

ON OTHER PAGES:

THOSE CONSTITUTIONAL AMMENDMENTS (Page 2)

ANOTHER BROADCAST ON "FOUR FREEDOMS" (Page 3)

ADVICE TO AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL CREDITERS (Page 3)

CRITICISM OF GOVT. BOARDS JUSTIFIED (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 8, No. 46 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, NOV. 20, 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).

Marketing, Boards, Finance and Democracy

Meeting at Coburg Town Hall

At a well attended public meeting, held in Coburg Town Hall on Thursday of last week, speakers on food production, marketing boards, finance and Democracy addressed an interested and enthusiastic audience.

Mr. Clark (Fruitgrowers Defence League) said that the decrease of output of potatoes was due to the interference of Government Boards. Growers of apples and pears received unremunerative prices, and tens of thousands of acres of orchard land were on the verge of destruction as owners could not carry on, through the influences of certain interests behind the board. Growers had no democratic vote and no say in appointment of delegates who attend conference. The cost of the Apple Board now was nearly £4,000,000. No balance sheet was presented and officials refused to give any information on the finances of the Board. Asked by a questioner how he would handle marketing to allow every grower to get a fair return, Mr. Clark replied that he was not a marketing expert. It was the experts' job to distribute. The orchard owners were experts as growers. He said it was not the matter of prices with which they were concerned, for even if the Board gave them £2 per case they would still oppose confiscation.

Mr. Bruce H. Brown asked "Why is it that we are not getting the results we want—access to the wherewithal to live as a right inherent in our birth?" (Hear, hear.) Theoretically, he said, we are a democracy, and we appointed Members of Parliament to give effect to the will of the people who live here.

(Applause). Federal Parliament had all the power necessary to give us what we want. The rich resources could not be used for the benefit of all of us because we are living under a financial dictatorship. That was a fact, not an opinion. He was glad to hear that many of our soldiers were waking up. (Applause.)

No honourable man or woman would be a party to a swindle. Yet, our school books, radio, and press remained silent. When bank deposits fell from approximately £600 millions to £400 millions, the depression occurred. Who asked for that? The people should insist upon getting the conditions they want, not what someone else imposes on them. Did anyone know what an overdraft is? (Laughter.) Few people realised that overdrafts were book entries made by bankers which, when drawn against by means of cheques, were paid into the accounts of the receivers of the cheques at the banks as deposits. Thus loans created deposits. Ninety per cent of the business of the country was done in that way. It was absurd to say that we cannot use the resources of the country because of limitations of figures in books. (Prolonged applause.)

Mr. Cutting (N.W.R.M.) said that the charter of the N.W.R.M. was open for revision from suggestions for the improvement of the common lot of all. President Wilson stated that Jacob Schiff, financier,

controlled the whole industrial system of America. The financial system should definitely serve the people. Thinking should guide our actions to bring pressure to bear upon our members. The N.W.R.M. was not affiliated with any other organisation. It consisted of men with the greatest desire for a real, true and just democracy. The people should demand the justice that is theirs, so we could have a commonwealth of co-operative nations.

Mr. F. C. Paice said he was not concerned whether the people want "reconstruction," financial reform, Henry Georgeism, Douglas Creditism, or Communism.

The fact remained that the people would get the "ism" they deserved. We had to recognise that M.P.'s are employees—not employers. If the people wanted apples or green quinces, the people should get what ever they want—otherwise it was not democracy.

"Therefore, if you want democracy," said Mr. Paice, "you must write to your M.P. to tell him what results you want." As Mr. Alex. Wilson, M.H.R., had recently told the audience at a public meeting, the numerous electors'-demand-letters put the skids under the objectionable National

(Continued on page 4.)

"Japan Offers Rubber and Tin to the U.S.A.!"

By ERIC D. BUTLER

The above startling headline—I was almost going to say unbelievable headline—appeared in "Sulla's" Commentary on World Affairs in the Catholic "Advocate" (Melbourne) of October 1. As I missed the news-item referred to by "Sulla" in his commentary, I rely upon his report of it. Unfortunately he makes the same false deduction, which must have prompted the Japanese to offer vital materials to their enemy—i.e., that, unless a country can export its "surpluses," it must collapse economically.

"Sulla" says: "In an article published in an American paper last July 25, a strange development in the Pacific war is reported 'on indisputable authority,' which discloses the gravity of Japan's great economic problem—the paralysis of markets for her newly-acquired mass of raw materials. The passage of rubber and tin to South America is effectively blocked by the United States navy, but the Japanese have some hopes, apparently, that the Americans may be persuaded to lift the blockade, and to buy these vital war materials from their enemies in the Latin-American market! Thus they will place the United States in the position of financing the tottering 'Co-Prosperity sphere' and helping to consolidate their conquests, at present threatened by a terrible economic crisis."

If the above be true, and it is alleged by the agents of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs that they have direct evidence, it would appear that the economic advisers of the Japanese Government are suffering from an acute attack of what is known as the "export mania." If these Japanese economic advisers are as mad as the news-item referred to would indicate, it is very cheering news. I would point out to "Sulla" that the Japanese don't use American money, and, as his commentary doesn't indicate that the Japanese desire any goods in exchange for their rubber and tin, it is hard to see how they can be held up in their organisation through a shortage of finance. If, as "Sulla" states, the native population are starving and out of work, the obvious thing for the Japanese to do is to put them to work producing foodstuffs. If the Japanese are, apart from the "export mania," also suffering from the "shortage-of-money-mania." That is further good news.

All students of the "new economics" know that, in "normal times," every country is so short of internal purchasing-power that it cannot consume all its production internally and seeks, to send it to some other country—i.e., "a foreign market." Japanese propaganda "justified" their aggression in China on the grounds that they were being shut off from the world's markets.

M.H.R. On "Pressure Politics"

At a large public meeting held in Melbourne recently, Mr. Alex. Wilson, Independent M.H.R. for Wimmera, insisted that the only way the people could get things done, according to THEIR wishes, was by sufficient electors writing to their respective parliamentary representatives, demanding the RESULTS they wanted.

This statement was made at an N.W.R.M. meeting, held in the "Victoria Palace" Banquet Hall on Tuesday, October 27, at which, Mr. Wilson was the principal speaker.

Mr. Wilson described some of the high-lights in the life of a politician at Canberra. He contended that politicians were "not a bad lot"—they were human. "They make you all sorts of promises at election-time, but when they get into Parliament they seem to forget to do all the things they promised you they would do—things that you, too have perhaps forgotten. Then you neglect to let them know what you want, so you do not get what you want."

Mr. Wilson referred to the time when the

Arthur Brenton, the well-known English social credit writer, once made a brilliant suggestion concerning the "export mania." He pointed out that all that some country had to do in order to achieve great prosperity with little effort by its citizens, was to take all the goods being exported by other countries, and issue to its citizens new money equivalent to the price of the goods, as a gift. Here is a unique opportunity for America to make Japan a laughing stock in the eyes of the world; take all the rubber and tin offered by Japan and use it to beat her. "Sulla" says: "The prices, it may be noted, which were being asked for rubber and tin were 'panic prices,' which would scarcely pay for loading and shipping." It is stated that Japan is worried because she can only use 15 per cent, of her rubber supplies; and, that, unless she can export the rest, a great number of the trees will become useless as a result of not being milked. Well, if Japan doesn't want them, why should she worry about them? And if the Japanese want to work for the sake of work, they could milk the trees and tip the rubber into the sea!

The whole thing is almost beyond, comprehension, and we may never hear the truth of this matter. However, in conclusion, I would like to make the following points:

(1) Germany was financed for the purpose of provoking war.

(2) Japan was financed and armed in a similar manner.

(3) British rubber interests in the East were very considerable, but Japanese forces soon overran the rubber producing areas.

(4) Synthetic rubber production, with the assistance of Wall Street, is now so far advanced, that the American Government can apparently do without alleged offers of rubber from Japan.

(5) If the Japanese allow the rubber plantations in the East to become useless before they are driven out, Wall Street might dominate the post-war rubber production for the whole world, with British manufacturers. Rubber is a key factor in modern production.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Credit for the reported smashing victory in Africa is given to the "big three" Generals famed for their unorthodoxy; that is, men who tried and succeeded with new ideas. This raises the thought that we may yet get new generals on our financial front to replace the "little three"—Giblin, Copland and Wood.

The economists still advocate 1842 ideas on finance, thus wasting manpower on rattling moneyboxes, posters and spruikers, instead of using the Commonwealth Bank and the modern credit structure. By the latter method, millions that would otherwise be paid in interest could be used to finance production of extra tanks, planes and guns and thousands of tax-gatherers could be employed more usefully.

POLITICIANS AND STRATEGISTS: It came as a surprise to those, who believe that military experts are in charge of war operations to read the following from the daily press of November 11: "Mr. Churchill declared that President Roosevelt had planned the invasion of French North Africa, and he (Mr. Churchill) had been an 'active lieutenant'." Maybe we will soon be informed that General MacArthur has planned the proposed alteration to the Constitution, and that General Blamey is to be the Prime Minister of a "National Government!"

MUNITIONS MIRACLE: Although John Citizen could not know whether the war-weapons presented at the Melbourne munitions display were good or otherwise, practical experts testify to the efficiency of the units, and the capacity of those who actually produced them. An important fact to remember in this connection is that not one politician constituting the Government, produced one single part of this equipment, which illustrated the foolishness of the idea that Governments produce things. It is equally absurd to suggest that Governments will produce our post-war needs—the cold, sober fact is that the people themselves will have to do this job for themselves. Governments can only remove artificial hindrances, such as bureaucracy and financial limitations.

BLOW-FLY PEST: Sir Dalziel Kelly, chairman of the Australian Wool Board, is reported in the "G & N Co-operator" of November 12 commenting on blow-fly "strike" on sheep and the "Mules" "plan of prevention. He intimates that the C.S.I.R. has made the amazing discovery that if the sheep's tale is permitted to grow sufficiently, the animal is less susceptible to fly-strike." In addition to many thousands of pounds allocated to C.S.I.R. and other bodies for research on this work the Wool Board last year allocated £3000 of wool-producers' money to demonstrate this wonderful discovery. Sheep-men please note; Leave nature alone—and save your money.

JUSTICE: An appeal by two women

against the man-power's authority action preventing them leaving their job to become peace officers, was dismissed, not by an independent tribunal, but by the chairman of the Manpower Board, Mr. Nicholas, who said: "The nation might have to pay too big a price by allowing the appeal." Here we find the Manpower Board in the dual role of Prosecutor and Judge; and giving a decision, not on the merits of the case, but on the price "the Nation" would have to pay. Seemingly, the individuals who constitute the nation can pay any price. Ye gods!

PROFIT BUG: Following his encouraging criticism against the fraudulent money system, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Temple) has now gone "hay-wire" on the questions of "Work" and "Profits." Previously he was reported as believing the Biblical statement that "work is a curse." Now, he bemoans unemployment (not unempayment) as a bad, and spiritually, bad, situation. Also, he now objects to enterprise receiving profits (rewards) for goods or services rendered. The philosophy of such men is difficult to understand; but, broadly speaking, unless their denouncement of the evil counterfeiting money system is accompanied by resistance to the regimenting of the people, they will not retard the march of internal "Hitlerism."

PAWN TICKETS: Illustrating the uselessness of the so-called Bank-Control Regulations, "Hansard" for September, 30 reports Senator Richard Darcy thus: "If the Government really controlled the financial system of Australia it would not need to sell £350 millions of Inscribed Stock . . . while the banks were prevented from buying Bonds, they are allowed to buy Inscribed Stock, which carry the same interest rate as Bonds." From this it is clear that the regulations are merely a blind. Moreover, he public are precluded from knowing who owns Inscribed Stock, because the names of holders are simply entered in a special ledger, and cannot be disclosed without the holders' consent.

NEW ORDERS: The latest "New Order" is that of the economist, Sir William Beveridge. This chap says: "We must go half way to Moscow, if we are not to be landed here altogether." Then he advocates a continuance of national savings (whatever they are) along with contributory insurance. Ye gods! The old socialistic "leveling-DOWN" idea again! These "New Orders" are becoming so numerous that we will require a "Board" to control them—before they control us.

—O.H.B.

SENATOR DARCEY'S BUDGET SPEECH

(Concluded from last issue.)

The Leader of the Opposition has also said that the ideas of the financial expert of the Labor Party, Senator Darcey, are not embodied in the Budget. While regretting that my views have not been incorporated in the Budget, I wish to correct the impression, which apparently is held by the Leader of the Opposition, that I am the financial adviser to this Government. I do not hold that position; it is held by Professor Copland. I have said on other occasions that that gentleman would, no doubt, be prepared to expand his orthodoxy to any degree in order to retain his job. I should not be surprised if he were prepared to accept a revolutionary change of the monetary system if by so doing he could retain his job.

Senator Foll: I disagree with the honorable Senator.

Senator Darcey: Some time ago that gentleman attacked me in a railway carriage and said what he would do to me if I were a younger man. I replied that if I were a younger man I would take him on physically, in which event he would soon be "squibbing," as he always "squibs" when I attack him on financial subjects. Then he came back all smiles. The orthodox economist cannot be offended; that is, if he has a good job.

I think that I have convinced any intelligent man that the present banking system can endure no longer. I cannot see any chance of establishing a new order unless we break the present banking system. As Mr. Dwyer-Gray has said, it is just as necessary to beat this system as it is to beat the Germans or the Japanese. That fact is being recognised in Great Britain to-day.

I repeat that banks are allowed to issue a substitute for money on which we pay interest. There are only three classes of people who get something for nothing. They are: the pickpocket, the coiner and the banker—but with the banker it is a case of "Arise, Sir Walter!" or "Arise, Sir Thomas!"; the bankers are knighted! Mr. Graham Towers, the manager of the Bank of Canada was asked if the Government had power to change the present system and he replied "Yes." He was also asked whether the Government could authorise banks to issue a substitute for money, and he replied, "Yes." They can issue it, but to the detriment of the country; and they will have people walking round in rags, as was the case in Alberta. I repeat that banks do not lend deposits. Honorable Senators should not forget that fact. I recall the propaganda which was used by the banks

spokesman when I was standing for election to the Senate. I knew the gentleman well. His father was a bank manager, and he also was a bank manager. He was also a chartered accountant, and a member of the local Stock Exchange. He should have known something about finance. He said that the banks performed a very useful purpose. If one wanted to travel on the Continent all one had to do was to get a bank draft. If Brown had £500 for which he had no immediate use, he could put it on deposit in a bank and get interest at a certain rate on it. He did not say that Brown would not receive a guarantee from the bank to get that money back. All that Brown is given is a receipt. However, if Brown wanted to borrow £500, he would be obliged to provide security worth £1000. There was no guarantee that Brown would be repaid his deposit of £500. I recall that in 1892, thirteen out of twenty-two banks in Australia closed their doors on depositors.

If Parliament wishes to change the present banking system it has the power to do so. Why does it not do so? To-day, we are satisfied that it is not necessary to keep a gold reserve in Australia. We have no such reserve to-day. Reverting to the instance I gave a few moments ago, the Commonwealth Bank gave the private banks the "right to draw" £5,000,000. They applied for another £10,000,000. The acting Governor of the Commonwealth Bank, Mr. Kell, opposed the proposition, but the private banks got not only that £10,000,000, but also an additional £10,000,000 in the following year. Here was the trick. All the banks had to do was to lend against that £30,000,000. They had the right to draw against it, and if they did so, they had to pay interest at a certain rate. But they could lend almost £200,000,000 against the £30,000,000 worth of notes printed for them, which they did not take up. Can you imagine any bigger racket than that? Incompetent and corrupt governments have been responsible for the rise of Mussolini and Hitler. However, I am tired of reiterating these facts. It is time that members of the Opposition in this chamber found out for themselves whether what I am saying is right or wrong. Every honorable Senator has sworn to do his best for his country, and particularly during a time like the present, he should find out for himself whether what I am saying is correct. If he fails to do so he will be failing in his duty as a member of this Parliament.

given country has an optimum, both of

THE OPTIMUM POPULATION

By B. M. PALMER, in the "Social Crediter" (Eng.).

The Social Credit Secretariat has made it quite clear that there is nothing in common between a Social Credit dividend and any system of family allowances which has so far been advocated by any political party in this country or in the Dominions.

It is necessary to state this fact by reason of a news item appearing in "Democracy" (N.Z.) for April 10. This periodical describes itself as an independent national fortnightly, incorporating the "New Zealand Social Credit News." [Incorporating is known to be a word with a wide range of meanings.] The editor in a letter to the New Zealand press supports the decision of the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress in favour of "family allowances," provided that the allowances are paid by the State, are non-contributory, and are free from a means test. He recommends the serious consideration of this proposal by the New Zealand Federation of Labour.

Family allowances as advocated by the British Labour Party are simply part of the ramp to alienate a large block of the National Credit and put it under the control of bureaucrats, in order that as large a proportion of the nation as possible shall come within the jurisdiction of the Public Assistance Board. To imagine that it is in any sense a distribution of the wages of the machine is entirely to misunderstand what is intended. It may be non-contributory as far as the recipients are concerned, but it is intended to obtain the money from a further increase in the national debt. No wonder Mr. Austin Hapwinson expressed indignation in the House at the waste of time involved in such a discussion during one of the major military and political crises of the war. As he pointed out, it has the further support of those who want us to breed like rabbits, some of whom are to be found among the extreme reactionaries of the Right. Thus Right and Left join hands in advocating what could only be another load of chains on a "free" people. The colossal impudence of those who suggest that the allowance shall not begin until the third child is born raises the query whether they see any difference between human beings and animals on stud farms.

There is, of course, a close connection between those who are terrified by the supposed decline in the numbers of the people and those who are obsessed by the work complex, but letters to the "Times" written by population experts, involving the most intricate of figures, do nothing whatever to clarify the position, as might have been expected. To those whose brains are mercifully free from the obscurities of Social Science it seems quite plain that the population of any

quality and quantity related to the comfort and convenience of the people who live there.

Enormous populations are, however, useful in the eyes of the planners. They can be used for flooding the world with goods in the revival of international trade, or they are useful as cannon fodder when it is necessary to interfere in other people's business abroad. And, in any case, it is nice to have a lot of material for the bureaucrats and social science experts to experiment upon, and work up into statistics, to say nothing of making an income out of them.

One may, however, in an idle moment, imagine a very different sort of country, and a population, perhaps no more than half of ours, but of keen intelligence and fine physique, under the direction of persons of integrity, and quite well able not only to lead a happy and comfortable life, but to defend itself against any military attack from any direction whatever. It is quality that counts; and quality leads and always has led the world, not equality.

Greece, Rome, Venice, Spain, Holland, England, all of them small, have all, in their turn, set the fashion in civilisation, and, in every case, their eminence has not only been in the midst of far greater, and, in many cases, opposing populations, but has, for the most part, been most clearly marked at a period when the disparity in numbers was greatest.—(The "Big Idea," XV.)

In spite of the intensive study of "trends" of population, much remains to be learned concerning them, nor will it be learned until people can live under correct conditions, and then its learning will have only an antiquarian value. Information concerning the Maori race, published in the "Times" on July 3, is a case in point. These people steadily declined until 1896, when they only numbered 42,000. The Maoris were resigned to their fate, saying "As clover killed the fern and the European dog the Maori dog—so our people will be gradually supplanted and exterminated by the Europeans."

But from that date there was a spectacular increase, and by 1936 the population was 82,000, almost doubling itself in forty years. The Maori birthrate is now 46 per thousand, as against a white birthrate of 17. No explanation of this phenomenon is suggested, except "the removal discouragement."

One thing is quite clear, there is only one sort of national dividend and nothing

THESE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

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

Sir,—A closer study of the Bill brought into the House of Representatives on 1st October by Dr. Evatt strengthens the feeling that the community would derive very little benefit from the acceptance of the proposals in their present form.

Whatever may be the intentions of Dr. Evatt, and most of us are ready to believe that they are altruistic, the fact remains that if the Commonwealth Constitution is altered as proposed it will actually undermine the sovereignty of the Australian people.

The purpose of the Bill is stated as empowering the Parliament to make laws for the purpose of carrying into effect the war aims and objects of Australia as one of the United Nations, including the attainment of economic security and social justice in the post-war world, and for the purpose of post-war reconstruction. It will, of course, be obvious that before any of us can exercise an intelligent vote on such proposals it is necessary that we clearly understand what they mean and involve. Have you, Mr. Editor, yet met any person who could tell you precisely what "the war aims and objects of Australia" are? Who formulated them, and how? Have the Australian people been consulted, and if so, when and how? I am not aware that the people of Australia have been given any opportunity to express themselves on the subject, and for having made reference to the conditions which must precede any satisfactory reconstruction my loyalty has been questioned.

Seeing that our Parliaments have not officially expressed themselves as to Australia's war aims and objects we should at least be given the names of the men who did set them out, as well as a copy of the instructions under which they acted. It is not sufficient to be told that they have the endorsement of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. These men did not prepare them and it is quite likely that they did not even initiate them. The important question is who did? There was no direction from the British Parliament or the United States Congress.

The "statement" submitted by Dr. Evatt when he introduced the Bill is strangely silent regarding the aims and objects to which Australia has apparently been committed. This "statement" is divided into eight sections, headed as follows:

1. The Problem of Post-War Reconstruction.
 2. The Horse and Buggy Constitution.
 3. Post-War Anarchy Without Constitutional Amendment.
 4. War-time Guarantees.
 5. Action in War-time.
 6. Fate of Past Referendums.
 7. Alternative Methods of Amendment.
 8. Broad Outline of Proposed Amendment.
- You will observe that there is no section II it is hard to make some people realise

headed "War Aims and Objects." Could that be an oversight? Perhaps the explanation is to be found in these three sentences taken from Section 8 viz.:

i. "The fundamental feature of the proposed amendment is contained in the title."

ii. "It is to entrust the Commonwealth with powers to carry into effect the war aims and objects of the United Nations."

iii. "At all points it is made clear that what the Parliament is asking for is power to carry out in peace-time the social and economic aims that the United Nations have declared in time of war."

The title of the Act is "Constitution Alteration (War Aims and Reconstruction) 1942." The war aims of the United Nations have not yet been clearly defined or even stated by the individual nations comprising the United Nations. As the war is not yet over, we could alter our Constitution as suggested, and then be irrevocably committed to SUBSEQUENT "declarations" in the name of the United Nations which we had not considered or for which even the opinion of our Government had not been sought!

If passed by referendum it will mean that Australian sovereignty has been surrendered to what is called "The United Nations." Ought we not first ask Who are these? How will they declare themselves? and Who will decide what they want? Will it be a procedure similar to the creation of the Atlantic Charter—the production of a programme based on secret discussion by unnamed persons with the clear intention of ensuring that whatever changes may be desired by an enlightened community, there will be no interference with the system that keeps us all subservient to finance? The fact is that every item enumerated in the Bill is dependent upon financial considerations, but, as pointed out last week, this aspect of the matter is not even mentioned in the Bill itself or in the "statement" which accompanied its presentation. Why? —Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, 15th November, 1942

THE TERRIBLE WARNING OF HISTORY

By ERIC D. BUTLER

To-day we are being moulded more and more to fit into the great slave State now being planned by the group of power-lusting maniacs who used men like Hitler Mussolini and Tojo to provide the conditions necessary to establish complete tyranny.

what a hell-on-earth the perfect slave State could be. We could all be well fed, well housed and well clothed. Everything could be run efficiently. But we would all work, preferably on big, national works, which would take great engineering skill. We would be mental and physical slaves. And civilisation cannot endure on slavery. History gives us a terrible warning. There have been great civilisations in the past. But they are all buried and forgotten. Egyptian civilisation was a typical example. The early Egyptians had a wonderful organisation, from the point of view of organisation. Great public works, which still endure, were carried out. But society was static, there was no life-creating force. The individual was nothing. Our present civilisation has been built on the human individual and personality. The fusion of the Greek concept of democratic government and the Christian concept of the great truth that man has a personality, is an individual, and does not live by bread alone, brought a new force into society. The British Commonwealth of Nations has been, until now, the most successful experiment in an organisation built to serve the individual that the world has yet seen. This war is being used to try and destroy that organisation by the introduction of a subtle bureaucracy which will destroy our civilisation unless checked.

Most people have read something about the old Incas civilisation in Peru, South America, which the Spanish conquered early in the sixteenth century. I recently read Professor Prescott's great history, "The Conquest of Peru," and found my horror of the perfectly "planned" State mounting as I read this scholarly work on a civilisation which, apart from great public works, has left nothing of benefit behind it; unless it be a warning to us of the fate that now threatens us.

Read the following extracts, and then look around to-day. Little comment is required:

When a nation was brought under the sceptre of the Incas, it resigned every per-

sonal right, even the rights dearest to humanity. . . . They had nothing that deserved to be called property. They could follow no craft, could engage in no labour or amusement, but such as was specialty provided by law. They could not change their residence or their dress without a license from the Government. They could not even exercise the freedom which is conceded to the most abject in other countries, that of selecting their own wives. The imperative spirit of despotism would not allow them to be happy or miserable in any way but that established by law."

Compare the above with the views being carefully fostered by our planners. Most of these planners hold out the bait of food, clothing and shelter in exchange for our liberties. Prescott's words on Peru are prophetic:

"The most enlightened of the Spaniards who first visited Peru, struck with the general appearance of plenty and prosperity, and the astonishing order with which everything throughout the country was regulated are loud in their expressions of admiration. No better Government, in their opinion could have been devised for the people . . . yet such results are scarcely reconcilable with the theory of the Government I have attempted to analyse. Where there is no free agency, there can be no morality. Where there is no temptation, there can be little claim to virtue. Where the routine is rigorously prescribed by law, the law and not the man must have the credit of the conduct. If that Government is the best which is felt the least, which encroaches on the natural liberty of the subject only so far as is essential to civil subordination, then of all Governments devised by man the Peruvian has the least real claim to our admiration . . . the spirit could hardly be strong in a people who had no interest in the soil, no personal rights to defend; and the facility with which, they yielded to the Spanish invader—after every allowance for their comparative inferiority—argues a deplorable destitution of that patriotic feeling which holds life as little in comparison with freedom."

And the people of early Peru had the perfect system of bureaucratic socialism.

It added not a little to the efficacy of the Government, that below the sovereign there was order of hereditary nobles of the same divine origin with himself, who.

(Continued on page 3)

will take its place; and when we have fought for it and got it, the population will, before very long, be exactly what it ought to be, neither more nor less. What its size will be we have no idea, nor are we interested.

" THE FOUR FREEDOMS "

A Talk Broadcast from 7HO by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., on Sunday November 8, 1942.

Last Sunday, in discussing President Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms," I suggested that they had very little real meaning because they did not touch the vitally important facts that make for real freedom — that is, the type of freedom which mean anything of value to you and to me.

To-day, we see large masses of men being shepherded into huge organisations—organisations over which they have little, if any control. Each day that passes we see the power of initiative and the power to make decisions being taken from the ordinary man and woman, and centralised in a small group.

The centralising process increasingly means less power to small men, small communities and small nations. Any person who has been in a large organisation knows how hopeless is the feeling of being a mere cog in a gigantic and soulless machine. Now, the men who are so energetically and continually engaged in destroying the freedom of small men and small communities and robbing them of all power of decision are the very men who are talking so loudly about freedom in the abstract. Let us again examine the question of Freedom of Speech, which as it is threatened, is to be granted to us after the war.

How can we discuss any important problem unless we have facts at our disposal; we can't discuss things in a vacuum; we can't apply logic to nothingness—although our so-called intelligentsia have been trying this for years. A few of us have placed facts in front of you which are of tremendous importance to you and your family, but before we can even get you to hear these facts, let alone discuss them, we have to compete

ADVICE TO AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL CREDITERS

The following letter has been sent to a correspondent in Australia by the Social Credit Secretariat, England:

It is of the greatest importance that the attempts on the part of public men to devitalise the basic ideas which underlie social credit should be identified and exposed immediately on their appearance.

Monetary reform has been conceded by J. M. Keynes and the "Times" (see the "Social Creditor" of April 4, 1942), but only on terms which provide control by the "State" in another form. If finance is willing to make such concessions that is an indication that a counter move is ready. There are many such. One is the acceptance of some scheme (which may in itself be sound) followed by its deliberate sabotage by a few administrators in key positions. Another is embodied in Federal Union—a device which sets another gulf between the individual and his institutions, leaving him completely powerless to control the wider issues of policy. And a third such move is the concentration of the national credit in the provision of social services and ameliorations, such as family allowances, a course which assumes that the individual does not desire (or deserve) the free use of his own credit.

THE MOST IMPORTANT ADVICE AT THE MOMENT IS TO RESIST AT ALL COSTS THE OBSESSION WITH MONEARY REFORM AS SUCH.

Sir Oliver Lyttleton, broadcasting on April 26 used the phrase 'National Dividend' . . . to be rendered in anything else but hard cash in our pockets. And on May 3rd Sir Stafford Cripps followed up with 'Economic Democracy' . . . to emerge from the 'reconstruction now taking place'—which Miss Ellen Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade) declares to be Socialism.

This misuse of the ideas and phrases used by Major Douglas has a significance which reinforces his injunction: "keep your eyes on the ball." And that is the remarking of the link which should transmit policy from the electors to those whom they appoint. Without that the misuse of the individual's own credit to his undoing is not a matter for speculation it is a certainty.

This attack towards the sterilisation of social credit conceptions has already penetrated Australia in the field of monetary reform; and other developments as above are likely to follow.

Your connections may be of great use in ensuring the immediate exposure of such developments, the snag in which is usually obvious enough. There is invariably some item which involves control: or the provision by some what they think others ought to have; and always the avoidance of Douglas' definition of freedom—"the ability to choose or refuse alternatives as they arise"—for in that statement lies the damnation of all dictators.

The Terrible Warning of History

placed far below himself, were still immeasurably above the rest of the community, not merely by descent, but, as it would seem, by their intellectual nature." (Just like our modern super-planners?) These were the exclusive depositories of power, and, as their long hereditary training made them familiar with their vocation, and secured them implicit deference from the multitude, they became the prompt and all-practiced agents for carrying out the executive measures of the administration.

And the policy of the administration was controlled by the Central Government. What hell-on-earth; more terrible because the people didn't recognise it as such. Prescott writes: The Government of the Incas was the oldest but the most searching of despotism.

Are we seeking to imitate the Peruvians and destroy ourselves? History warns us there is still time to heed it.

with American films, the Australian Broadcasting Commission, the Daily Press and our so-called educational system—all of which organs contradict, all day and every day, everything men like myself have to say.

Getting the truth to the people is not an easy job, and even when you get the truth to the people, your difficulties are only starting. It is not easy to speak to people who have been doped with propaganda for years. What does a little wage-slave, born and bred in a town, know of freedom—of real freedom—freedom to decide for himself whether or not he will accept or reject any proposition? I suppose if such a thing were suggested to him he would die laughing.

Freedom of Speech merely means the ignorant chatter of slaves, unless this freedom of speech is based on something much more substantial than that which we have today. Freedom of speech, to be of value, must have the backing of a community of free men where co-operation is on the voluntary basis, and where every man, woman and child has free access to the wealth of this world.

Where the wealth of a community is controlled and organised by a dominant clique, then education and news necessarily fall into the hands of the same clique, and the right to live is only permitted by a dole of some kind—and a dole is only given to those who can show clearly that they have stripped themselves of all means of self-protection. The characteristic of a dole, which goes under various names and is sometimes called a wage or a salary, or child endowment—its main characteristic is that it can be cut off at any time, and that

AN AGED ACTIONIST SPEAKS

The following extracts from an actionist's letter to the United Electors of Australia are published as an inspiration to others:—

" . . . I am now going on to my 88th milestone, and am thankful that even in my old age I was able to see the light per the New Times, and to appreciate the valuable educative work that you and those associated with you are doing for the sorely oppressed workers and primary producers. . . . As an appreciation I enclose a guinea towards those "bullets" you require, and when I reach the 88th milestone I will send you another. Realising that an organisation, as such, can only act as a directive force, and that it is the individuals, as such, that must make things happen, I have personally written to every member of the Curtin administration, varying the letters according to portfolios, but in the main emphasising the fact that a Government that did not control financial policy was merely an association for levying and collecting taxes for the real government—the Bankers. Naturally, I also stress the fact that the

IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT TRIAL

(From the "Social Creditor," August 1.) The questions addressed from wherever he is confined, by Captain Ramsay, MP., were in themselves admirable and well-timed. The general public is completely unable to understand why there should be any shortage of domestic coal, and the answer that "it would not be in the public interest" to disclose the amount of coal raised in Scotland, is impudent. But the continued incarceration without trial, of Captain Ramsay and many others like him is the gravest blot on the honour of this country that it has sustained since the days of the Star Chamber. We know nothing whatever about the pre-war activities as distinct from the expressed views of Captain Ramsay. The suggestion circulated is that he communicated with Germans. If he was foolish enough to fail to recognise that the Jewish policy he was attacking was, and always has been since the time of Frederick II. (the "Great") linked with German policy, he probably had less information than Mr. Montagu Norman, who assisted Hitler to rearm, and is still at large. But that a man of his antecedents and record had improper dealings with the declared enemy of his country, after the declaration of war, we flatly refuse to believe until he is convicted by a reputable jury, British by birth and descent.

School for Fabian Bureaucrats

The "Quarterly Review" for January, 1929, is cited as the authority for the quotation in the following:

The London school of Economics was founded by Mr. Sidney Webb and his socialist Fabian Society, with money obtained through Lord Haldane from Sir Ernest Cassel, international financier, which endowment Lord Haldane told Mr. J. H. Morgan, K.C. had been provided "to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist"

it is never adequate for the job on hand, or the price paid for it is extortionate.

With these few remarks let us examine those facts which can shed some useful light on the kind of freedom we have a right to expect from a twentieth-century environment. After all, the kind of freedom we can enjoy will depend largely on the amount of time required to feed and clothe ourselves. If a man spends most of his time scratching for a living and worrying how he is going to provide for his family, the kind of freedom he is likely to enjoy would be, I think, considerably lower than that of a cow feeding in a paddock.

Leisure time is of little value to a man whose mind is distressed about his family, or who is unable to acquire the simple necessities of life. As Tagore, the Indian poet, said: "Thoughts that must be thought, from which there is no escape, are but worries; the thoughts of the poor and the miserable cling to their minds as the ivy to a ruined temple."

The question we have to ask ourselves is: What is all this modern hustle about, where are we hurrying to? What are all our financial wizards and "smart alics" doing; where are they taking us to? What advantages do we get from Big Business and Big Trade Unions; what have they added to human happiness, human dignity and leisure in the past 25 years? It seems to me that if we are to have any Freedom after this war that is going to be of any value to you and me, we shall have to find some kind of answer to a few important questions.

Let us call the farms, factories and offices required to supply us with goods and services, the "Productive System." Then the question we have to answer is: Is this Productive System to be run, as I believe it should be run, to supply us with our needs, with as little bother and as little demand on our time as is the sewerage system? Or is it to be used as a kind of penitentiary to keep us working eight hours a day for 300 days in the year for fifty years, for union wages? In other words, is the Productive System, to be used to supply us with goods and services OR to supply men with jobs? (To be continued.)

NEW MOVEMENT

A public meeting will be held to-night (Friday, Nov. 20), at the Town Hall in the Melbourne suburb of Hawthorn. It has been organised by a number of Hawthorn citizens who have obtained the use of the Town Hall without charge so that local citizens may hear the story behind the recent liquor inquiry from their representative in the Legislative Assembly, Mr. L. H. Hollins. The Mayor of Hawthorn will occupy the chair.

The formation of a new movement will be announced. Its main object, we understand, will be to encourage electors, in each electorate, to inform their M.P. of the results they require, and to back him up so long as he re-presents their demands in Parliament. Thus, politics would be cleansed of the over-riding influence of political-party juntas and vested interests, such as banks and breweries. This electors' movement would operate independently in each electorate.

U.E.A. ACTION

During the past few weeks extensive experiments have been carried out by the United Electors of Australia to test the public reaction to Food Control Boards. These tests show clearly that the people are overwhelmingly opposed to this form of bureaucracy, which not only retards the war effort, but also constitutes a menace to our post-war freedom. The people are prepared to instruct their political employees that they require these unwanted controls abolished. Campaigners already operating on this issue report that the issue is just as live as the National Insurance issue, and the Coburg meeting, reported elsewhere in this issue, verifies this view. This should encourage supporters to get busy in their own circles and start the ball rolling. "Letter Forms" are now available from headquarters; if you are unable to call, just drop us a line intimating the number of "letters" you can handle. The price is 1/- per 100 from the United Electors of Australia, Mc-Ewan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the United Democrats, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

The Social Side: It is regretted that we could not include reference to the social aspect of the Quarterly Meeting in the notes of last week, since we extended ourselves a little too much as it was; but we do appreciate the efforts of those who took part. These were Messrs. C. H. Allen, A. J. Munyard, D. G. Day and Mr. and Mrs. Hutchinson. Without appearing to discriminate, we wish to especially thank Mr. and Mrs. Hutchinson for coming along and giving us some delightful music on the violin and piano, and also for leading us in community singing.

"Hands Off Our Clothes" Association: Some weeks ago, from a spontaneous move among the tailors of Adelaide, this Association was formed to protest against the regimentation brought about by the clothes rationing regulations. The leaders of this move went to the President of the United Democrats for advice as to how they should act. Later, forms were drawn up and printed, and quite a number have been sent to other States. The campaign is pushing ahead steadily in South Australia, and much good work is being done by the organiser, Mr. B. T. Moran, who is a very old worker for our cause. The Executive of the United Democrats has given the Association permission to use our headquarters address for purposes of communications. If you feel you can do anything to forward this move by the tailors, any communication addressed to this office will receive early attention.

"Economic Tribulation": This book is selling very rapidly and our first order is completely sold out, leaving quite a number of orders not supplied. We are expecting further copies of this book any day, and those who have ordered should receive theirs shortly. Those who have not ordered should do so as early as possible, —M. R. W. LEE, Hon. Secretary.

Your
VICTORY
SUIT
Hand-
Tailored
to Order



ELIZABETH HOUSE,
2nd Floor,
340 LITTLE COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE
Phone: M 5177

All Wool
Worsteds
from
7/7/-
(30 Coupons)

"For STYLE and EASE: FRANK DEVLIN PLEASE!"

CRITICISM OF BOARDS JUSTIFIED

Speaking at a reception tendered him on November 4 at Camperdown (Victoria), the Roman Catholic Bishop of Ballarat, Bishop O'Collins, declared that the authorities could not afford to "monkey about" with primary production the way they were doing without a famine following. Strongly criticising the Apple and Pear Board, he added that it would not be long before "this Garden of Eden" lacked apples. A famine in apples and pears would undoubtedly follow the strange workings of the Board. To let fruit rot on the ground while thousands of children were going without was scandalous, he declared, and a reflection on the Government. Healthy people were an asset and starved people an expense.

This thoroughly justified criticism by his Lordship brought forth the amazing retort from one politician—Mr. J. G. B. McDonald, M.L.A. for Goulburn Valley—that the only apples left on the ground this season were windfalls and those affected by disease. The Apple and Pear Board, he is reported to have stated, accepted all marketable apples, and had been anxious to get them. Inefficiency among some growers resulted in some fruit being unmarketable, for which the Board was not responsible. "The present acquisition plan," concluded the parliamentarian "is the only workable system in an industry which has lost its market for 6,000,000 bushels."

Mr. McDonald presumably was in attendance in the Legislative Assembly during the sessions in which the Apple and Pear and other Boards were discussed and unhesitatingly condemned.

Did he not hear Mr. Everard, Deputy Leader of the U.A.P., declare that he had SEEN hundreds of cases of fruit tipped into the Yarra to be swept out to sea?

Did he sit in silence and hear the late Mr. George Frost, member for Daylesford declare that millions of cases of apples and pears had been wantonly destroyed while little children were denied access to them?

Does Mr. McDonald deny that quite recently the High Court of Australia compelled the Apple and Pear Board to disgorge approximately £1280 illegally withheld from a grower in Orange, N.S.W., and to all intents and purposes, found it guilty of gross profiteering in that it purchased fruit at round about 3/6 a case and sold it as high as 18/- and 20/- a case?

Did not the Chief Justice state that it seemed impossible that the payment of £573 for fruit, the nett proceeds of which were £1288, constituted compensation upon just terms?

In short the High Court of Australia condemned the dishonest practices of the Apple and Pear Board, and made it make restitution of £1288 "compensation on just terms" it had illegally withheld from a grower who had been compelled to hand over his product to the Board for disposal.

And yet Mr. McDonald makes the amazing claim that "the present acquisition scheme is the only workable system" for the industry!

If there were nothing else to justify the universal opposition to food boards and food acquisition schemes the judgment of the High Court of Australia would do so. But on all sides producers, consumers, and taxpayers are heartily in agreement with the Bishop of Ballarat in his condemnation of bureaucratic organisations, whose sole purpose is to restrict production, create fictitious shortages in order to inflate prices, and, in doing so, penalise both growers and consumers and embark on systematic profiteering.

How any member of Parliament can sit unconcerned in face of the High Court judgment is beyond comprehension. But probably these smug Board apologists will receive a rude awakening when, in due course, and as a result of the High Court judgment, over 1100 claims for "just compensation" will be issued against the Apple and Pear Board.

Mr. McDonald would have received a splendid idea of the general opinion of the people of Victoria regarding Boards had he attended the annual workers' conference of the Mothers' Union, held in Melbourne on October 12 when loud applause greeted Dr. Mary King when she stated that while men could see only one point of view in regard to the activities of the Apple and Pear

Board, women would take a different one, and would not allow God's good gifts to be wasted. There was, she concluded, a solution of the problem of the growers' side of the question, and it was for women with economic brains and training to get on the job with the men and insist that a solution be found.

And still Mr. McDonald, M.L.A., is satisfied to remark, "the present acquisition plan is the only workable system in the industry!"

The effect of the Apple and Pear acquisition scheme has been to drive hundreds of growers out of business. The adoption of the burning-off system of fruit destruction, if not approved of certainly was not condemned by the Board, has been widespread. Thousands of fruit-bearing trees have been rooted out. The returns to the growers have been so unprofitable that hundreds of producers have sought highly-lucrative jobs in the cities.

The resultant tremendously reduced production of fruit during the coming season will reduce the wastage of fruit because there will be so little fruit produced that there will be none to waste. It would not be surprising if Mr. McDonald and Mr. Mills and other Board approvers will acclaim that disaster as a triumph for Board efficiency and good management!

Bishop O'Collins' strictures of Board bungling, terrific food wastage and the driving of producers out of this "garden of Eden" are thoroughly justified. And he could, with as much justification, have referred to the fact that the Apple and Pear Board itself admitted that it had, in the first year of acquisition, destroyed 7,000,000 cases of first quality fruit—not windfalls and diseased fruit, but fruit that had been accepted by the Board and had been paid for and then allowed to rot in the orchards!

He could have recited the fact that people were prosecuted and fined for feeding their own apples to pigs and giving fruit away to a hospital!

Is it any wonder that Cr. Wilson of Ballarat, speaking at the great public meeting held in that city on October 30 to protest against the continuation of the Apple and Pear and other iniquitous Boards should have stated that he wondered whether he was in Ballarat or Berlin when he heard the plain, unvarnished tales of the growers who have been so cruelly treated by the Boards.

But reflection would have shown that such frightful Godless wastage of food, as has been evidenced in Australia during the past two or three years at the behest of "marketing" Boards would have brought somebody before firing parties in Germany! Here such tactics are upheld by a member of Parliament as "the only workable system!"

In Oakleigh, Coburg, Ballarat, Ballan and shortly in Prahran, Bendigo, Warrnambool, Geelong, and Caulfield, public meetings have unanimously called upon the Federal Government to do away with these nefarious bureaucracies responsible for so much waste of money, manpower, and food, and it is certain that unless the Government heeded these demands before the elections there will be drastic changes in the Federal sphere.

The people of this country are loyal to the backbone, and are willing to co-operate to the fullest extent in the national war effort, but they are determined that they will no longer tolerate these discreditable food acquisition schemes which mercilessly penalise growers and consumers.

(Condensed from "Oakleigh and Caulfield Times," November 12)

HANDS OF CONSTITUTION CAMPAIGN

A leaflet (No. 13) issued by The Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide-street, Brisbane, reads as follows:

In the Brisbane "Telegraph" of 15th October, the former Premier of Queensland (Mr. Forgan Smith) is reported to have said, when discussing in the Legislative Assembly the Commonwealth Government's Constitution Reform Proposals that the proposals as submitted go beyond and outside the Labour Platform. Power was a dangerous explosive, and could only be kept in control by spreading it as widely as possible and in as many hands as possible. Much of the published matter in regard to these proposals was similar to matter published by Mussolini 10 years ago. There was a basis of Fascism in it.

"Once you are controlled and confined within the narrow compass of powers given to the Federal Government under this scheme it will take a revolution probably to break it up. If the first referendum is carried the people's power over the Constitution, unless through Parliament, will be gone.

"It was proposed to take away from the High Court its right to interpret any part of the Constitution. This was one of the most serious features of the proposals. It took away a man's common law rights. It was always a principle of jurisprudence that

"The people in 1942 were being asked to deprive themselves of a right they had enjoyed for hundreds of years, a right for which men had shed their blood—the unfettered right of appeal to justice. Under these proposals the Commonwealth Parliament was the sole authority. If the proposals became the law of Australia, Queensland would indeed have cause to mourn.

"He also said that the basic reason for the uniform tax was not to help the taxpayer, but to give additional security to banking and financial institutions, in fact, giving them security over the entire resources of the Commonwealth."

Even a cursory review of the above should satisfy any person of the grave danger to their rights and liberties entailed by surrendering this power to any Government, more particularly to the Curtin Government, which has offered such weak resistance to the pressure of vested financial interests in their attempt to exploit the people.

The statement of Mr. Forgan Smith that the basic reason for the uniform tax was to give additional security to banking and financial institutions should cause anyone to view with suspicion these proposals for reform of the Constitution. What is the real object behind these proposals? Are these proposals intended for the benefit of the people or like the uniform tax for the

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION AND THE STATUTE OF WESTMINSTER

To the Editor: Sir,—In a letter to the "Sydney Morning Herald" of 4/11/42 Bishop Pilcher, who recently was chief guest speaker at a Zionist celebration in Sydney of the 25th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration, stated:

"... A few years before the present war, largely as the result of incitement and support by the Axis Powers, the Arabs broke out into a revolt against the Declaration, accompanied by massacre and terrorism. An 'appeasement' Government was in power in Great Britain at the time, and to please the Arabs, issued the White Paper of 1939, which practically cancelled the Balfour Declaration."

The Balfour Declaration was issued during the last war in the form of a letter from the then Foreign Secretary and reads as follows:

Foreign Office, November 2, 1917.
"Dear Lord Rothschild,—I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to and approved by, the Cabinet.

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country."

"I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation. — Yours sincerely, Arthur James Balfour."

It was criticised in the House of Lords by such men as Lord Grey and Lord Buckmaster. Lord Grey, speaking in the House of Lords on March 27, 1923, said:

"I suggest that the best way of clearing our honour in this matter is officially to publish the whole of the engagements relating to this matter which we entered into during the war. . . . I think that we are placed in considerable difficulty by the Balfour Declaration itself. . . . It promised a Zionist home without prejudice to the civil and religious rights of the population of Palestine. A Zionist home, my Lords, undoubtedly means or implies a Zionist Government over the district in which the home is placed, and if 93% of the population of Palestine are Arabs, I do not see how you can establish other than an Arab Government without prejudice to their civil rights. That one sentence alone of the Balfour Declaration seems to me to involve, without overstating it, exceedingly great difficulty of fulfilment. It would be very desirable from the point of view of honour, that all these various pledges should be set, out side by side, and then, I think, the most honourable thing would be to look at them fairly, see what inconsistencies there are between them, and, having regard to the nature of each pledge and the date at which it was given, with all the facts before us, consider what is the fair thing to be done."

Lord Buckmaster, then Lord Chancellor, was even more emphatic. He declared that the McMahon-Hussein correspondence "showed unmistakably that there had not been something in the nature of casual inconsistency between different announcements at various times, as Lord Grey suggested, but that a deliberate pledge had been given on the one hand, and had been abandoned on the other."

Under the terms of a Covenant made between Sir Henry McMahon and the Sheriff Hussein of Mecca on October 25, 1915, the Arabs fought for us in Palestine, believing that we would support the claim to an independent Arab Kingdom in that country. Of this, F. Yeats Brown, in his book, "European Jungle," states: "It is deplorable that Mr. Winston Churchill should ever have prostituted his talents by upholding the quite untenable proposition that Palestine had not been promised to the Arabs."

There is, I think, an abundance of evidence available to substantiate the statement of Mr. Lloyd George in his attempted justification of the selling out of Palestine that it was done to reward Dr. Chaim Weissman, the Zionist leader, who saved

the British army at a moment when a particular ingredient essential for our guns was exhausted."

If, as Bishop Pilcher states, the Balfour Declaration was "practically cancelled" the Chamberlain Government, the inspiration for the vitriolic attacks on the late Prime Minister of Great Britain is easily identifiable. Nor will the fact that those attacks came mostly from Communist sources throughout the world, escape unnoticed. The connection needs no explanation.

It is, however, increasingly apparent that, qualified as our regard for Mr. Chamberlain may be his actions during his term of office not merely gave us the breathing space we so desperately needed, but also did much to identify the nature of the dark forces which threaten British Empire.

It will be appreciated that the Statute of Westminster also emanated from a formula framed by Lord Balfour, and that in the words of Lord Passfield when this measure was brought forward: "We cannot help this Bill. This Statute of Westminster is quite possibly a very dangerous experiment, but the Government is not responsible for it. The Draftsmen's Committee was not responsible for it. The absolute duty of the Government, the Conference, the Draftsmen's Committee, was to carry into effect, Mr. Balfour's formula as adopted by the Conference of 1926."

Lord Sankey in much the same language said: "This Bill, this report is the logical and legal consequence of the Balfour formula." Similar words were used by Mr. Brennan in submitting the Bill to the Australian House of Representatives: "You have to take this Bill or leave it. No amendments, no Committee stages. All this was settled in 1926 in the Balfour report"

We might ask at the behest of whose hidden hand was this, Statute of Westminster instituted? "Why, despite the opposition of eminent lawyers and statesmen, has this measure been rushed through various Parliaments of the British Empire? It was described by a statesman of repute, Sir Francis Bell, as "the first step in the dissolution of the Empire."

The point I wish to make is that war-time is not the time for constitutional reform of any kind. The majority of the people are engaged to the hilt in war activities and have little or no time to devote to the mass of legal technicalities involved in the present attempted "re forms."—Yours, etc., A. Ferguson, Carlton, N.S.W.

MARKETING BOARDS, ETC.

(Continued from Page 1.)

insurance scheme. A printed or typed letter, if unsigned, was a mere piece of paper, but once you attach your signature to it, it becomes your free declaration. A free expression of the people's will could be obtained in this way. Those who do not want food marketing boards could obtain a supply of letters printed for the convenience of those who desired to sign voluntarily. "If I enter a fruit shop and place 1/- on the counter," Mr. Paige explained, "I might be given pears instead of apples, therefore it is necessary to reject what I don't want and choose what I do want. In the matter of Government, it is the member's job to get what you want—but you have to tell him about it. As long as the people express their democratic rights, no law can operate against the will of the people." (Hear, hear.)

Although Hitler's armies had invaded France, the unarmed workers recently refused to co-operate—and, in this instance Hitler was beaten. (Applause.) A lesson for democratic people to learn was that the united will of the people was superior to armed force. If the people do not want food boards, they need not wait until next election. Various Coburg shopkeepers had agreed to receive signed elector's letters, and these would be forwarded, or, better still electors could write their Federal Members direct.

Large quantities of printed letters were disposed of after the meeting. They read as follows:-

Mr. M.H.R.
Federal Members' Rooms
Post Office Place,
Melbourne, C. I.

Dear Sir,
I am convinced that Food Marketing Boards and Food Control Committees are responsible for the unnecessarily high price of food, and for the restriction and destruction of wanted foodstuffs.

I therefore want them abolished and will be glad to learn what YOU, as Mr. Representative, intend to DO about it.

Yours faithfully
Name
Address

desire to do something effective to help the Australian people and to honour the promises made to members of the fighting services and to their dependents, as Dr. Evatt says it is, then it already has the power necessary, full and complete, without making any amendments whatever of the Constitution.

If the Federal Government exercised its prerogative over the control of the creation and issue of money it could, if it desired, bring our war effort up to the greatest capacity possible of our men and material, which should be the first consideration of any Government. This same power is, therefore, quite sufficient for any post-war reconstruction.

The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. If you do not wish to relinquish your freedom and independence sign and send this to your M.H.R. and Senators.

—A. W. Noakes, Director, The Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide Street, Brisbane 30/10/42

To
M.H.R. or Senator, Canberra.

I hereby request that you make every effort to prevent the proposed referendum for amendment of the Constitution from taking place during the war.