

ON OTHER PAGES

Straws in the Wind.
(Page 4.)
Sen. Darcey's Budget
Speech. (Page 3.)
This Jewish Business.
(Page 6.)
Short Story.
(Page 4.)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for
transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

Vol. 8. No. 2. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JAN. 16, 1942.

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).

Justice for Returned Men Demanded

M.H.R. Cites "Typical" Case

Mr. C. A. Morgan (M.H.R. for Reid) sent us the "Hansard" report of his recent speech, which we reprint hereunder in the interests of our fighting men:

I desire to refer to the attitude of the Repatriation Department towards returned soldiers and their dependants regarding claims for pensions. The case that I propose to cite is typical of a number which have come to my notice since I became a member of this chamber.

Lance Corporal Frederick W. Hughes, a member of the 55th Battalion in the last war, was wounded on active service, and as the result, one of his legs was amputated. From that time until his death a year ago, he walked with the assistance of crutches. His health was never again robust. His disability was recognised by the Repatriation Department, and during his lifetime he and his dependants were awarded a pension of £3/4/6 a week. In June, 1940, he suffered a stroke, and was taken to the Randwick Military Hospital. When the officials asked what side of his body had been affected by the stroke, they were informed that it was the same side as that on which the leg had been amputated. A certificate to this effect was given by Dr. Green of Punchbowl, who had attended Hughes for seventeen years. The hospital officials were satisfied with the certificate, and sent no departmental medical officer to verify the details. Hughes was then admitted to the institution, but failed to regain consciousness and died a fortnight later. His death was certified as having been due to cerebral haemorrhage. The pension payable to him and his wife and two children ceased immediately, although it was due to be paid on the day following his death. Incidentally, his wife had a little shop which returned to her a small income. This was closed at the time of Hughes' death and burial. The widow experienced considerable difficulty in obtaining

any payments for some days from the department, but subsequently, the pension was reduced to £1/4/6 a week for herself and two children. Then she applied to the Repatriation Commission for a war widow's pension but it was not until October 28, 1940—nine months later—that the matter was dealt with by the War Pensions Entitlement Tribunal. Her claim was disallowed on the ground that the death was not due to war disabilities. In reaching its decision the commission relied upon an opinion of a Melbourne specialist, who had never attended Hughes, and evidently disregarded a considerable volume of evidence by doctors and laymen of repute who had known him during his lifetime. Some time later when she approached me to intercede with the Repatriation Department on her behalf, the matter was revived and she obtained further

(Continued on page 7.)

"ROOT-CAUSES" OF HITLER

The London "Times" announces an advance in economic opinion. Apparently the advance has been accomplished simultaneously in Washington and New York. Whether this step has been taken to catch up with Social Crediters (who are more than one short step ahead) or to induce the "Times" to catch up with Wall Street is not clear.

Russia seems to have been the unconscious instrument of enlightenment. Russia is "anxious" to pay for everything she receives. We have no objection. It would hardly be our business to object to "Russia's" paying for what she didn't receive, or to object to her paying for what she received to someone she didn't receive it from. But these are matters for the consideration primarily of Russian citizens and American munition workers. The credit necessary to finance supplies to Russia is not to be a "debt-free" payment, like the credits the Australians have been asking for. It will be merely an "interest-free" payment postponed until five years after the war, and then payable in kind over a period of ten years. £250,000,000 distributed in this way may not have appreciable results; but where American manufacturers are to get the money to "buy" the raw materials which will form part of the payment, and American consumers the money to buy the commodities which will form another part are, alike, matters for Americans to consider. Somehow or other the "Times" seems to think that the procedure suggested avoids the creation of international debts and credits, and shows "a great advance towards the realistic treatment of war finance. "The return of goods for is, of course, realistic. But what this has to do with financing "perse" is not by any means alone

American unemployed, unless some illumination dawns concerning the inadequacy of the wage system, to distribute goods, will have the opportunity of complaining to their union bosses about "Russian dumping" instead of being justified in complaining in the same heedless quarters about high prices—i.e., prices their wages cannot cancel over the counter.

Whether this illumination is likely to constitute a further "advance of opinion" in America or not, it seems to be still far from the "Times." However "determined" the American administration may be "to avoid the mistakes made after the last war" the mistake of making work for "free" people does not seem down for avoidance. By undertaking to provide a decent standard of life for the world's millions, at least every American man and woman who wants work will get work (to provide a decent standard for someone else!). This is said to be getting "at the root causes of the economic evils which prepared the way for Hitler." It is, on the contrary, the continuation of root causes which will pave the way towards somebody's having to get rid of a super-Hitler. That Hitler had "root causes" in economics must not be taken to be the "Times's" way of saying that he is the child of the Devil. It is, however, an advance.

T

SUNDRY NOTES ON THE NEWS

The industrial chaos and resultant dislocation of our war effort arising from the ill-considered call-up is indicated by some of the following news-items:

War Jobs Delayed.—The following report appeared in the Melbourne "Herald" of January 1: "A serious labour shortage is holding up important war orders in N.S.W. engineering works." 'Wanted urgently' is a common sign outside engineering shops in Sydney, both skilled and unskilled workers being needed. Some managers producing machine tools said the need was desperate; in desperation one factory has engaged five Chinese as spray-painters."

Wharf Blockages. — Senator Keane recently personally visited the wharves to inspect the piled up goods. At the delivery end the trouble was found to be caused by petrol restrictions imposed on forwarding agents. As a result of this, additional storage facilities have to be built at the wharves—and so one blunder leads to another.

Brick Supply Muddle.—Mr. B. A. Mosley, N.S.W. Secretary of the Brickmakers' Council, is reported in the "Herald" of January 5 as saying that labour shortage had prevented 16 to 18 brick-yards from opening. Since bricks were urgently needed for air raid shelters and other defence works, Mr. Mosley wanted to know which was wanted: "Bricks or brick-makers." This is just another effect of bureaucracy run riot.

The Milk Muddle.—According to the Milk Board, as reported in the "Herald" of January 5, 91% of single milk carters and 58% of married carters are eligible for the call-up. Apparently the health of the civil population, who produce the soldiers' war needs, is of no consequence. The theoretical master minds responsible for the call-up seem to think that a trench full of soldiers is all that is necessary; the lessons of Greece and Crete have been wasted on these super-planners.

The Vegetable Plot: A petition signed by 197 South Australian market-gardeners (according to the "Herald" of January 5) will be sent to the Ministers for Munitions and the Navy, seeking an enquiry by the Commonwealth into the activities of unnaturalised market-gardeners. The petition claims that Italians and Bulgarians are allowed to work their gardens while military duties are causing hardship on Australian-born gardeners. This is just another illustration of irrespon-

(Continued on page 7.)

BISHOP BARNES BLUNDERS

The Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Barnes, has, in the name of freedom, denounced control of the industrial machine by Big Business and its chiefs. His solution, presumably also in the name of freedom, is control by the State.

"Some might argue," he added, "that, if the State is given the powers which a Socialist State must obviously have under modern conditions, it would become a tyrannical bureaucracy."

They might do more than argue, they might point to examples; but Dr. Barnes thinks that independent Christian criticism would be the solution to that tendency to tyrannical bureaucracy.

Here again is the confusion of words and deeds: even the wisest criticism is no use unless the critics have some sanctions to back up their words, and it is the essence of democracy that channels to make such criticism effective are an essential part of the framework of government. To transfer power from the individual to the bureaucrat or the State is

This Week's Gem

From last Monday's "Herald":

ADELAIDE. — Horace Ratliff—Communist, former internee, and hungerstriker, for whose sake thousands of New South Wales Workers went on strike six months ago—arrived in Adelaide to-day, "urging "no strikes" and continuity of production for an all-in War effort.

He plans to address factory gate meetings and other gatherings. Ratliff is in Adelaide at the invitation of, the newly-formed political, rights committee, whose secretary is the secretary of the State branch of the Federated ironworkers' Association (Mr. Maclean).

Ratliff said he would also urge that the Australian Communist Party be legalised, contending that Communists throughout the world had always led the fight against Fascism and Nazism.

How to Win the War — and the Peace

A Challenge to Every Britisher

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

(Continued from issue of December 12.)

Some people object to the statement that the banks create the bulk of the money for war loans. They point out that the lists of subscribers reveal the names of other companies and individuals. This is perfectly true. The banks don't want the fact advertised that they are obtaining a further lien on the assets of the nation at no cost to themselves.

There are not many people to-day who have so much "spare" money that they can invest it in war loans. However, they may have assets—houses or other property. The banks are prepared to lend them money against these assets. Now note: The bank obtains the lien on the real assets at no cost to itself, because it manufactures the "money—credit—lent, at no cost to itself. The man who has borrowed the money invests it in the war loan and receives in exchange a Government bond, a gilt-edged security. He can, if he so desires, lodge this bond as security for a further loan from the bank when the next loan is floated. By this policy the banks keep discreetly in the background. If we have a repetition of the banking policy adopted after the last war, the banks will create a depression by curtailing their loans and by asking their clients to reduce their overdrafts. Then many of those who will have mortgaged their assets to the banks in order to obtain money to buy war bonds will be unable to repay the banks and will lose or sacrifice both their assets and their bonds. This happened after the last war, and it will happen again unless a halt is called.

It will be too late to talk about dealing with the matter after the war. We must face the issue NOW—that is, if we desire to win the war and the peace.

LORD PRIVY SEAL HITS OUT

This treasonable racket has been exposed time and time again; but the most damning exposure has been made by the Rt. Hon. Thos. Johnson, P.C., Lord Privy Seal in the Macdonald Government, in his book, "The Financiers and the Nation." The following extracts should be brought under the notice of every loyal Britisher:—

"As each war loan became exhausted the lenders upon the first lower interest war loans were permitted to transfer into the later

higher interest loans, and usurer's interest upon credit was added to the national burden, so that to-day the national burden is insupportable and the nation staggers along cutting the bread and cheese of its poor and starving the social services in a vain attempt to meet the charges incurred in the Great War loan ramps.

"The report of the Cunliffe Committee (1921) relates the story of the progressive piling up of our war debt burdens. But it is in no wise a complete chronicle of usury in war-time, nor did its authors intend it to be. We find in its pages no reference or hint of the magical process by which, while the nation struggled almost at death's door for its very existence, and while masses of our manhood were daily being blown into bundles of bloody rags, our banking fraternities continued to create for themselves a great volume of new credit and to lend that credit to us at interest, indeed, at progressively increased interest; no reference to the fact that this manufacture of bankers' credit, some portion, variously estimated in amount, of what now stands as the public debt, was simply fabricated for private ends and was not a bona-fide loan of real wealth to the nation.

"Professor Soddy has estimated that the bankers actually created two thousand million pounds, no less, of this bank credit, and lent it out to us at 5 per cent . . .

"We must note another, even more amazing and more impudent, of the methods of debt and interest concoction in these delirious war times. The banks actually issued circulars to thousands of their customers inviting them to apply for a portion of the new war loan and to borrow credit from the banks for that purpose at 3 per cent.

"The customer was to put up no money for his war loan, no margin, no securities. The bank was to supply the credit, or rather was to back the customers' credit and was to charge the customer 3 per cent, interest for so doing; but the State was pledging itself to pay 4½ per cent, interest on the war loan which the customer was purchasing with his 3 per cent, money.

"The customer, after allowing for his income tax, etc., was clearly 1 per cent, better off on the deal. It is indeed difficult to write in cold blood of these financial dodges, arranged between the city and the Treasury and committed upon a nation in extremis.

"In March, 1916, the Bank of England, without any apparent sense of shame, issued press advertisements which ran:—'If you cannot fight, you can help your country by investing all you can in 5 per cent Exchequer bonds. Unlike the soldier, the investor runs no risk.'

"Yet all these efforts surely paled before the shameless greed of the third great war loan, in January, 1917. No foreign conqueror could have devised a more complete robbery and enslavement of the British nation.

"The rate of interest in war loan was jumped to 5 per cent, (or at the option of the investor, 4 per cent, free of income tax, until October, 1942) and the holders of previous war loans and Treasury bills and war expenditure certificates were invited to come in and convert their old stock into the higher rates of booty, and, for each £100 of stock in the new loan, only £95 had to be subscribed, so that the rate of interest really had been raised to 5½ per cent. . .

"But the controllers of the Money Power, the men, who cold-bloodedly raised their demands upon their fellow-countrymen with every German advance in the field, and with every German U-boat campaign at sea; the men who organised the creation of hundreds of millions of unnecessary debt; the men who inflated rates of interest; the men who, as the price of providing credits to free us from the threat of German slavery, enmeshed us in an interest burden of a million pounds per day—it is they whose war-time plunderings I have sought to record.

"The machinations of the organised Money Power during the stress of war provide the most convincing evidence that the nation must be the sole creator of money, and the guardian and banker of the savings and thrift of its citizens, if well-being and security are ever to be the common lot of man."

IN AUSTRALIA, TOO

A similar policy was pursued by the banks in this country. Professor A. L. G. Mackay, in his book, "The Australian Banking and Credit System," writes:—

"The usual process was for the banks to guarantee a certain portion of the loan, and, if the public did not subscribe liberally, then the banks became responsible for that proportion of the loan. Normally, an individual would apply for an amount of war loan, paying for it by cheque. Later on, earlier issues of war loan scrip which, in turn, were invested in a later issue of war loan. Finally, overdrafts were issued against the security of the war loan which the overdraft itself was going to buy. In these ways the Australian public contributed something like £213,000,000 to the various war loans that were issued. But, in reality, the main lenders were the banks and the insurance companies."

And the banks "obtained" the money by simply creating it by a process of writing figures in their own ledgers!

Professor Mackay's statement was confirmed by no less a person than Sir B. S. B. Stevens, when Premier of New South Wales. The Sydney "Daily Telegraph," of April 22, 1938, reports a meeting of the Loan Council when Sir Bertram (then Mr. Stevens) was trying to obtain further financial assistance for the States.

The "Telegraph" said Mr. Stevens pointed out that £60,000,000 of the £73,000,000 (Conversion Loan) was (held by the banks and other big financial institutions."

And still the banking racket is being continued, while the nation struggles for its very existence against an enemy which has brought the war right to our very shores. How long, O Lord, how long?

NO "MONEY SHORTAGE" IN GERMANY

It has slowly, but surely, dawned upon many people that Germany has been organised on a more efficient basis than ourselves—not because Germany has more raw materials and better engineers and industrialists than the British peoples, but because her leaders in their lust for world domination, have not, allowed any talk about a "shortage of money" to hamper them. We must examine this matter impartially. If the enemy has devised a new type of aircraft which is superior to ours, we must try to learn all we can about it and use the idea to improve our own aircraft. The same applies to financial organisation.

It has been obvious to students of finance for many years that
(Continued on page 3.)

WHAT IS SOCIAL CREDIT?

One can be brought up very sharply by the question: What is Social Credit?

There are several ways of reacting to such a query. Time was when it led almost directly to an explanation of the gap in prices and to argument, as it still can. And then later it was to a definition of what the two words Social Credit mean. But in neither instance did the answers really deal with what was probably most in the mind of the questioner, seeking for some visible, tangible evidence of what is called Social Credit, something active and dynamic, comprehending the Movement.

To attempt in any exact sense to define Social Credit in a single aspect, either as a Movement, or a philosophy, or a criticism, or a proposal, is likely to result in obscuring more than it reveals. In all likelihood it can be more usefully hinted at than defined.

A living organism has a policy which we may call Life. And it has a strategy and a tactic which combined make up its method of procedure, and its adaptation to circumstances. Policy remains fixed, but conditions are forever altering, and with that alteration an organism—a Movement, if it is dynamic—must change its strategy and tactics. This is the test of a Movement, and of whether it is organic or merely organised. The Labour Party affords an example of an association whose strategy and structure remain rigidly "put" in a top-heavy Party Organisation, pegged down to Internationalism, while its policy, so-called, reacts from Pacifism to War-fever, and from disarmament to total mobilisation.

Insofar as Social Credit is a real Movement it is the exact opposite to, that; neither, pacifist nor, bellicose in any political

sense, because neither represents its policy. It is adaptive. And the correct answer to the question, "What is Social Credit?" would not be the same in 1941 as it would be in 1931, or again in 1921; for the very appearance of an organism undergoes change according to circumstances—almost one might say, in proportion to its fixity of policy.

It is the height of practical wisdom to cultivate fixity of purpose and principle, and to hold on to it; to be ready, if necessary, to let most else, and especially yesterday's strategy, slide. For the strategy that was correct twelve months ago, is not necessarily or even probably correct for to-day. A principle, on the other hand, if it was ever correct is always so. To keep tight hold on policy then, and remain free to meet each shift and change of events is both the evidence of organic life and the surest way of promoting it.

So that at any rate one correct answer to the question is that Social Credit is quite literally a Movement, but without party or plan of organisation. That it possesses no definable numerical strength, nor headquarters worth mentioning, nor tangible assets on which Finance can get a lien. It is, in fact, remarkably like the Kingdom of God, of which it is stated that no one can say—"Lo here! or, Lo there! For behold the Kingdom of God is within you."

Social Credit attends on "events." And for that reason there is no status nor comforting membership button for Social Crediters; but only, ceaseless adaptation of strategy directed towards a constant organic policy, which after all, is the only thing that can make life really worth living.

—N.F.W., in the "Social Creditor."

SENATOR DARCEY'S BUDGET SPEECH

(Continued from last issue.)

In England £6,000,000,000 worth of credit was created during the last war. I hope that we shall not follow a similar procedure. The Commonwealth Bank can lend interest-free money to the Government. Shortly after I was elected to the Senate, I asked whether it was the intention of the then Government to discuss the findings of the Royal Commission on Monetary and Banking Systems before the ensuing Christmas vacation, and the reply I received was "Yes." That was nearly four years ago, yet that subject has never been debated. If it had been discussed the then Government's financial policy would have been revealed as being in direct opposition to the findings of the Royal Commission which it appointed. That is the reason why preceding Governments failed to provide honourable Senators with an opportunity to discuss that matter. Although Mr. Fadden spoke for an hour when introducing his Budget, he mentioned the Commonwealth Bank only once. Just before he concluded his speech he said that there was an honourable understanding with the bankers that there should be no great increase of profits. Mr. Fadden also said that he intended to give effect to one of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Monetary and Banking Systems, namely, that the private banks should deposit some of their surplus reserves with the Commonwealth Bank, to protect their depositors. It has been stated that the essence of bank credit is faith on the part of the depositors that their money is safe in the bank, and faith on the part of the bankers that, at the stipulated time, borrowers will return the money which has been loaned to them. That is a fallacy. The essence of bank credit is security. Money cannot be borrowed on faith. If I went to a bank to obtain money and said that I hoped that the banker would have sufficient faith in me, he would say that business could not be done on those terms. In fact, I was once told that, when I went to a bank to borrow money and the banker asked me what security I had in the form of bricks and mortar. I got the money on that occasion, but it was not because the banker had faith in me; it was because I had the necessary security. Mr. Nash, the New Zealand Minister for Finance, was here recently and stress has been laid on what has been done in New Zealand. The fact is that the New Zealand Government bought the bank established by

Sir Otto Niemeyer. After the last war the Bank of England sent emissaries, of whom Sir Otto Niemeyer was one, all over the British Empire to set up new banks, ostensibly to help the financial systems of the various countries in which the new banks were to be established. Sir Otto Niemeyer came to Australia but he found he could not establish a bank here because we already had a people's bank—the Commonwealth Bank. The Commonwealth Bank has been referred to as a central bank, but actually it is nothing of the kind. The term "central bank" is misapplied to the Commonwealth Bank. A central bank is the principal bank of a private banking system, and the Commonwealth Bank is the very antithesis of that, notwithstanding the mutilation which it suffered at the hands of the Bruce-Page Government in 1924. When Mr. Bruce, on the occasion of his last visit to this country, was sent around Australia to tell us what had happened after the Munich pact, he told us about the probable enemies of the Empire. I listened to that gentleman in Sydney, but I did not say anything to him on that occasion because he said that he intended to visit Tasmania. He did visit Tasmania, and once again he told us about the enemies of the Empire. I said, "What about the enemies within our gates?" He asked me what I meant by that, and I said, "I mean what I say; what about the action of the Bruce-Page Government in altering the Constitution of the Commonwealth Bank in favour of the private banks? In my opinion, that was an act of treachery to the people of Australia." Mr. Bruce flushed; he did not like it; but it was quite true. He was one of the enemies within our gates. We had another enemy, Mr. Casey, who introduced an amending Commonwealth Bank Bill before the outbreak of this war. The object was to amend the Commonwealth Bank Act in various ways, and to establish a mortgage bank by selling inscribed stock and debentures to provide the necessary capital. At that time the Commonwealth Bank had £19,000,000 worth of assets, and its deposits totalled £184,000,000. The trick was this: The only people who could buy inscribed stock at that time were the trading banks, so that, in effect, the new mortgage bank would have been under the control of the private banks. There is also another unpleasant point: Under company law, debenture holders can take over an organisation if they are not satisfied with the manner in which its affairs are being conducted. Therefore, the private banks could have taken over the new mortgage bank. Fortunately there was so much opposition to the proposed legislation that the matter was dropped. That is a good example of fifth column work in this country. The aim was to rob the people of the Commonwealth Bank, which is the main asset that Australia possesses today. It has been said that the Scullin Government was the first administration to reduce invalid and old-age pensions. That action was forced upon the Scullin Government because of the state of this country's finances after they

had been in the hands of the Bruce-Page Government for ten years. When Mr. Scullin returned from Great Britain he found an empty treasury, an adverse trade balance of £30,000,000, and the London loan market closed to Australia simply because a Labour Government was in office. Mr. Scullin had to look around for some new means of raising revenue because, under the present financial system, the only way any Government can carry on is by continually borrowing money. The only source of money was the private banks, and as that source had been closed the Government could not carry on. That is why I want to see a change. Use should be made of the great Commonwealth Bank, which has the assets of Australia behind it. The private banks created the last depression deliberately; they can create depressions whenever they desire. A depression can be started only by calling up of overdrafts, and withholding further credit. Under the present system, the private banks have the power to do these things at any time. . . . We have been told that the cost of living in this country has not increased to any great degree. The sales tax was introduced by the Scullin Government to meet the extraordinary position caused by the extravagance of the Bruce-Page Government. When it was introduced, it was only 2½ per cent., and it yielded a little more than £3,000,000 per annum. Under the Menzies and Fadden Governments, the sales tax was 15 per cent, and its contribution to the national revenue was £12,000,000 per annum. Now the sales tax on certain items is to be increased to 20 per cent. That affects everybody; very few items are exempt, and therefore the cost, of living must increase. The sales tax is invariably passed on. Therefore, it is no use saying that the people are not suffering from additional taxation impositions under war conditions. The Prices Commissioner, Professor Copland, has said that prices have risen by only 10 per cent, but, I would point out that he deals only with certain commodities. A few months ago Professor Copland came to Hobart and addressed the Chamber of Commerce, of which I am a member, on the subject of price fixation. He spoke for well over an hour, and when he was about to conclude I said to him, "There is one commodity which the Prices Commissioner has not dealt with, and that is what is known as bank credit. It is created on the premises, the raw materials being pens, ink and paper. It is indispensable in modern business, yet the banks are permitted to make a profit of more than 100 per cent, on it." I realised that, as an economist, Professor Copland knew perfectly well that all costs go into prices and have to be recovered from prices. I have never seen a man so confused. I do not think he had heard the case put in that way. He said, "I think, Senator, you will find that we shall obtain the money at a much lower rate of interest than you anticipate." That had nothing to do with my question, but the chairman closed the meeting.

—Condensed from "Hansard."
(To be continued.)

HOW TO WIN THE WAR—AND THE PEACE

Germany was making finance more or less subservient to national policy.

A rather revealing article on this subject, entitled "The German Financial Revolution," appeared in the American journal, "Harper's Magazine," for February, 1941. The author was Dal Hittchok.

Very mysteriously that issue of "Harper's" became unprocurable in this country a few weeks after its arrival. One can only speculate about what happened. The following brief extracts are very interesting:

"... A part of our task is to examine the enemy to see wherein lies his strength. We must not let the front page drama of blitzkrieg and luftwaffe, or the brutality of German political and social policy entirely divert our attention from the German financial programme. It is revolutionary, and it is successful.

"... It is becoming increasingly clear that Germany's internal financial programme is removing the limitations of her financial environment on rates of productive capacity. For years prior to the present war German industry operated at capacity. To do these things she is changing capitalism, but she is not destroying it.

"When Hitler launched his vast public works and armaments programmes in 1934 and 1935, authorities on finance announced that he would bankrupt Germany in a matter of months or years at most. Today the facts stand clear and incontrovertible that, instead of being bankrupt, Germany has created vast public improvements, expanded her industry, and built the most expensive and terrible war machine the world has ever seen. All this has been done in a nation that at the start was debt-ridden, impoverished, and deep in depression...

"The presumption that the Nazi financial system is merely a flat structure, whose acceptance can be enforced only by the Gestapo is a facile but unsatisfactory answer. Brute force alone could not have produced the results achieved had the financial mechanism been defective. . . .

"The Nazi explorers, in effect, have discovered, and are making use of, the fact that the financial world is round, while our financial geographers are still telling us that the heretics will sail off its edge. Traditional financial experts tell us that Government credit has narrowly defined limits beyond which lies destruction, yet the Nazi course of sailing straight into a sea of debt that seems endless, as judged by nineteenth-century preconceptions, has brought them back to the Fatherland with many nations hanging to the yardarms or chained in the brig. . . .

"How much simpler and more effective than the Russian attempts at State-operated production, distribution, and international commerce! The Russians have to blue-print the complete details of the production and flow of every commodity handled within their national economy, and each detail must be based on arbitrary decisions of the Commissars of this and the Commissars of that. The Nazis, by contrast, have put their fingers on a few key controls that give them complete mastery of their domestic economy, and then have let the otherwise normal and automatic operation of capitalism do its effective work.

"The Russians, who call themselves revolutionists, have made not one revolutionary change in capitalistic financial procedures, but they have destroyed the effectiveness of capitalism by eliminating the private ownership of business enterprise, without which it loses its primary virtue of automatic operation. Such confusion of thinking the world has rarely witnessed. But back to Germany, where we have things to learn."

The following report from the Sydney "Daily Mirror," of May 23, 1941, speaks for itself. As far as I know, this report did not appear in any other Australian newspaper; "GIGANTIC NAZI BILL FOR WAR. 'Daily Mirror' World Cables."

"London, Friday.—A vigorous attack on Britain's war effort was made in the House of Commons to-day during the debate on the Finance bill.

"The attack was, made by Mr. Clement Davies, a director of Lever Bros., who is Mr. Lloyd George's right hand man. He is National Liberal

Member for Montgomeryshire. Mr. Davies presented to the House some astonishing figures.

"He said that in the six years prior to the outbreak of war, Hitler spent £6,000,000,000 against Britain's £1,000,000,000. In the last quarter of 1940, the Germans were spending at a rate of between £5,500,000,000 and £6,000,000,000. That was the measure of their war effort at the end of last year.

"In the coming year, the sum of £3,350,000,000 measured Britain's war effort."

In the Melbourne "Herald" of May 29, 1940, there appeared a rather comprehensive and staggering article comparing British and Nazi finance. The writer clearly indicates, even from an orthodox point of view, that Germany's internal economy has been governed by one factor only—the amount of man-power and materials available. After dealing with the tremendous organisation in Germany, the writer draws a pitiable picture of what has been taking place in Britain. Significantly enough, this article only appeared in one edition of the "Herald."

It should be obvious to the meanest intelligence, that we must beat the totalitarian countries by developing a financial system equal to, if not better than theirs. . . .

(To be continued)

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. 8. FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 1942. No. 2.

STRAWS IN THE WIND

There have been abundant indications recently that the plot to bring about some sort of "Federal Union" is thickening remarkably. To loyal Australians this development is both alarming and infuriating. So many Australians are defending (or are preparing to defend) Australia's political independence, territorial integrity and British loyalties—with their very lives. To plot behind their backs with the object of destroying the very things they are prepared to give so much to defend, is despicable beyond description.

However, neither alarm nor anger will avail—unless followed by appropriate **action**. Citizens should write (and write again) to their representatives in the Federal Parliament, stressing the treasonable nature of this plot.

* * * *

Apparently our self-styled People's Government intends to keep the people as much in the dark as previous Governments did about the secrets of the Money Monopoly. The following report appeared in the Melbourne "Herald" last Monday: "Full Details Not For Public. Bank Balance-Sheets Sydney—Following the conference last week between the Treasurer (Mr. Chifley) and representatives of the Commonwealth and private trading banks, each bank in future will compile two balance-sheets—one for publication, and the other giving much greater detail for the information of the Treasurer and the Commonwealth Bank."

* * * *

The change of Government has not brought an end to the Apple and Pear Acquisition Scheme. The personnel of the Board is not to be changed, either. The State committees now comprise seven members; including four "representatives" of the growers, "representatives" of the agents and the consumers, and a nominee of the State Government. Who elected these "representatives" is a mystery into which the "New Times" is investigating. Mr. H. W. Foster (of Freeman-street, Fitzroy), is the Victorian consumers' "representative," but we have been unable to locate even one consumer who took part in his election! We have the utmost sympathy for the fruit growers, but fail to see why they should have four times the "representation" accorded to consumers. No doubt that is part of the Labour Party's peculiar conception of democracy. Of course, the whole idea of the Apple and Pear Acquisition Scheme is a lot of bureaucratic nonsense which misses the real nature of the problem altogether—as we have frequently explained in these columns,

* * * *

According to a report from Sydney appearing in the Melbourne "Age" on Monday of this week, allegations that employees at the Commonwealth Aircraft Corporation works were being "paid high wages to do nothing" are regarded so seriously by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ward) that he has asked the Minister of Aircraft Production (Senator Cameron) to thoroughly investigate the charges. "These men who are on the job are attaching their names to their charges, so, it does not look as though they are making irresponsible statements," said Mr. Ward, adding that according to one statement made to him personally, a man on finishing a job on Friday afternoon advised the foreman he wanted further work, and was told that the job "would do him for that afternoon and next morning." "The next morning was a Saturday morning, on which the men would be on overtime rates," declared Mr. Ward.

Mr. Ward is not alone in hearing such allegations from reliable sources. Many similar first-hand reports have reached the "New Times." The striking thing about them is that they ALL relate to **huge, centralised** industrial units (mostly State-owned, by the way). The moral surely is obvious.

LOYALTIES

A SHORT STORY BY JOHN CLIFFORD.

At times Myrtle would sit and think for hours about her divorce. She refused to admit that she had done wrong, although she often experienced days of mental agony. She wrestled with herself as she thought of the past years.

Jim had been bitter as, on the terrible day, he told her that she had deserted. It hurt every time she thought of that bitter statement; full of contempt. Dessertion! Jim hated deserters. He had been invalidated home from Tobruk. But she wasn't a deserter. No, she was justified her actions. She had her loyalties, also. She was loyal to her children. She felt better when she thought of the children. But then her conscience would twinge a little as she admitted to herself that she had also thought of herself. Still, she often told herself a little defiantly that she had a right to think of herself. It had been impossible for her to hold on. The heat, the sand, and the loneliness combined to break her spirit. During the first six months Jim's letters from Tobruk had helped to inspire her. As she read of the hellish conditions being experienced by the defenders of Tobruk she screwed up her courage and went on with the unequal fight. But she was not suited for the struggle. She had spent the first 19 years of her life in Melbourne, before starting school-teaching in the northern Mallee. She was now 27.

She had married Jim, a struggling wheat farmer, after keeping company with him for a few months. Life was an adventure at first, and she was hopelessly in love with Jim. She thought that she could live happily in a tent with him if necessary. But years of living in a blistering weather-board, four-roomed house, with no lining to break the heat from the iron roof, had slowly sapped her youth and enthusiasm. Then there were the babies. She slaved from morning to night. The children were a continual source of worry. She often helped with the harvest. John had been three when she had her first real quarrel with Jim. She would always remember that evening. She had been washing, out in the blistering heat all day—they couldn't afford a wash-house. She was very irritable. Jim came in late and rather curtly asked about tea. She lost control and said that she couldn't wash clothes and cook tea at the same time.

Jim replied: "Other farmers' wives can do it."

That was the last straw. She remembered her words, thrown at him as the tears streamed down her face: "I know that I am not used to this life. But when you married me you promised that you would soon be on your feet. You promised me some of the necessities which every woman should have. And here we are, after four years, no further advanced, and the place hopelessly mortgaged to the banks. I can't go on." She broke down completely.

Jim apologised and took her in his arms. "I'm sorry, my dear. I have worked hard. But, as you say, it doesn't appear to be any use. It's taking us all our time to pay the interest payments to the banks. I can't make it out. On the average we have been having good years, but the price is the trouble. There are thousands of people starving in this country because they haven't the money to buy wheaten products. The banks appear to be the only ones doing any good. I could never understand banking, but the harder we work the better the position of the banks. Perhaps you can explain that, my little schoolmarm?" He wiped her face with a rather dirty handkerchief. "No, Jim," she replied, "we were never taught anything; about money at college." They had gone on struggling. The children took up more and more of her time. She managed to have a trip to Melbourne once that

year. The few weeks were like heaven. It was hard to return to the Mallee. But she was loyal to Jim. He still loved her very dearly.

John had just started school when war broke out. Jim, whose father was killed, in France during the last war, joined up at once. "I must fight for you and the kids," he said. She was all confused. But she promised him that she would attempt to carry on the farm until he returned.

The first harvest after Jim's departure was a nightmare. But, with the assistance of neighbours and some hired labour—she had prevailed upon the local bank manager to increase the overdraft—she had struggled through. There was a lot of talk about the Government assisting the wheat-growers. But very little came of it. The lonely days passed. Jim wrote regularly. The second harvest was too much for her. She had been looking at herself in the cracked mirror in the bedroom a few weeks before Christmas, 1941. She noticed how she was ageing prematurely. She wept bitterly to herself. She couldn't go on. She was only young yet. Surely Jim couldn't expect her to continue to bury herself alive. That night, as she looked at the faces of the three sleeping children, she decided to leave. She wanted something better for her children than toiling to pay interest bills to banks on debts which never decreased. The next day she started to make preparations to leave. She saw the local banker. He was sympathetic, but unhelpful. "The bank's terms cannot be altered. If you walk out we will have to put the farm in the hands of a receiver."

Nothing mattered to her now. She was in Melbourne for Christmas Day. She stayed with her people. As the weeks passed she only thought of the Mallee farm as some nightmare of the past. She obtained a good job. She started to enjoy life again. She was able to give the children those little treats that she had often dreamed about. But her new-found happiness was soon shattered by a bitter letter from Jim. He said that the farm represented, his life's work, and that she had thrown it away. She wrote back and tried to defend her actions. She didn't receive any further letters for some time.

Her mother encouraged her to go out as much as possible. Her natural attractiveness soon returned. She lost her sunburned skin and haggard look. It was only natural that she was popular with the opposite sex. She met Bill at a dance. She had been very fond of dancing before she married Jim. She liked Bill very much. He had a good job as foreman in a munitions factory. He often took her and the children out on Sundays. The children grew to like him very much. But she only regarded Bill as a good friend. Jim now seemed so far away. He was very bitter in every letter. When he heard of her friendship with Bill, he wrote an accusing letter, to which she replied rather tactlessly. He wrote very little after that. Even her letters telling him how she was fighting for the future of their children failed to bring any response. Jim had been to Syria for a few months since the A.I.F. evacuation from Tobruk, when word came that he was to be invalidated home. She met him at the boat. But he was a changed man; a bitter man who was suspicious of everyone and everything. He hated Bill. He called him a coward who had stayed home while other men fought. Of course this wasn't true. Bill was a technical man who couldn't be

(Continued on page 5)

HABEAS CORPUS

LORD ATKIN'S DISSENTING SPEECH

The House of Lords, by a majority of four judgments to one, decided in a recent case that in administering Regulation 18b it is not necessary for the Home Secretary to justify himself by proving that the suspicions on which he has acted are those which would be entertained by the "reasonable man" of legal hypothesis: his decision is not subject to judicial review.

Lord Atkin, in the course of his dissenting speech, said that the material words were simple and, in his opinion, obviously gave only a conditional authority to the Minister to detain any person without trial, the condition being that he had reasonable cause for the belief which led to the detention order. The meaning, however, which appeared to have found favour with some of their Lordships was that there was no condition; for the words "if the Secretary of State has reasonable cause" merely meant that the Secretary of State thought that he had reasonable cause. The result was that the only implied condition was that the Secretary of State acted in good faith. If he did that the Minister had been given complete discretion whether he should detain a subject or not. It was an absolute power which had never been given before to the Executive, and he (his Lordship) would demonstrate that no such power was in fact given to the Minister by the words in question.

It was surely incapable of dispute that the words "If A has X" constituted a condition the essence of which was the existence of X and the having of it by A. The words did not and could not

LOYALTIES.—(Continued.)

spared from the industrial front.

She had continued to drift further and further apart from Jim. He wanted to return to the land under the Government's repatriation scheme. But she couldn't bring herself to face years of hell again. "It's not that I dislike the country. But I don't want to face the same financial slavery again, why don't you try and obtain a job here in Melbourne? I want my children to have a chance; and I am determined that they are going to have a chance."

Jim replied: "Conditions are getting worse everywhere. I will have no chance here in Melbourne."

I have no technical knowledge. I must get back to the land." But she could see by his tone that he wasn't very confident.

Jim went on his own after a bitter outburst. She was determined that, irrespective of her own happiness, the children were going to have a chance. She heard nothing of Jim for months. Then came, the bombshell. He was seeking a divorce! All the bitter past was dragged up again. But he obtained his divorce. She managed to retain the children, mainly because Jim had not pressed his claim to them.

Often, as she sat and thought about the past she recalled the words of the rather kindly-faced judge, who said: "This case is typical of thousands of tragedies."

I cannot bring myself to blame either party, although you," he said turning to her "have failed in your loyalty to your husband. No doubt you think you also have a greater loyalty to your children. I sympathise with you both because the real cause of your tragedy is something which affects us all—the present economic system. You, gentlemen, May report that statement," he said turning to the newspaper reporters.

She often thought of those words. How true they were. If Jim

mean. "If A **thinks** that he has." "Reasonable cause" for an action or a belief was just as much a positive fact capable of determination by a third party as a broken ankle or a legal right. That meaning of the words had been accepted in innumerable legal decisions for many generations; "reasonable cause" for a belief when the subject of legal dispute had been always treated as an objective fact to be proved by one or other party and to be determined by the appropriate tribunal.

In the Defence Regulations themselves the persons responsible for the framing of them had shown themselves to be fully aware of the true meaning of the words, and had obviously used the words "reasonable cause" to indicate that mere honest belief was not enough, using different words where it was intended that the Executive officer should have unqualified discretion.

Having considered the various Defence Regulations as supporting that view, his Lordship considered the wording of Regulation 18B, and said that organisations were impugned if the Secretary of State was satisfied as to their nature, but the person was not to be detained, unless the Secretary of State had reasonable cause to believe that he was a member. Why the two different expressions should be used if they had the same "subjective" meaning no one had been able to explain. He suggested that the obvious intention was to give a safeguard to the individual against arbitrary imprisonment.

It was argued that it could never have been intended to substitute the decision of Judges for that of the Minister. But no one proposed either a substitution or an appeal. A Judge had the duty to say whether the conditions of the power of detentions were fulfilled. If they were reasonable grounds, the Judge had no further duty of deciding whether he would have formed the same belief, any more than, if there was reasonable evidence to go to a jury, the Judge was concerned with whether he would have come to the same verdict. It was further argued that the grounds of belief might be confidential matters of public importance, and that it was impossible to suppose that the Secretary of State was intended to disclose

could only give her and the children a good home, and the fear of economic insecurity were removed, she could even tackle the Mallee again. But she shuddered to herself as she thought of those years of hell. No; a thousand times no! She could never face the same conditions again.

Perhaps things would change some day. The children would have had a chance. But, she suddenly checked this line of thought. Jim was no longer her husband. But she still harboured a foolish idea that she might return to him. In the meantime, she just thought and tried to make peace with her own conscience.

Myrtle is only one of tens of thousands who have been forced by the economic system to forgo certain loyalties. They are so frail; the system is so strong.

either his grounds or his information to the Court. The objection was answered by the very terms of the regulation itself, in its provisions that the detained person had the right to make objections to an advisory committee, and that the chairman must inform the objector of the grounds on which the order had been made against him.

The only argument as to expediency put forward by the defendants which had any weight was that it could not have been intended that the accumulated experience, instinct, knowledge of the Minister in coming to a decision on this matter could be replaced by a judgment of a Court of law. But before that decision was made there had to be a valid belief that the subject was of hostile origin, association, etc. Once that was established it was very unlikely that a Court would not in most cases accept as reasonable the Home Secretary's decision to detain.

He (Lord Atkin) viewed with apprehension the attitude of Judges who, on a mere question of construction, when face to face with claims involving the liberty of the subject, showed themselves more Executive minded than the Executive. Their function was to give words their natural meaning, although not perhaps in wartime leaning towards liberty. In this country, amid the clash of arms, the laws were not silent. They might be changed, but they spoke the same language in war as in peace. It had always been one of the pillars of freedom, one of the principles of liberty for which on recent authority Britain was now fighting, that the Judges were no respecters of persons, and stood between the subject and any attempted encroachments on his liberty by the Executive, alert to see that any coercive action was justified in law. In this case he (his Lordship) had listened to arguments which might have been addressed acceptably to the Court of King's Bench in the time of Charles I.

He protested, even if he did it alone, against a strained construction put on words with the effect of giving an uncontrolled power of imprisonment to the Minister. The words had only one meaning; they were used with that meaning in statements of the common law and in statutes. They had never been used in the sense now imputed to them; they were used in the Defence Regulations in the natural meaning.

He knew of only one authority which might justify the suggested method of construction. "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty had said in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less." "The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean different things." "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master—that's all." (Looking, Glass, c. vi.) After all the long discussion in that House the question was whether the words "If a man has" could mean "If a man thinks he has." He was of opinion that they could not, and that the case should be decided accordingly.

The plaintiff's right to particulars, however, was based on a principle which, again, was one of the pillars of liberty, in that in English law every imprisonment was "prima facie" unlawful, and that it was for a person directing imprisonment to justify, his act.

Lord Maugham, who presided over the hearing, wrote to "The Times" to say that according to the traditions of the Bar, counsel could not reply "even to so grave an animadversion" as Lord Atkin's statement that he had listened "to arguments which might

Hitler's Pro-Judaic Policy

"From the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, which is the most monstrous forgery of modern times, the bulk of Nazi methods and Nazi policy, domestic and foreign, is derived," declared Dr. Hans Kosmala in a recent speech at Glasgow, reported in the "Glasgow Herald" of September 5.

Dr. Kosmala, who is Polish by birth, is head of an organisation training missionaries for the Jewish field, which was formerly based at Leipzig and Vienna and is now established in London. He has discovered remarkable resemblances between the philosophy of Hitler's "Mein Kampf" and the "Protocols," which go far to explain the real connection between anti-Semitism and Hitler's New Order.

"We are witnessing do-day," said Dr. Kosmala, "one of the profoundest ironies of world history. It is not the Jews who are striving after world domination, as the Protocols would have us believe, but their Nazi persecutors and accusers.

"They are attempting to foist these spurious documents upon a credulous world. Nazi policy is the literal fulfilment of the Protocols. Every phrase and word of them sounds as if they were taken from Hitler's political text-book, 'Mein Kampf?'"

Readers are urged to buy Eric Butler's booklet, "The War Behind the War," for a comprehensive survey of the "Jewish Question."

have been addressed acceptably to the Court of King's Bench in the time of Charles I." Lord Maugham did not hear from counsel or from anyone else "anything which could justify such a remark."

A rejoinder from Mr. Gerald Gardiner the next day contains two interesting points:—

"It may be presumptuous for an ordinary lawyer to express a view upon the decision of the House of Lords, but as so distinguished a lawyer as Lord Maugham has thought your columns an appropriate place in which to comment upon part of the speech of another member of the tribunal, it may be permissible for a humble member of the Bar to follow his example and to say that in places where lawyers meet the view being, yesterday expressed by lawyers of all shades of opinion, was one of admiration for, and gratitude to, Lord Atkin for his dissenting speech, the contents of which appear to some ordinary lawyers to be unanswerable."

Mr. Gardiner also pointed out:—"The original Regulation 18B conferred on the Home Secretary an absolute discretion to detain persons if he was 'satisfied' of certain things. On October 31, 1939, upon a motion in the House of Commons to annul the regulations, grave dissatisfaction with this regulation was expressed in the House on the ground that the regulation left the liberty of the subject to the sole discretion of the Home Secretary. The Government thereupon withdrew the regulations and agreed to amend them to meet this and other objections, and, on, November 23, 1939, the amended regulations were made, the new Regulation 18B providing that the Home Secretary could only detain if he 'has reasonable cause to believe' those things of which previously he had only to be 'satisfied.' What is one to think of an Executive whose law officers now argue that the amended regulation means, and must have been intended to mean, precisely the same as the regulation which was withdrawn?"

THE MEDICINE MAN

Alexis Carrel wrote a book called "Man, The Unknown," and published it in 1935. Carrel was born at Sainte Foy les Lyon in 1873, the son of Alexis and Anna (Ricard) Carrel, in the preface to his book, Carrel says he has spent most of his time in the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in America.

There he "contemplated the phenomena of life while they were analysed by incomparable experts such as Meltzer, Jacques, Loeb, Noguchi and many others." That the study of living things has been undertaken at the Rockefeller Institute "with a broadness of vision so far unequalled" Carrel attributes to "the genius of Flexner." Presumably he means Simon Flexner, a Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. There are three Flexners. Abraham, described by "Who's Who in America" as an "educator." He has written about medical education in Europe and in America, and about prostitution in Europe. Bernard was Counsel to the Zionist delegation to the Peace Conference in 1918. The three are brothers, sons of Moses and Esther (Abraham) Flexner.

Loeb is probably as well-known as any of the others. He is a mechanistic physiologist who deems consciousness to be "an illusion" of sensation. But the purpose of this article is not to assess the importance of these personalities. It is not even to analyse the process or the results of centralisation of "scientific" enquiry in conjunction with the development of "big-business" policy, or any other policy. It is merely to draw attention, in the setting in which it occurs, to something curious, almost inexplicable.

"Human beings," says Carrel, "are not found anywhere in nature. There are only individuals. The individual differs from the human being because he is a concrete event. He is the only one who acts, loves, suffers, fights, and dies. On the contrary, the human being is a Platonic Idea living in our minds and, in our books. He consists of the abstractions studied by physiologists, psychologists, and sociologists. His characteristics are expressed by Universals. To-day we are again facing a problem which engrossed the philosophical minds of the Middle Ages, the problem of the reality of general ideas." He goes on to say that we live in two different worlds—the world of facts and that of their symbols. Carrel was awarded the Nobel prize (he is primarily a surgeon) for his work in transplanting tissues from one animal to another. It is not, however, a common trait in the character of surgeons to want to make the best of two worlds. Usually they strive to make the best of one of them. Carrel won't have the division between "the realists who believed in the existence of Universals and the nominalists who did not believe in it." (Anslem v. Abelard.) They "were equally right." "Scientists accustomed to the techniques of mechanics, chemistry, physics, and physiology, and unfamiliar with philosophy and intellectual culture, are liable to mingle the concepts of the different disciplines. . . . Education, medicine and sociology are concerned with the individual. They are guilty of a disastrous error when they look upon him only as a symbol. . . individuality is fundamental in man. . . Each individual is conscious of being unique. . . We are not even capable of discovering the essential characteristics of a given man. And still less his potentialities. . . Most of us are unaware of our own aptitudes. The tests applied to school children and students by inexperienced psychologists have no

great significance. They give an illusory confidence to those unacquainted with psychology. In fact, they should be accorded less importance. Psychology is not yet a science. . . Physicians . . . are asked to realise the impossible feat of building up a science of the particular. . . ."

Carrel has now made the best he can of World No. 1. "Each of us is certainly far larger and more diffuse than his own body. . . Love and hatred are realities. . . If we could visualise. . . immaterial links, human beings [not individuals?] would assume new and strange aspects. Some would hardly extend beyond their anatomical limits [although "we are not even capable of discovering the essential characteristics of a given man"]. Others would stretch out as far as a safe in a bank. . . Others would appear immense. They would expand in long tentacles. . . Leaders of nations, great philanthropists, saints, would look like fairy-tale giants, spreading their multiple arms over a country, a continent, the entire world. . . Caesar, Napoleon, Mussolini, all great leaders of nations, grow beyond human stature. . . Between certain individuals and nature there are subtle and obscure relations. . . Each man is bound to those who precede and follow him. . . Individuality is doubtless [sic!] real. But it is much less def-

inate than we believe. And the independence of each individual from the others and from the cosmos is an illusion. . . . Modern society ignores the individual."

From the point of recognising the relativity of individuals, which is a biological as well as a social fact, Carrel proceeds to stress the damage done to individuals by standardisation and our ignorance of "the constitution of the human being." It is to be noticed that the damage has been done to the real thing; but emphasis is now to be transferred to the abstraction, the human being. Carrel has already defined the province of science—"the abstractions studied by" scientists. Carrel is a scientist. (There's nothing like leather). "The democratic principle [what is that?] has contributed to the collapse of civilisation in opposing the development of an elite. . . . The standardisation of men by the democratic ideal has already determined the predominance of the weak. . . . Like the invalid, the criminal, and the insane, [the weak] attract the sympathy of the public. The myth of equality, the love of the symbol, the contempt for the concrete fact, are, in a large measure guilty of the collapse of the individual. . . . We know that he cannot adapt himself to the environment created by technology that such environment brings about his degradation." Technology is an omnibus abstraction; and things are not created by abstractions; but let this pass. "Science and machines are not responsible for his present state. We [who?] alone are guilty. We have not been capable of distinguishing the prohibited from the lawful. We have infringed natural laws. . . . Life always gives an

identical answer when asked to trespass on forbidden ground. It weakens and civilisations collapse."

Unconsciously, Carrel has been writing "science." He has described what the individual has become in terms of his abstractions. He is determined to effect the remaking of man by carrying his abstractions a stage further: to make the best of World No. 2. He says: "As long as the hereditary qualities of the race remain present, the strength and audacity of his forefathers can be resurrected in modern man by his own will. But is he still capable of such an effort?"

Grammatically, "his" will here is the individual's. Carrel must be ignorant of the notion:—

"The pyramidal structure of society gives environment the maximum control over individuality. The correct objective of any change is to give individuality maximum control over environment."

These words appeared in the first edition of "Economic Democracy."

Whether "he" (the Individual) is capable of an effort or not, Carrel, apparently is! And this is the form, apparently, which his effort is to take:—

"Medicine [at the Rockefeller Institute] is the most comprehensive of all the sciences concerning man, from anatomy to political economy. . . . Can any individual master anatomy, physiology, biological chemistry, psychology, metaphysics, pathology, medicine, and also have a thorough acquaintance with genetics, nutrition, development, pedagogy, esthetics, morals, religion, sociology, and economics. It seems that such an accomplishment is not impossible. In about twenty-five years of uninterrupted study, one could learn these sciences. At the age of fifty, those who have submitted themselves to this discipline could effectively direct the construction of the human being and of a civilisation based on his true nature. Indeed, the few gifted individuals who dedicate themselves to this work will have to renounce the common modes of existence. They will not be able to play golf and bridge, to go to cinemas, to listen to radios, to make speeches at banquets, to serve on committees, to attend meetings of scientific societies, political conventions, and academies, or to cross the ocean and take part in international congresses. They must live like. . . "Well, never mind: the chief point is that they will still live in the shadow of the genius of Flexner!" "Why," asks Carrel, "should, not some individuals sacrifice their lives to acquire the science indispensable to the making of man and his environment. . . . There is no more beautiful and dangerous adventure than the renovation of modern man." Dangerous, yes, and not only to the sacrificers; but the answer to this question is, briefly, that some individuals may do what they like, provided they do not merely make a corner in individuality, and are not merely obtaining maximum control for their individuality. But that, otherwise, so fatuous a proposal is both useless and unnecessary. Even at the Rockefeller Institute doctors differ. . . Is it not curious that men can know so much and understand so little? To take up an excellent point which Carrel makes himself, is it natural, that men should have to sacrifice their lives for an abstraction, and isn't the renovation of modern man an abstraction? Would it not be more "natural" if some of our abstractionists sacrificed a few of their abstractions in favour of the real individual, whose "essential characteristics" they are not "capable of discovering?" The opinion is Carrel's own.

-- T. J., in the "Social Crediter."

THIS JEWISH BUSINESS

By H. R. P., in the "Social Crediter."

No periodical, certainly not the "Social Crediter," is exempt from criticism by its subscribers. Much of that criticism, if constructive and put forward in reasonable fashion is very helpful. Some is not.

It is proposed here to deal with only one particular, but apparently frequent, criticism. It goes somewhat like this: "I read the paper because I feel I should, but I can't follow this Jew business." On the face of it such a critic has failed to grasp not only the reasoning in many published articles, but the implication of the bare facts put before the readers. In other words, each issue is in itself an answer to this criticism which persists merely because the critic has not thought the matter right through. These lines are intended to assist him to do so.

To begin with the "Social Crediter" is hostile only to certain Jews and certain Gentiles, who have been and still are guilty of plotting the submergence of democratic thought and a typically British mode of life.

The attack on these Jews and their Gentile collaborators goes deeper. There are still many people who think that what we are attacking and what we should exclusively criticise is a system. Such an approach is a compromise with the devil, and a few years ago may—or may not—have been psychologically sound. To-day such an approach, lacking as it does a background of reality, is undoubtedly misleading and therefore wrong. A system may be inefficient or faulty, i.e., it does not perform its agreed function with the least possible degree of friction, or it may not show the results pragmatically possible. But all systems are capable of alteration and adjustment. It only requires, some person to point out the fail-

ings in the system and it can be put right. So far as our financial system is concerned, attention was drawn to its faults in 1918. However, it has not been altered for the benefit of the individuals comprising this or any other country.

A system does not run itself. It is run by individuals. When these put up a very determined and active opposition to changing the system for the better, then the only remedy open to the people is to remove them from their positions of power and put in their place men who will carry out the people's policy. Opposition to the improvement of the financial system suggests another system, one of secret government, of which the financial system is only a part, albeit an important one.

The argument that the system should be attacked, and not the men by whom and for whom that system is run, is superficially plausible and rather subtle. It is, however, a matter for amazement that people, who in other respects have proved their capacity to recognise reality, should fall for it. A centre forward plays the individuals, singly or in combination, of the opposing team, he does not play "the team" and most certainly he does not play the rules of the F.A. Just so are we pitted not against a system but against the men who have proved over and over again that they are prepared to see all life on this planet extinguished rather than relinquish the power the system gives them.

On the whole their activities are subtle and hidden, but on several occasions they have been forced out into the open and have not shrunk from the crudest action. We have seen them artwork in this way in Austria, Bavaria, Australia,

(Continued on page 8.)

Justice For Returned Men

(Continued from page 1)

evidence. On October 8 last, the Deputy Commissioner of Repatriation in Sydney informed her that her claim had been disallowed. The commissioners considered the matter under section 44K of the Australian Soldiers' Repatriation Act, but adhered to the previous decision that the ex-soldier's death was not attributable to war service. The commission also decided that the further evidence submitted in the case was not material to, and had no substantial bearing upon, Mrs. Hughes's claim. The widow was advised of the decision, and was informed of the procedure to be followed should she desire the additional evidence to be placed before the War Pensions Entitlement Appeal Tribunal. On October 20, she wrote to me as follows:—

"Things are becoming increasingly difficult for me. I have been very sick and my doctor tells me I cannot much longer escape a major operation which will mean a long spell in hospital, and of course the way I am placed it will be impossible for me to continue my business, which is just giving us a bare living now, and would not stand the expense of paid help. So, if anything could be done to speed things in regard to my case, I would be very grateful."

In order to give honourable members some idea of the manner in which administration procedure operates, I shall conclude by reading extracts from evidence that was submitted to the Repatriation Commission and the War Pensions Entitlement Tribunal.

Mr. H. W. Bell, commercial traveller, of 108 Livingstone-road Marrickville, wrote:—

"To whom it may concern: Having been in constant touch with the late F. W. Hughes for the last nine years, I have frequently heard him complain of severe headaches, and have advised him to seek expert medical advice, and his reply to me was, 'What's the use?' He attributed it to the loss of his leg and shock caused by war wounds."

Dr. J. C. Green, of Punchbowl, stated:—"I knew the deceased for seventeen years, and I can say confidently that he was not addicted to alcohol. His death was due to cerebral haemorrhage, the cause of which was arteriosclerosis. His age was only forty-four at death, and this is unusually young for cerebral haemorrhage. In my opinion the loss of his leg at the war was the Probable cause of the arteriosclerosis, which led to his death."

H. Kefford, secretary, Master Butchers Meat and Allied Trades

Federation of Australia wrote:—"I knew the late Mr. Fred Hughes for a period of approximately eleven years, and came in contact with him almost daily. During the past five years, I noticed a distinct deterioration in his health. He frequently complained that his side was giving him considerable trouble, and that he was subject to continual headaches. On numerous occasions, especially in the year 1938-39, when I saw signs of a gradual break up, I suggested that he should see a specialist, but each time he informed me that his condition was solely due to war injuries and that nothing could be done for him. Mr. Hughes appeared to be fully cognisant of his steady decline in health and his condition worried him tremendously."

Mr. C. J. Swadling, J.P., station master, No. 1 platform, Sydney, stated:—"To whom it may concern. This serves to certify that I have known the late F. W. Hughes for a period extending over the past, ten years, and I have been closely associated with him for the past six years. During that period I have noticed his gradually failing in health. At times he would complain of frequent headaches, and pains in his injured side. His appearance suggested a very tired man, and of far greater age than his actual years. When I advised him at various times to consult a doctor, his reply was 'that it was useless as he knew that the trouble was caused by his war injuries,' and he 'could not afford to spend the money in this direction, which he otherwise required.' In conclusion I would like to state that the late Mr. Hughes led a very temperate life."

Dr. Edgar Stephen, 135 Macquarie-street, wrote:—"Dear Mrs. Hughes,—I regret that I cannot recall to memory anything about your late husband. The medicines I prescribed for him were strong nerve tonics. I am pretty sure the Repatriation Department will assist you in what education and training for a vocation your children may need, especially for children of a man who lost a limb. I am sorry I am unable to give any information and return the prescription book. I feel confident that you can get help in the way I have mentioned for the children's careers."

Further evidence was obtained from Dr. E. M. Thomson, of 362 Chapel-road, Bankstown, who is the district repatriation doctor:—"I hereby certify that Mrs. Hughes has consulted me re her late husband, F. W. Hughes. In

(Continued on page 8.)

SUNDRY NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

siberia government, and apparently the S.A. gardeners are not going to take it lying down.

The Bankers' Union: Tremendous publicity is being given to the proposal (Federal Union) to subjugate the British Empire to "Wall Street." The recent conference of world newsmongers is to intensify the propaganda. Some idea of U.S. influence over Britain can be obtained from the report of the "Herald" of December 31, wherein it is stated "that Britain would reluctantly obey the State Department's demand to restore the French islands, St. Pierre and Miquelon, to Vichy." It is pointed out that this will be a bitter blow to the British. Doubtless it will, especially if Britain presumes to determine her own policy.

U.S. Military Control: A heartening sign that the real British spirit still lives comes from the statement of Mr. R. E. Stokes in the House of Commons, as reported in the "Herald" on January 9, wherein he says: "I hate to think the military centre of control is shifting to Washington. It gives me a nasty feeling. We

may find ourselves reduced to occupying the position of America's Heligoland off the coast of Europe. I am sometimes angry at the complacency with which old men in the Cabinet, who have no real experience of fighting, and who have not indulged in the filthy business of killing, have let things drift; assuring us that all will finally come right—and sending cheering messages from the proximity of dug-outs costing £750,000.

Transport Reinstated: The Minister for Transport (Mr. Lawson) is reported in the "Herald" of January 10, as having clarified the announcement dealing with the restoration of certain road transport services. The chaos arising from the rationalising was so great that the war effort was affected. Fortunately the common sense of the people realised the position, and they asserted themselves to such purpose that the planners have been compelled to take corrective action. Needless to say Mr. Lawson did not explain the matter in these terms. It has been said that the people win wars in spite of governments; this seems particularly appropriate to this war.

Words Or Action? The following plea for action from the Dutch East Indies appeared in the "Herald" of January 10: "There is an unmistakable feeling of aversion to listening to the stream of words being poured on our heads from various allied capitals. The public here and in America and Britain insist on talk being dropped and letting deeds speak for themselves." Perhaps the public aversion has inspired this slogan: "The Yaps will fight the Japs in 1943."

Russia's War Aims: The following is from the same source: "Russia is secretive, suspicious and silent; but one thing certain is that she is fighting her own war, not any ideological war, and she has more interest in choosing her own best moment for any contest with Japan than in any assistance to Australia."

A move has also come from this group for a combined effort by all groups, particularly in propaganda work. One combined meeting has been held, with another in a few days' time.

The "Y?" Group—the youthful enthusiasts brought together by Mr. John Chappell—is as strong as ever. They now meet at 17 Waymouth-street on Monday nights. The former body meets at the same address on Tuesday nights.

For the ensuing weeks for the year we hope to publish reports of many other groups being formed or reformed. Can you lend a hand with this?

"OUR EMPIRE IN DANGER" leaflets have brought a request for a small parcel from as far a field as Bundaberg. We appreciate this gesture, and will endeavour to supply any other demands made upon us. Though we made no charge for the first batch, as a goodwill gesture appropriate to the season, we now announce that further supplies can be obtained for 1/6 per hundred. Help us distribute these—and get them signed—so that we can publish further leaflets at an early date.

Have you read: "Banks and Facts," 6d; "Victory Without Debt," 1/-; "Federal Union Exposed," 1/-; "The War Behind the War," 4d.? —M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Secretary.

Read in Comfort with Glasses Prescribed by—




CERTIFIED
ANDREW C. GADDES
STATE SAVING BANK OPTICAL
137-139 ELLIABETH ST. MELBOURNE

UNITED DEMOCRATS' REPORT

From United Democrats Headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street Adelaide.

1942: Possibly the most decisive year in our lives. A lot may happen for good or ill. One thing that will probably emerge from it will be an increasing desire on the part of the people to look at Social Credit principles as a means to solve their problems. People working together to get what they each want—security from oppression and depression. No one wants less than that; and that cannot be realised unless we do work together.

Then supposing we try—not merely resolve—to do this during the coming year? The time has gone by when we should get together and talk. Let's get together and do something big. We will not get through our present difficulties unless we do. Act on this suggestion and see how it works.

FEDERAL UNION is coming-

UNLESS you get busy to put a stop to it. Readers of the "New Times" have been well educated in this subject for months by Eric Butler, while readers of the "New Era" are not ignorant of what is being "put over." "Federal Union Exposed," by C.B.S., is a splendid job of work. These two writers deserve all the publicity possible so that this superimposture may be seen for what it is.

At a meeting of our Executive on January 8 it was resolved that the United Democrats should be only too anxious to encourage other groups to make a serious study of this new threat to our liberty. Call on us for advice or assistance. Literature available. OTHER GROUPS: The Adelaide Social Credit Group No. 1 is still pushing ahead. At the moment it is working on a series of small leaflets.

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: MU 2834.

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 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne, C.I.
Please forward me the "New Times" for.....
months, beginning with issue dated....., 19.....
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 £1 for 12 months; 10/- for 6 months; 5/- for 3 months. Post free.

JUSTICE FOR RETURNED MEN

(Continued from page 7.)

my opinion the loss of one leg with the resulting use of crutches for 23 years, would have caused undue strain on his system and would be a possible cause of arteriosclerosis."

Finally, I quote a letter by Dr. A. J. Hope, of Arthur-street, Punchbowl, which reads:—"Mrs. Hughes, the wife of the late F. W. Hughes, has consulted me re the latter's death. It seems to me quite feasible that the loss of a leg at the last war could have been the cause of his cerebral haemorrhage owing to the great effort required in using crutches over a lengthy period. I have seen a certificate issued by Dr. Green who attended him in which he expresses this view strongly,

The evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the claim of the widow of this deceased soldier. I have suggested to the Minister by means of a question on notice

This Jewish Business

(Continued from page 6.)

Alberta and elsewhere. It happens to be a fact that a large number of these men who form the secret world government, not yet—thank God!—in complete control, are Jews. Not only that, but the philosophy underlying the policy they pursue, the policy of this secret government, is identical with the Judaic philosophy. Its centralisation of policy, its deification of abstractions, its denial of the rights of the individual human being, have been shown in these pages frequently enough not to require repetition. Hitler's policy, which incorporates all these features, must derive from a similar philosophy.

It is this Judaic philosophic conception of life that is so abhorrent to the British mind. It follows that our enemies are those men who are so ruthlessly, by blood and sword, by death and falsehood, somehow, anyhow trying to clamp down, on a largely unsuspecting people, eternal slavery. Although many of their instruments are Gentiles, those men are mainly Jews. So long as the bulk of the Jewish people actively assist these men, they must be our enemies, too, whether they know to what ends they are being used or not. Hence this "Jew business"!

that the system in operation in Canada, where the onus is placed on the Repatriation Commissioner, should be in operation here also. The Minister assured me that that was the position in Australia; but if that be the legal position, I cannot understand why a different policy is in operation. A number of medical officers and independent citizens have given their testimony in this man's favour; but their evidence has been rejected in favour of that of a specialist in Melbourne. This attitude on the part of the Repatriation Commissioner is similar to that adopted by many life assurance companies which bring forward expert medical evidence in order to deprive assured persons of their rights. I hope that the new Minister, who I know is sympathetic to the claims of returned soldiers and their dependants will see that justice is done in this case. Probably some amendment of the Act will be necessary in order to ensure that justice will be done to returned soldiers. I hope, too, that the Minister will consider the hearing of the cases in open court rather than in camera, and that the Repatriation Commission, in fairness to the soldiers of the last war as well as to those who participate in the present war, will give attention to these matters.

Mr. Frost (Franklin—Minister for Repatriation): I shall have inquiries made into the case mentioned by the honourable member for Reid (Mr. Morgan) and shall let him have a reply as soon as possible.

No Debate on Chain Stores

In the British Parliament, Sir John Anderson told Mr. de la Bere (MP. for Evesham) in answer to a question that time could not be found for a debate on limitation of chain stores. He said the importance of the small shopkeeper in the economy and social structure was "pretty well recognised."

Mr. de la Bere had said that the livelihood of more than a million small shopkeepers was at stake.

SOCIETY FOR PROTECTION OF BRITONS AGAINST BUREAUCRATS

The following letter is reprinted from the "Dundee Courier and Advertiser:"

THE NIGHTMARE OF OFFICIAL FORMS.

Sir,—. . . Most in any trade, profession, or business are having their energy worn down very gradually but assuredly, not by enemy propaganda, not by consideration of friends in the forces or in the fighting line, nor by absent relatives, but by departmental forms to fill up. These are becoming the absolute stupid limit.

Government forms to fill up are coming in every morning, many contradicting each other—one to say one thing one month, one to say the next month that the position has "now been changed."

It is needless to say more. For those who receive these—we know too well their absolute annoyance—but "the worm will turn. It is to be borne in mind that folk all over the country are trying to save paper, yet these departments are using a colossal amount of unnecessary paper, and already it is proved for no purpose whatsoever, but to allow us to know that they are doing the job.

These folk could be done without; in fact we do not wish them. Many folk know not only for more than those who formulate these forms, but can carry out the war effort much more efficiently than those so-called people in charge. It is those offices we have taken away some of the best of our staff and left "those out of Government services or offices" carry on, not only without any one, but adding daily extra work to the various weakened organisations.

It is useless writing to any Government department to put a stop to this insane monster of so-called necessary statistics that has come amongst us, and it is high time we rose to protect ourselves against an absolute evil. It is my suggestion that we form a British Protection Society against our own Government servants issuing useless and wasteful forms.—I am, etc., W. H. Cowper, Mains of Logic, Hillside, Montrose.

U.E.A. NOTES

GENERAL MEETING.

The first general meeting of the United Electors of Australia for 1942 has been arranged for next Thursday, January 22, at room 8, McEwan House, 8 p.m. Activities for the new year, and the future policy of the movement will be discussed. With our organiser's field of action now strictly curtailed, the problem of organising has become most important. Latest reports indicate that the "Victory" public address trailer unit is nearing completion, and suggestions as to where and how it can best be used are invited. If you have any ideas on the subject, drop in at the rooms or write in to the secretary.

We also invite any suggestions as to the means of moving our trailer equipment from place to place. As petrol rationing has eliminated most petrol driven cars, is there some member owning a car fitted with a gas producer who would be prepared to assist us in taking our equipment to suitable spots? Once set up, the equipment can then be left in that place for the balance of the day, and need not interfere with the driver's plans for spending his Sunday or Saturday afternoon. Still, if you can assist us in this matter in any way, write or call the Hon. Sec., United Electors of Australia, (5th Floor, McEwan House), 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne.

ANTI-JEWISH OR ANTI-JUDAIC?

The present war has brought the "Jewish Question" to the notice of many thinking British citizens. Here is one of the most critical and impartial surveys of this, vital matter: "THE WAR BEHIND THE WAR." By ERIC D. BUTLER.

This booklet exposes the real forces behind Hitlerism. It shows clearly why Hitler must be defeated. It answers the cry about anti-semitism being introduced in British countries.

Price; 4d. posted. Obtainable from the "New Times," Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

"NEW TIMES" SHOPPING GUIDE AND BUSINESS DIRECTORY

PATRONISE THESE ADVERTISERS. Their Advertisement Helps Your Paper. Say You Saw I 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, WX 1430.

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. WX 2073.

GROCER, W. M. Anderson, 14 Main St. WX 1233.

HAIRDRESSER and Tobacconist. L. Larsen, Station: St., op, Gilpin's

IRONMONGER & SPORTS STORE. F.P Park, 10 Main St. WX 1290

WATCHMAKER and Jeweller. Bames 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 Street. 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 Collins St. Ladies' Hairdressers. OPTICIAN and Hearing Aids. 4th Floor, 57 Swanston St. F 5566,

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/-. H5813. 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, and All Jewellery Repairs. Old Gold Bought. Greaves, opp. Rialto.

IMPERIAL DAIRY, R. H. Kent 9 Brougham Street. Haw. 3243.

MOTOR GARAGE, Kew 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 Restrung from 7/6-GROCERY, McKAY. & WHITE, Bay Rd., opp. Theatre, XW 1924.

ST. KILDA.

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

SPRINGVALE

DAISY, M. Bowler. Buckingham Ave.

R. MACKAY & SONS. General Storekeepers. UM. 9269

WILLIAMSTOWN.

DUNSTAN DAIRYMAN 28 Station Rd. 'Phone; W'town 124.

Printed by M. F. Canavan, 25 Cullinton-road, Hartwell, for the New Times Limited McEwan House, Melbourne.