

ON OTHER PAGES:

THE CASE AGAINST BOARDS (Page 2)

MELBOURNE "Age" ON RED UNION (Page 3)

LONDON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON POST WAR PROBLEMS. (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 8. No. 43. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, OCT. 30. 1942 Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

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

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

Now, when the padlocks for our lips are forging,

Silence is crime. Whittier (1807-1892).

Statute Of Westminster and Constitution A mendment

Danger Seen By Many In Sudden Moves At Canberra

Many responsible and thoughtful citizens are mystified by the recent sudden move in the midst of war, to adopt the five unratified sections of the eleven-years-old Statute of Westminster. Widespread concern is also felt about the simultaneous move to stampede us into accepting an alteration to the Constitution that would further centralise power at Canberra. On another page we reprint a significant editorial from the Melbourne Age. Hereunder we quote a letter sent to members of Federal Parliament on October 6 by a leading Sydney social creditor:

I desire to urge with all the emphasis possible that you will act without delay in such a way as to prevent the ratification of the Statute of Westminster at this juncture in our history.

It is most opportune that two articles, one from the pen of Dorothy Thompson, appeared in "Truth" for October 4th, and that these items have been given world-wide release. For Australia, now attempting to sign the Statute of Westminster, they constitute a clear warning as well as a conformation of the reason for the general uneasiness felt by a growing majority of the people as to what may be the outcome of this severance of the legal ties with Britain.

On page 13 of "Truth" we have an article by Dorothy Thompson, which shows that there are two groups in America, both of which constitute a grave danger to the successful prosecution of the war, and are, therefore a course for uneasiness to our great ally. There is an Imperial Group anxious to substitute American Imperialism for British, and a Group engaged in propaganda to lower the prestige and destroy the solidarity of the British Commonwealth. Both are anti-British — one would destroy the British Commonwealth, the other (Imperial Group) would take over the assets and endeavour to make America the focus of an International Government, ultimately leading to a totalitarian world State, as expounded in C. Kirschmann Streits book, "Federal Union" (price 7/6 of all booksellers in Australia).

ARTICLE OF BANK OF INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENTS: In conjunction with the above article read in the same issue an inset statement on the B.I.S. (page 16), where the idea of a world new order

appears to have its origin. Here is disclosed the secret common meeting place of internationalists of both right and left, having similar aims to the two groups, also containing right and left elements, as described by D. Thompson. These groups are a growing menace in America to those Americans with whom we have ties of race and kinship, and who are now fighting loyally beside us in the cause of democracy.

A POSSIBLE OUTCOME: We cannot here relate the full story of the world-wide attempt, aided by war conditions, to break up the existing order of things for the purpose of substituting a world-wide totalitarian order. These "evil things" should be evident to anyone studying the course of events as they are made clear in the articles in "Truth."

ACTIVE AGENTS OF FEDERAL UNION: What I wish to emphasise is that the ratification of the Statute at such an abnormal time exposes Australia to the propaganda of Basle agents (see D. Thompson's reference to their activity in Canada), and makes it possible for the real and dangerous internationalism to receive support from those well-meaning idealists who regard "new world order" as merely the realisation of the brotherhood of man and the co-operation of nation. One of such well-meaning, but nevertheless, dangerous, idealists—the headmaster of an important boys' school in Victoria—recently was reported in the press as saying that if the King stood in the way of attainment of Federal Union ideals, he for one was prepared to sacrifice the Kingship of the British Commonwealth. No action was taken by Parliament for this statement. Other persons, some highly placed, and even in Parliament, have favourably referred to Federal Union, so we realise

that there is a considerable amount of support for this scheme from people quite innocent of its ultimate objective.

Even the sponsor of the ratification of the Statute spoke at a conference called to discuss Federal Union some two years ago, and pointed out the desirability of altering the Australian Constitution, at the same time he expressed himself in favour of some form of Federal Union.

WILL RATIFICATION PROVIDE OPPORTUNITY FOR INTERNATIONALISTS? We must recognise that the integrity of the British Commonwealth is an insurmountable obstacle to the realisation of the objectives of the Internationalists; hence their need to work for its dismemberment. When the constitutional and legislative links with Great Britain and Australia have been severed there is a clear field for these agents of Basle to capitalise the floating sentimentality of the aforementioned persons for their own support. Dr. Evatt is prepared, as he says, to go bond for the present Parliament as regards their loyalty, and rightly so, but can the nation afford to rely on the shifting sands of the personnel of Parliament, which may be changed at any time, and after a few years of experimental legislation, under the freedom of the Statute we may find both our social conditions and our outlook considerably changed. We must be safeguarded by retaining a sound constitutional relationship with Britain.

WHAT WE MAY LOSE BY A LEGAL SEPARATION: It is argued "that never have the common ties of race and kinship with Britain been so strong as at the present time." True, but how much of this is due to sentiment and how much to the formal tie? Race and kinship are the very

cement which binds the British Commonwealth together, but the fabric consists of a common constitution and common legislation; these are complementary and without either of them the other may perish. It is possible for a divergence in these matters to occur until what we know as British democracy has assumed a quite different character; it happened in America, it can happen here.

Do we wish to exchange the main features of the unwritten Constitution of Britain, which has come down to us as a tradition through the Constitution of the sovereign States of Australia—exchange, I say, these things for a written Constitution largely dictated by Dr. Evatt? The State Constitutions embody MAGNA CHARTA, HABEAS CORPUS, AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS—those priceless and tested elements of human liberty which have never been surpassed in any country, and prove unique in the world's history as vehicles to preserve individual liberty.

CONSTITUTION ALTERATION BILL: The Government is fully aware of the legislative confusion and chaos which must result from the ratification of the Statute by a Dominion, which contains sovereign States. To meet this Dr. Evatt is bringing down the above Bill. In this Bill it is proposed that the supreme powers granted to Parliament as a war-time experiment shall be incorporated in the altered Constitution and all legislation since the outbreak of war with Germany, together with legislation passed after the signing of the Statute shall extend into an indefinite post-war period.

As further addition to the Constitution, the "Four Freedoms" incorporated in the Atlantic Charter are to be added. It is incorrect to say that the four freedoms (Continued on page 4.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

The newly-appointed Catholic Coadjutor-Archbishop of Melbourne, Dr. J. D. Simonds, uttered a timely warning against the trend of Governments filching the people's liberty, under the pretext of war emergency, when he said: "We must be very much on our guard during these days to see that fundamental liberties we possess are not endangered." He declared that "the Constitution is the greatest safeguard against infringement of individual liberty." Moral: Beware of all those who seek to alter it.

BUREAUCRACY: The bureaucracy of "little clerks in office" and the tendency to eliminate safeguards against arbitrary prosecutions were strongly criticised recently in the Victorian Legislative Assembly. Mr. Eager, K.C., said that prosecutions should not be left to the discretion of some jack-in-office, which could result in some innocent persons being made criminals. This tendency, he said, was particularly noticeable in Federal regulations. Here is another good argument against permitting power to be taken from the people, as proposed in the plan to alter the Constitution.

CHINA'S FIGHT: According to obscure press paragraphs, China, after nine years of war and a few food famines, has "clinched the recovery of all air-bases from which Japan can be bombed and now threatens the main base from which Japan launched the initial offensive on May 31." In short, China is the only ally of the British who is actually driving the enemy back. Curiously enough, she never gets the press spotlight. No "featured" stories are being told of her valour and loyalty to the Allied cause. China, having a culture and a way of life all her very own, and being cold towards internationalism and socialism, is not held up as an example for emulation, as are certain other Asiatic races.

AUSTERITY: As a protest against the wowsieristic aspects of the "austerity" campaign, the N.S.W. Executive of the Official Australian Labor Party passed resolutions to the effect that "Saturday racing be restored, the ban on betting be lifted, and that adequate tennis balls and sporting leather goods be permitted to provide relaxation." It is a healthy reaction against prohibitionists seeking to use the war as an excuse to regiment the people.

PINCHED PENSIONS: Quite a new note was sounded in Parliament by Major-General Rankin when he demanded an amendment of the Repatriation Act to put the onus on the administrators of the Act to prove that soldiers are not entitled to pensions in some cases—instead of putting the onus on soldiers to prove that they are eligible. He also said "Doctors in the Repatriation Department were there merely to see that as few as possible got pensions." Usually the Major-General's remarks in Parliament are more truculent than intelligent; but he scored a bull's-eye this time.

GUILTY MEN: Chief of the U.S. Bureau of Investigation, Mr. Edgar Hoover, overlooks how much ultimate blame for world chaos rests on the financial gangsters when he says: "The laxity of the German Parole Board which released Hitler from prison 20 years ago was responsible for the present war." He does not mention Montagu Norman and other financiers who financed Hitler to build up National Socialism in Germany; nor does he mention the bankers who caused the "Great Depression" in Germany (and elsewhere), and thus gave Hitler his big chance.

SOLDIERS' PAY: The House of Commons debate on the British soldiers' niggardly pay-increase brought forth the following comment by Major Marlowe: "Let the rascals who prepared it be strung up to a lamp-post." And this from Major Yorke: "The explanation is a disgraceful piece of 'jiggery-pokery'—those responsible should be put in the service and given a taste of their own medicine." It has been said that behind every piece of mischief will be found the banker; but fancy suggesting that they be merely put in the firing line or strung-up. Well, it does seem that the age of chivalry is not yet dead.

GOLD-ITIS: U.S. reports state that gold-mining is to be completely shut down in order to free men and machines to win more important metals. This does not mean that the nation's hoard will stop growing, as the U.S. Government intends to import Russian, South American and Canadian gold at about £10 per ounce. A later report stated that there was no special significance in the fact that the visit to Britain of Mr. Morgenthau (U.S. Treasury) coincided with that of General Smuts (from gold-producing S. Africa).

FINAL PROBLEMS: The secretary of the Funeral Directors' Association reports that, manpower regulations have resulted in a shortage of coffins and grave-diggers. He also said that "one manpower officer would give one decision and then another would countermand it, and more employees would be called up." So, by denying hospital treatment, as also reported in the press the socialistic planners hasten some people's last journey, and then deny them reasonable facilities at the journey's end. May these planners soon taste their own medicine.

APPLE and PEAR BOARD LEAVES A TRAIL OF RUIN

Seven reasons "why I am destroying the whole of my potential Granny Smith apple crop this season," are given in a letter to the Sydney "Sun" by Sir. E. Ray, who for 20 years has been secretary of Bathurst Fruitgrowers' Association, Mr. Ray who is a member of the Council of the N.S.W. Apple and Pear Association lists the reasons:-

- (1). Because the crop would be acquired by the Apple and Pear Board.
- (2). The price he would then be paid would be miserably inadequate.
- (3). Manpower shortage to handle the crop.
- (4). Board returns would not cover worry, hard work and long hours.
- (5). By not allowing his trees to crop he will starve out the overwintering codlin moth population—a serious pest involving expensive spraying.
- (6). The apple trees represent his capital, and he would be foolish to allow them to become debilitated by heavy cropping just to grow cheap fruit for the board.
- (7). Time saved can be better used in other directions.

I am personally grubbing out practically all of my old apple planting—nearly all Granny Smith—despite the fact that many of the trees give evidence of years of useful life ahead," says Mr. Ray.

An area of over 20 acres of young trees of the same variety, which I have been cultivating for the past 10 years, are showing for their first excellent crop.

"For the reasons stated I am deliberately destroying all the blossom, and quite a number of other growers in the district are doing the same.

Mr. Ray says prices paid the grower range from 2/6 to 4/9 a case for Granny Smith and 5/- for delicious, but on the wholesale market apples are quoted at from 10/- to 8/- a case. "I leave comment to your readers," he said.

Because the Apple and Pear Marketing Board this year refused to take..... crop, Mr. W. F. Westneat, of Kentucky (N.S.W.), borrowed sheep from a neighbour to eat the fruit.

Mr. Westneat claims that he has been ruined by the operations of the board.

"The board, he adds, refused to take from him pears, which averaged 2 1/4 in., on the ground that they were too small.

"The only alternative was to use labour to dig the fruit into the ground, since it is illegal to sell except through the board," Mr. Westneat told the "Daily Mirror." "Orchardists are not permitted to even give the fruit away."

For 122 loose cases of Democrat apples picked in March and packed by the board into 74 cases for marketing, Mr. Westneat received on June 25 a cheque for £14-13/1—total income from his orchard for the year.

Yet the Sydney public pays 3d, 4d., and 5d. a piece for 2 1/4 in. pears, and up to 6d. for Democrats.

In Armidale, 25 miles from Kentucky, and in Uralla, 11 miles away, the same high prices rule.

This position, says Mr. Westneat, is typical of the majority of the 68 orchardists in the Kentucky district.

Mr. Westneat has been at Kentucky for 21 years.

He says that until the board came into operation he was making £400 to £500 a year from a 17-acre property. Allowing for dry seasons, he is convinced that had the board allowed him to market his crop he would have got at least a living wage this year.

A returned soldier from the last war, Mr.

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 Streets, Melbourne, C.I. Postal Address: Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne. Telephone: MU 2834.

Vol. 8

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1942

No. 43

The Case Against Boards

In concluding last week's editorial, headed "Food-Marketing Boards" we rashly said that we proposed "to give a resume of the overwhelming indictment against these Boards," in this issue. When we subsequently surveyed our file of "evidence for the prosecution," we were more than ever satisfied with our use of the term "overwhelming indictment," but we were also satisfied as to the impossibility of presenting in one issue the essentials of the case against even the Apple and Pear Board alone, if the general terms used last week are discarded in favour of more detailed and specific accusations. Therefore, we will present the case by means of a number of separate articles, spread over several issues. Elsewhere in this issue we offer the item headed "Apple and Pear Board Leaves Trail of Ruin," and we quote the following from the Sydney "Bulletin," of October 14:—

"It seems only yesterday since Australians were being exhorted by display advertisement and radio campaigns to eat more apples, pears and lamb and drink more wine. Housewives were assured that, by giving the family these things, they were 'winning the war in the kitchen.' Now, any Australian found taking a little wine, munching an apple or pear, furtively fondling a potato or feasting his family on lamb is apt to be suspected of black marketing. Nobody seems to know why commodities have suddenly become scarce, least of all the herd of boards set up to 'control' them. One, the Apple and Pear Board, has gone through millions of tax-money for a net result of making some fruits scarce and dear. In the year before the war Australia exported 186,493,500 lb. of mutton and lamb, 211,113,900 lb. of apples, 29,493,000 lb. of pears and 3,720,504 gallons of wine. Fruit and wine exports have ceased. Sheep-meat exports are cut to the bone. There should therefore be a surplus sufficient to give every man, woman and child about 26½ lb. of sheep meat, 30 lb. of apples, 4 lb. of pears and half a gallon of wine a year in addition to what was already being consumed. The contention that we have Allied service men to feed, that output of some land products has fallen and that the national capacity to satisfy its appetite has improved doesn't explain the almost complete disappearance of commodities that, without export relief, would reach glut proportions. The most astonishing thing of all is the scarcity of wine. It all points to shocking mismanagement of the whole food question, and the more boards and committees appointed the worse the position becomes."

TAXES AND USURY

(A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown.)

Sir,—Few of us have endeavoured to analyse the real basis of behaviour of an anti-social character. Even men who profess to place truth above the advantages of rank and fortune still shy away from an honest investigation of CAUSES. Instead they are content to play around with EFFECTS, and actually assist in perpetuating falsehood.

I am suggesting that the "Reward and Punishment" basis of law, as referred to last week, COMBINED WITH THE DENIAL OF ECONOMIC SECURITY AND PERSONAL FREEDOM TO THE RISING MANNHOOD OF THE NATION, leads to the overflowing energy of individuals evolving as "crime." Our lack of interest in this important aspect of our social experience is due largely to the way in which the swindlers have divided us, and they have done this by controlling the channels of publicity and school curricula.

Before the war, those who were employed and comfortably off had a grouse against those who were unemployed and in-secure, and this was because of having to pay extra taxation to assist them. Unemployment was not the fault of those who were employed. It was due to the mechanisation of industry, and to the methods under which industry is financed. Any benefits from machinery have gone to the owners of the machine, and the community obtained no benefit at all. The same applies exactly to the usurious financial system which makes interest the first charge on all production, and yet the people who have obtained none of the benefits (80 per cent, of the population) have been required to carry the burden of all the disabilities. That, of course, is swindling, but our minds have been kept so full of other things that the real culprits have escaped notice. Men in high places are quite uninformed on this all-important subject, and I am sorry to observe that some of them evince little de-

sire to get an understanding of it. Perhaps that is why they have been "selected"! Is it not a fact also that another division is brought about by encouraging the comfortably placed to be antagonistic to burglars and robbers. I could not, and do not, uphold robbery. In a world of plenty there is no need or excuse for it, and we know that if we kill poverty we will kill crime. As pointed out last week, forces were in evidence thousands of years ago, which do not belong to any particular country, but are trying to dominate all countries. It is a fundamental part of their plan that the PEOPLE shall be kept in a condition of ignorance about money and of division among themselves, arguing about this and that instead of uniting to obtain what they all really want—namely, economic security, social justice, and peace, all of which are physically possible, and should present no problem in countries where the people govern themselves for themselves.

Those of us who have made a study of the subject must never grow weary in the task of trying to show others that if they will do some investigating for themselves, they will find that the cause of Robbery, Taxation, Poverty, Insecurity, and all the other anti-social conditions is the fraudulent and erroneous financial system which enables the few to treat the many as cattle. If we wish to win the war without undue sacrifice of life, and place ourselves in the position to do justice to the men and women of the Forces, we must insist on the financial system being changed, and changed quickly. — Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne; 25th, October, 1942.

ASSIGNMENT IN UTOIA

(Reprinted from the book of that name, by Eugene Lyons, formerly the United Press correspondent in Moscow, etc.)

(Continued from last issue.)

BOOK I. PRELUDE TO MOSCOW.

V. Working for the Soviets.

I had met a number of United Press officials while Tass operated from their headquarters in Park Row. The President of the United Press, Karl A. Bickel, was on the friendliest terms with Durant and greatly impressed with his political perspicacity and journalistic talents. In anything touching Russia, Bickel usually consulted Durant. In 1926 the post of

Moscow correspondent fell vacant. Aware of my fervent hope of getting to the Soviet land, Durant suggested my name among others. The suggestion, I was chagrined to learn after the event, had been seriously considered but ultimately discarded.

When the post was again available, more than a year later, Bickel revived the suggestion. Before offering me the job however, he consulted Durant, who not only agreed, but supported the appointment in the warmest terms. He merely asked that I remain with Tass until he returned from a trip to Russia for the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the revolution. Bickel acquiesced, though it meant that

SENATOR DARCEY'S BUDGET SPEECH

(Continued from last issue.)

The Commonwealth Bank is refusing business every day, yet it made a profit of over £2,000,000 last year. No wonder the supporters of the private banks talked about "Fisher's flimsies," and said that the Commonwealth Bank was bound to fail. They went so far as to refuse to clear the cheques of the Commonwealth Bank.

Sir Ernest Harvey succeeded in separating the Savings Bank Department of the Commonwealth Bank from the general bank; but, under the Commonwealth Bank (Savings Bank) Act 1927, over 50 per cent, of the revenue of the Commonwealth Bank was taken away from it, and placed under the control of three directors. It was specially provided by an amendment of the definition of "bank" in the original act that the Commonwealth Bank of Australia "does not include the Savings Bank." That separation was not in the interests of the people. It was done to enable the Commonwealth Bank to exercise the same power to close down on the people as is exercised by the private banks. Much of the profit the Commonwealth Bank was earning was made in the Savings Bank Department. But the Bill did not merely lessen the bank's profits, it took away the bank's cash reserves, which enabled it to compete with private banks, terminated its trading operations, and reduced it to a bankers' bank. It became neither a trading bank nor a savings bank, nor yet a reserve bank, but a thing of shreds and patches, at the mercy of private institutions, which could be destroyed at any time. So said the late Mr. Charlton in the House of Representatives.

But the ownership of the bank was still vested in the people of Australia, and it was the first bank in the world to be established by the people for the purpose of functioning in the public interest. Had it not been for the traitorous action of the Bruce-Page Government, it would still be the strongest bank in Australia. It could have saved any other bank from difficulties, and it could have saved the credit of the country in every way. It can lend interest-free money to the Government or to others. The Battle of Waterloo was fought on credit. The money borrowed to finance that battle has not been repaid. Australia still owes £400,000,000 on the last war, although it has already paid over £400,000,000 by way of interest on the money borrowed to finance that conflict. Even Mr. J. M. Keynes, until he was placed on the Directorate of the Bank of England, said that we need not worry about money at all, because all we require is men and materials. Perhaps, as M. Gustave Le Bon, in his great book, says, "We are not governed by reason, but by anterior ideas," or, as Lord Sempill said—

"We have preconceived notions on financial and economic matters which we have held for so long, and which are so deeply rooted, that it is taking two world wars and the actual visible disruption of the system which was the expression of our theories, to induce us even to give a hearing to those who have from time to time

his Moscow Bureau would remain with only a Russian woman secretary, a Miss Jmudskaya, in charge.

Durant was away several months, during which I conducted the American work of the Tass service, with Joe Freeman assisting. Thousands of foreign sympathisers had gathered in Moscow and Leningrad for the decennial festivities. Lenin had been overjoyed when the Soviet regime lasted beyond the seventy-day record of the only other proletarian government in history, the Paris Commune. And now the revolution had endured an entire decade! The thrill of that achievement—of mere survival—could be felt right around the world. Even embittered foes of the Soviet idea felt the importance of the historic moment. Though a large section of that decade had been wasted on costly civil warfare and in fighting off interventionists and economic strangle holds, and in convalescing from a debilitating famine the young State had a great deal to show. The record of economic and cultural reconstruction before 1928, exhibited with the Russian genius for stage-setting in the celebration of November, 1927, made a most impressive total.

In spirit we participated in the celebration. The press accounts of the demonstrations and congresses and speeches and military displays may have been merely picturesque to other Americans. To those of us who regarded the Soviet land as our spiritual home, these were things that lifted us to a rarefied altitude of joy. Only the futile attempt of Trotsky and his followers to speak to the Soviet masses above the heads of the victorious Stalinists marred the festivities. In the elation of the soaring moment it was easier to brush such annoyances aside than to think them through.

The knowledge that in a few months I should be there, not merely looking on but reporting what I saw to an audience of a hundred million readers coloured this period of impatient waiting with all the tints of impending excitement.

(To be continued.)

been pointing out the direction in which reform is necessary.

When I say that we have not sufficient finance for the adequate defence of Australia, the answer given is where is the money to come from? Nothing hurts the conservative mind so much as a new idea and it seems quite impossible to convince honourable senators of the soundness of my financial beliefs. But I shall keep on trying to convert them. I made a statement in this chamber six months before the war broke out to the effect that the present monetary system had brought the world to poverty, and was rapidly leading us into a war that would destroy our civilisation. In April, 1939 I read an article entitled "Warning Europe," and embodied it in one of my speeches in the Senate. No more important statement than that contained in the article has ever been made in the chamber. I spoke for 20 or 25 minutes, but not a newspaper in Australia recorded one line of my remarks. So much for the freedom of the press! On the 18th November last, Lord Sempill said in the House of Lords—

"The interest rate now being paid to the banks for this newly created book entry represents in effect a fee to them for the additional clerical work involved. This cannot, however, I suggest, justify the capital sum being shown as a debt from the State to the banks, nor do I feel that the State should pay, by way of interest on the loan a fee which should properly be paid by the citizens enjoying the facilities of the bank.

The Leader of the Opposition in the House of Representatives (Mr. Fadden) stated on the 10th March —

"Our war" needs have been met and can be met by employing sound financial methods which will keep our internal currency stable. The financial credit which you apparently advocate could do this only by uncontrolled inflation.

I have asked many people from university professors downwards to tell me what is meant by inflation, and not one in 5 knows what it means. It has been regarded as a sort of black death which we must not allow to occur on any account, but now it merely means that if extra money goes into circulation, prices rise. We have a Prices Commissioner to prevent the undue increase of prices. The banks are not prevented to-day from exploiting the public. If they give 2½ per cent for deposits, and charge their customers 6 per cent, on overdrafts, that is the concern of the people. When the first war loan was raised, the Treasurer of Tasmania said that it would be foolish to continue to borrow on the present orthodox system. It is just as necessary to defeat the present financial system as to defeat Germany, but when the next loan was issued the same practice was adopted. A fight is proceeding at present in the House of Commons on the subject of whether loans should continue to be raised in the orthodox manner. Just as persons like myself in this Parliament are regarded as Bolsheviks, so there are Bolsheviks in the House of Commons. They want to know why the people of Great Britain are paying interest on £6,000,000,000 as the result of the last war.

Senator Collett—Does the honourable Senator know what national credit is?

Senator Darcey—Yes it is using the credit of the country to finance the country.

Senator Collett—What is the credit of the country?

Senator Darcey—A country's credit is its productive capacity. Last year Australia's production of goods was valued at £450,000,000.

Senator Spicer—Some of them were war goods.

Senator Darcey—That does not matter. The manager of the bank of Canada once said that there is no need to pay back the money used to create national assets. If the national credit be used in the defence of Australia, that should be sufficient repayment.

Senator Foll—Is not the credit of the country fairly heavily mortgaged already?

Senator Darcey—Yes to the private banks. At the beginning of the war Australia's national debt was about £1,200,000,000, of which 80% came from the private banks.

(To be continued.)

THE LAND ARMY

The glamour of the land army appeal will not be enhanced how that the pay role conditions are announced. During training the pay will be 20/- per week plus keep — or 3/- per day for broken periods. After training, 30/- whilst waiting placement. That's bad enough but there's worse to come. Refusal to accept allotment of position or to carry out instructions, or being absent without leave, will carry forfeiture of pay, or part of it, with such other disciplinary action as the Deputy General thinks necessary. Only a banker could have framed these niggardly rates and only a would be "Hitler" could have framed the penalties. Even in peace time the inducement of decent pay and conditions, without drastic regimentation, would produce a good flow of enthusiastic volunteers and the urgency of the present situation

MELBOURNE "AGE" ON FEDERAL UNION

We have never hesitated to criticise the "Age" if it seemed necessary, and we shall not hesitate in the future. We have no high opinion of the daily press, but, we must say that the "Age" is the only Melbourne daily to show ANY signs of that sturdy independence that should characterise all newspapers. As far as we are aware, it is the only Australian daily to make a stand, editorially, against the treasonable Federal Union proposals.

By publishing its leading article of October 6, the "Age" has earned the gratitude of all true Australians. We hope that our readers in all parts of Australia will not fail to write to the Editor of the "Age" (233 Collins St., Melbourne) and offer him a few words of appreciation and encouragement. In addition, Victorians who read one of the other Melbourne dailies could tangibly encourage him by giving the "Age" a trial. (No we are NOT getting paid for that "boost"!)

Slightly condensed, with our emphasis, the leading article to which we refer reads as follows:-
Proposals have been made to embody in the Australian constitution law-making powers for the purpose of carrying into effect the war aims and objectives of the United Nations, including the attainment of economic security and social justice. Large general objectives of this kind are attractive to many minds, and to the extent that they define and clarify, they dictate objectives worth fighting for. But many people abroad have gone beyond the Atlantic Charter and erected an elaborate superstructure of their own devising, a sort of blueprint of the world to be created when the carnage and destruction cease. In all discussions of peace and war objectives, and of collaboration between Governments in the future, lucid thinking and a proper grasp of historic forces that shape relations between nations is essential.

We are citizens first of Australia, then the British Commonwealth, then of a group of nations united to defeat aggressors whose aim is predatory conquest and enslavement of their victims. To avert this fate and to overthrow enemies must be our prime duty and first aim. There are dangers in indulging in visions of some new world-order in which security, peace and plenty would be aspired on the terms and specifications of the projectors.

All these projects for the future, and the facile assumptions on which many are realised, must be brought to the bar of practical judgment. Economic and social security, freedom from want and fear, are yearnings common to all mankind. . . Apostles of "federal union" claim to have a sovereign specific for the ills that beset human societies. Unless a critical judgment is applied, there is a risk of being led away by visionary projects of a "world federation" of twenty-six nations that differ vastly in political, social and industrial conditions, ranging from democracy, such as we understand it, to the type of centralised authoritarianism of Soviet Russia and Brazil, or the military oligarchy of China. As an example of well intentioned but loose and flutulent thinking, the federal union campaign is potentially mischievous and disruptive. Its objective would be incompatible with, even destructive of, national autonomy. In dangerous times when unity of all fighting for the common cause is imperative, men may clutch at any straw. But we shall ---- on illusions unless we realise the full implications of pretentious schemes which have acquired a vogue abroad, and which would be of direct concern to Australia not only as part of the English-speaking world, but also as an active partner in the struggle.

Already the facile assumptions of this school are being critically exposed in Britain and America. A world federation . . . postulates the subjugation of its component nations and states, which would have to abdicate important areas of their own sovereignty. The supra-national authority, according to some exponents would discharge a "police force" having aircraft, tanks, armoured divisions and other apparatus for keeping order. We in Australia would be asked to surrender the body of rights inherent in autonomous self-government to an over-riding authority remote from these ----. Such a plan is clearly impractical and to urge it as a panacea may be disastrous. It is obvious that we shall wish to work in close accord with the English-speaking world. But Australian can increase its stature and strength as a nation first by freely developing its resources and by retaining in its own hands full control of the means of fostering that worth. Although the restoration of "sovereign rights and self government" to those who have been forcibly deprived of them ---- a declared aim of the Atlantic Charter evangelists of federal union would reverse the process throughout the British Commonwealth. AND SURRENDER THE HERITAGE FOR WHICH THE EMPIRE IS POURING OUT BLOOD AND TREASURE.

True, the prospect is of close working whether by the British Commonwealth and America. But nothing could be more ---- and dangerous than to attempt to ---- future relations into federal union. ---- able refutation of the underlying ---- of this movement Mr. Lionel Gel---- a Canadian points out that Anglo-American friendship was planted in solid historic earth. "It wants air, sun--

room for growth; it may appear in one shape to-day and another shape to-morrow. Imprison it behind legalistic ----chain it within a constitutional for----, and it will languish or die.
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
and self-government that were granted to communities capable of the self-discipline implicit in political autonomy. It springs from the free association, promoted alike by sentiment, kinship and mutually beneficial trade. Imperial federation was rejected in the days of Joseph Chamberlain, and had the British Commonwealth been then organised into a rigid political system it would probably long ago have broken asunder. Our Imperial experience, with its retention of self-direction as a basic principle of communities owning a common allegiance, conveys a sounder lesson for the future than the escapist vapourings of utopians. Sober-minded Australians with their feet on the ground realise that friendship and co-operation in the international field must never be allowed to abrogate our own self-governing rights.

The "England -Let-Us-Down" Myth Exploded

(Continued from last issue.)

England, starting far behind scratch after Dunkirk, faced the future without once doubting her ability to travel the long, hard road to victory. The amazing thing is not that setbacks occurred (such as Greece, Crete, Malaya, the N.E.L., Libya and Egypt), but that there were not more of them. There may yet be more of them before the tide finally turns. In June, 1940, the 47 million people of Great Britain and Northern Ireland were opposed to 78 million Germans and Austrians, 44 million Italians, and many added millions in the occupied countries who were forced to work for Germany. In addition, practically all the battles the British had to fight outside England (with the invaluable but necessarily limited help of the Dominions), were fought so far away that their supply lines stretched for distances equal to half the circumference of the earth!

The British industrial effort was stepped up progressively until it now exceeds Germany's per capita. No other nation has ever exerted such an effort proportionately to its population. Such a prodigious achievement imposes hardships on the people, in long working hours and deprivation of consumption goods, to a degree as yet unthought of in Australia or America. Eighty per cent, of the total war production of British factories has been exported to Russia, the Middle East, Australia, and other theatres of war. Australia has had a far larger share of those exports than the man-in-the-Australian-street ever imagines. In the first two years of war, four out of every five British Empire casualties were sustained by troops from the United Kingdom. When Australia was threatened with a Japanese invasion, Great Britain offered to return the A.I.F. to Australia--no small undertaking. The troops were conveyed by the Royal Navy, without loss. The shipping diverted to this enterprise weakened the supply line from England to the Middle East, and doubtless made the British task harder in Libya.

The main problem in such distant theatres of war as the Middle East and the Far East is not production, or manpower, or even strategy, but shipping. The most incessant, most vital, and least advertised of all the battles in this war has been the Battle of the Atlantic, which later developed into the Battle of the Oceans. For two and a quarter years the Royal Navy and the British mercantile marine bore almost the whole brunt of it, again with invaluable but necessarily limited help from the Dominions, the Free French, and free men of other occupied European countries. More recently American ships and sailors have, with equal fortitude, faced the same perils. The story of the unceasing, unspectacular heroism of the men of the merchant navy will go down into history as one of the main factors in the ultimate defeat of Hitler.

There are some tiresome people who ignore the impossibility of making one ship do the work of two. They seem to imagine that it was England's duty to make "impregnable bastions" of England, Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Iraq, Iran, Malaya, Burma, India, Australia, and a few other places; to send unlimited supplies to Russia, open a second front in Europe, and defend the Netherlands Indies, so that we in Australia should not have to suffer the inconvenience of A.R.P. There are physical limits to what can be done by a country which, after all, has only about six timesXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

THE CONTROL OF POWER

A Book Review Broadcast from 7HO, Hobart, on Sunday, September 27, by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

(Continued from last issue.)

In his book, "Power," Bertrand Russell calls his last chapter "The Taming of Power." Being a Socialist, he believes in State control of everything, but he also and see that handing over entire economic and political power to a small political clique not only solves none of our difficulties, but increases every one of them. He says:

"Marxists, having retained, as a result of the authority of Marx and Engels, many ways of thinking that belong to the forties of last century, still conceive of businesses as if they belonged to individual capitalists, and have not learnt the lessons to be derived from the separation of ownership and control.

"The important person is the man who has control of economic power, not the man who has a fraction of the nominal ownership.

"The Prime Minister does not own No. 10 Downing Street, and Bishops do not own their palaces; but it would be absurd to pretend, on this account, that they are no better off as regards housing than the average wage-earner. Under any form of socialism which is not democratic, those who control economic power can, without 'owning' anything, have palatial official residences, the use of the best cars, a princely entertainment allowance, holidays

at the public expense in official holiday resorts, and so on, and so on.

"And why should they have any more concern for the ordinary worker than those in control have now? There can be no reason why they should have, unless the ordinary worker has power to deprive them of their positions (which he has not). Moreover, the subordination of the small investor in existing large corporations shows how easy it is for the office, to overpower the democracy, even when the 'democracy consists of capitalists.'

"Not only, therefore, is democracy essential if State ownership and control of economic enterprise is to be in any degree advantageous to the average citizen, but it will have to be an effective democracy, and this will be more difficult to secure than it is at present, since the official class will, unless very carefully supervised, combine the powers at present possessed by the Government and the men in control of industry and finance, and since the means of criticising the Government will have to be supplied by the Government itself, as the sole owner of halls, paper, and all the other essentials of propaganda."

When we consider the tremendous powers that lie at our disposal to-day: the modern powers to produce wealth of all kinds, powers as yet only partially used, powers so great as to baffle the imagination; when we consider the powers of the film and the broadcasting, and of education; when we consider the powers of a few men to produce death and destruction on a colossal scale; when we consider these things, must it not force any person with a spark of intelligence to devote his energies to this great problem, of our age--the problem of controlling Political, Economic and Military power?

The control of mechanical and electrical power follows certain definite laws, and the control of political and economic power also follows certain definite laws. It has been the task of the Electoral Campaign to lay these laws of Social Dynamics in front of the people so that they can take an intelligent part in the building up of a real democracy after this war.

LAW VERSUS JUSTICE

(To The Editor.)

Sir.--The decision of the High Court of Australia, in the case where A. U. Tonking claimed compensation from the Apple and Pear Marketing Board for underpayment for apples acquired, is very illuminating.

Tonking received for his fruit £573. The fact that the fruit sold for £2406, an increase of nearly 400 per cent., does much to explain (if any explanation were needed) two facts. Living standards of growers are so depressed, due to low price, that they feel impelled to form associations to oppose the Government. Since the stability of the State depends on the co-operation of its members, one result of the Fruit Board is to strain the coherence of society. The huge increase in cost explains why the price of fruit is such that the average housewife is compelled to reduce her purchases of apples to a minimum.

As its share of the price, the Board received £1286, which is just a little more than half the sale price. This is a natural result of the political appointees, incompetent or worse, who appear as inspectors and members of boards.

In its decision, the High Court decided that Tonking had not received "just compensation." Being the decision of the highest legal authority in Australia, one would expect that everyone interested in justice and the welfare of all would receive the judgment with satisfaction. But not so the Federal Attorney-General. His reaction was a statement that "he would see what action could be taken to overcome the position." If this statement means anything, it means that it is the intention of Dr. Evatt to see that in future "just compensation" is not obtained--such hindrances to the operation of the Board cannot be tolerated! In other words, when justice conflicts with what a "Board-mad" politician wants, then the law must be altered to prevent such justice.--Yours etc., "Citizen," Caulfield, Vic.

Advertisement for Frank Devlin Tailoring. Text includes: 'Your VICTORY SUIT Hand-Tailored to Order', 'All Wool Worsteds from 7/7/- (30 Coupons)', 'FRANK DEVLIN FOR BETTER TAILORING', 'ELIZABETH HOUSE, 2nd Floor, 340 LITTLE COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE', 'Phone: M 5177', and 'For STYLE and EASE: FRANK DEVLIN PLEASE!'.

LONDON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES

Under the heading "General Principles of a Post-War Economy," the London journal "The Engineer," in its issue of June 5 1942, publishes the following extracts from a report by the London Chamber of Commerce, dated May 29, 1942—

The Chamber submits that constantly raised tariffs, the imposition of quotas and prohibitions, and other signs of growing economic belligerency between the nations in the inter-war period, were not the result of stupidity nor ill will, but were, on the contrary, imposed for most compelling reasons. They represented attempts by the nations to defend themselves against very real and pressing dangers. The Chamber is convinced that until those dangers are recognised and removed, a direct attack upon trade barriers can serve no useful purpose, but will on the contrary, merely increase fear. In short, trade barriers are not themselves the disease, but merely the symptoms of the disease.

It is widely admitted that there was something radically wrong with our economic system. It was palpably absurd that nations should be desperately anxious to export more of their real wealth, to other nations than they received in return. It was equally absurd that men in want of the necessities of life should be denied the money with which to buy them because there was a superabundance of those necessities, and therefore their services were not required to make more.

The limiting factor in the production of real wealth has been the failure to distribute to would-be consumers enough money to buy the potential output, and goods are not for long produced if there are no buyers. Mass production implies mass consumption. We are driven, then, to investigate the mechanism for the provision of purchasing-power.

The system of distributing purchasing-power was evolved during an age of scarcity, i.e., an age in which there were not enough goods to go round. This system aimed, therefore, at ensuring maximum production with minimum consumption. Maximum production was achieved by a complex system of cut-throat competition for cheapness, both within the nation and internationally. The nation which could induce its workers to accept the smallest reward for their labour in relation to their efficiency could, other things being equal (e.g., equipment, transport, volume of output), undersell the other nations and compel them to lower the wages of their workers under threat of loss of markets and unemployment. In this way a downward pull was exerted on the standard of living of the masses in the advanced nations. On the other hand, the volume of output made possible by power production was exerting an upward pull, as it was clearly necessary to increase the purchasing power of the masses in order to provide buyers, without which the goods would not, for long, be produced.

To realise that tariffs, quotas and exchange restrictions did mitigate, for the advanced nations, the devastating effects of a financial system which, both in its national and international aspects, was an anachronism, it is merely necessary to consider what would have happened had all the nations removed these barriers and accepted unrestricted free trade. By means of tariffs, quotas, prohibitions and exchange restrictions, the advanced nations have, in some measure, protected themselves from these extreme consequences of international competition for cheapness, but the stresses and strains are still present although modified.

The London Chamber of Commerce submits that it is now essential, if greater disasters are to be avoided, so to change the system as to ensure that international trade . . . no longer constitutes a threat to the standard of living of any nation, but, on the contrary, must be used as a means of mutual aid and advantage to those participating in it. Competition, both within a nation and internationally, should remain, but should be reduced from a life-or-death struggle to healthy emulation.

The Chamber is also convinced that nations are in such different stages of development, politically, socially and economically, that any international trading system requiring for its successful working a substantial measure of uniformity in these matters must be ruled out as impracticable. It believes that an overriding factor in considering any scheme of post-war reconstruction should be the elimination of economic fear between nations. Economic relations should be a bond of union and not a source of fear.

The Chamber cannot, therefore, support any scheme which, in the economic sphere, relies upon some supra-national authority (which in practice must mean the most powerful nation or nations) to dictate to the weaker nations what their internal economic policy shall be. None of the nations, by the management of its own affairs, has given any indication of being competent to manage the affairs of other nations, whose conditions, aspirations and outlook would be entirely foreign to it.

It believes, on the contrary, that the largest measure of co-operation between nations will be realised when fear of financial and economic domination from outside is removed, and each nation is entirely free to co-operate or not as it

wishes; the extent of that co-operation also being within its own control.

It is an obvious absurdity that nations should regard it as necessary to export their real wealth, not for the purpose of paying for imports, but in order to solve their domestic unemployment problem by passing it on to other countries. Exports with this end in view are nothing more nor less than an excuse for distributing wages to people who otherwise would be unemployed. This purpose would be equally well served if the goods were to be thrown into the sea or if the people were to be employed to dig holes and to fill them up again.

When, however, it is remembered that even wealthy nations have a large percentage of their population underfed, ill-clothed and ill-housed, it is clear that these would be the best recipients of this allegedly "surplus" wealth. What is necessary is to improve the technique for the internal provision of money, so as to convert this human demand into effective demand.

The Chamber submits that international trade must now be raised to its true function: that is, nothing more nor less than an exchange of goods and services of a mutually advantageous character.

Instead of trying to equate supply with effective demand, the Chamber advocates that, in future, effective demand should be equated with supply. There can be no such thing as general over-production, of which complaint was made after the last war, although, of course, there can be over-production of a particular commodity in relation to others. The real trouble is under-consumption.

(To be concluded next week.)

A POPULAR ILLUSION DEBUNKED

We take the following from our English contemporary, "Reality":

For years, many miners, inspired by Socialist propaganda, have dreamed of the day when private owners of coal would be dispossessed of their "royalties."

This has now happened. On July 1, 1942, the ownership of all coal in this country is vested in the Coal Commission on behalf of the State. Four thousand royalty owners are being bought out, on a basis of fifteen years' purchase.

Hitherto, the miners, and many others, have been under the impression that when royalty owners became dispossessed in favour of the "State," the benefits would accrue to themselves and the public.

Let us examine the facts, for they show that Socialism can be—and is being—used as a lever for the consolidation of a tyrant bigger and more vicious than any coal-owner or group of coal-owners that ever existed.

The first fact to note is that royalties are to be levied as before. Having bought them out at public expense, the State demands that the public keeps on paying them—and that colliery companies must collect them from consumers in prices—as before.

"Yes, but they are collected on behalf of the State, instead of private interests," many would say if this fact is drawn to their attention.

But is it so?

STATUTE OF WESTMINSTER AND CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT

This is what happens: The Coal Commission (Continued from page 1.)

originated in the Atlantic Charter. They are to be found in C. Kirschmann Streit's book, "Federal Union," as part of a charter designed by him for acceptance by those nations coming into the "world State" (a police State). But they probably saw the light with the internationalist group at Basle.

These four freedoms have been enjoyed by British people for at least two hundred years, and are guaranteed by the British Constitution. Does Dr. Evatt wish to make us technically eligible for inclusion in a Federal Union State? or is he looking forward to some dark day which may follow the signing of the Statute?

Finally, the acceptance of the above by a Referendum should automatically destroy State Parliaments. The States would also be abolished except as administrative areas for Bureaucratic Socialism. The same fate awaits the Shire and Federal Councils. The people have no interest in administration, but it is essential that they shall control policy. This Government proposes to re-move this control as far as possible from the people, and centralise it at Canberra.

NEW FEATURE IN AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY. Moreover, Dr. Evatt has explained the introduction of a new principle into Australian Constitutional history—namely, that no person shall have power to challenge the validity of any legislation passed under the new powers relating to post-war reconstruction. The validity of such legislation is left to Parliament to decide. (Where is the machinery?) In short Dr. Evatt wants the Parlia-

Urgent Circular on Commonwealth Bank Bill

Mr. A. W. Noakes, Director of the Queensland Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide St., Brisbane, has issued the following circular to his supporters, and we pass on this information and suggestion for the benefit of readers everywhere:

Mr. D. J. Amos, author of "The Story of the Commonwealth Bank," has advised us that he considers sub-section 60 A.B.U. of Section 7 of the Bill to amend the Commonwealth Bank Act should be struck out.

We have, therefore, drawn up the enclosed letter form from the information supplied by Mr. Amos, and we urge you to spread this as widely as you can in your locality. Please impress upon the people the necessity of signing and forwarding these forms to their Federal Members. It would be much more effective if they were to write their own letters in their own way, demanding the deletion of this sub-section from the Bill.

Action should be taken by the people at once to prevent any measure from being included in the Bill that could in any way be used to sabotage our Bank. It is remarkable how persistent the efforts are to have some measure included in the Commonwealth Bank Act by which control of the Bank can be secured. Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom.

We can supply a limited number of these letter forms at 2/6 per 100 postage paid. In ordering please do not ask for more than you can use. Each form contains room for 12 signatures.

SUGGESTED LETTER TO Ms.P.

.....M.H.R.

Canberra,

Dear Sir:

I am informed that another BILL to amend the Commonwealth Bank Act, similar to that introduced by the Hon. R. G. Casey in 1938, has been brought forward.

In Section 7, Sub-section 60 A.B.U. the Treasurer is given power to borrow money under the Commonwealth Inscribed Stock

Acts, for the purpose of making advances to the Mortgage Bank Department SUBJECT TO SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS ARE AGREED UPON BETWEEN THE TREASURER AND THE BANK (Paragraphs Nos. 1 and 2)

This seems to mean that although the Bank cannot DIRECTLY issue inscribed stock secured upon its assets, it can do so INDIRECTLY through a third party, via the Treasurer.

There is no need for the Commonwealth Bank to borrow money from the Treasury or anyone else in order to establish the Mortgage Branch. As it can create and issue money to Governments and others free of any charge (Sec. 504 Report on Royal Commission on Banking) there is absolutely nothing whatever to prevent them from supplying what money is needed for the establishment of a Mortgage Bank.

(I) or (WE) therefore request that you take immediate action to have sub-section 60 A.B.U. of section 7 of the bill deleted and further that you take every precaution to prevent anything from being included in this Bill that will restrict in any way the functions of this Bank, or permit any persons or institutions whatever from obtaining any power or authority over our Commonwealth Bank.

Name.....Address

Apple and Pear Board etc.

(Continued from page 1.)

Westneat was placed on the land by the Repatriation Department.

Fifteen months ago he re-enlisted leaving his 20-year-old son, to run the farm. The son, to earn enough money, had to work at a sawmill. He has now been called up.

The Lands Department last month wrote to Mr. Westneat, saying that as he had made satisfactory arrangement for the working of the area, "necessary pruning, cultural work and eradication of noxious weeds would not be effected this season."

The department added that if he consented to vacate the area it would offer £300 as assistance, subject to execution by you of necessary documents, which will provide for an agreement to forfeiture of the holding and the handing over of any R.S.S. Advanced items for disposal.

"I have to pay the Repat. £50 a year said Mr. Westneat. Since the board took over, I haven't been able to meet these payments, and I have had to give the Rural Bank or the storekeeper a lien on the crop to enable me to keep going."

"The Rural Bank has now a lien of £150 on the property, I owe the storekeeper £100 for necessities, and I have plant on the property that I can't dispose of."

"I can get £300 from the lands department and walk off at a loss."

"In other words I have been ruined by the operations of the Apple and Pear Board. It looks to me that they are simply forcing Australians off the land."

The Statute was not designed for abnormal times like the present, but it was offered by a victorious Empire at the height of her power - the position is now entirely reversed.

The reasons advanced for the signing appear utterly unsubstantial beside the confusion which this and the Constitution Alteration Bill will cause at a time when war is engaging all the thought and energies of the people.

The ratification at this time would be an egregious act of bad faith to the soldiers who left these shores to defend our present way of life. Even if the referendum were put to them, they would have neither the time nor opportunity to give a reasoned verdict.

PRESENT CONDITIONS NOT SATISFACTORY FOR SIGNING: Can we trust a Government which takes advantage of war conditions to put such momentous issues forward? National Security Act severely curtails freedom of action and speech—in short we are muzzled and the people cannot give free expression to their views.

Already the people are being constrained under a threat to sanction the Government Bill and Referendum. Under the shadow to the threat that if the power asked for are not granted chaos and poverty will be the lot of returned men. There is no justification for this threat; nevertheless it will bias the minds of men and women governed by very right sentiment toward returned soldiers.

The referendum must of necessity be complicated, and will include a now controversial subject as the occupancy of the Throne, together with more controversial subjects. (See Mr. Maund's letter to "S.M.H." October 1st.) Liberty consists of the ability to choose or reject one thing at a time, not to have to make a decision between two dire alternatives.

Now, Sir I could go on indefinitely getting proof that we have reached a supreme crisis in our history, but I can now only urge you to do all in your power to preserve this nation from the dangers inherent in the situation.

I can assure you that behind the opinions expressed herein there is an expanding body of public conviction. You must ensure delay in the signing of this Statute of Westminster.