

ON OTHER
PAGES

Fruitgrowers versus
Bureaucracy."
(Page 5.)
N.Z. Professor's
Warning. (Page 6.)
"The Churchill
Problem." (Page 7.)
"Caesarism"
Threatens Britain.
(Page 8.)

EVERY FRIDAY **THE** PRICE 4 PENCE
NEW TIMES

Vol. 8. No. 6. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEB. 13, 1942.

Now, when our
land to ruin's
brink is verging,

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

Now, when the
padlocks for our
lips are forging,
Silence is crime. —
Whittier (1807-1892).

LIFE IN A FEDERAL UNION

LABOR RACKETEERING NOT ELIMINATED

Advocates of Federal Union often cite the U.S.A. as a working model of their proposed Utopia. Realistic writers on the spot, however, are not so enthusiastic. Workers should digest the following article, reprinted from a recent issue of the American newsmagazine, "Time":

C.I.O.'s big, glowering John L. Lewis, who has many other things to think about, last week had a rank-and-file revolt on his hands. . . . All because his miners had been asked to kick in a little more money to the United Mine Workers' treasury.

A majority of the voting members of the U.M.W. had approved the idea of raising assessments from two dollars to six dollars a year. But District 7, around the valley of Panther Creek, did not approve. Neither did it approve Mr. Lewis' large-handed contributions to political causes. In District 7 grumbling was heard that shaggy-haired President Lewis had political ambitions, was getting together a hope chest with their increased dues.

Roving pickets swooped through Panther Creek Valley, invading collieries, gathering recruits to the rebellion. They intended to strike at Mr. Lewis by striking and closing the mines. In strange alliance, company detectives stood shoulder to shoulder with Mr. Lewis' union organisers, swapping blows with rank and filers. By week's end an estimated 22,000 men had quit work in the district, mines were closed, and the revolt was spreading to District 9.

Officials at U.M.W.'s magnificent headquarters in Washington wrapped themselves in deep, angry silence. Unofficially it was explained that the assessment boost was to build up a war chest against the day when defence work ends and the recession sets in. But neither Mr. Lewis nor

any U.M.W. bigwig would "dignify this little unprintable strike" with official comment.

HOLD-UP MEN OF LABOUR

Certain Congressmen came to the conclusion last week that something had to be done about the great A.F. of L.

President William Green's federation is infested with racketeers, as C.I.O. is plagued with Reds. Since A. F. of L. leaders seem little inclined to do anything about it, Congressmen, following the lead of Assistant Attorney-General Thurman Arnold, got ready to move in.

Besides adding heavily to the cost of the defence programme, A. F. of L. racketeering (according to Arnold's estimate) costs the U.S. a billion dollars a year. It lays its heavy, sweaty hand on everyone, from cabbage-eaters to movie kings. This week, as Willie Bioff, an ex-pimp, and George Browne, a vice-president of A. F. of L., awaited trial in New York's Federal Court for allegedly extorting half a million dollars from four motion-picture companies, farmers coming into Manhattan were shelling out to

(Continued on page 6.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

U.S. WAR COSTS.—"To hell with stopping to count the cost of war contracts," as the statement of Mr. Donald Nelson, U.S. production chief, according to the "Herald" of January 31. Quite a good mouthful—but why not "To prison with anyone who raises finance as an objection"—especially those who insist on private bank finance.

DEFENCE OR CASH: The State Premiers met on February 3 to have the usual wrangling contest with the bankers' agents for loan allocations for defence work—meanwhile the works will not work. The above words of the U.S. production chief should be framed and hung around each Premier's neck, but great care should be taken to ensure that the cord is not pulled too tight—in case they are willing to turn realist.

'PLANE-TAX HOOEY: Senator Cameron joins the bankers' propaganda agents, according to the "Herald" of February 3, when saying, "As far as he can see more taxes will be required to build planes, and he profoundly says that we will need more aircraft to win the war." If Senator Cameron had more vision, he would realise that the people are able to provide the physical tax required for this purpose, but it is not within their capacity or their province to supply adequate finance—which is the sovereign prerogative and responsibility of the Federal Government. It is absurd for the Government to place the onus on the people of providing the money; it would be just

as silly for the police to place the onus of defending them on the public.

FRAUD ON BRITISH: We are informed by the "Herald" of February 3 that "the British people, through its Government, have been defrauded of £500,000 by a firm on war work making up false wages sheets." It is remarkable how these pin-money thefts are discovered, whilst the authorities permit thousands of millions of pounds to be counterfeited by the private bankers, which can only be described as robbery in the first and highest degree.

WORLD AIR FORCE: Colonel Claire L. Chennault, a retired U.S. Army officer, is described in the "Herald" of February 5 as the "leader of the international air force, largely composed of Americans, who have had success against the Japanese." This is the first public intimation of the personnel of an embryo world air force, or that it is actually in existence—but no indication is given as to whether or not Russia, Italy, Japan or Germany or other nations are to be represented among the post-war personnel.

PARTY GOVERNMENT: Following on the daily press agitation for an "all party" or national Government, the "Herald" of February 5 strongly features a French journalist, "Pertinax," who supports their propaganda. However dissatisfied one may feel toward one or the other party, the results of the British or French national Governments have not demonstrated any advantages—unless the fact that

(Continued on page 4.)

GERMANY'S OIL POSITION

The Imperial Policy Group's "Review of World Affairs" for November has an informative passage about the oil situation, based on the sources of the Petroleum Press Bureau, the editor of which writes:

". . . there is no reason to suppose that [recent German] operations have in any way been hampered through a shortage of oil. Nor does there appear to be any likelihood that they will be in the near future. In fact, one may assume that in respect of oil, as of other supplies, the German High Command has made adequate preparations."

The conquest of Poland, Estonia and the Ukraine has provided new resources, although stocks above ground have doubtless been destroyed.

The oilfields of Eastern Galicia, which the Russians acquired when they occupied Eastern Poland in September, 1939, had an output of 370,000 tons in 1938. These are the older fields of Poland, and production had been steadily declining for a number of years before the war.

There also natural mineral wax deposits at Boryslav, where appreciable quantities of Ozokerite are obtained by mining.

The enemy will doubtless put these sources back into operation as quickly as possible. The Estonian shale oil industry had an output of some 180,000 tons of erode oil in 1939, the principal product being fuel oil, although about 24,000 tons of gasoline were produced in that year.

The Imperial Policy Group concludes:

"The fact remains that the annual pre-war consumption of what is now German-controlled Europe was about 21 million tons—exclusive of what was needed for ships' bunkers. The reduction of this to an emergency ration of eight million tons a year was considered drastic enough a few weeks ago.

"It now seems probable that in order to maintain a safety margin for military operations, this may be reduced to six million tons, though it would be difficult to keep Europe and its industries sufficiently hard at work to suit Germany with such a reduced supply.

"The Petroleum Press Bureau thinks we ought to assume that Germany's resources have now risen to 12 million tons annually; and that consumption on the Eastern Front is now at the rate of four million tons a year.

"On these figures, after having reduced Europe to the lowest possible ration, there is now an emergency balance of about two million tons a year to meet any fresh military needs, and losses. These figures take no account of reserves.

"It is probably true, therefore, that although the situation may be a little easier in some respects, the enemy is nevertheless operating on a narrow margin."

FARMERS' DEBTS

In a speech (broadcast by 3AW) at the close of the Catholic Rural Conference, the national secretary, Mr. B. A. Santamaria, B.A., LL.B., referred to the problem of rural debt.

He said that it was the one problem that could be met by the Government alone. It was a colossal weight, crushing out the very life of the land—a dreadful incubus which had sold the birthright of farmers to the vested interests of the city, which drained the fertility of the soil, and which was in the process of transforming millions of acres of good Australian land into a desert in which not even the nomads would be able to live. Government after Government had closed its eyes to the fact that the good earth of Australia is mortgaged to financial interests to the tune of no less than £500,000,000. So that before the farmers of Australia begin to pay off a penny of their capital debt, they must find no less than £25,000,000 a year in interest alone. This was an, utter impossibility, and the sole purpose which is served by the colossal structure of debt is to keep the farmer in perpetual servitude, bound hand and foot to a few individuals who run the economic life of the land from the safe sanctuary of city offices.

TAXES HAMPER WAR EFFORT

"I should have preferred the Government to adopt a method of raising this revenue other than that which it has selected. . . . As the honourable member for Robertson (Mr. Spooner) has pointed out, this measure will necessitate the creation of additional administrative machinery. The Taxation Department is already seriously overloaded with work, and the collection of revenue is therefore being delayed. However, there is an even more serious aspect of the matter than this. The production of munitions which is vital to our war effort is being held up because of the fact that the skilled cost investigators and qualified accountants who are needed by the Munitions Department are not available to it. The complicated system of munitions production which has been instituted in Australia, including the cost-plus methods, requires the employment of capable accountants. However, the Taxation Commissioner pays higher fees to these men than are offered by the Munitions Department, and therefore

(Continued on page 3.)

How to Win the War - and the Peace

A Challenge to Every Britisher

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

(Continued from last issue.)

The question of leisure and the displacement of men by machines has been brought home to us by the war. In spite of the fact that we have hundreds of thousands of our best men out of the productive system, the average standard-of-living has remained approximately the same.

Those working in production are not only able to produce sufficient to feed and clothe all those men as well as themselves; they are also able to produce hundreds of millions of pounds worth of materials in the shape of shells etc. which we are GIVING to the enemy. Therefore, is there any good reason why we shouldn't GIVE these hundreds of millions of pounds to ourselves after the war to spend on consumable goods? The great productive system for war could be switched to peace production. We could give every returned man a few years holiday if he wanted it—and a dividend besides. We don't need all those men for civil production now. Then why all this cry about getting them back to work after the war? There is no need for it.

Under a sane system only the best and keenest men would be wanted in industry. Men would strive to get into industry because they were interested in industry. This is the only thing to do. We can't all represent Australia in the cricket eleven. Only the best and keenest are chosen. And it is regarded as an honour. In industry it would be the same. It has been said that we would have a democracy of consumers, and an aristocracy of producers to serve the consumers. This would be sane organisation. Let us examine it a little more closely.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ASSOCIATION.

Sociologists tell us how our present complex society has been built up on the principle of association. This principle was first put into operation when two individuals first associated in primitive society in order to produce a specific result which they could not obtain as individuals. A real democracy is based on the assumption that individuals have voluntarily associated for their individual benefit.

The best work in society is done by those individuals who are able to voluntarily work in the particular sphere in which they are primarily interested. The nearest approach to a really democratic organisation, based on the principles of voluntary association, is a sports club—such as a cricket club. Let me say quite emphatically that there is no fundamental difference between a game of cricket and an industrial undertaking. Don Bradman spends energy—obtained by consuming foodstuffs—in moving a cricket ball from one point on a cricket field to another point. Apart from the physical exercise, he gains a certain amount of psychological satisfaction in batting well. In the industrial world there are engineers who also expend energy on certain undertakings, which give them just as much personal satisfaction as that derived by cricketers. It is particularly noteworthy that all the best work in every sphere of human activity is done by those individuals who voluntarily engage in some undertaking because they like it. Psychologists tell us that when people are forced to engage in activities in which they have no real interest they become dissatisfied. Their efficiency is impaired. A little investigation clearly reveals that the majority of people to-day are being forced by the economic system to engage in activities in which they have no fundamental interest. Friction grows between the people, instead of the spirit of co-operation.

Every individual has a creative urge—unless, of course, he has been battered too severely by the economic system. If we could only alter our financial system to allow every individual to do the work he was interested in, we would reach a state of efficiency in industrial organisation which would rival the efficiency reached in the sporting world. In case some reader

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 finger tips. 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 letter 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

should be doubtful, can he name any individual in the world of sport who has devoted as much time and reached such a degree of efficiency as either Madame Curie or Professor Soddy - to name only two of thousands - have done in the world of science? With financial limitations removed and every individual able to do the things he was interested in, what marvels of production and efficiency we could achieve! The principles of association would be really put into complete practice instead of being destroyed as they are.

If we could only increase the spirit of voluntary association in every phase of our war effort we would achieve tremendous results - apart from demonstrating to ourselves that we can certainly apply the same principles in winning the peace.

A NEW WORLD.

Man is naturally creative; let there be no fear that people wouldn't know what to do with their leisure. Educators should be the chief advocates of more leisure because they would then find real scope for their effort. The mind hardly comprehends the marvellous things that we could do. Professor Lowes Dickinson has written:

"For my own part, I could, as Hamlet says, be 'bounded in a nutshell and count myself a king of infinite space, but I have had had dreams. My dreams are of reality—of the misery and squalor of human life. Let that disappear and I could find unending satisfaction in conversation, in friendship, in love, in the arts, in speculation, in the growth of knowledge, in the mystery lying beyond. That, I agree, may be a kind of satisfaction not everybody cares about. But what is to prevent other people from indulging their tastes, too? If they like—as many do, and many of the best—physical exercise, adventure, exploration, danger, they will always have scope enough for all that. But there are other tastes than these. There are the people who are naturally creative with their hands, and for these there will be opportunities from which most of them are excluded now. Released from the necessity of earning a living by spending their whole time in factories, they could devote their leisure to creation. The arts could return to their natural basis in handicraft and would flourish the better for that, since that was always their basis in the great days of Art. Or, again, if people wanted to play, which seems to be the principal delight of the English, they could play as long as they liked. Nor would beauty and love cease because we were not murdering one another."

What would YOU do if you had leisure and sufficient money tickets? You would do all those things that you have thought about. You would have more time to devote to your home, to your family. And that son of yours who is so keen on engineering could fit himself to take his place in that aristocracy of technicians already mentioned.

Ask any individual whether he thinks that a dividend would demoralise him and he will answer "No." But everyone is worried about the "other fellow." I am not denying that, as a result of our present system, there would be a few individuals who would "drink themselves to death." But, are we to refuse the great majority their heritage because of a few? No.

Then start to work now for a real peace after the war; not a "peace" where we will all fight for work with the result that the export mania will continue and produce another conflagration in another twenty years' time.
(To be concluded.)

BRITAIN'S PLEDGE

"The British pledged themselves last week not to take advantage of Lend-Lease by using it to maintain their foreign trade. An agreement was negotiated by British Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, and U.S. Ambassador, John Gilbert Winant. The agreement was published as a White Paper, in which the British promised to limit their export business during World War II. to the minimum necessary to continue the war effort ...

"But the U.S. officially, was rejecting the theory, popular with some U.S. businessmen, that Great Britain's trade must be hopelessly crippled before U.S. help is given. The agreement was based on the principle that the British must maintain about two-thirds of normal export trade in order to get vital foreign exchange to buy materials unobtainable in the U.S. And it is obviously to U.S. advantage to have Britain to pay for as many of her necessities as possible by exports, rather than need everything as a gift from the U.S.

"Yet British industries, which have already absorbed some shrewd body blows, will now have to take more punishment under the agreement. Example: no British paint firm may now offer in any world market any paint which contains zinc (imported from the U.S.)... Last week a paint company which had done business in England for 120 years closed up.

"Trade repercussions may be vast, and South American complaints may soon pile up. Example: Argentina buys British machines, British tools, British steel, and pays for them in wheat and beef. Under the new agreement, much of this exchange must stop. Argentina will get U.S. steel, machines, tools - if she can get U.S. priorities. (Some priorities for

THE RED LIGHT!

NEW YORK, Sunday.—Close and lasting co-operation between Britain, America and Russia was urged by the Czechoslovakian Deputy Prime Minister (M. Jan Masaryk) in a speech to a meeting of American bankers to-day. . . .

"A Federated Europe after the war, under the leadership of the English-speaking democracies, will be acceptable to Russia."

—Melb. "Herald," 9/2/42. (Our emphasis.)

Look through the trees again, Hubert. See the giraffe now as he moves? He was there all the time.

This Week's Puzzle

Injury, self-inflicted while on active service, is a major army crime and disgrace. A "Digger" raises the question: "Should the Japs hit him with a piece of our own scrap-iron, would his wound be called self-inflicted?"

Caravan Campaign

The last report from Mr. Rolls advised that he would be leaving Seymour early in the week, and expected to reach Melbourne some time before the week-end.

Note: Mr. Rolls is anxious to secure paddocking for two horses in the Box Hill district. Would any supporter knowing of suitable accommodation please advise Mr. Rolls immediately, c/o. 5 Barcelona-street, Box Hill, or ring WX1305?

Latin America have already been granted.) And the U.S. cannot be paid in wheat and beef. What then? Henry Wallace's Economic Defence Board is likely to sit many months before this problem is solved."

—"Time"(U.S.A.), SEPT.22,41.

**SENATOR DARCEY'S
SPEECH**

(Concluded from last issue.)

The manager of the Canadian Government Bank, Mr. Graham Towers, when giving evidence on oath before a monetary commission, was asked whether the Government bank could loan interest-free money to the Government. He replied, "Yes, undoubtedly; not only that, there is no need for the Government to repay the money to the bank. Through increased prosperity brought about by the spending of that money, the Government is repaid indirectly, and it is a good policy to adopt."

What did our orthodox economists tell the Commonwealth Government during the depression? The late Sir Robert Gibson, when governor of the Commonwealth Bank, who was a servant of the Commonwealth Government, said to the Government that unless it lowered social services and reduced salaries by 10 per cent, he would not come to its assistance.

The Royal Commission on Banking and Monetary Systems, in paragraph 530 of its report, stated that Parliament is ultimately responsible for finance and everything for the good government of Australia. The Commonwealth Bank has certain powers granted to it by statute. These powers are to be exercised in the interest of the nation. The Royal Commission stated that at any time when a difference of opinion arises between the Bank Board and the Government as to policy, a free and frank discussion should take place on the matter in order to show the Bank Board where it stands. If the views of the board and the Government are still irreconcilable, the Government should say to the board that it takes full responsibility, and tell the board how to act.

Why did not the previous Government use those powers? It did many things under the National Security Act. Under section 42A of that act anyone criticising the financial policy of the Government was liable to arrest and punishment. . . . When speaking from the platform of the Town Hall in Hobart, I told my listeners that under Section 42A of the National Security Act I was liable to be imprisoned for what I was saying, but that I would rather go to gaol than hold my tongue. I told the people the truth. I have told the Senate the truth on many occasions, but honorable senators seem to have little regard for the truth. I have taken up considerable time in delivering this speech, and I hope that I have not been speaking only to the walls. The desperate position which confronts us to-day compels me to speak at great length. Things are very bad indeed.

I know of many young men who have given up excellent occupations in which they had good prospects for the rest of their lives, in order to join our fighting forces, yet while they are overseas fighting in the defence of the Empire, the private bankers who stay at home seek only to increase their own dividends. In 1914, the then Prime Minister pledged Australia to the last man and the last shilling, but he did not use the Commonwealth Bank for the purpose for which it was created. He ran up a war bill of £360,000,000 by adopting orthodox methods of finance, and when the soldiers came back from the front he took their last shilling in taxation to pay interest to the banks.

That is what will happen again this time if the present system is not altered. I have high hopes that it will be altered, and that justice will be done to the men who are prepared to suffer hardships and undergo the risks of war in order that those who stay behind may live in safety and comfort. I wonder what the two - shillings - a - day English "Tommy" thinks when he reads that the Midland Bank declared a dividend of 16 per cent, due mainly to the fact that it has lent millions of pounds to

the British Government for war purposes. It is time that that racket was stopped.

The trouble is to get people to realise just what a racket is going on. I have travelled all over Australia from Cairns to Perth, and have addressed hundreds of meetings on monetary questions. Although I am confident that I have converted quite a number of people, the ignorance of the average man, whether he be a wharf labourer or a university graduate, is astounding. He does not take the trouble to find out just how he is being governed. Certainly he grumbles about taxation. In fact, I heard such grumbings in Sydney during the past few days.

Two years ago I told honorable senators that not until half their salaries had been taken in taxation would they take any notice of what I had been advocating. But it is coming to pass. Very little will be left of our salaries next year. When we touch the people's pockets we sometimes touch their conscience, but we also touch the sensibility as to their personal interests. That is what will happen in this country before there is a realisation of what we are being driven to.

**UNITED DEMOCRATS'
REPORT**

From Headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.

A Leaflet Drive.—On several occasions now we have made a special effort to collect signatures to Demand Forms at the Central Market. Permission has been received to conduct another such drive on Friday, February 13. Our new "Empire in Danger" leaflets, which have the Demand Form attached, will be used. We have quite a good list of helpers for the event, but there are never too many. These notes will be published on that day, so when you see this you may still have time to offer your services. Remember, the people suffer many things they really do not want—insecurity, and the wars that result therefrom—not because they are powerless to do anything about it, but because they don't do anything about it. They can only realise their power by being encouraged to give determined expression to their wants at every opportunity. Signing a Demand Form and sending it to their M.P. is one means of expression, of making their desires vocal, and felt where desires should be felt—Canberra. Put these leaflets before the people and help them to help themselves. If you cannot assist at the Central Market, then try conducting a private signature drive of your own.

Quarterly Meeting.—This will give you your opportunity to bring your friends and introduce them to others, and—if they are new friends—to the ideas of political and economic democracy. This meeting will be mostly a social gathering, though you will have a chance to hear of what we are doing, and what we hope to do. You will also be welcome to bring forward any matter of policy. Do your best to make this meeting a success, because that depends on every one of you who can possibly attend, and not merely on the executive.

Good Literature is the best way, for most of us, of educating the public. You may get quite "hot under the collar" trying to convince possible converts by your unaided powers of persuasion. But place a good pamphlet in their hands, where they, still calm and cool, may see the cold facts. If anyone wants to learn, that is what convinces them. If you are out of good literature, send in for more. Get "Federal Union Exposed." It is selling remarkably well. Also secure the

THESE SOCIALIST LEADERS

Here is a quotation from L. McNeil Weir's great book, "The Tragedy, of Ramsay MacDonald":

"When a worker becomes a leader and renounces his former occupation, he generally has no desire to return to it, and is inclined to cling to his new post for economic reasons. He has attained a higher social status, which he does not wish to lose.

"Place a man in a position of power among his fellows and he will always seek to extend that power, to consolidate it, to defend it, and to put himself beyond the control of any who might threaten to destroy it. It was Bakunin who said that the possession of power transformed the most devoted friend of liberty into a tyrant.

"The Socialist leader is tempted to envy the security of the leaders of the other parties. His practice tends to be represented by the slogan, 'Safety First.' He becomes opportunist. To such a one the self-denying altruism of the Socialist faith becomes more and more anathema, and the metamorphosis of the leader becomes complete. The revolutionary becomes a reformist, no longer inspired by a lofty idealism, but guiding his action by self-regarding intrigue. This moderate doctrine is the religion of the political back-slider.

"The Socialist in office the world over is often a very different person from the world-shaking iconoclast of the irresponsible opposition. It was Joseph Chamberlain who used to sneer at the wild enthusiasts 'tamed to the Treasury Bench.' Much has been written of this metamorphosis of Socialist leaders. There is not a country on the Continent whose history could not supply many examples of the Socialist who began his political career on the Left, often very extreme, and ended up on the no less extreme Right.

". . . MacDonald was always the most accommodating of Socialists. His Socialism was of the kind that Sir William Harcourt meant when he said on a famous occasion: 'We are all Socialists now.' His Socialism is that far-off never-never-land, born of vague aspirations and described by him in picturesque generalities. . . It is as real and as remote as the Hesperides. Anyone can believe it without sacrifice or even inconvenience.

other books listed below. We regret to tell the many enquirers for "The Enemy Within the Empire" that it is temporarily unobtainable.

Books to Read.—"Banks and Facts," 6d.; "Victory Without Debt," 1/-; "Federal Union Exposed," 1/-; "The War Behind the War," 4d.

—M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Sec.

"It is evident now that MacDonald never really accepted the Socialist faith of a classless world, based on unselfish service. It can be seen now that he never could have at heart believed in the principles of Brotherhood and self-denial, which are the bases of Socialism.

"Just for a handful of silver he left us,

Just for a ribbon to stick in his coat.'

"The consciousness of power has often a demoralising effect. Sweet are the pleasures of pre-eminence. To renounce a position of honour and security for the sake of a principle is an act of diplomatic devotion, which is rare in the modern world. MacDonald feared that he might have to make this sacrifice, and, to avoid it, committed a great act of political treachery. The organism, says the scientist, is continually adapted to its environment. There is one part of MacDonald's environment that directed the current of his life. This was his early poverty. . . .

". . . In the struggle against poverty the laws that obtain are the laws of the jungle, and almost any action could be condoned that helped the victim to escape to freedom and security.

"It is MacDonald's conduct after he had climbed clear of the swamp, after he had reached a position of safety, his primary needs satisfied, that calls for the strongest condemnation. Then he had no excuse, and then it was that he turned on those who had befriended him, and sought to drive deeper into the slough of poverty the people who had helped him out of it."

**Taxes Hamper War
Effort**

(Continued from page 1.)

he secures the services of most of those who are available. Also, many qualified accountants are engaged by taxpayers in order to work out income tax returns. The Munitions Department needs these men more urgently than does the Taxation Commissioner or the taxpayer. But it cannot obtain their services, and, accordingly, payments to war contractors are being delayed and the production of munitions is being retarded unduly. This difficulty can be overcome only by causing the Commonwealth Bank to function as it was intended to function—by using the national credit and simplifying financial procedure.—C. A. Morgan, M.H.R., speaking in Parliament on War Tax Bill 1941, December 17. ("Hansard" report.)

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....

I enclose postal note for the sum of.....
cheque
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: MU 2834.

Vol. 8 FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1942. No. 6.

OWNERSHIP OR CONTROL

"Down with the owning class!" says the Communist, Homo sapiens, we say, is the only true class—all men are men. But it may be argued that this is a biological classification of little practical use in a civilisation which has developed "class-consciousness" as the inevitable outcome of a particular economic and financial system which forces the individual to plunder his fellows. The way out of that difficulty is an alteration in the economic and financial system. But, before this can be undertaken it is necessary to have a correct analysis of the present impasse and a logical alternative.

To some, there are but two points of view—labelled "Capitalism" (private ownership) and "Socialism" (public or common ownership)—into which all other arguments and theories are forced to fit. The point at issue is usually one of the "ownership of the means of production." This question of ownership is the pivotal doctrine of most socialist theory, from the mild Liberal-Fabian to the revolutionary Communist. It is the king-pin of Socialism, upon which the bewildering maze of different, and even opposing, socialist theories depend. Take away this question of ownership and most of the Socialist argument falls to pieces. Of course, "socialism" may be made to mean almost any proposal for social reform and reorganisation, and may include the rabid rationalistic Social Imperialism of Robert Blatchford, the Workers' Revolutionary Struggle of the Communists, the semi-scientific Utopian fantasies of H. G. Wells, or the antics of the Labor Party. In such a fog of half-born ideas we have to look for some one central formula. "Public or common ownership of the means of production," gives us this central doctrine. It is over this, we are told, that the "class struggle" develops; so let us examine the issue rather than fritter away time upon the thousand and one side-issues which spread out from it.

The assumption is that public ownership of the means of production will give public control over production, distribution and consumption. The average socialist is convinced that public ownership spells public control; that the one will follow the other. Trotsky's quarrel with Ramsay MacDonald was not one of practical ends, but of practical means. MacDonald said "Ballot-box," Trotsky said "Rifles." They both agreed that ownership gives control. It is just at this point that we ask the question: — Does it?

It is quite certain that private ownership does not give private control; - for if it did, the private owners ("the capitalists") would certainly control their own productions. Having materials, plant, labour and organisation, why do their factories ever go on half-time or close down, their fields go out of cultivation, and their workshops rust for want of use? As no private manufacturer or group of manufacturers, as **such**, is able to control demand, because demand cannot be effective unless backed by money, their ownership of the means of production has only a contingent value. Real control of markets, and therefore of production, lies elsewhere.

Supposing the "wage-earning masses" obtained collective ownership of the means of production, how **could** they control demand?: how could they control the scarcity or otherwise of money?—for such control of money, and therefore of demand, has no connection with property ownership, public or private. Nationalisation of the banks—the public ownership of buildings, furniture, ledgers, pens, ink, blotting-paper and State-paid officials—would not necessarily alter anything. Mere nationalisation would leave banking policy untouched, and the control of money still beyond the reach of the nationalises. Yet, without such control the "wage-earning masses" could not guarantee themselves production, work, or wages, and would be faced with the same economic enigma which faces the private owners.

Public control of demand can be established **without** any change of ownership of the means of production, in which case the hub of the socialist and capitalist wheel is removed and we need not bother to pick up the spokes. That is not to say, however, that all the present owners will, at the outset, welcome the establishment of public control of demand (i.e., credit power); for many are with the socialist in this, that they are under the delusion that ownership gives control and that to establish public control of demand would deprive them of it. It has to be patiently demonstrated to them that they now have no control—they simply own the means of production. As for those who, **owning little or nothing**, do actually control the demand for, and therefore the production of, goods and services, they will fight against any such scheme of public control to the last ditch.

Many socialists are so bemused by the ownership complex that as soon as "public control" is mentioned they imagine it must mean "nationalisation" of industry and the banks. It seems necessary to give an illustration of what we mean by "public control." The Weights and Measures Act of 1878 enacts certain legal standards in Great Britain, basing them upon the Standard Yard and the Standard Pound in the custody of the Standards Department of the Board of Trade. We can imagine what would happen if these public standards were left to the private indivi-

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

the British Government refused to have an election can be considered desirable. It is noteworthy that the press never advocates a parliament of independent men free from the domination of the more easily controlled party machines.

FUEL SABOTAGE: To avoid unnecessary expense, according to the "Herald" of February 6, Mr. Beasley is reported as saying that "alcohol distilleries will be reduced from 8 to 4." Considering that liquid fuel is one of our greatest war needs, deliberately reducing our supply in this matter simply because of expense, can only be regarded as sabotage—and the person responsible for this decision can only be regarded as a public enemy.

SOLICITUDE: Mr. Forde, in the "Herald" of February 7, announced the Malayan casualty list, and extended the sincerest sympathy of the Government to the soldiers' relatives and friends. He then eulogised their heroism in their superhuman task. Australians will strongly endorse these remarks and sentiments, but, being practical people, will realise that words are rather empty unless accompanied by a tangible expression of sincerity; and it is worthy of note that Mr. Forde did not evince the slightest interest in the financial circumstances of the relatives of these members of the fighting forces; many of whom may otherwise be destitute for the rest of their lives. Faith without works. . . .

RAILWAY MESS: Railways Commissioner M. J. Canny is reported in the "Herald" of January 30 as "fearing that rail services might be restricted because of the coal shortage." It was not pointed out that the coal shortage was an effect of the call-up; it would never do for even a Commissioner to point to causes—his job is to deal with effects as best he can.

FARM LABOUR: Mr. Dunstan is reported in the "Herald" of January 30 as saying that "thousands of applications for rural labour have been received by the State Government; he hoped to obtain military exemptions for essential work, however—but defence of Australia must take priority." Evidently it would be too much to expect of him to understand that even an army marches and fights on its stomach, and that the first line of defence and offence is primary production.

A.B.C.D. OF FINANCE: America-Britain - Chinese - Debt. The "Her-

ald" of February 3, reports a British loan of £50 millions and a U.S. loan of £100 millions to China; it will be remembered that Sir Otto Neimeyer recently visited China, and that a sticky time was predicted for China—well, here it is. Obviously by the amounts involved the odds are 2 to 1 on U.S. winning the race for control via finance; all this wangling raises the question whether, in the financiers' final blue print of the world-to-be, the Soongs are to be given dominance over the Mitsuis, with China in complete bondage to U.S. and British financiers.

WHEAT RESTRICTIONS: More plans are ready for restricting wheat production, which will displace a considerable number of growers. It is pleasing to note that Mr. Alex. Wilson, M.H.R., is advocating that "the Government shall assume financial responsibility for losses caused to individual growers arising from Governmental action." That is an important principle of responsible government — which should be the first consideration in all such matters.

APPLE PRICES: Mr. Scully expects apple prices to fall soon, according to the "Herald" of January 30, which reports: "The apple crop will be lighter because of the drought." He, of course, did not mention the spraying of trees to prevent fruiting. The people, indeed, have a difficult job in defeating the external enemy and at the same time dealing with the Apple Board tyranny—which can only be described as stabbing us in the back.

POST-WAR RUSSIA: The following information comes from the "Herald" of February 3: "What seems certain is that, if Russia overwhelms Germany, she will have by far the greatest say in deciding post-war boundaries—and much else." Under such circumstances it will be interesting to learn how Russia will react to the proposed English-speaking Federal Union; it would not be surprising if the daily press tells us next that all Russians have been taught to speak English so as to qualify for the new form of socialism.

WAR-DAMAGE INSURANCE: The War-Damage Commission will soon present regulations containing details of compulsory insurance; voluntary insurance of chattels, furniture, will also be dealt with. The main consideration will be State buildings which are to be insured, presumably with
(Continued on page 5.)

duals who are now forced to conform to them. The yard measure would shrink and enlarge, like a piece of elastic. But, in order to enforce this public control, was it necessary to take over the ownership of factories and workshops making yard measures, weights and scales, etc.? No, it is obvious that the control of these standards is not connected with the ownership of the means of production.

The economic problem is not one of production and not one of ownership, but of **distribution**. Distribution depends upon demand, and this, to be effective, must be backed by money. You may demand a Rolls-Royce, but without some £2000 or more your demand will be ineffective. Do the private owners of the means of production control the issue and cancellation of money, and, therefore, in the ultimate sense, prices? No. By what means, then, would communal owners control money and prices? Obviously it cannot be done by changing ownership; so that is not the right line of attack.

If the Communists shouted: "Public control of the People's Credit and make book-entry money conform to an intelligible public standard, so that purchasing-power will keep step as powers of production increase," their proposed revolution would take on some revolutionary meaning. As it is, they proclaim the same old slogans:—"The right to work!" "Workers' control of industry!" and "Nationalisation!"—all slogans of Production and Ownership. In one sense the "struggle, of the classes" may be inevitable, may be the logical outcome of "historic processes"; but it is none the less wide of the mark, and no such proletarian fatalistic mysticism will solve the fundamental problem of distribution.

What method would be used in keeping the Communal Credit Account? is the question we ask. Until that is answered in such a way as to prove that it would, at least, always be possible to consume and utilise all wanted goods and services, produced without restraint, nationalisation will remain out of the running except as yet another form of mass-hallucination, a sort of counter-irritant to the egocentric capitalist aberration.

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, an 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.) 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 years 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 what 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 sup-

pose 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 him (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.

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 spacious 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.

—Hilton Ross.

OF THE

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. If 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 ever more so in the future. If the Government took all the people's money and their future incomes, by loan or otherwise, 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 St. That is by increasing taxation for everybody and by raising new loans thus creating 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 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.

LIFE IN A FEDERAL UNION

(Continued from page 1.)

A. F. of L. mutineers for the privilege of unloading perishable produce from their trucks. In Thurman Arnold's flies are stories of fees extorted, flow of trade blocked, employment restricted by A. F. of L. unions—holdups which have added hundreds of thousands of dollars to the cost of building roads, factories, houses, defence plants, etc.

In addition to racketeering, jurisdictional fights have resulted in oppressive restraints on U.S. industry. Building-trade unions have blocked improved methods of construction. Hod-carriers and operating engineers have prevented the use of ready-mixed concrete and mechanical truck mixers. Carpenters have fought the introduction of pre-fabricated parts. Such obstructions have been justified by A. F. of L. leaders on the ground that they must protect their members from technological unemployment. But there is more than a suspicion that A. F. of L. leaders, in many cases, are more concerned about their own jobs than their men's. A shift in methods might mean the end of a craft, the collapse of a union, the disintegration of a dues-paying membership.

Sitting in his shirt sleeves in his small office in Washington, President Green reads of these things with the resigned air of a man who had heard it all before—as, in fact, he has: ever since, 17 years ago, when he was raised to the decorative presidency of A.F. of L. In those years he has reached some philosophic conclusions: that boys will be boys; that no one is perfect; that in the long run the laws of economics will fix things up; that, besides, he couldn't do anything about it if he wanted to. The thing that gets him excited is the insinuation that he has been an accessory, before or after the fact, in any crookedness. That is unjustifiable slander. Mr. Green makes the windows rattle with his shouts of self-defence. Were all bankers crooked because Richard Whitney went to prison? he asks. Is Mr. Green a crook because there are a few irrepressible extroverts among the 4,247,443 paid-up members of his union?

Mr. Green's rhetorical questions go unanswered. Observers, more interested in Mr. Green's organisation than in Mr. Green, go on opening doors and peering into some dark closets.

OUTSIDE THE LAW

The infant A. F. of L. which broke away from the Knights of Labour in 1886 was no idealistic organisation. It was a business proposition—"pure and simple unionism"—set up for the economic improvement of its members. After a time that business proposition sprouted some fungi.

Business leaders discovered that some labour leaders, for a price, would co-operate in destroying competitors. That was the beginning of labour racketeering. Sam Parks, Skinny Madden, Bob Brindell, Al Capone, Tom Maloy, "Joe the Greaser" Rosenweig, "Dopey Benny" Fein, Louis Lepke, Jacob Chapiro, et al., strewed the industrial U.S. with wrecked property, spoiled vegetables, stink-bombed theatres, ruined laundry, the bodies of innocent bystanders, of fellow goons, of banditti who opposed them.

The same sort of fungi can still be found sprouting palely in the darker, danker corners of A. F. of L. For instance: "Umbrella Mike" Boyle. During the lush, war years, Mike collected thousands of dollars in "insurance premiums" for guaranteeing that his Chicago electrical workers would not strike. He served two months (on a year's sentence) in the clink for conspiring to break the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. But last week he was still running the Chicago electrical workers.

Also in Chicago is fat-faced Max

Caldwell. From a lowly start as a waiter-bouncer and an unsuccessful organiser of hat-check girls and night-club entertainers, Mr. Caldwell bounced into the food-store field, where his take in dues and initiation fees was said to be terrific.

Branching out, he tried to swallow up a small union of hair-wash demonstrators. Caldwell men made such alleged threats as: "Nice lookin' legs you got in them silk stockings, babe. How do you think they are going to look when we break them for you?" But the hysterical women raised such a shriek that Mr. Caldwell retired. Anyhow, he soon had his hands full with his store clerks, who had revolted and were demanding an accounting of some 910,000 dollars which they had paid to Mr. Caldwell in dues. Further embarrassing Mr. Caldwell, State officials raided a safe-deposit box and found a cache of jewels, including a diamond-studded union pin worth 1000 dollars.

The rebelling clerks were rebuffed by Mr. Green, who snorted: "[They] are a small, impatient group and a good example of the type we have to deal with when we are trying to do something constructive." So far Leader Caldwell, although he has been ousted from the Chicago Federation, has not been publicly repudiated by Mr. Green.

To Pittsburgh some years ago went hard-boiled, sleek-haired Nick Stirone. There he set about organising the hod-carriers and common labourers. He moved in on Pennsylvania's vast dam and road building programme.

"When farmers refused to pay the Stirone organisation a fee for working on the projects, a reign of terror was begun which finally ended in the trial of Stirone unionists—but not Nick. From the stand, Stirone was accused of telling an aide that he wanted a contractor and two C.I.O. organisers murdered, that he wanted people to "shiver in their boots when Nick Stirone was mentioned." Last month Stirone was hauled into court by the business agent of a labourers' local, who wanted Nick put under bond to keep the peace because "he said he would cave my head in." But last week Nick was still doing business as the president of his A. F. of L. local.

The law has put its finger on many another A.F. of L. figure: Jake ("The Bum") Wellner, business agent of the Brooklyn painters; Sam Kaplan, on the executive board of Local No. 306, New York Motion-Picture Machine Operators; John J. Dempsey, international treasurer of the ironworkers. Though a little brown around the edges, their careers have not been blighted. President Green has shouted; "We disavow racketeering, gangsterism, and disregard for law" most emphatically and without reservation—but they still have their jobs.

BEYOND THE LAW

By a recent Supreme Court decision, certain coercive union practices, not out-and-out racketeering, were placed above and beyond the law. In that still-legal area flourish such robust A. F. of L. chieftains as William Hutcheson, executive council bigshot.

Hulking, button-eyed Big Bill Hutcheson has ruled the carpenters for 20-odd years. He has fought fellow chieftains in bitter internecine wars. The case which was taken to Supreme Court was a quarrel over whether his carpenters or Brother Harvey Brown's machinists should install machinery in Anheuser-Busch's brewery. One of his colleagues whom Hutcheson has fought is Brother Dan Tobin, head of the powerful A. F. of L. teamsters. With 500,000 teamsters in his union, Dan Tobin is in a tactical position to tie up almost any job there is.

President Green admits his impotence when it comes to settling brawls between such behemoths.

The various national and international unions, loosely bound together as a "federation," are autonomous, a law unto themselves. The best that ageing Mr. Green can do is to distract the public's attention from their wasteful and costly conflicts by incessantly standing on his head, like Father William, and emitting such soothing cries as: "The officers and members of the American Federation of Labour are irrevocably committed to the preservation of our common heritage, individual liberty, our democratic form of government and our democratic institutions at any cost."

But inside Mr. Green's A. F. of L., democracy frequently gets pushed around. Heads of the autonomous unions rule their bailiwicks with a heavy hand. This week, the hod-carriers and common labourers met in convention for the first time in 30 years. One of the things convention delegates will ask for: an accounting of millions of dollars which they have been paying in dues.

William Green is part of an entrenched A. F. of L. hierarchy, which

will fight to the bitter end any attempt to dislodge it. Purge, shake-up, expulsion mean disruption of the whole carefully erected structure. William Green draws a 20,000-a-year salary, but heads of some of the national and international unions do even better. James Caesar ("Mussolini") Petrillo, dark, arrogant son of a ditch-digger and the all-powerful boss of 138,000 musicians collects 40,000 dollars plus a year.

Next month, big and little shots will march to Seattle for A. F. of L.A.; 61st annual convention. Marching obediently behind will be rank-and-file delegates. President Green and the hierarchy will be re-elected. Questions of racketeering, jurisdictional disputes, monopolies may come up; some action may be taken. But not much. Indications were last week that George Browne would be ousted from the executive council by the simple device of eliminating the vice-presidency which he now occupies. But it was a safe bet that A. F. of L., corrupt and contented, would not willingly change its spots.

N.Z. PROFESSOR'S WARNING

The New Zealand Institute of International Affairs has published a sixpenny pamphlet entitled "Problems of Reconstruction," and written by Professor H. Belshaw, who has some wise words to say on the subject of Planning:—

It has no merit of its own. It must be judged in terms of the net result of human welfare. Controls may be good or bad, according to the objects for which they are imposed, their success in achieving those objects, and the extent to which other undesirable consequences may result from their imposition. They do not enlarge the mind of man, nor liberate the human spirit from the bonds of ignorance. . . nor do they of themselves generate a force making for social cohesion. On the contrary, unless they are wisely conceived and administered, they may . . . do much damage to social unity. They may (in the words of G. D. H. Cole) 'create a political machine too vast and complicated to be amenable to any real democratic control, and we may thus become ourselves the victims of the very power-mania which at the present

time we are organising ourselves to defeat."

Belshaw goes on to point out that this same "power-mania" may not be confined to the economic field but may "spill over" into the privileged area of democracy, free thought and expression. In short, the free indulgence of the "power-mania" leads on to the power politics of Fascism from which we are seeking to liberate ourselves as well as the rest of mankind.

Appreciate the Professor's final words when he alludes to the grave danger of too great a concentration of power in the hands of any groups "It's a short step to heresy hunting, the suppression of freedom of speech and criticism and subservience of the rank and file to party leaders—in short, to a growing lack of faith in democracy both by the leaders and the led."

"COME UP AND SEE ME SOME TIME"

This world-famed formula of hospitality, which originated in the speaking part of a female character in a certain film-play, captured the imaginations of the Canadian chartered banks.

In a full double-column announcement published in the "Farm and Ranch Review," the "Chartered Banks of Canada" extended the same invitation.—

"Whether you deal with a bank or whether you don't, some time soon—say the very next time you are passing the bank's door—why not drop in and get acquainted?"

—which is what the lady said. Furthermore, it is extended in the same spirit as animated the lady. You need not do business, nor even talk business. No—

"You're sure of a welcome, because, the bank manager wants to know you"

—which, of course, was the lady's motive. What you're invited to do is quite innocent and inexpensive.

"So find out for yourself what kind of fellow he is. And before you leave, take a look at his staff." —which, again, was what the lady suggested.

Again, you are given the following assurance—

"This is your introduction to a series of chats, in the course of which you will be surprised at how

little of mystery and how much of service there is in the business of banking in Canada."

—an assurance which, no doubt, was satisfactorily verifiable on a visit to the lady; for upon reflection you will agree that the ratio of mystery to service in the business of vamping in Canada (if such business takes place in that Dominion) is very near to the ratio in the business of banking there.

But you will want to know why you should take a look at the bank manager's staff. Well, the advertisement tells you—

"The head offices are manned and managed by just that sort of man. Every general manager in Canada started in the banking business as a junior in some small branch, and rose from the ranks."

In other words, you are urged to notice that little bankers do not alter as they grow up. If they chasten you it is because they love you. Behind their frowning Caution is smiling Benevolence. So join in the chorus, please: "Comrades, comrades, ever since we were boys."

The lady in the film story wanted her callers to know her better so that they should realise that when she exacted little gifts from them it was not because she valued the gifts above their friendship, but because their giving reassured her of the reality of

(Continued on page 7.)

"THE CHURCHILL PROBLEM"

A Talk Broadcast from 7HO, Hobart, at 8.15 p.m. on Sunday, February 8, by James Guthrie, B.Sc.

With the developing crisis in the Pacific and the serious losses already suffered by the British forces, a great flood of criticism has risen throughout the Empire.

Since the Empire effort and strategy have been directed from London by Mr. Churchill and his Cabinet, these men have been the focus of the criticism, and since the lives of many men and the existence of the Empire are dependent on these few men, the question has been asked: Are these few men capable of carrying such a colossal burden? The answer has been given, and is: Very Definitely, NO.

No man can carry the burden Mr. Churchill has placed upon his own shoulders.

The criticism levelled at the British Government is important because it comes from the most important men in England to-day, men who are actually producing and designing the tanks, aeroplanes and guns, which are so desperately needed.

The very serious complaints voiced by the engineers of England have been echoed in the British press and in the House of Commons. It is also worth noticing that the strongest criticism of the British Government comes from the oldest and most conservative newspapers of England.

Mr. Churchill, in his recent review of the war situation, made it quite clear that we were short of 'planes, tanks and ships, that this shortage of equipment dominated the whole strategy of the war, and that we could not supply adequate equipment for Malaya or Hong Kong without denuding the army in Lybia.

You and I are not military experts; neither is Mr. Churchill, for that matter. And since somebody has to decide the best time and place for placing our fighting equipment, we can only hope that the Government is using the best expert military advice.

However, military and naval commanders are bound to secrecy and the taxpayer is unable to find out what is happening until serious damage has been done. It took about ten years for the British people to find out that Mr. Baldwin had reduced their country to a third-class Power. Ten years is just long enough to fight and lose a war. The men who allowed their country to be reduced to a third-class Power, who were instrumental in that country being reduced to a state of

helplessness, are in the British Government to-day.

And the same paralysing influence which forced three million unemployed to walk the streets and which shut down and dismantled some of the finest shipyards in England while German factories were working day and night—these men are still in control of the British Government and of the destiny of the British Empire.

The question arises: Is the British Empire strong enough to carry the present British Government on its back? The British people, for purposes of war, are a united people, holding a common allegiance to the one King, the centre of the British peoples.

British Governments may come and British Governments may go, but the British people will still remain united because the unity of the British people does not depend on party politics; it rests on something more permanent.

There has never been any doubt about the fighting powers of the Empire forces or about the skill of our engineers. Why, then, are our sailors and soldiers still being bombed from the skies without adequate protection? What, after two and a half years of war, is still disorganising the production of munitions in England?

Last July, the Engineering Industries Association of Great Britain gave each member of the House of Commons a reasoned and detailed statement showing how the production of munitions is being held up all along the line. The statements are almost incredible and certainly scandalous. No one would believe them unless they had had similar experience of the tremendous frustration and confusion caused by Government officials trying to tell first-class experts how to do their job.

The Engineering Industries Association of Great Britain maintains that the production of munitions of war could have been and still can be, increased enormously, if the men who are actually doing the work were not unnecessarily interfered with and restricted by the British Government.

This interference and restriction has three main causes. The first is the British Civil Service; the second is the British Treasury; the third is the hush-hush policy enforced on executives. The British Civil Service has for long been composed of men of the highest integrity animated by a spirit of service to which many tributes have been paid; the Civil Service is very efficient for certain purposes in peace time. Everything in the Civil Service has to be carried on strictly according to rules; everything has to be checked and cross-checked; everybody's responsibility is strictly limited. Initiative is not permitted, and it is considered dangerous. In the Service it is considered better to do nothing than to do something wrong or do something without authority. The Civil Service is organised more on the basis of a police force than a creative and productive force. It works well enough when things are stationary and there are no quick and constant changes. But in war-time it is completely at sea, and becomes a deadly menace to its own country unless it is controlled by men who are big enough to take risks and who are prepared to obtain results at the expense of breaking regulations. Such men are seldom found in Civil Service departments; the Civil Service spells death to such men. Munitions of war cannot be made, and never will be made under a Civil Service organisation. We could have had thousands of aeroplanes and many more ships if the men who made them had been given a free hand. These aeroplanes and ships would have been a godsend now no matter what the cost had been. After all, few broken re-

gulations and several million pounds spent are small things compared with the cost of human life and the loss recently suffered in materials and ships in the Pacific.

Highly skilled men capable of accepting the enormous responsibilities imposed by war are very limited in number; these men should be assisted to do their work without unnecessary irritation and interference. Yet, these same men are so overwhelmed by Government regulations and red tape that they have no time to do their own highly-skilled work. The result is that their whole organisation is flung into chaos, or carried on in a very inefficient manner.

It is sometimes necessary for a high executive officer to sign twenty documents to obtain the expenditure of 10/- per week. Thousands of highly-skilled men are glued to office chairs trying to understand Government regulations or answering telephone calls from various Government departments wanting to know why only 31 of the 32 forms were filled in and why the proper signatures were not obtained. Some engineering firms have had to wait nine months, chasing through various Government departments before they can find the person who has the necessary power to give permission to let them go on with the work which is being urgently demanded.

Oceans of papers and documents are circulating the country, demanding more and more office space, and more and more office staff, and more and more time from the overworked executives of the engineering industry of Great Britain.

The munition factories may be short of men, but the number of men in Government offices keep on increasing every day. The number of men polishing their backsides on office chairs must be reaching amazing proportions.

In my opinion these showers of paper bombs which are being dropped on defenceless executives have done much more harm than the bombs dropped by the Nazis.

There is a war on in England—a paper war; and nobody seems able to do anything about it. Mr. Churchill

seems to be quite helpless to do anything. He has more power than any British Prime Minister ever had, but he doesn't use it to stop the confusion, and everybody wants to know why. Nearly every English paper is demanding an answer; but Mr. Churchill refuses to give an answer.

I have in front of me a copy of the Memorandum addressed by the Engineering Industries Association to members of Parliament. I have only time to read to you one extract:

"Financial legislation has, however, made it impossible for many engineering firms to buy such plant and equipment (for extensions)—the normal machinery of Finance has been disturbed and no adequate substitute has been provided. New capital cannot be obtained, since Excess Profit Tax has hit hardest at those industries which have had to expand for war production. Loans cannot be obtained, since the expenditure in question has little post-war value. Even the banks are now refusing further advances. As a result of this situation, businesses are being forced to avoid all expenditure which would increase their output and the efficiency of working and have to resort to uneconomic expenditure which can be charged to revenue. The Government finance which is available scarcely helps. The average time taken for a decision varies from four to nine months; it is impossible to provide enough Government officials with industrial knowledge to investigate all the applications which should be made. In any case, it is impracticable for all essential capital expenditure to be approved by Government officials because they do not understand what is essential and what is not, and it is a separation of authority from responsibility."

The question arises how such a state of affairs could have persisted after two and a half years of war. The reason is that the men who knew most about it and the business men who could have spoken to some effect were afraid to talk. Government officials were not allowed to talk and the army and navy are pledged to secrecy

(Continued on page 8.)

A MISLEADING PAMPHLET

"What is Nazism, Fascism, Democracy, Capitalism, Socialism, Communism, The Soviet Union, The Jewish Question, Douglas Credit?—A complete explanation by a Labour Research Committee." Thus runs the inscription on the cover of a threepenny pamphlet distributed amongst the Sunday afternoon audiences of the speakers in the Adelaide Botanic Park,

In the paragraph on the Jewish Question, the failure of the authors to distinguish between ownership of capital and control of capital, through credit-power, raises doubts as to their competence to write understandingly of the subject of money and credit, doubts which are fully justified by their supposed "complete explanation" of Douglas Credit, which reads as follows: "The Douglas Social Credit upholders claim that their theories are a panacea for everything. With unlimited currency being printed the prices would rise. Under such inflation of the currency there would soon be chaos. The Social Credit theories reek with absurdities."

Readers who wish to understand the Douglas proposals should take the time and trouble to study accredited literature concerning the philosophy as well as the technical proposals of Social Credit. Briefly what Social Crediters actually claim for them is that by removing the cause of restriction and destruction, of production, and permitting a more satisfactory distribution of the commodities available poverty would soon be unknown. The distribution of goods with the least waste of energy, not "making work," would be the objective of industry, thus ensuring the maximum of leisure or real free-

dom for personal development. A paramount feature of the Douglas proposals is the arrangement of a subsidy which decreases prices to consumers and increases purchasing power at the same time, thus definitely preventing the possibility of inflation, as the word is generally understood. Also it is made clear that there need be no increase of printed paper currency unless the increase of goods for distribution called for the use of more legal tender money in correct ratio.

Some few Social Crediters favour limitation of incomes, a maximum above which income may not rise, and a minimum below which income must not fall; all of them agree that raising the lower standards of living by increasing production and distribution of wanted goods, is better than pulling down the high standards for redistribution.

A pamphlet which so grossly misrepresents Social Credit as expounded by Major Douglas may be also suspected of similar want of comprehension in its "complete explanation" of Socialism, Communism, etc. Ostensibly emanating from those who use "Workers Unite" as a rallying slogan, it is more likely to help the International Financiers who work on the "Divide and Rule" principle. -G. K. Tavender,

"COME UP AND SEE ME SOMETIME"

(Continued from page 6.)

their friendship. The great moral of this is that all of us—whatever we are and do now—were once upon a time little innocents in little cradles, owing nothing, being owed nothing, producing nothing, and, in fact, doing only one thing—consuming something. Well, by all means, let us pal up with the bankers if we and they can bring back the old cradle times once more. There is a basis for unity along this line; for not one of us has ever ceased to be a consumer. More than that, each of us, for himself, puts consumption as the primary and overriding necessity of life. So there is every reason why the banker and his customer should tell each other all about it—all about what bankers do and why they do it, and all about the consequences, and why they are unpleasant. Of course, it must be a two-way fraternisation. For bank managers, though nice fellows are not more liable to misjudgment by their customers than are those customers by bank managers. These managers do not appreciate, for instance, what a jolly fellow, and, indeed, what a socially, useful fellow, is the spendthrift. So three cheers for the new Fraternisation.

A TRAP FOR THE UNWARY

"It is absurd to imagine that the great mass of a mighty nation are being in any sense led, badgered, or cajoled by a system which they do not accept into conduct of which they do not approve. The Germans would be quick enough to accept the spoils of victory if Hitler won. To suggest any other than that Germany is solidly behind the Nazi regime is to be blind to the history of the last hundred years."

—"Nature."

Such a brilliant burst of logical reasoning certainly does not deserve to pass unnoticed and uncriticised. For years, we here in Australia have been "badgered" and "cajoled" into accepting a system and a state of affairs of which we did not, and still do not, approve. For the very simple reason that, on the one hand, there was the great, literally leaderless mass of the people, and arrayed against them on the other side were the powerful forces of the daily press, radio propaganda and mighty political party machines—the sheer weight of propaganda media backed by almost unlimited financial resources. The gradual awakening of the people to the REAL cause of their economic subjugation has been but the stirrings of a sleeping giant, and only now, when the stress of war is showing up these things in their true light, is the need for immediate and drastic action becoming evident to many Australians.

"Conduct of which they do not approve." No doubt many Germans did not and still do not, approve of the conduct of Nazism. But they were starving, and Hitler promised them food. And he has continued to give them food—not intermittently, but consistently throughout every year of his rule. He gave them "full employment" (the goal of the orthodox economists), and assurance of some sort of a roof always over their heads. To a great extent, he replaced uncertainty and doubt with certainty and assurance. The price was individual freedom and the right to rule themselves.

The German people have tolerated the Nazi Party because it was the only party that seemed able to give them some sort of order and escape from the misery and disorder that surrounded them, where all others had failed. They tolerate it because they fear that, once they cease to

tolerate it, what little security they have managed to gain will immediately be lost in the chaotic conditions which, they believe, will return once more. They accepted Hitler's terms because they were assured of getting at least their necessities of life. Nor should we forget that Hitler and his followers were, and still are, a definite minority in Germany, and that, exactly as the party system in Australia does NOT represent the desires and the will of the majority of the people of Australia, Hitler and the Nazi Party do NOT represent the unexpressed will of the majority of the German people.

For those who did not and would not tolerate Nazism and accept Hitler's terms, there was always the powerful "persuasion" of the Gestapo, the concentration camp, the block and the firing squad. Hitler held all the aces, and continues to hold them

A NEW MOVEMENT

The "New World Movement," recently formed in Melbourne, whose first principle for economic reconstruction is "economic security for every man, woman and child, as an inalienable right," will commence a series of weekly broadcasts from 3AK on March 1, at 10.15 p.m.

insofar as the German internal situation is concerned.

What of so many of our own "pacifists," those who so stoutly declared war to be wrong and that they would not sanction another war or take up arms against another nation? How many of these have wilted under the "mass hysteria" of war and other pressure, with the shadow of the not-so-distant-prison in the background? All conscientious individuals; but the moral and emotional forces opposed to them were too great, and they, too, have been compelled to accept conduct of which THEY do not approve, and have shouldered the rifle along with many another militia man. How many more would have succumbed had the "persuasions" such as Hitler has used been let loose among them? Man has his price—either in cash security from want, or fear for his own safety or those dependent on him.

Let us not blind ourselves, either

to the fact that Hitler has been provided with a great deal of material with which to plead his specious case to the German people—e.g., Versailles and the partial shutting down of trade channels (e.g., Roosevelt's 25 per cent, embargo on German imports into America, 24 hours after his world peace talk in April, 1939). Such things have lent colour to Hitler's wild claims that the world was opposed to a revitalised Germany. Such things have provided much fruitful propaganda for Goebbels' claims that their cause was just.

Let us frankly admit that the German people have been very cleverly manoeuvred by Hitler into the position in which they are to-day, partly through their own ignorance, partly through their own fears, but, in the main, because of factors over which they had no control. The answer to

their problem lies in the one answer to such questions as: Who financed the Nazi Party and its armament schemes? Who caused the Great Depression? Who was responsible for the partial closing of trade channels? Who, in short, fostered conditions which enabled Nazism to grow and strengthen its hold on Germany and increase its power in world affairs?

Having seen the fate that is the German peoples, by exchanging liberty and individual freedom for a little economic security, and a system and way of life planned and ordered by someone else over whom they had no control; let us take that, lesson to heart and see that we, too, do not fall into the trap when we, in our turn, are asked to give up some of our hard-won rights for empty prizes. Let us keep on the road to Security AND Freedom.

—Hilton Ross.

"CAESARISM" THREATENS BRITAIN

The disease of "Caesarism," rampant in Germany and Russia, has reached Britain, Mr. John A. Barry told the audience of several thousand people at the Catholic Truth Society rally in Glasgow.

In Britain, he said, the disease shows itself chiefly as an urge for planning.

"Already our planners want to herd us into communal eating places, where to the grind of canned music we shall eat planned meals of mass-produced foods, so much more 'efficient' than those the wife would cook in her own kitchen and serve in her own home to her own man and family!

REGIMENTATION

"Then there are to be communal nurseries where children can eat, sleep and be brought up by 'experts' on mass-production lines, so that not only may the mother go out to work and live her own life, but the babies will enjoy a 'scientific' upbringing on uniform lines, directed towards making them all to the same pattern. . . .

"We are all for law and order when it is properly directed towards the freedom and happiness of the individual. We are all against it when it makes for servitude, for soulless regimentation; above all, when it violates the rights of the individual or of the family.

"You know how far this craze has gone in Germany. Dreadful tales have come through of mass murder of the unfit, of the weak, the aged, those

no longer able to serve the State. There may be exaggeration, but much of it is true. And if any of it is true, what is to stop the rest?

"Are we free from this dread danger here? We are not. Already there are 'responsible' people who shout for the sterilisation of the unfit. . . . Can they not see that when they deny its rights to one of God's creatures they deny them to all?"

—Melbourne "Advocate," Feb. 5.

"THE CHURCHILL PROBLEM"

(Continued from page 7.)

secrecy and can be court-martialled if they talk. The only people who could talk were the politician, and you know what they have said. This hush-hush policy has cost the Empire dear. Creating a god out of Mr. Churchill has been madness. Let us face the facts like man and realise that this war can only be won by making big sacrifices, and if the entire British Cabinet has to be removed before we can win this war, well, it is better that it be done quickly and now.

"NEW TIMES" SHOPPING GUIDE AND BUSINESS DIRECTORY

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

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

BLACKBURN.
"A" GRADE MOTOR ENGINEERS, Station Garage, "Whitehorse Road, WX 1430.

BOX HILL.
BOX HILL FURNISHING CO. 247-9 Station St. Cash or Terms.

CHAS. L. COX, TAILOR, Men's and Boys' Wear. 285 Station Street.

CHEMIST, F. Cheshire, For Your Prescriptions. 270 Station Street.

COOL DRINKS, Sweets, Smokes. R. Dannock, 1124 Whitehorse Road.

FURNITURE REMOVERS. Gill Bros., 254 Station St. WX 2073.

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

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

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

WATCHMAKER and Jeweller. Bames, 82 Main Street. Repairs.

CITY.
BLINDS of every sort. Car curtains repaired. T. Pettit, 235a Queen St.

CAKES, PASTRY, etc. Home-made "Clovelly," The Block, Elizabeth Street. Cent. 255.

DAVIS, 563 Bourke Street. Royal Medal Milkers, Separators, Engines.

DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT BOOKSHOP, 166 Lit. Collins St.

ELECTRO-PLATING.—Nickel, Silver and Chromium Plating. Highest Grade Work only. W. R. SPEAKMAN, 69 Latrobe St. Melbourne.

MAISON MERLIN, Natl. Bk. Bldg., 271 Collins St. Ladies' Hairdressers.

OPTICIAN and Hearing Aids. 4th Floor, 57 Swanston St. F 5566.

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

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

GLENFERRIE.
OPTICIAN, W. W. Nicholls, 100 Glenferrie Road. Haw. 5845.

SUITS to order from 70/-. 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.
ANDERSONS, 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. Graves, opp. Rialto.

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

MOTOR GARAGE, Kew Junction Service Station, Cr. High, and Denmark Streets. Haw. 6455.

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

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

SANDRINGHAM.
A. RYAN, opp. Stn., Shoe Repairs. Tennis Racquets Restrung from 7/6.

GROCERY, McKAY & WHITE, Bay Rd., opp. Theatre. XW 1924.

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

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

WILLIAMSTOWN.
DUNSTAN, DAIRYMAN, 28 Station Rd. Phone: W'town 124

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