

ON OTHER PAGES

Billeting. (Page 4.)
Socialism and Post-war Reconstruction. (Page 4.)
The international Situation. (Page 6.)
Bankers' War Aims. (Page 6.)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE

PRICE 4 PENCE

NEW TIMES

Vol. 8. No. 5. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEB. 6, 1942.

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

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 it crime.—Whittier (1807-1892).

Spotlight On Sir Keith Murdoch

Patriot or Powermonger?

Last week considerable prominence was given in the press and on the radio to the fact that Sir Keith Murdoch had returned to Australia, and that he had certain opinions about the conduct of the war. He was specially photographed for the purpose and his views were quoted by the national broadcasting stations. In addition, the Melbourne "Herald," one of his newspapers, was quoted by the British Broadcasting Corporation, and his name also found a place in the news sessions from enemy radio stations.

On January 29, "he was entertained at dinner . . . as a welcome home from his recent tour of U.S.A., Britain, Middle East and N.E.I., which he undertook at the request of the British Government" ("Argus," 30/1/42). Those present at the dinner included the Chief of the Air Staff, the G.O.C., Southern Command, the Second Naval Member, the Deputy Chief of the General Staff, the Assistant Chief of the Air Staff, the Director-General of Munitions and Aircraft Production, and (note specially) Mr. Harold Darling, of the Bank-owning Metal Monopoly.

It is reasonable to inquire about the identity of this apparently important man and to ask how came it that the British Government requested him to undertake such a tour. It is also reasonable to inquire whether it is in the best interests of the Australian nation that the commanders of all arms of our fighting forces in their official capacities should have been publicly associated with him on the very day on which one of his propaganda agencies (the Melbourne "Sun") sought to influence our war strategy in the Pacific. On that day the "Sun" editorial contained the following modest sentence: "Mr. Churchill, like Sir Keith Murdoch, considers that an invasion of Australia is an operation too ambitious for Japan to undertake in the limited time likely to be available to her before the British and American Navies regain control of the Pacific."

Put briefly, Sir Keith Murdoch may be described as a newspaper magnate and one of the men responsible for keeping the Australian people in financial servitude to foreign interests. He is managing director of the Herald and Weekly Times Ltd., and its broadcasting stations; managing editor of The "Herald," the "Sun," the "Weekly

GESTAPO!

The "Sun" of January 29 reports that Ministers will discuss "issuing identity discs or cards to all civilians to ensure that nobody evaded the impending register. It is further suggested that special inspectors be located at railway stations, ferry barriers, trams, trains and sporting crowds, with power to demand identity discs." The police Eureka in exercised similar power to demand miners' licenses. History regards the terrible results of these practices which were, and are now, a violent insult to free men. It is to be hoped the Labor leaders will return to a sane, democratic outlook and forget such dangerous ideas, which could incite easily endanger our national society.

Times" and their associated publications; director of Australian Associated Press (by whose "courtesy" we get the overseas news); chairman of directors of Australian Newsprint Mills Pty. Ltd.; director of both the "Advertiser" and "News" in Adelaide (which are popularly supposed to be in competition), and the "Courier Mail" in Brisbane; editor and manager of the United Cable Service. He has represented the London "Times" and was educated at the London School of Economics.

This brief list shows him to be controller of the channels of publicity and the instruments of propaganda, and he has used both to mislead the people and thus create so-called public opinion to suit his own interests. By the unscrupulous use of his power in this direction, he is largely responsible for the defeat of Govern-

(Continued on page 8.)

NATIONAL CREDIT MOTION IN N.S.W. PARLIAMENT NEARLY BLOCKED BY LABOR "JUNTA"

Hereunder, in black type, is the resolution moved recently by Mr. A. G. Enticknap (Murrumbidgee), in the N.S.W. Legislative Assembly. The circular letter reprinted thereunder, besides indicating activity in the Riverina, reveals how the undemocratic Labor "junta" nearly kept this progressive local citizen out of Parliament.

(1) That, in the opinion of this House, the Commonwealth Government should use the national credit of Australia as a right, and not as a debt created by trading banks, so that finance may be made available through the Commonwealth Bank, without inflation and free of debt, to the full extent and thus ensure that men, materials, and equipment are available for the prosecution of the war, for the security and development of the country and its industries, and to ensure payable prices for our products, to facilitate social reforms, and for post-war reconstruction.

(2) That this House instructs its representatives to the Commonwealth Loan Council to advocate and vote for the above.

* * *

Leeton, N.S.W.

Dear Sir,—I take this opportunity of forwarding you a copy of a Notice of Motion given in the New South Wales Legislative Assembly by Mr. A. G. Enticknap, the Labor member for Murrumbidgee. An identical resolution has been carried in the Legislative Assemblies in four States of the Commonwealth, and, as you will agree, it is essential that it be carried in the State House of this State also.

In order that you may render the fullest aid towards it being carried I

respectfully suggest that, in the first instance, you write to your representative in the Legislative Assembly requesting or instructing him to support Mr. Enticknap's resolution when it is being dealt with, which, it is anticipated, will be very shortly. I further suggest that you write to Mr. J. J. Langtry, M.H.R., and request him to enlist the fullest and all practical support, towards the successful treatment of this resolution by the Loan Council. In passing, I suggest also, and particularly commend the suggestion to you, that you write and congratulate Mr. Enticknap upon the valuable action he is taking regarding this all-important matter.

With all who understand and deplore the orthodoxy of the Curtin-Chifley Budget, I most heartily agree. Incidentally, I have conveyed those sentiments to Mr. Langtry with the utmost vigour and emphasis.

As you may know, Mr. Enticknap was elected to represent the Murrumbidgee electorate at the last State elections by a strong Labor organisation but not with the concurrence of the Official Labor executive. The official executive attempted to deny the right given to the rank and file members of the Labor Party under the rules and constitution of the

(Continued on page 8)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

CHURCHILL'S SPEECH.—A most exhaustive examination of Churchill's speech to his own confidence motion failed to produce any information of value to anyone—including, of course, the enemy.

MILITIA PAY.—The Government's "money complex" is very evident regarding militia pay. As usual, the human element is disregarded: especially the wives and children of militia men. It is reported that the proposed increase will take the form of deferred pay to the huge amount of 2/-. The bankers' philosophy of money scarcity, and the belief that whilst the soldiers may be trusted to fight and die they cannot be trusted with their own money, can be discerned quite clearly in this approach. Perhaps the R.S.L. will take up this issue on behalf of the fighting forces?

U.S. TROOPS IN IRELAND.—Mr. de Valera is reported in the "Herald" of January 28 as "protesting against the landing of U.S. troops in Northern Ireland. He declares that his Government was not consulted by Britain or U.S." This report was pointed out to President Roosevelt, who "expressed himself as amazed." The report did not affirm or deny the correctness or otherwise of Mr. de Valera's statement. In the same issue, we are told that U.S. Senator Robinson "demanded to

know why the American force, complete with ships and planes, had been sent to Ireland instead of to the Philippines." Further in this matter, the London "Times" New York correspondent states that "the arrival of U.S. troops will permit the despatch of British troops to the Pacific"—perhaps he had the Philippines in mind.

COPLAND'S CAPERS.—This wizard declared ("Herald," January 28), that "it was a fixed principle of price control during war-time that scarcity of supply and increased demand shall not be allowed to force prices up." This statement is in direct contradiction to those he uses when scaring the public with the inflation bogey—when he insists that a scarcity of civil goods automatically forces the prices of such commodities skywards. It has been said that economists will advocate any theory to hold their jobs, so there is still hope for intelligent economists.

CANADA'S NEW WIPE-OFF.—Special war-time financial assistance plan from Canada to Britain includes £333 millions worth of munitions, raw materials and foodstuffs—free of charge or obligation; in return for which Britain is to repatriate £98 millions of Canadian National Railway securities. Canada will also convert her sterling credits of £233 million into an interest-free loan for the duration. This nett wipe-off of £235 million, plus interest on £233 million, seems to be in addition to the earlier one. No doubt this is a bankers' move to clear the decks for the export-debt circus to start all over again—and to prepare the public for the twin niggers in the woodpile: Federal Union and the Gold Standard.

LEADER MANIA.—Forthright criticism of Mr. Churchill is that from Mr. Curtin, reported in the "Sun" of January 27: "No nation can afford to risk its failure on the infallibility of one man." Mr. Curtin makes a sound point, but he is the last person one would expect to attack the leadership

(Continued on page 7.)

EVACUATION PLANS

There is much confusion on this question, and the comments of Mr. Cremean, M.L.A., which appeared in the "Herald" of January 29, to the effect that "the plans for reception of evacuees were in a disgraceful condition," are not likely to engender confidence. If the need for evacuation arises, the first essential will be financial security, because thousands of citizens will be separated from their incomes as well as their families. The Government should accept full financial responsibility for such a situation arising from its legislation - and provide adequate finance for each individual.

How to Win the War — and the Peace

A Challenge to Every Britisher

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

(Continued from last issue.)

It has been suggested in some quarters that unless we are prepared to forego some of our cherished liberties in favour of Federal Union, there will be a post-war depression. Surely this, and every other British country, can solve its own problem if the people control their own financial policy. This talk of depression is defeatism. Let me give one example:

At a dinner in Auckland, New Zealand, on his way back to Australia late in May, 1941, Mr. Menzies, then Prime Minister, gave us a very clear indication of what we are to expect. He scorned the idea that the people of Britain were putting everything they had into the war because of any hope they might have of getting improved conditions afterwards. "I encountered no thinking human being in Britain who did not realise that if the price of victory is poverty, AND I THINK IT IS—AND WHAT IS WRONG WITH POVERTY, PROVIDED IT IS THE POVERTY OF FREEDOM?—then the business of statesmanship after the war is to see that poverty is honourably shared."

Ye gods! Is this the way to build enthusiasm? Perhaps Mr. Menzies will tell us what we will be materially short of at the conclusion of this conflict. Compare his destructive remarks with the following extract from a recent cable from America:

"The view that war will impoverish all countries is not sustained by past experience, says a policy statement of the U.S. National Planning Board. 'No nation need be impoverished if its productive resources—both capital and human—are intact,' it adds. 'The United States is building up its production to unprecedented heights. The war should end with America's resources greater than ever before. We shall have enormous productive capacities in machine industries.'"

The same applies to this country. During the last war, Britain actually finished the war with her assets 25 per cent greater than when the war started—and this was accomplished in spite of the fact that millions of her able-bodied men were destroying hundreds of millions of pounds of material across the Channel. At the conclusion, of the last war, Britain was in the position to give her people a much higher standard of living than they had ever enjoyed. And surely, after four years of war, they were entitled to it. But the cup of victory was dashed from their lips as they were about to taste it. Millions who fought in the mud of Flanders to "save democracy" were thrown on the economic scrap-heap. Why? The bankers decreed a shortage of tickets—money—credit! The victory was sabotaged. Do YOU want that to happen again? You don't? Right. You must get busy now and tell as many people as possible the truth about this money mesmerism. But don't delay. This is war, war against an enemy who will beat us unless we beat him.

There is no material reason why we should have poverty after, this war. Let us see that there is no repetition of the money mesmerism. The people must have the monetary demand that will switch the colossal production for war to the production for peace.

THE WORK MANIA

One of the worst manias that ever kept the human race enslaved is the "work mania." I refer to "work" as something which we are forced to do in order to obtain some of the inadequate supply of tickets made available by the banking system. The great cry for years before the outbreak of the war was: "We must get people back to work." This cry went up when there was already sufficient, and more, being produced to satisfy the desires of all the people—WITHOUT THE UNEMPLOYED BEING PUT TO WORK TO

DON'T "LEAVE IT TO LABOR"

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY FUNCTION

Told in a Clear, Simple, But Comprehensive Manner in:

"The Money Power Versus Democracy"

By Eric D. Butler.

Don't waste your time talking. Pass this book on to your friends to read. It will answer all their questions. In forty-eight pages, the author has crystallised the philosophy history and application of democratic principles.

A damning indictment of the Party System. Ask your Labor Party friends if they can answer the arguments. A splendid reference book for those quotations which you must have at your fingertips. The simple presentation of the money question can be followed by a child; even politicians can be given a copy! This book tells you of the practical steps which have already been taken to make democracy function. Read how National Insurance was defeated.

Apart from being packed with facts, quotations and information, this book shows the reader what to do. A suggested letters to be sent to Members of Parliament is printed at the end of the book. This book is undoubtedly the finest exposition of political and economic democracy to yet appear in this country. Thousands of copies have already been sold.

Price: 10d, posted. Obtainable from the

"New Times," Box 1226, G.P.O. Melbourne.

PRODUCE STILL FURTHER SUPPLIES OF GOODS. But the unemployed lacked money because the present ideas governing society say that, unless you work—even if there is no need for you to work—you shall receive no money (except, perhaps, a miserly and humiliating "dole.") Hence we saw slow starvation in the midst of abundance.

Now the cry for getting people "back to work" grows stronger. "What are we going to do with our fighting men after the war?" is being asked by groups of every shade of political opinion. "We must find work for them." Let me challenge here and now the idea that we must try to "find work." The whole of the efforts of the best brains of civilisation have been directed for hundreds of years towards releasing man from forced drudgery in order that he could LIVE. Those who don't agree that the aim of scientific knowledge should be fully applied to release man from work must logically agree that, under our present system, the only thing to be done is to revert to a state of barbarism and scarcity. All labour-saving machinery should be destroyed!

Scientific knowledge has made our civilisation possible. There was a time when man had to spend all his time working long hours—hunting, catching fish, etc.—in order to exist. But simple inventions gradually released some men from the necessity of devoting all their time to obtaining food. These men had leisure to lay the foundations of culture—music, writing, painting, etc. It is physically possible, and it will be more readily so after this war, for a small number of keen, efficient experts working short hours, to produce sufficient for the whole of the population. But it would be impossible for the people to obtain the goods unless they had sufficient money. And they could not obtain money by working, as there would be no need for them to work. What's the solution? We must see that the people are issued with sufficient money to buy the goods. Yes, a dividend. It is their right. It is their heritage.

"What, something for nothing!" certain moralists, banterers and power-lusters will shout. But why not? Even the most complacent reactionary cannot flatter himself that he invented the arts which he enjoys to-day. He has got something for nothing. Solar power has been tapped by science to serve man (water-power, coal and electricity). Solar energy is something for nothing, a gift to mankind from nature. Don't let us be frightened about this ticket mesmerism, the only thing which prevents us from using it fully.

In order to grasp this matter more fully, let us clearly understand, the objective of industry. Surely no one will deny that the only objective of industry should be to deliver the maximum of goods, with the minimum of effort, when and where desired by consumers. Industry's objective is NOT to provide work. Work is incidental to the real objective. In a sane society, only those keenly interested in production would be able to find a place in industry. And their sole aim would be production based on the ideal of service. To-day, everything is reversed. The following extract from "The Deadlock In Finance," by an engineer, Major A. E. Powell, is well worth quoting on this point:

"... The end has been obscured by the means. The sole end of industry, apart from giving us something useful and interesting to do, and enabling us to help and serve one another, is to produce and distribute its manifold products for the welfare, comfort and pleasure of mankind. To lose sight of this primary objective, and to make industry merely a means of collecting 'tickets,' is as foolish as it would be to make it our business to collect omnibus or railway tickets, or postage stamps, and to make wholly secondary and incidental to this futile occupation travel by omnibus and railway train, or writing and receiving letters."

It is only the present monetary mesmerism which forces producers to think in terms of "tickets" instead of thinking in terms of reality.

THE PAULINE DOCTRINE

There are many people who will refer the advocate of paid leisure to the Pauline doctrine that it is wrong for a man to eat unless he works. However St. Paul had never seen a steam turbine or a mechanical excavator. Those interested in preserving the Work State will often refer to what St. Paul said. I will refer to the words of his Holiness Pope Pius X., who in his Encyclical of 1931, wrote as follows:

"The appeal made by some of the words of the Apostle, 'If any man will not work, neither let him eat,' is as inept as it is unfounded. The Apostle is here passing judgment on those who refuse to work when they could and ought to do so; he admonishes us to use diligently our time and our powers of body and mind, and not to become burdensome to others so long as we are able to provide for ourselves. In no sense does he teach that labour is the sole title which gives a right to a living or to profits."

And aren't we told in the New Testament about the lilies that "spin not"? Any suggestion that man will become demoralised unless he is forced to work is not verified by history. All our best culture has been developed by those fortunate few who have had no necessity to work. Man is naturally creative. The great Greek civilisation was based on leisure. The Greek citizens did no work, as we speak of work, at all. They devoted all their lives to the development of their bodies and their minds. But they only had this leisure by using human slaves. That was, I believe, one of the causes of the collapse of their civilisation. But we have mechanical slaves to-day — slaves which will serve us if we will only get rid of this work mania.

MACHINES DISPLACE MEN

It may be as well if I marshal a few facts about this age of plenty and the displacement of men by machines. Very few people realise what a marvellous world we could live in after the war. We could have lived in it before the war. It was physically possible. (Needless to say, if we had lived in that world, there would have been no war.) A big book could be written on this subject. I can only try to stimulate the reader to learn more about it.

One of the most comprehensive surveys ever made of potential production was carried out in 1933 in America. Sixty-five of the leading technicians in America set out to ascertain what standard-of-living the American people could enjoy if the production machine were used to capacity. The report, known as the United States Government's National Survey of Product Capacity, stated that it was possible to provide every American family with an income of 4400 dollars (approximately £900) in goods and services. Think of it! £18 a week! And that was nine years ago.

A few years ago it was estimated by scientists that the total of all forms of power in the world was approximately 1500 million horse-power. This works out at approximately eighty horse-power for every individual. And the war is increasing our release of power to an extent which makes the mind reel.

With present-day equipment 4000 men are sufficient to cultivate the soil for the United States wheat crop, whereas 100 years ago, 5,000,000 men would have been required. Modern farming machinery has revolutionised farming.

The Chief Mechanical Engineer of the South Australian Railways has stated that in 1929, 800 men at the Islington workshops were doing the same amount of work that 1800 did in 1925.

Mr. J. B. Priestly, the famous British writer, wrote in "English Journey":—"One monster excavator I examined at some length and went into the steel cab to

(Continued on page 3)

SENATOR DARCEY'S BUDGET SPEECH

(Continued from last Issue.)

We have a Joint Committee on Social Security, which has been charged with the task of recommending means by which the social conditions of the people could be improved. When that committee was appointed by the last Government, I felt that a lot of time and money would be wasted, because it would not tackle the money question, and, consequently, could not get to the root of the trouble and make worthwhile recommendations. The bad social conditions that exist to-day are brought about by lack of purchasing power in the hands of the people. When it is realised that the banks have the sole right to create credit, which represents the purchasing power of the people, and that they can stop it at any time, it will be realised what tremendous power is vested in them. During the depression, food valued at hundreds of millions of pounds was destroyed on the advice of so-called economists as a means of keeping up prices. . . .

I have said more than once in this chamber that debt takes away individual and national liberty. Suppose I am a baker accustomed to buy flour from two or three millers. I owe one miller considerably more than the others. He says to me: "You must buy all your requirements from me in the future; otherwise I shall put you through the insolvency court." Because of my indebtedness to him I lose my individual liberty. A baker very often continues to supply poor people with bread, even though he knows that the prospect of being paid for it is rather remote. He has not the heart to stop their bread when he knows that little children in the house have nothing else to eat. In that way, he runs into debt, and immediately loses his economic liberty and becomes the slave of the miller. In addition, he is compelled to pay

any price the miller to whom he is indebted likes to charge. In just the same way many nations are up to the neck in debt to the banks. When the late Mr. Lyons was Prime Minister he floated a loan on the market at 6 per cent.

Senator Keane.—And then "welched" on the interest rate.

Senator Darcey.—That is so. We must remember that from 75 per cent, to 80 per cent, of all loans are subscribed by the banks. Having realised that, it is easy to see who fixes the rate of interest. As I have said on many occasions, interest can be paid only by further borrowing. That is why the national debt has increased so tremendously in the last few years. In Hobart recently I was interested to hear a lecturer, an economist at Melbourne University, give his impressions of a visit to Russia in 1934. Dealing with the Soviet's financial policy, he said that M. Stalin had a habit of putting a loan on the market at 6 per cent, and, when he got the money, of lowering the interest rate to 3 per cent. I point out that that practice is not peculiar to Russia. I do not know whether M. Stalin learned of it from Mr. Lyons, or whether Mr. Lyons learned of it from M. Stalin.

I have endeavoured to give honourable senators some idea of the mess we have got into as a result of following orthodox methods of finance. The only way Australia may be saved from financial and economic ruin is by a complete alteration of the financial system. There should be a revolutionary change in the finances of this country. The word "revolution" means a violent departure from existing methods or ideals. A violent departure from orthodox financial methods must be brought about in Australia if this country is to be saved from financial insolvency. To continue

as we are going on to-day is madness. History shows that on several occasions one man has been right when the rest of the world has been wrong.

One of the new economists whom I follow has said that banks do not need to have money to start at all. This man was asked to go to Ottawa to express an opinion on a bank Bill then before the Canadian Parliament. He was asked how much capital a bank required before it should be given a charter to trade. To the amazement of his hearers he said, "A bank does not need capital to start business. It needs only buildings, books and pens." When a bank commences business it invites people to make deposits with it, and when it accepts deposits it simply gives receipts for them. But a depositor is given no security that he will get it back again. If I deposit, say, £100 in a bank, the manager says, "We will pay you interest at the rate of 2½ per cent, for two years." I say, "All right"; and I get a receipt for the deposit. On the other hand, if I wish to borrow £100 from a bank, the bank wants a guaranteed security to twice the value of the loan either in real estate, or bricks and mortar, before it will advance the loan. The banks are like the bookmakers. The latter cry the odds and you cannot get a bet unless you take their prices. The banks make all the terms. It is useless to go from one bank to another, because they have a gentleman's agreement.

Recently I was talking to the only son of a Queensland farmer who was heir to an estate of 14,000 acres. His father was one of the best stockmen in Queensland. In the bank-created depression in 1929, the bank seized the whole of the 14,000 acres and the owner saw the finest milch cows being sold for 11/- a head. He lost the whole of his security because in the depression, which the banks created, his overdraft was called up. Later, he was glad to get a job on a farm at 10/- a week. He worked at breaking in horses, and when he was injured in a fall and was obliged to cease duty for two weeks, his employer stopped £1 out of his wages. That is an indication of the policy of the banking system in Australia. Is it any wonder that Professor Wadham, who inquired into the wheat industry in Australia, reported that the wheat lands of this country were mortgaged to the banks and financial institutions to the amount of £160,000,000? At that time the price of wheat was 2/4 a bushel. Yet the Government of the day was urging the farmers to grow more wheat. Before this war broke out, the wool industry was in the same parlous state. The debt of the wool-growers to the banks and financial institutions was £175,000,000; and they requested the Government to pay

a bonus of 1d. per lb. in order to enable them to pay their overdrafts. The banks have never created 1d. worth of wealth in Australia, yet they own Australia.

Senator Brown.—Ned Kelly.

Senator Darcey.—They are worse than Ned Kelly. The bushranger takes the risk of being hanged, but the successful banker is admired by his shareholders. I know wheat and wool-growers who never saw a cheque for years because the banks would not finance their clip, or crop, until these were made over to them. Ned Kelly was decent compared with some of them. I do not blame the bank managers. They have absolutely no say in the matter. Many take their instructions from London, and London takes its instructions from the Bank of International Settlements at Basle. That bank is not subject to the law of any country. Absolute power is given to it under its charter. . . . In 1939, Mr. Montagu Norman loaned Hitler £50,000,000. He said, "We shall have to let Germany have the money, although we might never get it back. But it is worth £50,000,000 to support Nazism." . . .

Financially, we are fighting with one hand behind our back. When a totalitarian State makes war on a democratic State, it has complete control over the whole of the financial resources of its nation. There is no individualism in a totalitarian State. Two years ago I said that Germany was using its national credit ever since it started the armament race. I gave figures showing how the gold reserves of the world were held in 1939. In that year the total gold reserves amounted to 14,301,000,000 American dollars. That reserve was held as follows: United States of America, 8,126,000,000 dollars; Great Britain, 396,000,000 dollars; France, 1,435,000,000 dollars; Holland, 595,000,000 dollars; Belgium, 318,000,000 dollars; Switzerland, 407,000,000 dollars; Germany, 17,000,000 dollars; Italy, 124,000,000 dollars, and Japan 97,000,000 dollars. The three most powerful and warlike nations of today have not as much gold between them as little Switzerland; yet we were told at that time by the orthodox economists that Germany could not possibly arm and fight a war because it was "broke." Germany realised that wars are fought not with money but with credit. . . . Dr. Schacht, the manager of the German Reich Bank, wanted to adhere to orthodox methods and to lend money to the nation through the Reich Bank. For that reason Hitler "sacked" him; but when the business people of Germany worked out a financial system to meet the needs of the nation, Dr. Schacht was given back his job. . . .

(Continued on page 8.)

HOW TO WIN THE WAR—AND THE PEACE

see the controls, which were so ingenious that the enormous brute could easily be handled by one man, and not necessarily, I imagine, a very intelligent or experienced man. Yet this one machine could do the work of 800 navvies. This is a small fact that throws a sharply focused light on the industrial world of to-day. At one stroke, 800 manual labourers are obliterated. I do not protest against the fact. What little navvying I did during the war I heartily disliked. Let the steel monsters do it by all means. But I cannot believe that an industrial and economic system, which assumes that 800 men are shovelling away, are drawing wages, are buying food and clothing, can possibly continue functioning properly when 800 men have been dismissed and in their place a solitary machine that only asks for a man and a regular feed of heavy engine oil. In other words, machines of this kind are obviously revolutionising industry, and if we want to avoid a complete breakdown it seems to me our economics will have to be revolutionised, too."

Yes, men must be paid the wages of the machine.

Listen to Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, chairman of Tubes Ltd., reported in the "Times," December 15, 1932: "I doubt if people realise how far this displacement has gone. In 1908 in a number of representative Birmingham businesses, labour represented 28 per cent, and profits 12½ per cent, of the sales figure. To-day these percentages are nearer 18 per cent and six per cent. I know of a trade in which, in 1912, labour represented 10 per cent, of the works cost, rose, by 1930, to 20 per cent, and now in a modern layout will account for no more than 3 per cent; and it is common to all of us to hear of plant installations designed to produce within some such figure as ten, the work previously turned out by sixty or seventy operatives. No wonder that there is unemployment."

But unemployment is, generally regarded as a cause to be cured. It's not. It's a desirable objective for which man has been striving for centuries. Only an insane ticket system stands between man and his heritage.

The facts were well summed up in a letter to the London "Times" of October 27, 1932, by Sir Harold Bowden. He stated:-

"(1) Machinery has been for many years visibly displacing men from employment in all industries. No economic process can ever find remunerative work for them elsewhere, for science is progressively diminishing the demand for man-power. To put the point in concrete form, we can to-day produce in, say, eighty man-hours, what we formerly produced in one hundred man-hours. An agricultural revival, emigration, a universal five-day week (were this possible), would act as palliatives, but the mechanisation process will inevitably continue and be intensified.

"(2) Purchasing-power is in the main distributed as a reward for labour. If the labour is not needed, the purchasing power is not distributed under our present system, except in the form; of doles, charity, poor-law relief, and by similar unsatisfactory and demoralizing devices.

"(3) In an age of cheap production and ample supply, millions are suffering from want. They are deprived of purchasing power, not through any fault of their own, but because our statesmen, financiers, and economists have been able to devise no other pretext for giving it to them except in exchange for work."

(To be continued)

TO OUR READERS

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

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

Subscription Form

To New Times Ltd.,
Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne, C.I.

Please forward me the "New Times" for.....

months beginning with issue dated.....19...
cheque

I enclose postal note for the sum of.....
money order

Name.....

Full Postal Address.....

Date.....

Please fill in name and address in block capitals.

The subscription rate to the "New Times" is £1 for 12 months; 10/- for 6 months; 5/- for 3 months. Post free.

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, FEBRUARY 6, 1942.

No. 5.

SOCIALISM AND POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

One edition of the "Encyclopaedia Britannica" contains an article on Socialism by Bernard Shaw. Mr. Shaw's conception of an ideal State is based upon the following first principles: "The iniquity of private property, the paramount social importance of equality of income and the criminality of idleness."

The "New Times" challenges every point. Only a completely servile state could possibly result from such a moral basis. It represents the maximum interference with personal liberty and implies compulsory industrial service. Neither private property nor inequality of income nor idleness are essential problems in our civilisation from which first principles of post-war reconstruction can be formed. The fact that such first principles are put forward shows that the economic analysis has become entangled with two side-issues—"Ownership" and "Work"—neither of which are vitally connected with the financial difficulty of distribution now facing mankind. There cannot be the slightest doubt that Shavianism and Fabianism are already out of date, together with all theories of socialism which accept the same views, if these principles are put forward as the basis for social re-organisation.

The "criminality of idleness" is the most unconvincing of all. There is not the slightest reason, moral or otherwise, why people should not be idle if they wish to be, when automatic machines plus a comparatively few highly-skilled and highly-paid engineers and mechanics are able and willing to produce essential peace-time supplies and a margin of luxuries for general distribution.

The nineteenth century was marked by the advent of power-driven machinery. The outstanding fact of our own period is the application of AUTOMATIC power-driven machinery to production. What has already been accomplished in this direction is astonishing, and it is still more astonishing that its effect upon the economic problem should be so generally overlooked. Given a lead and a free hand, the industrial engineer, by the application of improved automatic machinery, could "throw out of work" the majority of those who scramble for a job. The Labour-Saving Revolution is upon us—has already begun. While, Mr. Shaw is intent upon keeping people at work and inculcating the ju-ju of the "criminality of idleness," the industrial engineer and organiser is doing his best, with the help of the inventor, to increase the number of unemployed.

The only thing that is wrong about it is that these peace-time unemployed are left more or less on the verge of subsistence—when there are not only plenty of goods for them to buy, but producers only too anxious to find a market! They are denied sufficient money—because they have not worked. No one, except those afflicted with the work-complex, wants them to work. There is no necessary work for them. Production goes forward without them. And there will be less and less work for them as methods of industrial efficiency are speeded up and unnecessary human labour is thrown out of the factory. For some unknown reason, Mr. Shaw cannot bear to think of a man receiving purchasing-power unless he has done his quota of machine-minding in the Compulsory State Workhouse. It is absurd. No doubt Mr. Shaw would be quite willing to leave his pen and do his share of robotism for an hour or two a day. But no one wishes him to do so, and there is no economic need for any such part-time work-sharing. It is a ramshackle notion which has no relation to the facts of modern productive organisation. In every department of labour more and more human beings will be given "the sack" because they are not needed.

"But even automatic machines have to be attended to, watched, and kept in good order," some may say. Of course; but not by part-time amateurs. Those whose whole interest is in the perfecting and construction of mechanism are the right types. "Why should the few toil for the many?" comes the wail. The answer is: "Because they want to—it is their special interest and life's work. That wail about the few well-educated, skilled and efficient engineers and mechanics being left to see after the productive machinery for the supply of the majority is a miserable howl about no real inequality at all. It is the leavings of a socialism soaked in sentimental slosh, and unable to disentangle itself from ideas formulated under different conditions. If Mr. Shaw wants, for some reason, to eradicate the "terrible vice" of idleness, there is but one way of doing it; and that is to see that everyone is idle! An Irishman should be able to understand the practical result of such paradoxical action.

The fact is we are dealing here, not with economics at all, but with an ethical dictum pronounced by St. Paul—which may have applied to the problems of his own day, but which certainly cannot apply to the mass production of our own. Mr. Shaw shakes hands with St. Paul and reiterates the "No work, no food" slogan. Too often the attitude of the socialist and the capitalist towards the idea of work is identical. You must work before you can eat even if there is plenty of food and your work is not required. It is a ridiculous

BILLETING

With the authorities in Sydney and elsewhere making house-to-house enquiries re accommodation available for billeting, the whole question of billeting becomes one which is fraught with interest for Australians. "

Since this war began there have been three major attempts to impose billeting upon the British people.

First, there was the attempt to billet proposed evacuees from the congested areas of London upon the rural homes. This was supposed to be a precautionary measure in relation to the "blitzkrieg." It failed utterly. It was rejected by the proposed evacuees, in whose interest it was proposed to operate, with the same unanimity as marked its rejection by rural residents.

Chilled by this outstanding failure, we have heard very little of billeting for a long time, but we now have in Britain the second and third attempt to revive billeting, being tried simultaneously.

It would appear that this second attempt was to billet Italian prisoners upon British farmers. This attempt appears to have been rejected with an even more vehement scorn than the first attempt. In this connection the following, from the Sydney "Sun," 10/1/42, is interesting:

"**ANGERED BY BILLET PLAN.** London, Saturday.—British farmers and their wives are revolting against a proposal by the Ministry of Agriculture that they should billet good-conduct Italian prisoners in their homes. Opposition is so fierce it is unlikely the Ministry will press the idea. Italians have been assigned to work on farms from which 10,000 young Britishers are due to be called up for the services, but many farmers regard the majority of them as lazy, insolent, surly, bad tempered and over-pampered. Farmers made these charges: (1) Some Italians demand long-handled shovels so they will not have to bend their backs too much. (2) Prisoners receive a weekly allowance of 60 cigarettes, while the soldiers guarding them receive only

30. (3) Some Fascists refuse to work, throw their shovels over a hedge, and sit down. (4) Those who do work do not arrive until 9 a.m. They work 20 minutes then take 10 minutes off to warm themselves at a brazier."

The third attempt is referred to in the "Sun" of 13/1/42, as follows: "Female civil servants, sent from London to provincial cities, and compulsorily billeted in private homes, are finding many landlords thoroughly hostile. Strict rules are imposed on them. One woman stated that the idea of boarding a civil servant was distressing, almost repugnant."

It would appear, therefore, that the idea of billeting is as repugnant to this generation of Britishers as it was to that generation which prohibited in the Bill of Rights this imposition of billeting, in terms simple and unmistakable.

In passing, it would be interesting to learn by what warped process of reasoning the existing British Parliament (and the Australian Parliament, for that matter), came to the obviously false conclusion that it had a mandate to override that direction given so plainly by the British people in the Bill of Rights. It would be interesting to see the matter tested in the courts, and to hear the opinion on this matter by learned judges.

It has been said that the worst catastrophe which can befall a country is to be occupied by a hostile force; and for a country to be occupied by an allied and friendly force is a catastrophe of the same order, but less in degree. During the last war the writer witnessed at first hand some of the milder fruits of this latter disaster, for he saw France occupied by her ally, the British.

In 1918, coming from the line, we were billeted in a small French village

(Continued on page 5.)

attitude, which will pass away as the forces at work within industry are recognised.

The attitude of the wage-slave (a perfectly correct term) is: "Please could you give me a job of work?" Mr. Shaw would change this to: "O Gord! I've got to go and do my two hours of robotism in the ginger-beer factory. Damn!—otherwise the poor wretch is liable to be charged with "criminal idleness."

The "New Times" foresees a state of affairs in which an "idle" citizen might say: "Fed up doing nothing in particular—I think I'd like to do a job of work." And when he applied to be taken on, he would be asked: "You want to work eh? Are you any good? Have you any particular skill or ability? Oh, no, we make, fill stopper and pack all our bottles automatically. Two of us look after that. If you've any new idea or invention to offer of if you've studied the process... Why not try the handicraft workshops, they might allow you to do a bit of weaving or rough carpentry?"

When the individual can live without being forced to do industrial oakum-picking before he is allowed to have a penny in his pocket, the ethical values regarding work will become clear. Work in the economic sphere or social services will be the privilege of the few; the few who love the particular work they have chosen and can do efficiently. Others will be free to develop their "uneconomic" special talents, instead of being square pegs in round holes. The man who is just a person, with no special bent, can dig his garden, mend the taps in the bathroom paper the spare room, read a book or smoke his pipe. Only the really keen men will be able to get into industry. Work? It will be an honour to be allowed to work there.

In such a state of affairs, those who are capable will naturally go into those departments for which they know themselves to be fitted. The teaching profession, for example, at present clogged and congested with a mass of inefficient and weary men and women, will be released from its economic bugbear. Those inefficient who take no particular interest in education, but who "had to do something to earn a living," and so became teachers, will drop out and will be able to live without strangling the minds of little children. The vital and enthusiastic teacher, full of vim and ideas, keen on his job and able to do it with a gleam of joy in his heart and plenty of physical energy in his body, will come into this department (because he not driven by fear of being an "idle criminal" if he stays out) and he will receive adequate purchasing-power over and above the "national dividends" of those who are not considered capable of such work (and bang goes the "equal income" nonsense). Those who do no work will be able to live without working, and those who are first-class workers will get first-class pay.

AUNT ELLA FACES UP

"Really, you know, this war is becoming a frightful nuisance," announced Aunt Ella. "Am I to understand that it is obligatory for one to erect or excavate or whatever it is, on air raid shelter?"

"Not exactly," I replied. "The provision of a suitable shelter is in the nature of a civic duty."

Aunt Ella considered that for a moment. Then she said, "Your explanation is not entirely satisfactory. While I am naturally disposed to agree that certain lives are a greater civic asset than others, I have seldom observed an official anxiety for the preservation of what we are agreed to call 'the best people.' Nevertheless, I suppose we shall have to do something. You know how it will be. . . ."

"Indeed I do, Aunt. People will say, 'Why should we bother to save ourselves? Look at the Footles, the De Kayes and the Doherty-Grubs. They aren't going to bother.' No" (I went on), "our duty is plain. Noblesse oblige, and all that."

"That's out of date," said Pongo, waking up for the first time in the debate. "Profitable as well as practical, is the motto nowadays."

"Don't be cynical, Percival. Someone has to do the right thing. But the point at the moment is to get the most practical kind of shelter. Where do you get the plans for those things?" "I really don't know," I confessed. "Well, somebody ought to have them. Would it be the undertakers, do you think? It's really in their line, isn't it?"

"I should hardly think so. They'd be more interested in salvage after the event, wouldn't they?"

Aunt Ella snorted. "The reason I always dislike discussing things with you," she declared tartly, "is that you're one of those unsatisfactory people who know where everything isn't, but never seem to know where anything is—like that awful man announcing the news, who always says there's nothing to report, when all the time everything is going from bad to worse. Haven't you any ideas at all, Percival?"

"My own personal opinion is," said he, "that a really safe dugout needs to be at least 20 feet deep and should have a reinforced concrete dome."

"With a lift, of course," I suggested. "Wouldn't it be a bit difficult to drain?" asked Aunt Ella, who has observed what happens to holes in the rainy season.

"How about surrounding the dugout with other dugouts several feet deeper?" I suggested.

Billeting

(Continued from page 4.)

for a period of rest. With others, I was assigned to a billet in a certain house, the owner of which was a young and beautiful and charming French lady, with the sweetest child of four year's I have ever seen. The husband was fighting on a remote front. Among our number was a handsome young man of 25. He was debonair and gallant, and was esteemed of us all. It was not long before his charm had captivated Madame, and I witnessed the sad spectacle of the rapid crumbling of that French home, filled with such tender beauty, in the absence of the French soldier-husband.

Multiply that sad spectacle by 10,000 or by any factor your fancy suggests, and you begin to have a realisation of the nature of the solid ground of resistance which British people have always opposed to billeting. The Bill of Rights did not prohibit billeting for any flimsy or inadequate reason.

Fellow Australians, before you accept the principle of billeting, and permit your Government to impose it upon you, look carefully into the grounds upon which it was rejected by your forebears, when they formed the Bill of Rights.

—John Hampden

She glared stonily at me. "I don't expect to get much help from you, but it would be a courtesy if you refrained from hindering. Anyhow, I don't like the idea of deep dugouts. I can't stand heights."

"But this isn't height," persisted Pongo, "it's depth."

"Its height if you're at the bottom," I pointed out.

"But you don't have to look up," replied Pongo,

"You have to GO up," said Aunt Ella. "It's when you get to the top you get giddy."

"But you're never giddy at ground level, Aunt."

"Oh, do be quiet! You're both as stupid as can be. Surely there are other alternatives?"

"Certainly," replied Pongo, "You can build at ground level; sort of pill-box affair, you know." "What do you think?" asked Aunt Ella, turning to me.

"Good idea to wall up some of the pills in this locality."

"Neither of you seems able to say anything sane. What are all the other people doing?"

"It's no use going by what they do," stated Pongo. "Some look as though they are scratching for bait; others seem as though they are trying to make an artificial lake. There are attenuated slits that wouldn't accommodate a robust skeleton unless you resolved it into its several components. There are also rudimentary earth-works like the Druidical tumuli."

"Really, you're both being very tiresome. Surely there must be some rapid, inexpensive and practical way of getting protection from a casual raid. Now, suppose you knew for certain that hostile aircraft were going to arrive in four or five hours from now, what would you do to protect yourself on the spot?"

"Oh, that's easy," declared Pongo. "I'd dig a trench about three feet deep from those crotons to the hydrangea over there."

"Oh, but you couldn't possibly. You'd ruin the garden completely. You'd go right through the dahlias, to say nothing of the lawn."

"Oh, it doesn't matter exactly where," conceded Pongo. "You could have it over there, between the roses and the frangipanni."

"But, my dear boy, you must be crazy, I'd never get those shrubs to grow again."

"Well, over there, then," said Pongo, beginning to get peeved, and waving vaguely.

"No use at all," announced Aunt Ella, "The laundress would break her neck and sue me for damages. I'm afraid you aren't very helpful. Surely someone has solved the question."

"Certainly," I admitted. "There are people who have no roses, no crotons or frangipanni or laundresses. They can do just as they like when it comes to digging."

"There must be another solution," she persisted. "Percival, you haven't suggested anything yet."

Pongo looked startled. Then he said, maliciously, "The only bloke I ever heard of who really made a job of an air-raid shelter was a bit before his time. Chappie named Cheops."

"Peculiar name," remarked Aunt Ella. "Foreigner, I suppose?"

"Yes, rather. Egyptian!"

"Oh, I don't like dark people. Still, he may be worth looking up. Where is he?"

"He's been dead thousands of years," I said. "Pongo means the great pyramids at Ghizeh, Aunt."

"Of course he does. Do you suppose

I didn't know?" she demanded unblushingly. "Oh, dear, isn't it a pity to think of those perfectly wonderful air-raid shelters all going to waste? And if it weren't for this wretched war we could go and make use of them."

"We don't seem to have got very far," I pointed out. "We have uncovered the usual crop of disadvantages which seem to be the stuff of which life is principally made. It seems to me the only way you can guarantee to avoid being hurt by a bomb is to be somewhere else."

"That is the only sensible remark you have made all day," asserted Aunt Ella. "We shall evacuate."

CORRECTION

To the Editor.

Sir,—I shall be obliged if you will kindly correct the misprint which appeared in the article, "Our Sovereignty" in your issue of last week, viz., the word 'allegiance' comes from the Latin Word 'ligare' (not 'ligaro')—to bind (not build). The alteration has an important connection with the preceding sentence.—Yours etc, A. J. O'C.

P.S.: I "think your printer's devil ought to be incarcerated."

—Hilton Ross.

Sassoon's Suggestion

Sir Victor Sassoon, former member of the Indian Legislative Assembly, and a member of the great banking family of that name, considers that "In these times of total war, all democratic liberties should be put in pawn until the day of victory arrives." The Viceroy of India (Lord Linlithgow) should rule "as a temporary dictator. Britain, at the same time, should give notice that any pledges which have been made should be subject to MODIFICATION if it is found after the war they are causing stalemate and preventing India from enjoying the fruits of Dominion status." (Our emphasis.)

The Sassoon boys have always been full of specious reasons as to why we should give up this liberty and that particular privilege. Now that we have a war on our hands, it is always the excuse that these rights and liberties are interfering with our war effort. But surely the suggestion that Britain should reserve any right to alter or "MODIFY" any pledges she has made, after the war, is going too far. Why doesn't Sir Victor explain exactly what he means—that the Government should be placed in a position where it can either fulfil all its promises, or only part of them, or renounce the whole lot of them if it does not suit it to keep them.

THE VOICE OF THE ELECTORS

The daily papers are always telling their readers what prominent politicians are saying to the electors. But what are electors saying to politicians? That is much more important in a democracy. The following letter gives some indication:

To the Hon. E. J. Holloway, Minister for Social Services and Minister for Health,

Dear Sir,—As an elector of Melbourne Ports and a loyal subject of his Majesty the King, I wish to bring to your notice my utter disgust at the financial policy of the Curtin Government. The views I express are the views of thousands of your electors, and hundreds of thousands throughout Australia. Every day people are becoming more discontented, although willing and anxious to serve in any way that will help to save our country and the Empire. They are beginning to realise that in the background of our war effort lurks the octopus of international finance, which is retarding every move.

It is national suicide to allow financial limitations to bar our way at any time, let alone at a time of grave crisis such as we are now facing. It is sheer stupidity to keep on with a system of "cadge" for war purposes, when such a system has lamentably failed to support even our charitable institutions in peace-time. It is madness to carry on with a policy of borrowing that has proved so disastrous in the past, and will prove even more so in the future. If the Government took all the people's money and their future incomes, by loan or other wise, the total sum would represent only a small percentage of the Government's financial requirements. If every person in Australia bought War Bonds or Certificates, who is going to pay the interest? Anyhow, if the Government cannot finance the war effort without resorting to Dark Age technique, how on earth does it propose to redeem such securities when they mature?

There is only one way to do it under orthodox finance, Mr. Holloway, and you know it. That is by increasing taxation for everybody and by raising new loans, thus cheating new and larger debts to cancel out or postpone old ones, with an ever-increasing burden of interest which is the greatest curse of the age. It is now a well-known fact that over 80 per cent of Government loan expenditure is new money, created out of nothing, as a debt to the community by the private banking institutions. It is also a fact

that a large percentage of well-meaning people are pawning their assets and securities to the same banking institutions for the purpose of contributing to the war effort. This farce was exposed after the last war as "the greatest ramp in all history" by no less a person than the Right Hon. Thos. Johnson, P.C., Lord Privy Seal in the MacDonald Government in his book, "The Financiers and the Nation."

Do we really want to win the war and the peace? If so, let us have a real all-in war effort. That can only be done by the Government changing its policy from a "sound" to a sane financial policy. I feel confident that the great majority of people are anxious to do their utmost. If it is physically possible to put forward a greater war effort, it is up to the Curtin Government to make it financially possible.

The Government has a grand opportunity to do something real in an effort to save the country, and to preserve our British system of democracy and civilisation, and thereby gain the endless blessings of this and future generations, or it has the alternative of pursuing its present policy to the bitter end and going down in history at no very distant date as a Government that failed this country and its people, leaving behind it a state of chaos that I shudder to contemplate. I expect you, Mr. Holloway, as my representative in Parliament, to do your utmost to bring about a change of financial policy that will ensure victory.

I have before me extracts of fine speeches made by you in the past, severely criticising the orthodox system of finance. Fine speeches are no good now. Action is needed, and that quickly. The burning question is, are we to have victory and a lasting peace, or are we going to be defeated on our very hearths by the enemy within, the octopus of International finance? Are we going to have Hell for Peace like we did last time—starvation in the midst of plenty? The Curtin Government can decide that; that is, if its members have the courage.—Yours respectfully, M. KEOGH, 249 Bank street, South Melbourne.

THE BANKERS' WAR AIMS

While the democracies are engaged in a life-and-death struggle to win the war, the international bankers are plotting to win the peace for themselves. Federal Union and the Gold Standard are undoubtedly the weapons being forged for world domination by the enemy in the rear—the bankers.

The bewildering state of world affairs, which is widely admitted to be basically economic, may logically be reduced and described as financial; and since finance begins and ends with the bankers, it is an inescapable conclusion that the tremendous power they wield has been fatal to our well-being. The following quotations will illustrate this point. Abraham Lincoln, during the Civil War: "I have two great enemies; the Southern Army in front of me, and the financial institutions in the rear. Of the two, the one in the rear is my greatest foe." And now the words of the American lawyer and statesman, William Jennings Bryan: "The money power preys on the people in times of peace and conspires against it in times of adversity. It is more despotic than monarchy, more insolent than autocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy. It denounces as public enemies all who question its methods or throw light upon its crimes."

FEDERAL UNION IS BANKERS' FIRST WAR AIM.

The task of governing the world is obviously immense, but it is more easily accomplished through key men with dictatorial powers. It is more difficult, however, in countries such as constitute the British Empire; where political machinery such as our Parliaments, nominally elected by the people, exist. Even though the local bankers dictate the policy of local Parliaments at present, there is always the possibility that the people will one day identify the real enemy and his secret power. Therefore, such countries constitute a threat to the money power controlling, such zones—and indirectly, the central power. Logically the method of dealing with this threat is to reduce them to totalitarian States under the control of key men—as a prelude to the creation of a Federal Union with a world-police force and air force to prevent any revolt when the people realise the trap they are in. That is the bankers' war aim number one. Under the stress of war, while the people's attention is fully occupied, is the best time to achieve this result.

WORLD-GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA.

Few people realise the extent of the propaganda for Federal Union or World Government, and are still less aware that such proposals are usually hidden under such titles as "Plan to end wars," "World rehabilitation" or "Reconstruction." The reason for this subtle presentation, which usually comes through the banker-controlled press, is that to openly advocate Federal Union is subversive in so far as it postulates the abrogation of allegiance to our Sovereign King. Any politician, soldier judge, policeman or others who have sworn allegiance, who advocate this proposal are, of course, guilty of plotting against the King. Nevertheless, there are such highly-placed persons advocating it - which is definitely a treasonable act. An examination of the origin of the proposal discloses that it emanates from "Wall Street" financiers, and as far as can be ascertained, without the consent or knowledge of American citizens. It will be remembered that Mr. Churchill offered Federal Union to France before she capitulated, which lends colour to the terrible suggestion that the cold-blooded financiers are prepared to batter the world into acceptance of their plan. The statement of William Jennings Bryan certainly indicates they are capable of this diabolical act.

CRUX OF FEDERAL UNION PLOT.

Federal Union provides that English-speaking countries shall have population voting strength, which permits "Wall Street" to dominate the policy. Obviously the bankers would control this machinery as they now control the policy of Parliaments in each country, but they would have their own "world police force" to impose their policy, which they have not got at present. Again, the proposal would simply be an English-speaking "trade bloc," which would only lead to bigger and bigger wars—it certainly would not stop wars, as suggested by short-sighted or disloyal advocates—some of whom may even be innocently well-meaning. Once in the clutches of this bankers' trap, the countries concerned would forfeit their power to control their own affairs, and would be quickly bombed by the bankers' air force if they attempted to carry out any development or reform on their own initiative. In other words, they would have to obtain permission from the World Government—a preposterous and decidedly un-British idea.

GOLD STANDARD IS BANKERS' SECOND WAR AIM.

There has been a tendency by some countries in recent years to adopt a realistic attitude towards international trade on a goods standard. This, of course, cuts right across the path of the financiers, who require a gold, standard which affords them easier control. Just prior to the last war some countries "went off gold," and since then every country has abandoned it as unworkable. After the 1914-18 war the Bank of England (a private company controlled by the international bankers) forced Britain "back on the gold standard, which was again found wanting and discarded.

UNITED DEMOCRATS' REPORT

(From Headquarters, 17 Wymouth Street, Adelaide.)

The War Effort: Most of us agree that we are fighting a war on two fronts—one against the Axis Powers overseas, and one against, the power that inspired the Axis Powers. This latter struggle is going on within our own borders. We know that everyone is extremely busy - the writer is now working overtime, whereas, up till 1941, he had not known a regular job for several years. It is not my wish to introduce a personal note here, but you will see that it is not easy to act as secretary after hours when those hours are already extended. Your president and treasurer are similarly placed. Had we not been fortunate in securing the assistance of Mrs. Hopcraft in the office, it would have been impossible to carry on. Mrs. Hopcraft is now a very enthusiastic worker in the cause. Until she started with us, she had not heard of us. Another result of Mr. Harvey's work.

So much we count on you to do your utmost? We know you are doing all you can in the more obvious war effort. But for the sake of the things we believe in and have struggled years for, do not let up in this fight for freedom in security. For, *depend on it, freedom (from institutional interference)* will not come automatically on the cessation of military hostilities. If you haven't time to do much (and we only ask help in the distribution of literature and a good word dropped at the right time perhaps you could manage a donation? This would be used for more propaganda, and not for any sinking fund. Our treasurer reports that we are solvent.

During the intervening years, U.S. has been cornering the world's gold supply at Fort Knox, where it is guarded as the taxpayers' expense. Financiers aim to now compel the world to adopt gold once again as currency basis. Some people regard this as a clever trick—and it certainly will be if the people fall for it. Public enlightenment on the money racket has made the financiers' position somewhat insecure—therefore they are taking this gambler's last chance to regain and reinforce their position while the people's attention is focused on the war. If they can bring about Federal Union and restore the Gold Standard, their power will be assured. They can then govern the world with their own private army—plus the money mechanism, with their Gold Standard as its base.

FIGHTING THE ENEMY IN THE REAR.

The people of all countries will, as did Abraham Lincoln, also have to fight the enemy in the rear. They will have to win the peace as well as the war, otherwise the victory will be barren. Australia cannot attend to such matters in other countries, but she, and only she, can attend to this matter in Australia, and all who say that we must wait on the rest of the world must be regarded with suspicion, because that is the bankers' propaganda in other countries also. Our fighting forces are not fighting and dying for Federal Union or the Gold Standard, and we will be false to them if we permit their liberties to be filched from them by the financial molochs lurking in the rear and spinning a web of debt by interest-bearing loans which will hold them in bondage for eternity. The fact that our Federal Government assists the private bankers to develop their controlling debt system through unnecessary loans in preference to providing its own finance through the people's Commonwealth Bank provides additional proof of the fact that they also are controlled by the bankers. Our individual political representatives being responsible must be made to answer for their actions. It must be

(Continued on page 8.)

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Sir,—I would like to bring certain aspects of the international situation before your readers in order that Australia's position can be properly assessed. I am becoming alarmed at what appears to be a deliberate attempt by powerful forces to drive a wedge between Australia and Britain. I have always contended that the Socialists and Communists were no friends of British democracy; Socialism is being used as the Jewish technique to submerge the British Empire—politically, culturally and economically.

Mr. Curtin obtained office just prior to the military explosion in the East—the international forces had supplied the necessary powder in the shape of economic pressure for years past. He told us that, in future, we must look more to Russia and America. Well, we have been looking to Russia for weeks past to relieve the pressure in the Pacific. But an apologist of Communism—a member of one of the Aid for Russia Committees—recently said that Russia couldn't attack Japan because Stalin had signed a non-aggression pact with Matsuoka when that astute Oriental visited the Kremlin. Just think of that! And yet apologists for the Churchill Government—or, should I say dictatorship?—in the House of Commons' debate last week said that one of the reasons why Malaya was not as well equipped as should have been the case was the result of sending great quantities of equipment to Russia. Beaverbrook said last week that half the British tank production was going to Russia. If we can believe the confident statements being issued by Russian spokesmen, they had no need of this equipment.

The wrong people are being blamed for the Far East chaos. This press campaign against the British "brass hats" has gone far enough. One thing emerged from the House of Commons' debate: That the military chiefs have been dictated to by the political heads—principally Churchill, who thinks that he can run the British Empire on his own. And Churchill apparently does everything desired of him by Russia and America. We even declared war on Bulgaria, Roumania and Finland because Stalin asked us to do so. Even Sir Keith Murdoch admits that Russia is playing a secretive and shrewd game, a game to suit herself and not us. And still we have people rushing up and down this country telling, us that Russia will save us. It might be pertinent to ask all those people who have been shouting about forming committees to send aid to Russia if any Aid for Australia Committees have been yet formed in Russia. Some writers are so realistic as to suggest that Russia is prepared to co-operate with Japan—temporarily, of course—in dividing spheres of influence in the East. With the use of our equipment, Russia is threatening, quite openly now, to smash Germany up and straighten Europe out—in other words, Bolshevis Europe. Churchill and his Socialists are apparently quite agreeable to this.

I am becoming very tired of hearing that Britain is not worrying about us and that we should adopt a more isolationist policy and look after our selves. Churchill is not Britain. The British people are undoubtedly as keen to help us as we are to help them. Then let us challenge this campaign, which is causing strong opinion and rightfully strong, too-to be directed against the British people as a whole instead of being directed against international Jewry's friends—Churchill, Attlee, Cripps, (note how Cripps the communist is now being suggested for a more important position), Bevin and others.

I have no objection to fighting with America and Russia to defeat our common

(Continued on page 7.)

—M. R. W. Lee, Hon Sec.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

complex which has been built up around Mr. Churchill by the press which boosted him into office. The "single strong man" idea is very insignificant when compared with the representative word, "Britain," and all it implies. Such propaganda is a weak and psychologically incorrect imitation of the Hitler boosters. The whole set-up would crumble if a stray bullet or a bankers' edict toppled these built-up personalities.

A.R.P. PROBLEM.—Because the appointment of paid A.R.P. workers would be expensive, according to councillors at the recent municipal conference, "the Government deferred a decision hoping that the war position would improve." It is just as well that this mentality is not applied to munitions, 'planes and tanks production; but, apart from this, the safety of the public is apparently to be governed by money—not manpower and resources. Apparently the councillors who raised this plea do not understand that we use Australian-made money, and that the Federal Government alone has the right and the responsibility of creating the necessary finance. In which case they are fools of the first magnitude—if they do know, their attitude can only be described as treason.

WORLD CURRENCY.—Rumours of a change in official sterling-dollar rates are reported in the "Herald" of January 24. The report "visualises an early establishment of a common currency based on gold." In a vague way the rumour is connected with Churchill's visit to America. Well, it took a long time before this important purpose of the visit emerged from the propaganda. So, the financiers are pressing hard on the Gold Standard front—the financiers' second war aim. When the people get over this shock, which is the lesser one, they will then get the big shock—Federal Union. But maybe, for once, Britishers will not take it.

FOOD WINS WARS.—Mr. Wickard, U.S. Secretary for Agriculture, realistically points out that "food will win the war, and write the peace when it comes." It is to be hoped that our

theoretical mis-planners, responsible for the call-up and food restriction, will read and absorb this report. They may then realise that their irresponsible activities, which have dangerously affected our essential food supplies, will continue to retard the war effort—unless they speed-up corrective action.

—O. B. H.

AMERICANISATION

Britannia needs no Boulevards,
No spaces wide and gay;
Her inarch was through the crooked streets
Along the narrow way.
Nor looks she where, New York's seduction,
The Broadway leadeth to destruction.

Britannia needs no Cafes:
If Coffee needs must be,
Its place should be the Coffee-house
Where Johnson growled for Tea;
But who can hear that human mountain
Growl for an ice-cream soda-fountain?

She needs no Russian Theatre,
Where Father strangles Mother,
In scenes where all the characters
And colours kill each other:
Her boast is freedom had by halves,
And Britons never shall be Slavs.

But if not hers the Dance of Death,
Great Dostolevsky's dance,
And if the things most finely French
Are better done in France—
Might not Americanisation
Be best applied to its own nation?

Ere every shop shall be a store
And every Trade a Trust . . .
Lo, many men in many lands
Know when their cause is just.
There will be quite a large attendance
When we declare our Independence.

—G. K. Chesterton.

CARAVAN CAMPAIGN

The latest report from Mr. Rolls advises that he spent approximately two days in Numurkah, where, with the assistance of local supporters, he secured further new subscribers to the "New Times," and made a number of worthwhile "contacts."

Campaigning through other small centres, Mr. Rolls arrived in Shepparton on Sunday last and expected to be busy in that district until Wednesday. Local supporters are co-operating in arranging interviews which should prove successful, and Mr. Rolls, in the limited time at his disposal, is concentrating upon the "intelligentsia" in each district, with most satisfactory results.

Owing to frequent difficulties in connection, with accommodation for the horses, Mr. Rolls finds it impossible to adhere to any prearranged itinerary. However, he expected to leave Shepparton on Wednesday last, to put in some time at Mooropna and Tatura and proceed via Murchison, Nagambie etc., to Seymour, which should be reached early next week. Those wishing to contact him are advised to write at once c/o. P.O., Seymour.

The following further donations to the Caravan Campaign Fund have been received, and are gratefully acknowledged:

Previously acknowledged:	£20 7 0
Yalloum Supporters, Yal-	
loun, Vic.....	£ 1 10 0
J. W., Leeton, N.S.W.....	0 10 0
C.M., Woy Woy N.S.W.....	0 5 0
L.S., Bangerang North, Vic.	0 10 0
Total to date.....	£23 2 0

CHALLENGE OF THE MACHINE

In his book, *Men and Machines*, Stuart Chase, the well-known economist, writes:—"The total man and animal power of North America and Western Europe probably does not exceed the equivalent of 60 million H.P., while the total horse power, capable of generation in the engines of the two continents is well over 1000 million H.P." "If we add to this huge total the capacity of all the great power engines in use in other parts of the world, we have a grand total which would not be less than 1500 million HP." "As a horse power will do the work of ten strong men, man has not less than fifteen thousand million mechanical slaves ready to serve him day and night, year in and year out, never faltering."

"MACHINES SAVE LABOURERS"
This mighty force should provide every man, woman and child in the world with not fewer than seven tireless slaves, which should make this "machine age" not only an "age of plenty," but an "age of leisure" as well.

As men everywhere are working under greater tension than in any previous age, we are led to ask, "Do machines save labour?" All the evidence available proves conclusively that machines do save labour; but because of a flaw in our financial accounting methods the labour-saving machines are a curse rather than a blessing to mankind. The real truth is that, under our present economic system, saved labour really means saved labourers.

FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM

The following letter, by Eric D. Butler, appears in the latest issue of "Salt," the Army Educational Department's magazine; but references to Finance, which would have educated the Army quite a bit, were deleted from the writer's original letter:—

I noted with interest the suggestion, for decentralising Germany after the war and the paragraph dealing with the financial cost of governing Australia (same issue). Both items refer to aspects of the fundamental problem confronting man to-day. The present world-wide struggle is fundamentally a clash between two philosophies; totalitarianism and democracy. But totalitarian, ideas are not confined to Germany, Italy and Japan. Every move towards centralisation of government is a move towards totalitarianism: it places more and more power in the hands of fewer and fewer men. The cry that we have too many Governments in Australia is dangerous. The cost of our State Parliament works out at about 1/6 per head of population. Power over all policies can be restored to the people only through British democracy. In spite of some faults, the growth of the British Commonwealth of Nations has been based on the principle of decentralisation of government.

Take Germany: The great days of German, culture were prior to 1871, when the German States lost autonomous power over their own destinies. To-day, under a centralised Government, they have their destinies decided for them. Since Bismarck centralised Germany, the peoples of the various States have been used by power-lusting individuals to start two world wars.

Germany must be decentralised, back into its original States, in order that unscrupulous men can never use the centralised State to start further wars. The German people, apart from a militant minority would soon appreciate the sanity of this move. This policy should then be progressively pursued all over the world. Once the people control their own policies through local government, they will quickly solve all economic and other problems.

Machines can only do one of two things—i.e., increase our material comfort or decrease our working hours. On the one hand our material comforts have been increased. This, of course, only applies to those in employment. On the other hand, the decrease in working hours is enormous. At first sight this would not appear to be correct, for we know that we have not had a reduction in working hours for many years; but if we look at the unemployed we will find the saved labour among the saved labourers.

The following illustrations should make this point clear. If it takes 10 men 100 hours to produce a certain commodity, what would be the result if a labour-saving machine were introduced which cut the man-hours in half? Under our present system, five saved labourers would be thrown on to the industrial scrap heap, while the other five still work the same number of hours. Result, a saving of 500 man-hours, and five men without jobs or incomes.

Many of us have the idea that these five men would be re-employed making the labour-saving machine. To prove that this is not so, the sewing machine may be taken as a case in point. One girl operating a sewing machine will displace 12 men for the life of the machine—usually about ten years—yet the man-labour required to produce a similar machine is four and a half days. We thus see that one of these men by working four and a half days could produce a machine which would replace twelve men for ten years.

AUTOMATIC PRODUCTION.

We employ machines to-day because they save wages; because they save labourers! Yet by some extraordinary process of reasoning we expect the saved labourers to buy the goods which the wage-savers have produced. This being the case, it naturally follows that a large part of the goods we produce cannot be bought without bank loans.

Due to the mechanisation of industry, especially during and since the Great War, the direct labour payments are becoming smaller, whilst the charges—i.e., the wages of the machine—are increasing with every improvement in process. Many industries have been so mechanised to-day that they have become almost entirely automatic; for instance, it is reported that the direct labour cost of producing Rayon yarn in Japan is 3/4 of one per cent.

For hundreds of years engineers and scientists have been striving to eliminate human labour in production the fact that they have succeeded is amply demonstrated by the multitude of saved labourers on the industrial scrap heap. With few exceptions, the ultimate goal of all inventions is labour-saving or wage-saving. Suppose man reached his goal, what would be the result? On the one hand, we would have a mountain of goods produced by automatic machinery, and on the other a multitude of people destitute and poverty-stricken. Not having worked in industry, they would not have any money—i.e., titles to the goods—thus they could not claim them.

The most significant fact of all is that the owners of the machines could not buy the goods unless they spent their own capital, for the price includes charges which, as we have seen, are not income to anyone until the goods are sold. As there are no direct labour payments, the goods cannot be sold. We thus see that if man reached his goal it would be necessary to distribute the goods free of cost or distribute the money-tickets as a gift, so that each citizen could claim his just share.

—L. H. Hollins, M.L.A.

Letter to the Editor

(Continued from page 6.)

enemies, but I have a strong objection to fighting for the ideological aims of International Jewry. Culturally, I desire to remain British. I believe that this is true of the majority of Australians. The monarchy is still the key-stone of the Empire. It's a pity that we don't hear more about the monarchy and less about Churchill.

And another thing. If we are going to receive help from Russia and America, then the people are entitled to know on what terms, if any, we are obtaining that help. There appeared a certain item in a Sydney paper regarding certain terms—financial—regarding the Lender-Lease Act and Australia. Pressure was brought to bear to have that item deleted from the press and to prevent it being published to any other paper.

This war, so far as the people are concerned is being fought to preserve the British Empire and safeguard the rights of the small nations—at least, that is what we started the war about. But some people have a suspicion that our various socialistic Governments have secretly changed the aims to Federal Union and International Socialism.

While accepting all the assistance offered by Russia and America, never let us forget that International Jewry must disintegrate the Empire to achieve complete success. Let us, therefore, refuse to be divided by our financial enemies, who seek to make the "Tories," "brass hats" and others the scapegoats for their sins. — Yours etc., ERIC D. BUTLER.

SPOTLIGHT ON SIR KEITH MURDOCH

(Continued from page 1.)

ments and the degradation of the Australian people. He is largely responsible for Australia's present military crisis, as he supported the betrayal of the Commonwealth Bank by the Bruce-Page Government in 1924, has consistently opposed the increasing demands for financial reform, persuaded the people to vote against Labor's policy of a strong Air Force, and supported the trade diversion policy of the Lyons Government.

He took a leading part in imposing "The Premiers' Plan" on us, and did it for the benefit of overseas financiers, an action that brought ruin and suffering to thousands of God-fearing and hard-working Australians. He supported the treasonable disposal of the Commonwealth "Woolen Mills, the Commonwealth Shipping Line and other valuable Commonwealth establishments, and did it for the benefit of private financial institutions. He supported the Lyons Government in its abandonment of the 1934 Railway Gauge Unification Plan because of an alleged lack of "funds"; i.e., to him finance was more important than defence or the people's well-being. Even while this was going on Germany was re-arming with the assistance of "British" financiers, even though British ship-building yards were being dismantled as the result of pressure from the same financial gang, but there was no word of protest from the patriotic Sir Keith.

He has opposed every movement for the subjugation of money to the service of the people, and has used every means at his command to maintain the subjugation of the people to the service of money. Politically, economically and nationally, we regard him as a dangerous man, and it is at least of doubtful propriety for the military, air and naval chiefs to be attending dinners for his entertainment.

Who can find the reason for his being so specially selected by the British Government to conduct a world tour? Was it so that he could broadcast to our enemies from London that Australian war vessels were, being concentrated in the Pacific? Who told him that, anyway? Was it because, as a former student at the London School of Economics he had mixed with the people who sought the defeat of the Empire while making it appear that they were devoted to its service and prosperity? Was it because, through the London "Times" and other propaganda

instrumentalities, he had become known to Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England and helper in the rearmament of Germany (Montagu Norman is a Director of the London "Times")? Was it because there had been a change of Government in Australia and the powers-that-be in Britain desired an influential Australian spokesman to undermine the work of the Australian Government, which was challenging the efficiency and propriety of some of the British Government's actions and its attitude towards Australia's needs?

Whatever the reason, we take the view that Sir Keith has already had far too much to say in Australian affairs, and that the disastrous results which can be seen all around us are the clearest indication that instead of taking notice of his views any longer, we, as a nation, should be calling him to account for what he has done against the public interest in the past.

National Credit Motion in N.S.W. Parliament

(Continued from page 1.)

Australian Labor Party to select a candidate to represent them. They departed from the rules and constitution, and against the will and wishes of the members of the Labor movement and affiliated unionists, the executive selected a Mr. Fitzgerald, a resident of Sydney, as their choice of a candidate for the Murrumbidgee electorate.

The members of the Labor movement in the electorate made every effort to dissuade the executive from carrying into effect this undemocratic decision. The executive was adamant, and when members of the Labor movement in the electorate realised that the executive was determined to filch their rights from them, the Labor men and women within the electorate set proper machinery in motion, in keeping with the spirit of the Labor Party, to conduct a selection ballot. I was appointed returning officer. The candidates who nominated were Mr. C. E. Stuart, of Griffith; Mr. W. J. Quirk, of Narrandera; Mr. A. G. Enticknap, of Yenda, and Mr. J. Grace, of Sydney. (Mr. Grace later withdrew.) Several hundred members of the Labor party and affiliated unionists participated in the ballot, and Mr. Enticknap won the selection. With the combined support of the real Labor movement in the electorate, and the valuable support of all

The Bankers' War Aims

(Continued from page 6.)

remembered that they constitute Parliament.

CITIZENS HOLD M.P.'s RESPONSIBLE.

All loyal citizens should defend our fighting men from the enemy in the rear by immediately bringing pressure, in the form of personal letters, on their local Federal member to force the issue in Parliament. He should be instructed to oppose Federal Union, the Gold Standard, and private bank interest-bearing loans. If he fails to comply with such directions, it will be obvious that his interest is not with the fighting forces, and that he is not a fit and proper person to represent British subjects. In the last analysis, control of individual members is the most effective way to defeat the enemies of democracy. So let us leave no stone unturned in the fight for freedom, against the enemy in the rear.

—O.B.H.

Senator Darcey's Budget Speech


(Continued from page 3.)

We must depend on what the banks lend to us. We do not use our national productive capacity as the Germans do. Until our system is altered we are fighting, financially, with one hand behind our back. There are many things which we could learn from German economics and finance; but we are compelled to adopt orthodox methods. If Germany is better armed and has a different financial system from our own, we must devise a means in order to enable us to meet Germany on its own terms. Therefore, our best plan is to alter our financial system in order to give us the greatest productive capacity in armaments and men. I repeat that we do not need money to fight the war. What we need are credits; but in the past we have used them through the wrong channel.

If the circulation of additional money increases prices, it does not matter from which source that money comes if prices are not controlled. But we are told that they are controlled. We had been told that an increase of only 10 per cent, has been allowed, due solely to the fact that the costs, such as freight and insurance, are increasing. However, the prices of only some commodities have not increased. One finds that the prices of vegetables and fish, for instance, have increased considerably. That is the case in respect of everything that means food and shelter to the people. Rents are increasing, but rents do not come within the scheme of price control visualised by the Prices Commissioner.

(To be concluded.)

Read in Comfort with Glasses Prescribed by—




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

"NEW TIMES" SHOPPING GUIDE AND BUSINESS DIRECTORY

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

ASCOTVALE. A.J. AMESS, 390 Mt. Alexander Rd. (next Tram Sheds). Motor Garage Just Price Discount — Repairs and Supplies.	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.	GLENFERRIE. OPTICIAN, W. W. Nicholls. 100 Glenferrie Road. Haw. 5845. SUITS to order from 70/-. H 5813. A.Sutherland, 184 Glenferrie Road IVANHOE BOOT REPAIRS, J. Fraser solicits your custom. 130 Upper H'berg Rd. UPHOLSTERER, Blinds and Bedding. Duke's, 11 H'berg Road Ivan, 626. KEW ANDERSON'S, 141 High St. Authorised Newsagent. Haw. 1145. C. KENNEDY, Grocer. Haw. 229 Opp. Cemetery Clock, Parkhill Rd. DRY CLEANING, Depot & Library, A. I. Fraser, 182 High. St. H 3733. E. WHITE, 109 High Street Confectionery and Smokes. GIFTS, and All Jewellery Repairs. Old Gold Bought. Greaves, opp. Rialto. IMPERAL DAIRY, R.H. Kent, 9 Brougham Street. Haw. 3243. MOTOR GARAGE, Kew Junction Service Station, Cr. High and Denmark Streets. -Haw. 6455.	MORELAND. BOOT REPAIRS, J. T. Nolan, Holmes St., 4 doors Moreland Rd. NORTH FITZROY. KEITH PARLON, The Fitzroy Tailor, 45 Best Street, JW. 1555. SANDRINGHAM. A. RYAN, opp. Stn., Shoe Repairs. Tennis Racquets Restring from 7/6. GROCERY, McKAY & WHITE, Bay Rd. opp. Theatre. XW 1924. ST. KILDA HARVEY'S COFFEE GARDEN. Sweets, Smokes. 227 Barkly Street, SPRINGVALE. DAIRY, M. Bowler. Buckingham Ave. Ave. R. MACKAY & SONS. General Storekeepers. UM 9269. WILLIAMSTOWN DUNSTANDARYMAN 28 Stn Rd Phone W10W124
BLACKBURN "A" GRADE MOTOR ENGINEERS, Station Garage, Whitehorse Road, WX 1430.	BOXHILL BOX HILL FURNISHING CO. 247-9 Station St. Cash or Terms. CHAS. L. COX, TAILOR Mens 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. op. Gilpin's WATCHMAKER and Jeweller, Barnes, 82 Main Street. Repairs.		
	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. 8 d. large. Down with the profiteer.		

Printed by M.F. Caravan, 25 Gullin Road, Hatfield, for the New Times Limited, 14 Ewan House, Melbourne