small business man of this country; some have even gone as far as to say that the Budget was designed by the big monopolies for that very purpose. Yet, these same men vote for the Budget. Why? Because they didn't want to put in a Labor Government. Clever, isn't it? Devilishly clever. I wonder

if the devil was half as cunning as the men who run our political parties.

I am not going to discuss the speeches made by Mr. Fadden and Mr. Curtin; time doesn't permit. Probably some of the private members made much more valuable contributions, but we will not be able to read them until we obtain copies of "Hansard." The dribs and drabs that come through the press are valueless and misleading.

The points of importance to notice in this Parliamentary crisis were these: First, that there is no dispute that the money to finance the war has got to be found. All are agreed on that. The dispute arises in the methods by which the money is to be found. Mr. Fadden considers the methods so important that he has been persuaded to stake the existence of his Government on the issue.

Let us examine why he attaches so much importance to the method of collecting this sum of £300 million. As I have already said, the private members of the U.A.P. have very little, if any, say in the framing of the Budget. The Budget is framed by those in control of the financial institutions of this country. I don't think that any U.A.P. member sitting in Canberra could contradict that statement.

The three main methods by which money is collected for the war are: (1) by taxation; (2) by the private banks creating the necessary credits, exchanging cheques for Government bonds; (3) by the Commonwealth Bank creating its own credits without paying interest to the private banks.

All other methods, such as the few shillings subscribed by people like you and me, don't count for very much. Obviously, the way the money is collected is of very great importance to the private banks, because if the Commonwealth Bank creates the necessary money for the prosecution of the war, the private banks are going to be pushed out of the greatest money swindle in the history of man namely, creating illegal money by hundreds of millions and lending it to the Government at interest. That is what the fight is about, and sooner or later it must come to a crisis.

Moreover, to pay these huge sums of interest on this illegal money, heavier and heavier taxation is needed. That is why the private banks are so keen on higher and higher taxation; that is why they have so much difficulty to find a man to push this Budget through Parliament, and that accounts for the type of man they are forced to use.

While writing these words, news came through of the defeat of the

WILL CURTIN HAVE POWER?

It has been recognised in the right quarter that the Budget proposals of the Fadden Government were most unfair. Both the Fadden Government and its Budget have received their exact deserts. That which should provoke concern amongst the people of Australia now is the question whether the Curtin Budget will be a people's Budget, or whether the Curtin Government will be merely in office but not in power.

The daily press is already at pains to impress upon the minds of the public that the policy of the Labor Party is "nationalisation." Years ago, Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, was asked his opinion. He replied, "Nationalisation? We welcome it." Doubtless he stroked his beard at the time.

We warn the people of Australia against the pitfalls into which they may be led. Private capitalism, substituted by State capitalism, means that the State would own the business enterprises of the nation — e.g., apple and pear industry — and certain banking and industrial interests would own the State, through their ownership of the Government's bond issues. The owners of the bonds have their economic security assured by the levies of taxes upon the people. The people's Government would GUARANTEE the return to the bondholders, the security being the resources of the whole nation.

If the people are to get the results they want, the first step to be taken by their Government must be the "nationalisation of CREDIT." The Government bonds of tax slavery must be supplanted by Government bonds of freedom. It is preposterous to suggest that the banks and wealthy corporations should be given interest-bearing Government bonds in return for the money they supply to the Government at little cost to themselves, while the wage-earners and other taxpayers supply their hard-earned money to be confiscated, because no Government bonds are given to them in return for the money they have to pay in taxes. The taxpayers' claim upon the nation's title deeds — Government bonds — must be established if they are to share in the fruits of victory resulting from their co-operative effort in the war. Otherwise the banks and wealthy corporations, as the predominant owners of our Government bonds, will be the beneficiaries of the people's contribution to victory. If the Labor Government is to function as a people's Government, the people must demand it. The elec-

Government. Mr. Wilson voted against the Government. He stated that in his travels round the country he found nothing but dissatisfaction with the methods by which the war effort was being conducted, and especially with the methods by which the money was being found. He also stated that everywhere, people were anxious to find out more about this great structure of debt that is being created by the private banks.

All power to Mr. Wilson; he has had great power in his hands, and he has used it to expose one of the world's greatest scandals. Let us hope he will use his advantage to the benefit of the people of this long-suffering country.

I want you to take advantage of the present situation to sweep aside much of the ignorance, which has been exploited by the Party Bosses. At the present time, we have a stock of Bruce Brown's book, "Banks and Facts," setting out the principle facts of war finance and an answer to statements issued by the private banks. These books can be obtained at 6d each at the office of the Electoral Campaign, 101 Collins-street, Hobart, just opposite the Imperial. All can help to spread the facts, which we broadcast over this station. Give us your help; we need it badly.

tors, as individual actionists, should, at this opportune moment, instruct their respective representatives in Parliament that it is their desire that, in future, the Government shall issue Government bonds to the taxpayers as post-war credits in return for money levied from the taxpayers to provide for an all-in war effort with equality of sacrifice. Such post-war credits must be met after the war out of DEBT-FREE funds, to be supplied by the Commonwealth Bank. Also, in order to avoid inflation, that no increase in prices to the public be permitted.

Such steps should be taken at once, not only to induce the maximum war effort, but also to ease the widespread fear of depression after the war.

Electors must act in numbers, because no Government can be expected to act without public pressure. Parliamentary representatives should be informed that as long as they may be relied upon to represent the desires of their electors, then their electors, in turn, will be ready and willing to work and vote for the re-election of such representatives to Parliament, where things are done and must be done for the people.

—A.J.O'C

MAN OR STATE?

To the Editor of "The Scotsman."
Sir, —In thanking Miss M. T. Munro for her sound and thoughtful letter in your issue of Thursday, may I suggest that the first essential to progress in the direction which she desires is that we should escape from Utopia?

Germany, Italy, Russia are all Utopias. They are the result of the rise to power of groups, or of figureheads empowered by groups, each of which succeeded in persuading an uncritical population that some "ism" could be imposed upon a large population from above, and that therefrom would come the millennium. Such an "ism" was most frequently the outcome of the literary effort of failures in the world as it exists. It is a bad world, and it does not appear to be getting better, but I feel confident that ability to do some task in it well, however small that task may be, is a sound qualification for suggestions as to the next step.

The millennium would have come for most of us if we were able to realise our private Utopias. If that could be done to a reasonable extent, and it is by no means so difficult as it may sound, most of the frictions of life, which arise from the desire of some organisation to impose its Utopia upon us, would disappear.

But a comprehensive and imposed Utopia ignores the fundamental uniqueness of the individual—the constant increase of tastes and aptitudes with cultural progress. It is most unfortunate that the Christian Churches, with their domination by the Old Testament, pay far too little attention to the primary message of the New Testament, which stresses this uniqueness.

There are certain very practical deductions to be drawn from these considerations. Since laws pretend to be no respecter of persons, every increase in the number of our laws is a contradiction of the fact that the relation of the developing individual to a given set of circumstances is increasingly individual. We want far less law, instead of the spate of new laws we are getting. The second, and very urgent matter is that if the Parliamentary

(Continued on page 3.)

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, CI

Please forward me the "New Times" for,

Months, beginning with issue dated, 19....
cheque

I enclose 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 £1 for 12 months; 10/- for 6 months; 5/- for 3 months. Post-free.

WHO CONTROLS THE BANK OF CANADA?

Mr. Ilsley, the Canadian Finance Minister, recently admitted that Parliament had no control over the Bank of Canada, in spite of its "nationalisation"; three days later he denied that he made the statement, or, alternatively, if he did, that he did not mean it.

Just before the Canadian House of Commons rose on June 2, the Speaker suggested that the Bill under discussion should be read a third time. Following a member's dissent because he wanted an opportunity to discuss matters concerning the Bank of Canada, the debate continued thus, according to the Canadian, "Hansard":

Mr. Ilsley: "I will go as far as I can on the matter of the Bank of Canada, but I do not think I would agree to a discussion of the policies or internal administration of the Bank of Canada, because it is a separate organisation."

Mr. Blackmore: "Do I understand the minister to say that the Bank of Canada is not directly under the control of the Department of Finance?"

Mr. Ilsley: "Correct."

Mr. Blackmore: "That is, independent of the Finance Department, and therefore independent of this House?"

Mr. Ilsley: "Correct."

Mr. Blackmore: "Independent of the administration, too?"

Mr. Ilsley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what stage we are at, but the Bank of Canada is a separate organisation, just like the Canadian National Railways or the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. These separate corporations are owned by the Government; in the case of the Bank of Canada the stock is owned by the Government and the directors are nominated by the Government, but once the directors are appointed, I have no right, nor has the Government any right, to dictate to the Bank of Canada as to what its policies shall be"

Mr. Hanson (York Sunbury): "I distinctly dissent from that proposal, that in all these Government-owned organisations Parliament has lost control. That is distinctly not true in connection with the Canadian National Railways; and it must never be the accepted principle in this House of Commons or in this Canada of ours that any of these boards set up by the Government as public agencies shall never be referred to in this House. I wish to register a protest against that statement of the Minister."

Mr. Speaker: "Order, please."

Three days later, on June 5, during the course of debate, Mr. Norman Jaques, Social Credit-New Democracy member for Wetaskiwin, raised the following discussion taken from "Hansard":

Mr. Jaques: "... The hon. gentleman who just took his seat referred to the inevitable depression that will follow this war, but what guarantee have we that the next depression will be regarded at all differently from the previous one? Before the luncheon recess the Minister said this station had not been built before the war because of the depression. And why was there nothing done during the depression? There was only one reason. Here were hundreds of thousands of men willing and able to do the actual construction work; miners, steel workers and so on all down the list, were looking for work, but nothing was done. Why? There was only one answer: because there was no money. And there was no money because, as the Minister for Finance told us on Monday afternoon, neither the Government nor this House has any control whatever over the financial policy of this Government. That is the reason."

Mr. Ilsley: "I deny that I made that statement, Mr. Chairman."

Mr. Jaques: "Well, the Bank of Canada controls the financial policy of this country, and certainly the Minister for Finance told us that

neither his Department nor this House had any control whatever over the financial policy of the Bank of Canada."

Mr. Ilsley: "I deny that I made that statement I said the Government had no control over the internal operations of the Bank of Canada."

Mr. Johnston (Bow River): "Oh, no."

Mr. Ilsley: "Well, if I did not say that I meant to do so. We were talking about the internal operations of the bank at that time. I find that this matter was discussed at great length in the banking and commerce committee of 1939, and at that time the phrase used was 'day to day operations.' I had no intention of announcing any change in the policy that was laid down at that time. The distinction between having something to say about monetary or financial policy, and the Government controlling the day-to-day operations of the Bank of Canada, was made very clear in 1939. Just before six o'clock the other evening I was the object of some rapid questioning here, and it may be that I went further than I should have gone. I have not looked at 'Hansard' to see what I said, but I want to say to the members of the Social Credit party right now that I do not want them to attach any significance to any statements I made at that time in so far as they were at variance with the clearly established rule and policy laid down in the banking and commerce committee in 1939."

Mr. Jaques: "I am not blaming the Minister, but I should like to quote his words."

The Chairman: "The hon. gentleman must accept the statement of the Minister as to what he meant."

Mr. Jaques: "I accept his statement as it appears in 'Hansard.'"

The Chairman: "The hon. gentleman cannot accept 'Hansard' as against the statement of another hon. member of this House. When an hon. gentleman says that he made a certain statement, and that what he said was so and so, any other hon. member must accept what he says."

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): "If the record is the other way I would raise a point of order at once."

The Chairman: "Hansard' is not the record of the House; and 'Hansard' cannot prevail against the statement made by an hon. member. 'Hansard' is only for the convenience of the public; it is not the official record of the House, and under the rules no one can challenge a statement made by an hon. member as to what he did or did not say."

Mr. Jaques: "Then this makes the case even worse, because if the Government had control..."

The Chairman: "Furthermore, it is not permissible to quote anything said during a debate, other than the one now proceeding, which took place during the present session."

* * *
"Spitfire" comments in "To-day and To-morrow" of June 19: —

Now it will be plain that Mr. Ilsley's denial of June 5 simply does not square with his categorical assertions made on June 2.

In the first place, nobody in the responsible position of a spokesman for the Government could possibly confuse policy and administration. Policy has to do with objectives whereas administration has to do with methods for the attainment of objectives.

The Minister for Finance stated definitely that neither he nor the Government had "any right to dictate to the Bank of Canada as to what its policies shall be."

If he had made a slip the opportunity to correct this arose when

the Leader of the Opposition protested against the Minister's assertion and was called to order by the Speaker. But Mr. Ilsley did not withdraw.

The second point to be observed is that the Minister for Finance implies that the Government has "something to say about monetary and financial policy," without controlling the day-to-day operations of the Bank of Canada. But it does not require a profound knowledge of organisation to know that control of policy automatically carries with it control of administration.

Another feature about the affair is the amazing statement made by the Chairman regarding "Hansard" as the official record of debates in the House of Commons.

If a Minister of the Crown can make a definite statement, and, in reply to questions, clarify it so that no possibility of misunderstanding can exist, and then three days later deny he made the statement or alternatively, if he did, that he did not mean it, an extremely serious situation exists. For if he did not mean what he said the first time what assurance has the House of Commons or the public that he really means what he said the second time?

Of course the matter goes beyond this to anything a responsible Government spokesman may say in Parliament.

The next move in this altogether astounding affair followed the publication of the statement by Premier Aberhart* challenging Mr. Ilsley's revelations of June 2.

The following news item was published in the press on Friday, June 13.

"Ottawa, June 13: While responsibility for operations of the Bank of Canada rests upon the shoulders of the governor and board of directors the responsibility for Canada's monetary policy is the Government's, Finance Minister Ilsley told the House of Commons today.

He referred to a statement issued by Premier Aberhart of Alberta based on statements the Minister made in the House on June 2 to the effect that the bank was not controlled by the Government.

"The Minister said he regretted that his words spoken during a 'question and answer' exchange on another subject, had provided a basis for misconception.

"In the operation of the bank the governor and directors had freedom from Government control, but that did not mean that the Government was relieved of its responsibility for general monetary policy nor did the freedom of the bank from Government interference militate against the Government's power to direct the general monetary policy of the country."

If the Federal Government does in fact control the country's monetary policy and, therefore, has complete and effective control over the Bank of Canada, why should the Minister for Finance have stated that the bank is not directly under the control of the Department for Finance? Why should he have refused to allow the Bank of Canada to be discussed in the House of Commons? Further, if the Bank of Canada operates free from Government interference, as Mr. Ilsley states, in reality what possible control can either the Government or Parliament have over monetary policy?

In short, it would seem that far from Mr. Ilsley's last two statements being reassuring, they provide grounds for increased uneasiness.

*Mr. Aberhart pointed out that if neither the Minister of Finance nor the Parliament of Canada had any control over the policies of the Bank of Canada and had no right to question these policies, then clearly Parliament was subservient to the Bank of Canada. "Unless the people of Canada... demand immediate action to restore to Parliament its full sovereign powers over the control and issue of currency and credit and of monetary policy, how can responsible democratic government survive in Canada?"

United Democrats' Report

(From Headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

Our New Secretary: After a somewhat anxious period, it gives the executive great pleasure to announce the appointment of Mr. H. B. Harvey as organising secretary. To members of our movement in S.A., Mr. Harvey needs no introduction, having been a very keen worker for a very long time. We are sure that, before long, a number of new people will know both Mr. Harvey and the United Democrats. Part of the new secretary's job will be to contact as many prospects as possible; it will also be the job of existing members to add to the list of such contacts. The executive has placed before the secretary certain objectives towards which he will strive. To do this, he will need, and will doubtless receive, the active co-operation of every sincere supporter. One of these objectives is the formation of similar groups to the Adelaide Social Credit Group No. 1. There are also all the union secretaries to contact re "Victory Without Debt"; and there will be the arranging of further drives for the collection of signatures for V.W.D. forms. People working in co-operation can get what they want. The executive invites you to throw your weight in with all those who see great possibilities in the near future. By doing this you will make Mr. Harvey's work so much lighter and so much more worthwhile.

Country Meeting: The meeting arranged for Nuriootpa on October 16 will be held on the 13th instead.

Quarterly Meeting: Because of a Town Hall meeting, originally arranged to protest against the Budget, which will be held on October 23, the quarterly meeting booked for the same date will be postponed.

Luncheon Address: The speaker on Friday, October 17, will be Mr. Elliot Johnson, secretary of the Anglo-Soviet Union.

Saturday, October 11, is the bridge and checkers evening. Don't forget it

Free Lists of our cheap books are available. You will never have this chance again. We also have some back numbers of the "Social Crediter" you may have for three pence each.

— M. R. W. Lee,
Correspondence Secretary.

MAN OR STATE?

(Continued from page 2.)

system is to survive, it must be recognised that the member must become, what he is not, a representative, Government by Cabinet is bad, but government by Cabinet, claiming to be responsible to delegates who allow themselves to be put in the position of experts is intolerable. This is the present position.

The comprehensive Utopia is the result of the organised centralisation of the will-to-power. Its defeat and our escape from it cannot be by way of alternative Utopias of the "planned" variety, but by the organic growth resulting from its progressive decentralisation. — I am, etc., C. H. Douglas, 8 Fig Tree Court, Temple, E.G. 4. July 19, 1941.

3DB Heckle Hour

Listen-in to 3DB at 8 p.m. on Saturday, October 11, for debate between Mr. A. Hutchinson, B.Sc., and Mr. J. Bradshaw, A.F.I.A., Secretary, Citizens' Rights League, on the subject, "Should the Initiative Referendum and Recall be introduced to reform our Parliamentary system?"

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: MU 2834.

Vol. 7. FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1941. No. 40.

CALL TO ACTION

The Fadden Government and its Bankers' Budget have been defeated. **What next?** Some citizens seem to think that, with the Labor Party in office, the struggle against orthodox finance, centralisation and bureaucracy is practically over—and that we should all sit down, politically speaking, and "leave it to Labor." Nothing could be more dangerous, as New Zealanders can testify, because they tried it. Nothing could be more undemocratic; government of the people, by the Labor Caucus, whether "for" the people or not, is NOT democracy, any more than government of the people, by the U.A.P.-C.P., for the banks. In any case, the Curtin Cabinet, be their sincerity and intentions all that might be desired, have no easy task ahead of them. They have an extremely slender and somewhat precarious majority in the House of Representatives, and cannot command a majority in the Senate, while the Money Power undoubtedly has a few cards left up its sleeve.

Therefore, electors now have a great opportunity and a grave responsibility to make their wishes known to their respective M.H.R.'s and Senators. It is a matter of the utmost urgency that they should thus bestir themselves in regard to the forthcoming Budget. The time is very short, and those, like readers of this paper, who have some, understanding of the basic issues and what to DO, must give a lead to their fellow-electors. We appeal to EVERY reader of this paper to do all that lies in his or her power. With the not-distant possibility of a double dissolution confronting them, politicians of all Parties in both Houses will "have their ears to the ground." Write to your M.H.R. and each of the Senators for your State. Do it NOW. Then set out to get every fellow-elector you can contact to do likewise—and keep at it. If your nearest Electoral Campaign organisation has printed demand-letter forms that cover the main principles to which a people's Budget should conform, get as many as you can use without delay and USE them. Printed copies of a special demand-letter are being issued by the United Electors of Australia, and may be obtained, at one shilling per hundred, by writing to Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne, or by calling at the U.E.A. office, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

FACTS OF PLENTY

The following table compiled by the Inter-Church Social Research Council shows the increase in production for the thirty-three-year period ending 1933. It should be of special interest to those few unthinking people who are mesmerised by orthodox economists into thinking that our "cake" or productivity is limited to its present size.

Dairy Cattle.....	200	money-depression years, when more than 250,000 individuals were relegated to the industrial scrap-heap.
Sheep	38	
Wheat.....	269	
Wool.....	101	It should be remembered also that this represents ONLY actual production increase, and does not take into account potential increase.
Butter	324	
Sugar	374	
Honey.....	345	
Cheese	213	An important point in this connection is that production expansion is being obtained with fewer operatives; machine slaves are rapidly replacing human slaves, who, under the "work-or-starve" wage system, are then without income to purchase the products of the machine.
Bacon and Ham	100	
Wine.....	135	
Fruit Crops	228	
Eggs and Poultry.....	105	
Factory Production.....	406	
Population increase over same period.....	76	
This period includes the 1914-18-war period, and the 1929-33		

NORMAN ROLLS' AN OBSOLETE SYSTEM ITINERARY

A series of misfortunes has delayed Mr. and Mrs. Rolls, and they will not be leaving the Newcastle district until this weekend, or possibly Monday, when they proceed via Maitland and New England district instead of the Pacific Highway coastal route. They will call at post offices at Singleton, Musswellbrook, Aberdeen, Scone, etc.

Extract from "Economic Tribulation," by V. C. Vickers, Director of the Bank of England from 1910 to 1919:

"Slowly, but inevitably, the old financial system is crumbling under the weight of modern conditions and the better education of the people; the sooner it crumbles the better, and the sooner it gives way to a better and more modern technique the sooner will the world achieve goodwill and peace among men."

SENATOR DARCEY "ON THE JOB"

LOAN COUNCIL SCANDAL RECALLED

Senator Richard Darcey never misses an opportunity of educating his fellow-Senators about the money question. As most of them are not very apt pupils, his patience and persistence are to be commended. He held one of his "classes" on September 18. "Hansard" reports it as follows:

Senator Darcey (Tasmania): It is not my intention to anticipate the Budget, but it will be generally conceded that when it is introduced the bone of contention will be matters of finance. For that reason, I bring to the notice of honourable senators some happenings at a recent meeting of the Loan Council, which was presided over by the Treasurer (Mr. Fadden). At the August meeting of the Loan Council, Mr. Cosgrove, the Premier of Tasmania, moved—

1. This Loan Council concurs in the view expressed by the State Parliaments of West Australia, South Australia, Queensland, and Tasmania, that national credit, operated through the Commonwealth Bank only, should be utilised in financing the war for the general well being of the people of Australia.

2. In order to give effect to this policy in a practical manner, the Loan Council recommends to the Commonwealth Government the adoption of the following principles:

(a) In future, no subscriptions to public loans should be accepted from the trading banks nor should the trading banks be permitted to increase their holdings in Commonwealth bonds;

(b) Public loan flotations should be limited to amounts within the capacity of the public market, as distinct from trading banks and the Commonwealth Bank;

(c) Other borrowings should be in the form of direct advances from the Commonwealth Bank;

(d) Adequate steps should be taken to neutralise increases in cash held by the trading banks and to prevent an expansion of trading bank advances for purposes not consistent with the Government's war policy.

2. The Loan Council further urges the Commonwealth Government to use its wartime emergency powers to make whatever legal arrangements are required to give effect to these principles.

Mr. Fadden, the chairman of the Loan Council, ruled the motion out of order, and that ruling prevented Mr. E. Dwyer Gray, the Treasurer of Tasmania, from saying all that was necessary in supporting the motion of his leader. However, he did say—

I remind the Council, further, that at the Loan Council held in Melbourne, on 19th January 1940, I moved the following motion and received no support, namely:

An approximate amount of £42,000,000 being required, this Council advises the Commonwealth Government to make arrangements for an extension of national credit through the Commonwealth Bank solely of at least £15,000,000, the balance to be financed by a later public loan for war purposes only after effecting the arrangements with the trading banks suggested by the State of Tasmania.

At present, the press of Australia is misleading the public as to what national credit really means. Recently, a Sydney newspaper took me to task. I put it down to the effect of an interjection by Senator Gibson, who admitted that paragraph 504 of the report of the Royal Commission on Banking and Monetary Systems stated that the Commonwealth Bank "can" advance interest-free money to the

Government, but did not say that the Commonwealth Bank "shall" do so. Of course, the Royal Commission did not use the word "shall." What right has any commission to lay down the financial policy of the Government? The commission was engaged on an inquiry, at the termination of which it submitted certain recommendations. I wonder whether Senator Gibson, who is chairman of the Joint Committee on Broadcasting, would go so far as to tell the Government what it "shall" do regarding the future of the Australian Broadcasting Commission? **Senator McBride:** The committee will no doubt make recommendations.

Senator Darcey: That is what the Royal Commission to which I have referred did. On the evidence presented to that Royal Commission, which was presided over by a judge of the Supreme Court of South Australia—a gentleman with a high reputation as an authority on constitutional matters—the Commission reported that the Commonwealth Bank can lend money to the Commonwealth Government free of interest. The only objection to implementing that proposal is that the Commission did not say that the Commonwealth Bank "shall" do so. That is an absurd argument.

Senator McBride: The honourable senator can lend to me money free of interest if he so desires.

Senator Darcey: I remind the Minister that banks do not lend money at all; they merely create credit out of nothing. It is time that the Minister either decided whether I am right or wrong, or held his tongue.

Senator McBride: What do the honourable senator's colleagues think about his views?

Senator Darcey: I do not intend to take any notice of inane interjections. At the last meeting of the Loan Council, Sir Harry Brown told that body that the Commonwealth Bank could advance £25,000,000 to meet the requirements of the States. Evidently, the Commonwealth Treasurer thinks that wars are won with money, but he should know that they are won by the issue of credit.

Senator McBride: They are won with arms and munitions.

Senator Darcey: The Commonwealth is spending thousands of pounds in an effort to convince the people of Australia that if they do not subscribe to war loans, the output of munitions will be adversely affected. Nothing could be more absurd. The total supply of gold in the world was estimated at £14,000,000,000 in 1939. Most of that gold was held by the United States of America, Great Britain and France, although Belgium, Holland and other small countries held various small amounts. But the remarkable thing is that Germany, Italy and Japan had not gold resources equal to those possessed by the small nation of Switzerland. Surely that proves that wars are not won with money. The Battle of Waterloo has not yet been paid for. At the Loan Council meeting, Mr. Fadden made it appear that money had to be conserved in order that the war may be won. When Sir Harry Brown, who is a most capable man, told the Loan Council that the Commonwealth Bank "can" advance £25,000,000 for the requirements of the States, Mr. Fadden said: "No; we want the money for the prosecution of the war." (Continued on page 5.)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Don't "Leave It to Labor"

Sir, —In view of the fact that we now have the Labor Party in office at Canberra, I would like to take this opportunity of placing it upon public record that I have no faith whatever in the Labor Party as such. I believe that acceptance of the suggestion that we can now sit back and wait for results would be a national disaster. A close study of Curtin's attitude towards financial policy clearly reveals that his policy differs very little from that pursued by Menzies and Fadden. That there are many splendid individuals in the Labor Party, no one will deny. Public opinion must be further mobilised behind all individual members of Parliament to make sure that—

(1) All money required for the maximum prosecution of the war shall be created on behalf of the Government;

(2) This money shall belong to the Government, representing the people, as an asset, and not as a debt;

(3) It shall be created for the mere cost of production, instead of carrying a perpetual interest charge;

(4) There shall be no further increases in taxation on any section of the people, unless the Government finds it necessary in isolated cases—i.e., individuals or companies making excess profits;

(5) That the Government shall take steps to ensure that any increase of the money supply shall not be offset by increased prices.

Mr. Curtin may use more bank credit than Mr. Fadden proposed to use. But, will it be debt-and-interest-free? That is the crux of the matter.—Yours etc., ERIC D BUTLER, Melbourne.

Prehistoric Press

Sir, — I feel that you may be interested to learn from a former political correspondent who has become a "realist," that, in my opinion, History Has Commenced.

I have been very amused this week by reading other people's comments in our prehistoric press. Yesterday (October 3), Mr. Coles delivered, in my opinion, the best speech of the session. He was restrained, dignified, concise and deliberate, the more impressive since it was obvious that his speech had not been prepared by the Bank Board, nor influenced by the more militant of the N.S.W. Socialists.

Mr. Coles' speech occupied about twenty-five minutes, and

SENATOR DARCEY "ON THE JOB."

(Continued from previous page.)

Senator McBride: What did the Premier of Tasmania say?

Senator Darcey: That is the trouble. We were let down by the "heads."

Senator McBride: The honourable senator should not get out of step with all of his colleagues.

Senator Darcey: The people should know what national credit really means. Unfortunately, many members of Parliament have only kindergarten knowledge of the subject. In trying to placate both Government supporters and members of the Opposition, I am afraid the Treasurer will fall between two fires. For three years I have urged that greater use be made of the national credit of this country, and I have successfully challenged members of the Government to controvert my statements in regard to finance generally. Only by the use of the national credit will Australia be saved from financial failure and repudiation.

Mr. Holt then occupied twenty-three minutes of his speech in a petulant but useless attack on Mr. Coles.

Previously, I had observed that the "Sydney Morning Herald" had allotted fifteen inches to Mr. McEwen's speech—judged by the gallery to be the worst of the session—and only twelve or thirteen inches to Mr. Beasley's speech, which I thought dealt with extreme measures in a restrained manner.

Moreover, the press, on the whole, deprecated Mr. Curtin's and Mr. Forde's speeches, and yet Mr. Coles and Mr. Wilson admitted that the points raised by these two Opposition members influenced their votes.

The press boosted Mr. Fadden's speech, but the opinion in the gallery was that it was mathematically confusing and not constructive.

Altogether, the press favoured the Government in allotment of space, in prominence and in "framework," shamelessly.

When, oh when, are we going to return to the good old days when a newspaper man was a MAN and not a piece of scatter-writing machinery, and who could fearlessly look a man in the eye and say, "I tell 'em as I see 'em"? —Yours, etc., "APPERCEPTION," Canberra.

Nationalisation

Sir, —I hope readers will have appreciated the homely and apt way in which "Avon" illustrates ("N.T.," Oct. 3) that change of policy can become effective without a change of ownership. He applies the idea to banking institutions, but similar principles apply to land tenure. It may surprise some Single Taxers to know that in the famous Communist Manifesto one of the measures listed reads: "Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes." Again, some altruists have a rooted objection to land being appropriated "for private gain."

If we agree that the aim or policy in all productive processes should be the satisfaction of human wants, we may also come to agree that, if the distribution of commodities to consumers is happily accomplished, then it is relatively of little importance who happens to be named on the Title Deeds of the land where the crops are grown or the factory is built.

Lawyers alone need to be critically alive to the ownership part of the business. Let them so frame the laws that "ownership" gives protection to users of the land from stupid interference by irresponsible citizens, and that "owners" cannot maintain any dog-in-the-manger attitudes which are anti-social. —Yours, etc., C. H. ALLEN, Millswood, S.A.

MONOPOLIES
and the
WAR EFFORT

The startling revelations about Australia's war effort by Mr. C. A. Morgan, M.H.R., which appeared in the "New Times" of July 11 under the heading, "The Bottle-Necking of Australia's War Effort," are now available in pamphlet form, under the title, "Monopolies and the War Effort."

Inquiries are coming in from all over Australia, and readers are requested to place their orders now. These sensational facts should be brought to the notice of every Australian. Order your copies NOW.

Price: 1/- per dozen; 6/6 per 100; 30/- per 500.

Address all communications to: United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I.

A Sensational Booklet

The Enemy Within
the EmpireA SHORT HISTORY OF THE BANK OF
ENGLAND

By ERIC D BUTLER

On the right is a facsimile of the front cover of our latest publication in booklet form.

It's a winner!

Those who read its contents when they appeared recently as a series of articles in the "New Times" will agree that it should be.

There was never such an exposure of "The Enemy Within." It's devastating!

52 pages. Price 7d posted. Dozen lots, 4/-, post-free.

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



THE CONSPIRATORS.

Dr. Schacht (of the German Reichsbank) and Mr. Montagu Norman (Governor of the Bank of England) talking things over before the Second World War.

"In view of the disastrous policy followed by the Bank of England after the last war and the part it is believed to have played in the re-armament of Germany, does not the right hon. gentleman (Sir John Simon) consider it time that the people knew a bit more about the proprietors of this unique concern?"

—Mr. R. Stokes, in the British House of Commons, April 16, 1940.

THE LITTLE-BUT O(WE) SO MUCH!

By FOOTLE

I have decided to give up the study of economics—as expounded by Canberra at any rate—until I've taken a course of astrology. Congo Pyke takes a mercenary view of my decision, and recommends me to concentrate on what the spiritist blokes call "apports."

He reckons there ought to be a fortune in contacting the spirits of departed tobacco magnates and oil kings as long as the intercourse can be kept on the plane of delivery of the goods. He believes, even as I do, that they are not likely to be more than average at anything else.

But that isn't my idea at all. All I feel is required is sufficient understanding of the occult to assist me in grasping the principal of finance. Finance isn't like the ordinary things of human experience. It works kind of upside down. For instance, if you want to succeed in business, the first thing you have to do is to make something that is likely to remain property—at least until the sale is complete. I mean to say, in the furniture business the goods have to be just as tangible to the customer as to the dealer. It wouldn't matter how convinced the dealer happened to be that he could sit in a chair he was trying to sell; if the customer saw him apparently supported in a sitting posture by nothing at all, the only trade likely to ensue would be that done by the hotel on the corner. Then is no doubt that in circumstances such as these, it would pay a fellow to give up commerce in favour of the stage before he got himself certified as one hundred per cent "nuts."

The immediate problem, however, which is slowly undermining my belief in the obvious, is not quite as spooky as that, but is causing me a spot of bother all the same. I am very distressed about it, because the majority of other people seem to have no trouble over it at all. What I mean is, that whereas well-meaning blokes go broke in making or growing things, it appears they could, if they only knew, make a steady two per cent, at least in busting things up. The problem of unmaking things at a profit and of paying a dividend upon the nothing, which used to be something, has been solved by modern economic science. The Budget of Mr. Fadden made this clear enough, although I am much too silly to grasp how it is done. Of course I've known myself such a long time that my silliness has ceased to disturb me, but the trouble doesn't end there. It seems, according to Mr. Fadden's pronouncement that I am not entitled to hold my head up in patriotic society; that, in fact, my stupidity is tantamount to fifth column activity. Yet I merely desire in my humble way to understand what Mr. Fadden appears to know so well, namely, how to make a profit, not only on nothing at all, but upon the unmaking of something.

I used to have a lot of bother over this profit on nothing at all, and believed, with the Roman poets, that out of nothing, nothing comes. That theory has been exploded, of course, for it is being continually demonstrated that everything we use today began as a row of noughts in a book somewhere. But, with my brain still reeling from this realisation, I am in no case to grasp, still less to expound, why willful destruction should show a profit.

To be precise, Pongo was complaining not so long before the war that he couldn't get any money anywhere to make portable fireproof houses for our hardy pioneers. He was told there was no money in it because the people who had the money didn't want portable homes and weren't pioneers, anyway. But, when the war started, the com-

pany went in war work and made some gadget which was calculated to render someone homeless somewhere in the world. That was a profitable transaction; so profitable that the Commonwealth Government, in its eagerness to bring the benefits of it to everyone in the land, is pro-posing drastic steps to ensure that everyone shares in the prosperity by way of compulsory loans.

This kind of altruism is extra ordinary enough, and, in calmed and more reflective moment would of itself probably fill me with misgiving. But, touching the profit of this investment in noise and nothingness, I feel moved to borrow a question from our own politicians and ask, "Where is the money for the profit to come from?" What I mean is, if, having nothing, we have to borrow money so as to make something, of which the destiny is to become nothing as effectively as possible, who pays the profit said to be involved? I mean to say, if you can pay a dividend of so much percent, on the money you've borrowed to produce nothing, why can't you pay a dividend right now on the same amount of nothing? I can't see how owing a lot more money is going to make this transaction easier. Which shows you what sort of a fool I am and what sort of a fool Mr. Fadden is not.

All the same, he seems to have shifted his ground a bit. He was always one of the blokes who used to assert that you couldn't get something for nothing, whereas he is now even more emphatic in his expression of the contrary belief, and calls a man a fifth columnist if he can't see where the profit comes from. He has certainly produced abundant evidence that, so long as we are annihilating something, we are really building securely for the future—a future that we shall have to enjoy in poverty caused by the cessation of annihilating processes.

I really wonder, in these circumstances, that the Government permits the activity of all those people who are limbering up the old muscles for a post-war reconstruction. The darn fellows will ruin us if they are allowed to behave in such an unscientific manner. If you were to ask me I'd say they're more fifth column than I am.

But, of course, Governments often adopt a peculiar attitude to certain social phenomena. I mean to say, when a bloke breaks a plate glass window deliberately or derails a train, the Government behaves as though it is seriously annoyed, whereas you would expect it to be the first to commend such profit-making activity. I also feel surprised at the relative lack of consideration shown to the unemployed—on a purely scientific basis—because next to the man who busts things up, the man who never works, either because he cannot or because he doesn't want to, is obviously conferring a great benefit upon society by producing nothing at all.

But, as I said before, I'm no good at these things, and really haven't the right to bother you about the business. Perhaps the only consoling thing I can say of myself in this mat-

THE ORIGINS OF "P.E.P."

McFadden's Speech in Congress in 1934

In a speech in Congress in 1934 (see "Congressional Record" for June 8, 1934), Congressman Louis T. McFadden referred to the activities of "P.E.P." Mr. McFadden first stated that data in his possession showed the existence of a well-organised plan for world control and a "hellish conspiracy to enslave and dominate the free peoples of the earth."

He then traced the history of the Fabian Society in Britain in which he asserted the planning was nurtured. Ninety per cent of the last British Labour Government were Fabians, and the society was extremely active and influential insinuating Socialism by stealth.

He continued:

"During 1931 this group of Fabians—among them Gerald Barr I. Nicolson and Kenneth Lindsay used a newspaper at that time owned by Lord Beaverbrook... It is understood that Beaverbrook upon becoming familiar with the plans, disapproved; whereupon they left his paper and continued to publish their ideas in another on means furnished according to my informant, by Mrs. Leonard Elmhirst formerly Dorothy Willard Straight, nee Whitney. Sir B. Blackett director, of the Bank of England became chairman of the group in 1931. From this time the organisation was called "Political and Economic Planning." Among other members were Israel Moses Sieff Sir Henry Bunbury, Graeme Haldane, I. Hodges, Lady Reading Daniel Neal and H. V. Hodson. The group split on international policy and... Israel Moses Sieff became chairman in July 1932... Israel Moses Sieff is an English Jew the director of a chain-store enterprise called 'Marks and Spencers. This enterprise declared a 40 per-cent, dividend during 1933, and was enabled to do so by the fact that it handled almost exclusively all imports from Soviet Russia, thus being able to undersell established British competitors... The Political and Economic Planning organisation is divided into many separate, well-organised and well-financed departments... the document 'Freedom and Planning' heretofore inserted in the "Congressional Record," is entirely secret and, to the best of my belief, has never before been published....In a Broadsheet dated April 25, 1933, they define their organisation as follows: 'A group of people who are actively engaged in distribution and production, in the social services, in town and country planning, in finance, in education, in research, in persuasion, and in various other key functions within the United Kingdom.' The Political and Economic Plan' group members hold heir meetings in a private room in the House of Commons. One of the first meetings was held on October 31, 1932, with the cognisance of Prime Minister MacDonald. Among those present were Malcolm MacDonald, son of the Prime Minister; J. H. Thomas, Sir Ernest Bennet, Lord Delawarr, Israel Moses Sieff, and Kenneth Lindsay, secretary of PEP. This plan is already in operation in the British Government by means of the Tariff Advisory Board, which in many of its powers is somewhat comparable to the National Recovery Administration in the United States.

"This group organisation has gathered all data and statistics obtained by Governmental and private organisations in administrative, industrial, social, educational, agricultural and other circles; and the army, navy and airport statistics are in their hands. This, has been made possible from the fact that the Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald, being a Fabian, the Political Economic

ter, is that, at last my feet are set in the direction of the road to UNDERSTANDING. I think I shall go to a cup reading tonight.

Plan—Fabian-group has had all archives at its disposal.

"Through the Tariff Advisory Board created in February, 1933 and headed by Sir George May, the control over industry and trade is being firmly established. This board works in direct connection with the Treasury and with it devises, tariff policy. It has also been granted the powers of a law court and can exact under oath that all information concerning industry and trade be given it

"Iron and steel, as also cotton, industrials in England, have been ordered by the Tariff Advisory Board to prepare and submit plans for the reorganisation of their industries and warned that should they fail to do so a plan for complete re-construction would be imposed upon them. The Tariff Advisory Board has been granted default powers and can, therefore, impose its plan. The Committee is, composed of Sir George May, Sydney Chapman, professor of economics and statistics, and Sir George Allan Powell, of the board and food council.

"An interesting bit of information has come to me in this connection to the effect that the Fabian group has close connections with the Foreign Policy Association in New York City. This association was largely sponsored by the late Paul Warburg, of Kuhn, Loeb and Company (the 'Father of the Federal Reserve Board'), and has received the close attention and support of Bernard M. Baruch and Felix M. Frankfurter,

"Many serious people in England feel that this Fabian organisation practically controls the British Government, and that this Government will soon be known as His Majesty's Soviet Government' it is asserted that both Prime Minister MacDonald and his son belong to the organisation and that the movement is well-financed and well organised and intends to practically Sovietise the English-speaking race.

"About three months after the passage of the National Recovery act in the United States, when Israel Moses Sieff was urged by members of his committee to show more activity he said, 'Let us go slowly for a while and wait and see how our plan carries out in America.'"

INCONCEIVABLE!

"It is inconceivable that British foreign policy should flourish in an enforced alliance with, and largely controlled by, the money market of the world and the Bank for International Settlements, and almost innumerable international industrial and financial combines."

—Extract from "Economic Tribulation," by Vincent C. Vickers, Director of the Bank of England, 1910 to 1919.

Eric Butler Plans Further Activities

Mr. Eric Butler is making plans for further activities in the immediate future. He desires to arrange as many meetings in Victorian country centres before Christmas as possible.

All those supporters desirous of making use of Mr. Butler's services are asked to communicate with him care of the "New Times," Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne—NOW!

IS CHINA A DEMOCRACY?

Asks DARLEY DALE

I was staggered! The bookshop window was nearly filled with copies of the book and every front-cover shouted at me: "Two Pacific Democracies: China and Australia." It was the last straw. I thought of the Finns, the Yanks, the Bolsheviks, and all the other "leopards" whose "spots" had been mysteriously and swiftly changed for them by a facile press. Now China, under a MILITARY-FINANCIAL DICTATORSHIP, as I thought, was described as a Democracy!

I thought of all I had read about the domination of China by the modern war-lords, headed by Chiang Kai-Shek, and the more subtle, but probably over-riding, domination of China by the bankers, headed by T. V. Soong (whose daughter married Chiang Kai-Shek), I remembered reading in the Melbourne "Herald" of September 27, that "At the invitation of the Chinese Government, SIR OTTO NIEMEYER will head a financial and economic mission to China. Sir Otto was recently in Washington consulting American officials."

TRANSLATION ERROR?

Was I wrong, I wondered, in translating that news item? I had done so as follows:

"At the invitation of Chinese bankers—issued, for appearance sake, by the subservient Chinese Government—Sir Otto Niemeyer (international financier, representing the so-called Bank 'of England', the Bank of International Settlements, and God knows what other anti-democratic interests) will inspect the international financiers' debt-farm known as China. He may condescend to let the Chinese Government pawn the Chinese people (who will NOT be consulted) more completely to international financiers in return for war supplies provided by the British and American peoples. Once upon a time a 'British' financier would make sure a proposition was 'Al at Lloyds,' but nowadays he has to make sure it is 'O.K. at Wall Street' (a change in financial jargon due to change in the financial world's centre-of-gravity), therefore, Sir Otto has been in America before going to China."

Well, I thought, if I could be mistaken in translating a news item in an Australian daily newspaper into plain English, couldn't the Chinese author of the book be more easily mistaken in translating his ideas into English? Perhaps he got "Democracy" and "Dictatorship" mixed up. Did he know our definitions of Democracy—"Government of the people, BY the people, for the people"—a society in which the people get what THEY want—and so on? Did he realise that well-informed Australians don't regard a country as being a real Democracy unless its people dictate POLICY, especially financial policy?

WE THOUGHT WE WERE

Then I thought about Sir Otto again, and offered up a little prayer for the Chinese. I remembered that in 1930 two men with un-British names and un-British interests and affiliations came to this British country. They were Sir Otto Niemeyer and Professor Theodor Emanuel Guggenheim Gregory. Sir Otto gave instructions to our State and Federal Governments. Although Australians were producing real wealth faster than ever before, faster, in fact, than they were allowed to buy it, and they could have produced it much faster, Sir Otto said:

" . . . the standard of living in Australia has reached a point which is economically beyond the capacity of the country to bear . . . the mere fact of my presence here and the growing co-operation between the present Commonwealth Bank and the Bank of England as a sister central bank may, I think, be claimed as a sign of good-will from responsible authorities . . . But . . . Australia MUST reassure the work as to the direction in which she is going, financially and economically . . ."

The Australian Governments OBEYED this alien's preposterous pontifical demand that our purchasing power be savagely reduced. It was quite unnecessary, of course, and the people were not consulted, although THEY had to pull in their belts and live on short rations. Workers lost their homes, businessmen and farmers went bankrupt; the physical and mental suffering was incalculable.

I wondered if this Chinese author would describe Australia

in 1930 as a self-governing Democracy! Perhaps I should buy his book and examine his ideas about Democracy and his extraordinary claim that China already enjoyed that happy state. I pulled out the few coins in my pocket and eyed them ruefully. I reflected that our "Democratic" Government, without the consent of my fellow-citizens and myself, had taken away so much of our slender incomes that we couldn't buy some of the foodstuffs going to waste, much less delve into this Oriental mystery. I turned away from the bookshop and wended my way home, intending to spend my Saturday afternoon recovering from this blow at my preconceptions.

ANY EVIDENCE?

But I couldn't dismiss the matter from my mind. I told my wife about it. She was sympathetic, but not informative. I wished I could ask someone who had lived in China. I soon had my chance. Our Chinese fruiterer called in for a little friendly

argument with my wife about the price of vegetables. Perhaps that wasn't exactly what he came for, but that's what he got. My wife says she is a "business woman." When I reproach her, she says the cost of living drives her to it. When she had done what she could to hasten our visitor on the road to bankruptcy, I confronted him and threw the gauntlet at his feet "John," I said bluntly, "as man to man, is China a Democracy?" But he had given away enough for one day, apparently. "No savee" said he, with true Oriental cunning. He looked at me queerly. I believe he thought I was trying to pull his leg. Then, giving me a broad grin to show there was no ill feeling, he departed abruptly.

I wished I could get the views of someone who had read the book. Believe it or not, this second wish was fulfilled as promptly as the first. I opened a daily newspaper at random and almost immediately came across the heading, "Is China Democratic?" I felt like Sherlock Holmes on the brink of one of his greater triumphs. A gentleman calling himself "The Bookworm" had wormed what he could out of the book and presented a summary of his research under this heading. When I finished reading this tabloid review I felt like Sherlock Holmes at his lowest ebb. It boiled down to this: China has a Draft Constitution "that certainly has a democratic complexion." (So has Russia, I reflected.) It bestows the political rights of free adult franchise, communal ownership of the land, and initiative referendum and recall. The author's point, said the reviewer, "is that the belief in liberty, equality and fraternity has passed the theoretic stage in China, and is being translated into practical action." I could find NO EVIDENCE that Democracy is a functioning reality in China.

My wife brought me back to earth. "You can't DO anything about Democracy in China, but you CAN write to our M.P. demanding no increases in debt, taxation or prices," she said. "But first of all, PLEASE mow the lawn."

BRITISH BUREAUCRACY SATIRISED

FIREWATCHERS' ACT, 1941. Equipment to be carried by all firewatchers:

- (1) Respirator.
- (2) Axe, stuck in belt.
- (3) One stirrup-pump carried over left shoulder.
- (4) One long-handled shovel to be carried over left shoulder.
- (5) One extending ladder to be carried over right shoulder.
- (6) One belt to go round the waist, with hooks (10) to carry six full sandbags and four buckets (two gallons) of clean water.
- (7) Two wet blankets to be slung around the neck.
- (8) One tin hat, with upturned brim, to carry spare clean water.
- (9) Spare sand to be carried in all pockets.
- (10) One full box of matches, to light all incendiary bombs, which have failed to ignite.

Firewatchers should be on duty all night and all day, and should be able to deal with all types of bombs (incendiaries, fire - bombs, gas, casualties, D.A.s, H.E.s, B.F.s and others), and should be able to smell out fires by their sense of smell. All olfactory organs to be examined by the M.O.H. every six months. In their spare time they should be able to assist the Wardens and the officers of the Casualty Bureau.

This Act is not to be confused with the Acrobats Act of 1756.

This scheme applies to all unfit persons for H.M. Forces and ladies unfit for service with the W.A.A.C.s. Red Tape Office, S.W.

.....1941.
(Reprinted from the "Social Creditor," England.)

UNORTHODOX VOICE IN NEW YORK

That "Money," a New York monthly, doesn't see eye to eye with its neighbours in Wall Street or the ballyhoo-factories called newspaper offices, is indicated by the following "pertinent pars." from the September issue:

High Octane Gas to Japan was embargoed July '40. But exports jumped in Sept. to a new high. Cause—a new definition of aviation gasoline. So, why should Japan worry about '41 decrees?

"**Boston-Herald**," Roosevelt supporter, Aug. 3—"Where are the guns, tanks, grenades, even rifles for the infantry to train? Have they gone to the British? Are they going to the Muscovites? Or haven't we made any for all the taxes and talk? —rushed all these youths into service with nothing for them to do—turning them into grass cutters, ditch diggers, bored and disgusted barracks steps loafers. —We've been fully militarised for a year, and we couldn't lick the Boy Scouts if they threw stones."

U.S. Debt is piling up at the rate of \$16,650 a minute. It is now 50 billions; almost twice the world war debt. Each person, from babies up, owes now \$377 on this Federal debt alone.

The Stock Market did not react to the Churchill-Roosevelt conference. Meaning: It was a flop. This year's reports from the chairman of the "Big Five" banks in England are interesting because they tell of the enormous sums of money created by the banking system for war purposes, but it is nothing short of astonishing to find some bankers still clinging to the childish notion that banking consists in taking money in at one end of the counter and lending part of it out at the other.

Sumner Welles' New Order: A new league of nations, points to more international control, such as now maintains in the money system. Our new order: Smash the international money racket, establish a scientific economy so all our people may have the power to consume what we can so abundantly produce, then the need to sell in a foreign market to get local money will cease, and the cause of war will, too.

A New York Editor has discovered that we can't stop a blitz with gold. Russia sent gold out refused to take it back. What is this gold-darned world coming to? **Nudeal's major problem** is to make debts higher, interest larger. Henry Corn-Wallace, by destroying billions in food crops while a third of the nation went half-starved, raised debts a lot. For this high service to finance Corn-Wallace was retired up with high honour. But war is a better destroyer. Now Nudeal depends on the Three Old Men, Stimson, Knox and Glass. Watch the debts rise

Union Now means to subjugate a dozen nations, including U.S.A., to a One Grand Dictatorship that would make Hitler and Stalin look like an atom after Einstein had worked it over. Ask Dies to investigate Union Now.

U.S. Democracy and Russian Communism fighting Finnish Democracy and National Socialism! All over a matter of bookkeeping; and to think that only Finland paid her debts!

The Secret of Nazi organising is

(1) decentralised authority in (2) a centralised organisation. Example: (2) issues a general order, no details, no petty questions, as clear a path for army advance; then (1) each unit (tank, motorcycle) takes authority and full responsibility, without let or hindrance from above. In industry and trade it is the same. Mistakes happen with decentralised authority, but are less costly than red tape.

The Alberta Bank Bill, to give the Province its own bank, lost in the Dominion Parliament. Grounds—no constitutional right to grant it. What a farce!

Raise less wheat and win the war! was the Canadian cry last spring. In Australia it is destroy fruits . . . throwing God's gifts back in His face.

Aluminium Merry-Go-Round: 20 million lbs. donated for defence by housewives; sold by Government to 30 smelters who will make a net profit of \$700,000; smelters will sell to civilian industries (scrap metal no good for 'planes), another profit; housewives buy back the pots.

British Major Victor Cazalet wrote his superior, David Margesson, Minister of War and former Tory Whip: "Stimson is a very decent, honest pro-British man." . . . "Knox is passionately anxious for America to come into the war at once." . . . "The President is the greatest dictator of all time." . . . "If America came into the war tomorrow she would find just as we did, that she has practically nothing with which to make war."—From paper read by Senator Wheeler in Senate, July 28. Internationalists say it takes two to make a fight. So unite all nations into one, then war is impossible. Our better way—all commit suicide except one, then let him rule his world in peace.

\$50 a Month for our oldster would bankrupt America, but the billions handed over to the Communist Party of Russia only make us prosperous. How long, O Lord how long!

CONDITIONS IN NEW ZEALAND

The three letters reprinted hereunder are selected from several with the same implication appearing in the correspondence columns of ONE issue (Sept. 10) of "John A. Lee's weekly," Auckland:

I intend to address this communication to the member for the district, but as I suspect he may be merely a Labour "yes-man," gone Tory-Capitalistic, "I am taking the liberty of informing you (as a true-blue Labour man) of a further example of Fraser-Nash-Semple indifference to the lot of the common soldier. I am a married man, married after May 1940, and have been conscripted for overseas service. I now desire, before proceeding overseas, to transfer my small home to my wife's name as a precaution for her security. Upon making inquiries at the Stamp Duty Department, I find that instead of the usual fee payable for the transfer of property (22/- per £100) I am required to pay £5 per £100 on Deed of Gift, which will amount to £40 in my case. And so I am supposed to accept, cheerfully, army pay, which is about a fifth of my civil wage, risk my life and my wife's happiness, and to pay the country for which I am to make these sacrifices, £40 for transferring my home to my wife's name. If I was sure that this sacrifice was for the common good, I would make it willingly, but it seems that one is to fight for the privilege of paying interest on the National Debt System and for post-war soup kitchens. I do not expect that by merely writing to you this matter can be remedied, but the thought occurs to me that knowledge of the difficulty a married soldier is in, when wishing to transfer his property, may be able to be employed by you as a further nail in the long overdue coffin of the Traitor Labour Party.

* * * *

Would you please kindly note on the 5th of this present month I became the age of 60 years. The firm I was employed by paid me off owing to my advanced age. After a few days trying to get employment without success, I then went to the Placement Office. I was told to go to the Social Security. Now, after waiting three weeks I was given the sum of £2/9/7. All I will receive will be 30/- per week, and I am paying 35/- per week rent. I have again been, today, to the Placement Office, and was told there was nothing they could offer me. Now, Mr. Lee, would you bring this up in the House and ask if there is no other means of destroy-

ing a family than by fear and want? When war broke out in 1914, I at once offered my services, and passed the doctor medically fit. When this present war came, I offered my service for overseas or any way. I was told I was over age. This last three weeks I have tried on two occasions to join up to guard the vital points, but I am told I am too old, although I am physically fit and in the best of health. My God, what have I to do to keep a roof over my wife's head, who is just back from hospital? I am dragged down lower than a coolie's condition.

* * *

I was listening to Parliament the other night and I heard a Labour member state that there were no unemployed fit men in New Zealand. Well, I am afraid he is all wrong. I am a married woman with two school children, and my husband, a fit man of 34 years, has been out of work three months. We get sustenance, £2/1/- per week, to keep the four of us; 15/- rent which we can't pay and have been threatened to be put out on account of that. He was offered work at Klondyke, about 60 miles from here, and because he refused that, we had to go for two weeks without any sustenance at all. We can't keep two homes going, and this is what our Labour Government is doing for us, and we are only one family of many in Timaru.

ANGLICANS PLEASE NOTE!

(Continued from Page 1.)

mocracy? Then we must secure certain things, and here, in brief, they are:

"We must resume control of money. To create money is a Crown prerogative. In the main, it has passed unawares into PRIVATE BANKING HANDS.

"Money must reach consumers in adequate quantities. That is not so today, when money possessed by individual members of industrial communities is proving to be more and more inadequate to purchase the goods, which they have produced in their corporate capacity, at prices which must be charged to cover costs."

SOME AMERICAN VIEWS ON FEDERAL UNION

The "San Francisco Chronicle" published on June 16 the answers of five prominent Californians to the question, "What is your view of the merit and practicability of the suggestion that the nations of the Western Hemisphere and Great Britain unite in a federal union?"

Francis H. Herrick, associate professor of European History at Mill College, who has some knowledge of the points at issue, wrote:

"The question as, I understand it, includes Latin America and excludes those parts of the British Empire, other than Great Britain, which are not in the Western Hemisphere. Obviously the Latin American countries, so jealously independent even of each other, would never willingly accept union with the more numerous and powerful English-speaking peoples. Nor would the British accept a union, which would cut them off from most of the Empire. Taken literally, such a proposal is clearly without merit.

"Even a federal union of the United States and the British Empire is impracticable. The ideas of union fundamental to the creation and growth of the United States were closely associated with territorial and cultural homogeneity. Although necessities of defence or moments of imperialism have brought outlying regions under our control, we have steadily resisted the admission to the federal system of any territories outside the solid block of the forty-eight States.

"The British Empire, on the other hand, glories in its far-flung lands and recognises the cultural dissimilarity of its parts. India, the Crown colonies and the mandated territories include such a variety of peoples and governments that simple union would be impossible except on the basis of despotism. Union and representation in Westminster was tried in Ireland, but it has failed. Union of neighbouring provinces and responsible governments was tried in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, and it succeeded. Years of growth have produced a Commonwealth with independent parliaments under one crown, which is almost the antithesis of a union of many lands and peoples under one parliament.

"Much as we sympathise with the intentions of advocates of such a federal union, we must recognise that it would serve no useful purpose at the present time. Every nerve of the British is strained to sustain the war, and they are not likely to appreciate a proposal, which would indeed join the re-

sources of the United States to their own, but only at the price of subordination of the institutions they are defending. They do not ask and we should not suggest that the supplies which they sorely need should be delivered wrapped in a new constitution."

He is the only democrat among the contributors; and he is the only one of them who looks at the facts.

Rabbi Irving F. Reichert, of San Francisco's Congregation of Emanu-El, on the other hand, is keenly in favour of union, and apparently thinks that it is the only alternative to chaos. He asks, "But if the Axis should be defeated, what then? Without an international federal union, our world must certainly revert to its old predatory nationalisms . . ." Nationalisms, maybe, but not necessarily 'predatory.'

"Objectors to the plan call it a scheme to salvage British Imperialism. Others criticise it as an attempt to substitute Anglo-American imperialism. Both are mistaken. **Its object is to begin a world state that will end all narrow nationalisms and imperialisms.**" (Our emphasis.)

The second of the three great advantages he quotes is:—

"Even were the British Isles taken, the struggle could continue effectively from Canada. The British Fleet could not be surrendered by England. It would be controlled by the union."

Finally, Rabbi Reichert looks forward to an international "arrangement" in which "economic, political, social and cultural values would be humanly fostered for the good of all and the hurt of none." How tepid!

Mr. Crum, a San Francisco lawyer, in saying that the United States was already committed to policies that led inevitably to Federal Union, concludes by letting the cat out of the bag:—

"In the coming struggle, a federal union of the democracies would unify our efforts, would tend to insure against the reckless and stupid peace of 1919. It would begin to make positive our position (which we have certainly assumed) as the moral leader of the world. **It would be the instrument to make effective our policies and our aims.**" (Our emphasis.)

"NEW TIMES" SHOPPING GUIDE AND BUSINESS DIRECTORY

PATRONISE THESE ADVERTISERS. Their Advertisement Helps Your Paper. Say You Saw It in the "New Times."

ASCOT VALE.
A. J. AMESS, 390 Mt. Alexander Rd. (next Tram Sheds). Motor Garage. Just Price Discount — Repairs and Supplies.

BLACKBURN.
"A" GRADE MOTOR ENGINEERS, Station Garage, Whitehorse Road, WX1430.

BOX HILL.
BOX HILL FURNISHING CO. 247-9 Station St. Cash or Terms. CHAS. L. COX, TAILOR, Men's and Boys' Wear. 285 Station Street CHEMIST, F. Cheshire, For Your Prescriptions. 270 Station Street. COOL DRINKS, Sweets, Smokes. R. Dannock, 1124 Whitehorse Road. FURNITURE REMOVERS. Gill Bros., 254 Station St. WX2073 GROCER, W. M. Anderson, 14 Main St. WX1233. HAIRDRESSER and Tobacconist. L. Larsen, Station St., op. Gilpin's. IRONMONGER & SPORTS STORE F. P. Park, 10 Main St. WX1290. WATCHMAKER and Jeweller. Barnes, 82 Main Street Repairs.

CITY.
BLINDS of every sort. Car curtains repaired. T. Pettit, 235a Queen St. CAKES, PASTRY, etc. Home-made "Clovelly." The Block, Elizabeth Street. Cent. 255. DAVIS, 563 Bourke St Royal Medal Milkery, Separators, Engines. DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT BOOKSHOP, 166 Lit Collins St. ELECTRO-PLATING.—Nickel, Silver and Chromium Plating. Highest Grade Work only. W. R. SPEAKMAN, 69 Latrobe st, Melbourne. MAISON MERLIN, Natl. Bk. Bldg., 271 Col. St, Ladies' Hairdressers. OPTICIAN and Hearing Aids. 4th Floor, 57 Swanston St. F5566.

FAIRFIELD.
BUTCHER, 93 Station Street. Arthur B. Heath Solicits Your Patronage.

FOOTSCRAY.
BOOT REPAIRS. A. A. Taylor, Station Ramp, While U Wait Service. NU-BAKE. Bakers and Pastry cooks, opp. Woolworths. Best bread, 8d large. Down with the profiteer.

GLENFERRIE.
OPTICIAN, W. W. Nicholls. 100 Glenferrie Road. Haw. 5845. SUITS to order from 70/-. H.5813. A. Sutherland, 184 Glenferrie road.

IVANHOE.
BOOT REPAIRS, J. Fraser solicits your custom. 130 Upper H'berg Rd UPHOLSTERER, Blinds and Bedding. Duke's, 11 H'berg Road. Ivan. 626.

KEW.
ANDERSON'S, 141 High St. Authorised Newsagent. Haw. 1145. C. KENNEDY, Grocer, Haw. 229. Opp. Cemetery Clock, Parkhill Rd. DRY CLEANING, Depot & Library A. I. Fraser, 182 High St. H.3733. E. WHITE, 109 High Street. Confectionery and Smokes. GIFTS, & All Jewellery Repairs. Old Gold Bought. Greaves, opp. Rialto. IMPERIAL DAIRY, R. H. Kent, 9 Brougham Street. Haw. 3243. MOTOR GARAGE, Kew Junction Service Station, Cr. High and Denmark Streets. Haw. 6455.

MORELAND.
BOOT REPAIRS, J. T. Nolan, Holmes St., 4 doors Moreland Rd.

NORTH FITZROY.
KEITH PARLON, The Fitzroy Tailor, 45 Best Street JW 1555.

SANDRINGHAM.
A. RYAN, opp. Stn., Shoe Repairs. Tennis Racquets Restring from 7/0 GROCERY, McKAY & WHITE, Bay Rd., opp. Theatre. XW1924.

ST. KILDA.
HARVEY'S COFFEE GARDEN. Sweets, Smokes. 227 Barkly Street.

SPRINGVALE.
DAIRY, M. Bowler. Buckingham Ave. R. MACKAY & SONS. General Storekeepers. UM 9269.

WILLIAMSTOWN.
DUNSTAN, DAIRYMAN. 28 Station Rd. Phone: Wtown 124