

ON OTHER PAGES:
NOTES ON THE NEWS.
(Page 2)
BANKERS' MOUTHPIECE
ADVOCATES SOCIALISM.
(Page 2)
L. H. HOLLINS ON
C'WEALTH POWERS BILL.
(Page 4)
CLASH IN COMMONS OVER
SOCIAL CREDIT. (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 9 No. 1 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JAN. 8 1943

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

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

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

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

Power Of The Liquor Interests Condemned

Plain-Speaking At Coburg Meeting

Electors Urged to Assert Themselves

In response to a petition signed by a number of public men, the Mayor of Coburg (Melbourne) convened a public meeting on December 17, to enable the citizens to hear of the facts related to the Royal Commission appointed by the State Government to enquire into the liquor problem. Between 200 and 300 citizens assembled at the Town Hall, which the Mayor made available.

Mr. Hollins, M.L.A., explained that he worked as a reformer to bring about a change in our monetary and electoral systems. He was not a prohibitionist. Although a total abstainer, he considered prohibition to be undemocratic. If the people wanted hotels on every street corner, they had a perfect right to get what they wanted. If, on the other hand, the people wanted hotels to be properly conducted, he, as a member of Parliament, would respond to the will of the people. Many members of Parliament were as much concerned in this as the citizens, but they did not dare to take a stand against certain interests behind the scenes. The reason was that citizens failed to give their representatives support and power to enable them to take the stand that was needed. He had made enquiries concerning the conduct of hotels, one of which was concerned in the Leonski trial. When the police reported that there was nothing wrong about the conditions in public streets, he realised that there was something wrong with the police department. When a deputation of citizens waited upon the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, that astute gentleman escaped by pulling the wool over their eyes. "Your Member of Parliament," said Mr. Hollins, "is your servant, and it is time that the people should tell their members what to do." (Loud applause.) "When I moved in the Assembly for an enquiry, only five members rose to support me," he said. The press took the matter up, aroused public opinion, and a Royal Commission was set up. The terms of reference were so limited that, although maladministration had been revealed, the findings were not unfavourable to the liquor interests. He (Mr. Hollins) had been attacked because he did not go into the witness box. Had he done so, he would have had to reveal the source of his information, which he considered would amount to a breach of faith between himself as a member and his informants as members of the community.

When he complained that a Brief sent to the Chief Secretary was never heard of again, it was suggested that he should go to the Chief Commissioner. He went to a

higher authority—to Parliament—(Applause)—where all he got was abuse. "It is up to you, the people, to reverse the pressure," said Mr. Hollins, in conclusion, "against that of the vested interests controlling your Parliament. Your local member is one of the greatest fighters in Parliament. When you bring pressure behind him you will give him power to get the results you want." (Loud applause.)

Mr. M. Blackburn, M.H.R., said that freedom of speech in Parliament was a settled law to enable members to discharge their duties to their constituents and to the country. Confidential information given by members of the community to members could not be obtained if the names of those who gave such information were divulged. He was glad that Mr. Hollins did not submit to cross-examination by the Commission, and he trusted that a strong public opinion on this matter would be maintained. (Applause.)

Rev. Palmer Phillips said we should support the stalwarts and independents, who fought for liberty of thought and democratic action. It was obvious that the liquor traffic was a menace to our democratic life, and that we should break its power of political intrigue. No democrat could approve of political privilege, for in that case democracy could not function.

A Voice: "Finance is the power behind privilege." The Speaker: "Yes. Finance and vested financial interests."

Anyone who said that the liquor trade did not break down our laws was either a fool or a liar. (Applause.) Unfortunately, its powerful political procedure had consumers on its side in the people who like a glass of beer. It had the power to stifle discussion—including the P.S.A. at Wesley Church.

Mr. F. C. Paice said whether we drink beer or not, we must agree that there is something radically wrong, and the situation compelled us to either think for ourselves or submit to government by vested interests. The Finance-controlled liquor interests were being used to bring into disrepute everything in the nature of democracy, to take away our freedom, to regi-

ment the people until we become an anti-like community. The objective was government "of" the people and to remove control "by" the people. They would abolish our council, our State Parliament, until finally our representative could not be found at Canberra. He would be sent to Wall St., New York. (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. Paice submitted the following resolution:

"We, the citizens of Coburg, here assembled, express our unqualified disappointment with the Liquor Inquiry, and we demand a complete and open public inquiry into the charges laid by Mr. Hollins, M.L.A. We further desire to express our determination that we as individuals will do all in our power to see that members of Parliament carry out the wishes of their electors, irrespective of the issue involved."

Mr. Edmunds said that he had worked against Mr. Hollins, but realising the futility of party politics, he now supported Mr. Hollins. As an obscure officer he had been prohibited from participating in the anti-liquor committee supporting Mr. Hollins. Brig.-Gen. J. C. Stewart had directed the liquor campaign. He could not see the sense in using military rank on the one hand for liquor, but not on the other for temperance. By the pressure of forces in democratic action the liquor trade, like some of its customers, would not have a leg to stand on.

Persons willing to join the association of citizens to fight for democratic government were asked to leave their names on cards provided.

The resolution is to be presented to the Premier by Mr. Mutton, as the Representative in the State House of the citizens of Coburg.

REFORMERS WANT STATE POWERS RETAINED

Striking Appeal to Victorian M.P.'s

A further example of the opposition in reform circles to the totalitarian idea of centralising power at Canberra is provided by the excellent letter sent by the Melbourne Economic Research Council to all members of the Victorian Parliament. We congratulate the M.E.R.C. on their timely action and reproduce their letter hereunder:

Dear Sir,—The Melbourne Economic Research Council appeals to you, as a member of Parliament, to take a stand against the present proposals to increase the powers of the Federal Government.

We base our appeal on matters of principle. We believe that the principles underlying the democratic ideal are fundamentally just and right, and must be the eventual basis of peace and happiness amongst the peoples of the world.

The nearest approach to democracy has been achieved in those communities, such as our own, in which local government has been fostered and encouraged, and although democratic principles have had to be temporarily suspended owing to the exigencies of war, this by no means proves that democracy has failed, that its ideals are false, or that the progress towards it had been without great and lasting value. The action now taken, therefore, by the representatives of State Governments in agreeing to transfer to the Federal Government, for a long period, great and vaguely defined powers in matters for which they themselves have hitherto been responsible, is a most dangerous step in the wrong direction. We fail entirely to see why the coming of peace should herald a period of chaos, unemployment and poverty. The local and State authorities of Australia are well aware of the many tasks of construction and development—housing, schools, water supplies, etc.—which need to be undertaken within their own spheres, tasks which they themselves can best define and are best fitted to undertake. The carrying out of these tasks has been impeded, in the main, by lack of, or uncertainty as to the provision of, the necessary money or funds.

Now that the war has illustrated once again the tremendous productive power of the community, when the impediment of finance is removed, we trust that the representatives of the people will never again admit that "lack of funds" can be an adequate reason for failure to carry out necessary works, provided that the physical and human resources are available. In other words, if there is money for war there must also be money for peace.

The supremacy of the Federal Parliament in financial matters, has, we suggest, led both the members of that body and its officials to conclude that they alone had the brains or ability to carry out such works. This we, and we believe you, would indignantly deny.

The Federal Government already possesses ample authority by reason of its power under the Constitution to regulate the monetary supplies of the Commonwealth. Its most important duty should be to ensure that adequate funds are made available both for its own legitimate functions in relation to such matters as communications, quarantine, defence, etc., and for the use of the States in order that the latter may

fully employ their own diversified productive resources in the manner which they themselves may decide.

It is true that Federal Action ensures uniformity, but there is no virtue in uniformity as such. Though it has to be enforced in some spheres, these should be conceded with the utmost reluctance, since uniformity brings the blight of monotony and is destructive of initiative, experiment and progress.

The essence of democracy is the decentralisation of power. The essence of the totalitarianism against which we are fighting is its centralisation.

The State Parliaments were elected by the democratic franchise to give effect to the wishes of the people as expressed in the endorsement of policies submitted to them. Included in that mandate there was certainly no authority to abdicate powers and functions which the citizens of the States are entitled to expect shall be exercised by their own Parliaments on their behalf.

We urge you, therefore, to reject the present proposals and to do your utmost, rather, to ensure that the Federal Government shall be seized of its proper functions, and shall discharge them with thoroughness and justice.

JOHN DALE, Chairman.

S. W. NEWMAN, Secretary.

203 Tooronga Rd., Hawthorn. 27/11/42

BRITISH BUILDERS REJECT GOVT. CONTRACT FORM

"At a special general meeting of the National Federation of Building Trades Employers, held in London and attended by members from all parts of the country, it was unanimously decided to instruct members of the Federation not to accept the new standard form of Government contract, pending negotiations with the Government Departments concerned. The Federation of Civil Engineering Contractors has issued similar instructions.

"The following memorandum on the subject is issued jointly by the National Federation of Building Trades Employers and the Federation of Civil Engineering Contractors:

"The Contracts Co-ordinating Committee of the Government Contracting Departments has introduced a new form of contract conditions for Government building and civil engineering works. The National Federation of Building Trades Employers and the Federation of Civil Engineering Contractors, though they fully accept the Government's view that a new single form is desirable, have represented to Ministers that the new form, on which the industrial organisations have not been consulted, is based on principles they regard as very unfair.

"By way of example, it would deny all right of appeal to independent arbitration on fundamental matters, with the result that on these matters the officials of the Government Departments would be left as judges in their own cause, with autocratic powers not only to administer, but also to interpret, the contract, contrary to general industrial practice.

"Another example is that, if the works or buildings develop faults or failures by reason of errors in the design, the responsibility for the mistakes of the Government Departments' designers is placed on the contractor.

"So seriously do the Federations regard this new action by the Government Departments, that they have instructed their members to make it clear, when tendering for Government work, that their tenders are subject to adjustment of the terms of contract in a manner to be agreed with the Government Departments. In issuing this instruction, the Federations have made it quite clear that on no account must there be any holding up of Government work at this time, and that in every case the actual work must be started immediately and carried out with the utmost possible expedition; but they do maintain that the Government should give effect to the democratic principle of collective bargaining, and the right of the Federations to discuss and agree with the Government Departments the conditions of contract which their members are to be asked to sign."

—"The Illustrated Carpenter and Builder," October 9, 1942. (Our emphasis.)

This Week's Gem

At a meeting in the Savoy Theatre, Melbourne, on Sunday evening, convened by the Committee of the Anti-Conscription Campaign, the chairman, Mr. Thomas, in the course of his opening remarks, stated that during the early part of this war Dr. G. P. O'Day (well-known Melbourne Communist leader) paid his membership fee to the No-Conscription Fellowship. Dr. O'Day now urges conscription (for others).

IDEOLOGICAL ERROR

"As a result of the refusal of the Hungarian Government to allow baptized Jews to hold a Congress to organise their life, and the Government's action in applying to large categories of baptized Jews the restrictions enforced against Jews generally, about 3000 of the converts, headed by Dr. Aladar Soboltchi, have decided to return to the Jewish community. They announce that they have come to the conclusion that their action in abandoning the Jewish faith was a grave ideological error, and that they feel that they are spiritually bound up with the Jews."

—"Jewish Chronicle," Sept. 25, 1942.

BANKERS' MOUTHPIECE ADVOCATES SOCIALISM

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

There was a time, not very long ago either, when those of us who had devoted considerable research and study to our subject were told that our statements that the International Bankers were agreeably disposed to the Labour-Socialist movements were ridiculous nonsense.

I was often told by people who should have known much better, that I should not criticise the socialists and communists. But a great number of people are beginning to realise that "Right-Wing" movements and "Left-Wing" movements are essential instruments in the hands of powerful financial and kindred groups.

Sir William Beveridge, the orthodox British economist, who has been closely connected with banking groups for the past 30 years, has a "plan" which is receiving widespread and favourable publicity in Britain. Before going on to deal with his "plan," I would like to draw attention to his statement, made to the English "Daily Telegraph." It is worthy of black type: "My report takes us half-way to Moscow."

It can be safely stated that the British people will not be given the free choice of deciding whether they will follow Sir William to Moscow or not. Sir William's "plan" is, ostensibly, for the purpose of overcoming poverty in Britain. Some people in this country are advocating the introduction of Sir William's "plan" into Australia.

As I read the details of this plan, I thought of all the other planners who are offering to look after our liberties and economic security after this war. I also thought of the dying words of a victim of the French Revolution, Madame Roland: "O Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name!" Now, quite a number of people had plans for abolishing poverty long before this war was started. Very practical plans, too. But no one in a position to remedy things would take any notice. It is a very sinister fact that, only after a world war was created, were we told that the associates of the bankers had "plans" to "save" us. It is asking too much of our credulity to ask us to believe that any of these plans are for our benefit.

Sir William Beveridge, in an article in the London "Times," the mouthpiece of financial orthodoxy, and lately an advocate of socialism, states:

"We have continued to rely on individual capitalism, with its accompanying wage bargaining. We have left vital production in the hands of individuals, whose duty it is to study not only the needs of the nation, but the interests of their shareholders and the post-war position of their businesses. The times call for these changes: (1) Direct State responsibility and control of vital industries and distribution of incomes; and (2) The assertion that the principle of service, rather than

personal gain, should be the mainspring of the war effort in industry, as in fighting."

Not once in his report does Sir William mention the money system. But, of course, both the socialists and the bankers are agreed that there is nothing wrong with the money system. Oh, dear, no, it is that terrible private production for profit! To say, as Sir William does, that there is some difference between the interests of the "nation" and the interests of shareholders of firms, who are members of the nation, is vague, misleading nonsense. All shareholders desire sufficient financial returns from their industries, above the cost of production, to allow them to purchase food, clothing, shelter and the amenities of civilisation. Most of these shareholders know from bitter experience, that, after this war, as a result of a shortage of money, they may find it hard to obtain sufficient profits to obtain a decent standard of living. The fear of the future is apparently greater than the fear of the Germans. Sir William does not put forward any suggestions for removing these fears now; he proposes that the "State," some unnamed group of individuals, will run industry much more efficiently than the present owners. Just for the sheer love of it, too! Has anyone who is not a liar or a fool had any first hand experience of any bureaucrat in this country doing a job just for the sake of doing it? No. The bureaucrat does it for personal gain, a monetary reward. I don't know of any private firm which has made such a mess of its affairs as our State owned and controlled Boards are making in this country. And God help us all if the State is going to control our incomes. No, Sir William, you can go all the way to Moscow if you like. But we have no desire to follow you. We are not concerned with this sentimental nonsense about "service." We say quite bluntly that we all want more profits out of this war, profits which will allow us to retain our institutions and our way of life; profits in terms of money, which will allow us all to buy the goods which the production system can easily produce if we have the purchasing power.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

For once Mr. Menzies pointed out a real danger to our British way of life, when as reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of December 15, he said "it was ironical that those who had done most to restrict our freedom had been the present Government"

True enough; but, of course, he failed to mention that his Party had instituted the socialistic Marketing-Boards, and that the "Country" Party had assisted it. Continuing, he said that "the Labour Government was working to bring about internal revolution" and that "the constitutional changes now being considered by the State Parliaments should be strongly opposed." If this isn't bluff, the Bankers will have a word in Menzies' ear.

A.R.P. BOMBAST: The press of December 12, reports big noise A.R.P. Officials, as, on the one hand, asking for compulsory service, whilst at the same time threatening 2500 honorary volunteer wardens with dismissal for alleged apathy—presumably being voluntary, they cannot be bossed so effectively. This reflects the dictator mind of those in high places who, being in semi-government positions, are fully paid men. Mr. J. Kemp, who is also a fully paid Fire Brigade officer, intimidates voluntary wardens thus, "With anyone who does not attend regularly and is apathetic, we ask for his resignation and hand his name to the Allied Works Council." When such arrogant and insolent men are in charge of these affairs, it is no wonder there is 'apathy.'

DISCIPLINE: It is reported that the Parliamentary committee on Standing Orders propose some form of discipline to prevent Members from criticising people outside Parliament—especially newspaper magnates. The report follows strong Parliamentary criticism and allegations against the Murdoch press relative to stirring up sectarianism and offences against the censorship. (This newspaper report does not, of course, mention this. Oh, no! In accordance with the canons of "press freedom," it makes it appear that it is espousing the public welfare. It is a glaring example of the abuse of power and intellectual dishonesty.)

NEWS-RIGGERS: Whilst screaming headlines were allocated to the overseas conscription issue (the elimination of freedom), the Melbourne "Sun" of December 19 did its best to hide away in an obscure corner a strong plea by Archbishop Simonds for individual freedom. He objected strongly to our youths being handed over to the man-power authorities at school-leaving age, on the grounds that political power over them was very dangerous. Concluding, he also said: "Great power, especially political power, corrupted those who used it, and if the liberty of the individual was not safeguarded after

the war they would really be fighting in vain."

BUMP-OFFS: The assassination of Admiral Darlan ends a sticky situation from an Allied international relationship viewpoint. It also illustrates how easily these built-up personalities can be disposed of—at the correct time—by the World Planners.

BANKERS' SECRETS: Mr. Reginald McKenna, Midland Bank chairman, commenting on bankers' hidden reserves, is quoted in the Melbourne "Sun" of December 14 as saying that "they are much larger than is generally thought, the figure for the 'Big Five' alone being £116 millions—which almost equals their published reserves, capital and undistributed profits." He also points out that bank credit continues to expand rapidly, and that from the start of the war to date the private banks have taken up Treasury Bills to the extent of £1350 millions at an average rate of 13%. This means that the people of Britain after the war will have to give £23 million pounds worth of their production to the private bankers every year—merely for writing a few figures in books!

NEW ORDERS: Sir Patrick Hannon (M.P., President of the London Union of Manufacturers), like the Japanese, Germans and Italians, is advocating a New Order of full-employment—and the postponement of social advancement. It doesn't occur to him that if full-employment does not it would be better to have leisure. What automatically brings social advancement, it worries him most is that "Britain's national debt of £2000 millions makes industrial impoverishment an absolute certainty." It is men such as these—mesmerised by money symbols, with stunted minds and limited vision—from whom the idea of a decadent Britain arises.

BUREAUCRACY: Recommendations by the Commonwealth Bank Board (private bank nominees) to Mr. Curtin make it quite clear that it is the financial dictators that sponsor and guide Labor's policy of regimentation. They have informed Mr.

(Continued on page 4)

UNDERMINING OUR MORALE

Sir James Elder Again

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

(Continued from last issue.)

Sir,—In that portion of Sir James Elder's speech which was quoted in the last issue of the "New Times," there was a statement which is not only untrue, but which obviously has the evil intention behind it of deliberately misleading the community at large. For easy reference I requote as follows:

"The fact that no country has devised methods of financing a war which completely avoid reduction in the purchasing-power of its money must not blind us to the dangers of currency depreciation. Present financial trends in Australia demand that these dangers be more clearly recognised, and that every one of us should fight with all our might to arrest the progressive depreciation of the Australian £."

There are two statements here calling for separate attention. The first refers to methods which could avoid reduction of purchasing power, and the second to what is technically called "currency depreciation." It would be thought funny in some quarters if I said that currency depreciation simply means the undermining of a country's legal money by manipulation of the "other" money known as bank credit. It would also be thought funny by the same type of people if I declared that it is not possible to avoid currency depreciation while men with ideas like those held by Sir James Elder are permitted to determine financial POLICY. But funny or not, it is the literal truth, and all these "warnings" and urgings by the sycophants of the present controllers of society are merely calculated to create such a frame of mind that the great bulk of the people will feel themselves absolutely at the mercy of a FORCE they cannot see or understand. They will be so bewildered, and their morale so undermined, that they will be easy prey for the planners of the SLAVE STATE. These men and their paid agents are enemies of the people of Australia, and should be treated as such.

Who told Sir James that "no country has devised methods of financing a war which completely avoid reduction in the purchasing-power of its money"? Who ever was responsible for preparing his speech should be taken severely to task. Surely there can be little satisfaction in leading an old man astray, unless, of course, it is a calculated plan to use him to also lead astray those who have hitherto put their trust in him. The latter seems the more likely explanation. Anyhow, the fact is that the men forming the Government of the Province of Alberta, in the Dominion of Canada, DO know how to finance a war without reducing the purchasing power of money. What is more, the bankers KNOW that they know! That is why every attempt on the part of the Alberta Government to demonstrate to the world that their knowledge is sound has been prevented by the International Financial Dictators working through the Canadian House of Commons and the Privy Council. Is it not the very essence of convenience that the Bank of England has its Governor as a member of the Privy Council? That's the place for keeping an eye on things!

But quite apart from Alberta, Sir James can hardly be ignorant of the fact that Abraham Lincoln was once President of the United States of America, that he DID devise such methods, that he put them into practice, and that they were so successful, AND SO BENEFICIAL TO THE PEOPLE, that, international financiers took action, just as they are taking action to-day, to prevent the continuance of such methods. Indeed, the evidence points to their having been responsible for the assassination of that very great man. It was he who said this:

"Government possessing the power to create and issue currency and credit as money, and enjoying the power to withdraw both currency and credit from circulation by taxation and otherwise, NEED NOT AND SHOULD NOT borrow capital at interest as the means of financing Government work and public enterprise. The Government should create, issue, and circulate all the currency and credit needed to satisfy the spending power of the Government and the buying power of the consumers. The privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of Government, but is the Government's greatest creative opportunity."

The truth of this has been admitted by the President of the American Bankers' Association, who in 1939 said: "There is no more direct way to capture control of a nation than through its credit system." Sir James Elder also is well aware of its truth, and it is because of the truth of it that he is fighting to RETAIN for the bankers the control over the Australian nation they have improperly obtained by establishing a private monopoly of the public credit.

It was because Abraham Lincoln had discovered the fraud of the money trick and had taken steps to release his people from financial bondage that he was "liquidated." His Government supplied them with purchasing-power without the aid of the private financial institutions and without requiring his people to pay heavy taxes to meet interest charges for counterfeiters and pretenders. This proved so successful for the nation, and so dis-

turbing for the counterfeiting usurers, that the London "Times" wrote about it editorially as follows:

"If that mischievous financial policy which had its origin in the North American Republic during the late war in that country should become indurated down to a fixture, then that Government will furnish its own money without cost. It will pay off its debt and be without a debt. It will have all the money necessary to carry on its commerce. It will become prosperous beyond precedent in the history of the civilised government of the world. That Government must be destroyed."

And it was destroyed! It is on public record that two years before the death of Lincoln a secret society for his assassination had been specially financed by certain wealthy persons.

The whole purpose of this Bankers' campaign is to prevent the Government from providing the people with money, because, as the American Bankers' Association wrote in 1887, "such a course would seriously affect our individual profits as bankers and lenders." And is it not the very essence of convenience that the Governor of the Bank of England is also on the board controlling the London "Times"?

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, 20th December, 1942.

(To be continued.)

THIS CENTRALISATION

AN M.H.R.'s SIGNIFICANT COMMENT

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—Although no sensible person expects anything from any of the Parties in the Federal Parliament, individual members make some sensible remarks from time to time. Although my own Federal representative does not see my point of view on the money question, I am pleased to say that, in my opinion, he is putting up some fight against the bankers' policy of centralisation. I recently wrote to him about the Statute of Westminster and the Constitution issue. The last few lines of his reply are very interesting:

"I certainly agree with you that unless a watchful eye is kept on political movements at home 'our way of life' might be lost in the tumult. I have frequently heard it said at Canberra that, with large numbers of the population on service and others at home extremely busy, now is the time to 'put things over.' However, you can rest assured that there are many others who are just as determined that things will not be 'put over' during this period, and I am one of them.—Sincerely, WILLIAM HUTCHINSON."

I urge every reader of the "New Times" to request his Federal representative to make a definite statement on his attitude towards the powerful moves to centralise Government.

—Yours, etc., ERIC D. BUTLER.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

Thus wrote Macaulay of William Pitt: "While his schemes were confounded, while his predictions were falsified, . . . while the expeditions which he had set forth at enormous expense were ending in rout . . . his authority over the House of Commons was constantly becoming more and more absolute. . . . If some great misfortune, a pitched battle lost by the Allies, the annexation of a new department to the French Republic . . . had spread dismay through the ranks of his majority, that dismay lasted only till he rose from the Treasury Bench, drew up his haughty head, stretched his arm with commanding gesture, and poured forth, in deep and sonorous tones, the lofty language of inextinguishable hope and inflexible resolution. Thus, through a long and calamitous period, every disaster that happened without the walls of Parliament was regularly followed by a triumph within them. At length he had no longer an Opposition to encounter. In the eventful year, 1799, the largest opposition that could be mustered against the Government was twenty-five."

(The largest number of votes cast against the present British Government is twenty-five!)

—"Reveille," R.S.L. Official Journal in N.S.W., Dec. 1, 1942

FABIANISATION OF THE QUAKERS?

(Condensed from the "Social Crediter," England.)

It is a well-known feature of (the Fabian centralisation which has now been proceeding for many years past that organisations which might be expected to be highly antipathetic and opposed to one another in policy 'get together,' 'sink their differences' and congratulate themselves and each other upon an increase in their rate of progress.

If a shrewd but disinterested bystander remarks upon the fact that the advancement which is apparent seems to have changed its direction, the common answer is, "Oh, no! That has always been ONE of the directions in which we were going!" The meaning may not always be put so clearly; but that IS the meaning.

Chesterton's objection (on purely sympathetic grounds, no doubt) to people who "progressed in all directions at once" is that if they get anywhere at all, they get everywhere at once, which is nowhere in particular. On the face of it, advance in a direction which happens to be one of the chosen directions of someone else is liable to lose any element of choice as the process goes on. The question of priority is not attended to; assuming that everyone gets somewhere they all wanted to get (which is a very large assumption indeed) it certainly is not where each most wanted to get.

William Penn was a great apostle of peace, despite the fact that the only authentic portrait of him in existence represents him as a young man accoutred as a soldier. As Social Crediters, we are quite interested in his cancellation of a Government debt due to his father (£16,000) by receiving instead a tract of land little less than the area of the whole of England, and still more interested in his demonstration that he was right, not wrong, judged by results, to treat the Indians of Pennsylvania as friends "and not as vermin to be extirpated," an attitude which seemed to his critics that of a madman. Penn, it is recorded, met the Indians, spoke kindly to them, promised to pay a fair price (perhaps it was the just price?) for whatever land he and his friends might occupy, and assured them of his good-will. If offences should unhappily arise, a jury of six Indians and six Englishmen should decide upon them. "The Indians met Penn in his own spirit. No oaths, seals, no official mummeries were used; the treaty was ratified on both sides with a yea, yea." Voltaire has remarked that it was the only one the world has ever known, never sworn to, and never broken.

It is not our intention to trace the fulfilment of this early promise or otherwise in the later history of Pennsylvania. A correspondent who approaches us on the subject does seem right in thinking that something—something, he suggests, not fully appreciated by the members of the older generation of the Society of Friends—has come over the order which is now discovering that more than one of its directions happen to be the same as more than one (or perhaps in this case it is

only one) of the directions of the Fabian Society. Whether that society has more than one direction is extremely doubtful! The curious point is that the Fabian Society, as everyone knows, is all for "official mummeries" and the eating up of everything into one vast official mummery. In 1907, it appears the Society of Friends went so far in dissociation from the Great Centralisation ramp as actually to set its ban on the receipt of money from the State in the form of school grants. This year, "although there had not been time for all the bodies concerned to give adequate consideration to the matter," . . . the Yearly Meeting "rightly decided" to withdraw the ban! It appears that earlier in the year there had been a meeting of younger teachers at Sibford, and some of them were willing to go further than the Yearly Meeting and ask for grants. "A State that gladly accepts the help of Quakers in the provision of allotments for unemployed might be glad also to pay over to a voluntary body, doing the work which the State would otherwise have to do itself [our emphasis: the preparation of school children in Russian history to the exclusion of some of our other allies, is, presumably, not specifically meant] the £30 or £40 per pupil per annum that represents the cost of the free secondary education for all that is surely coming as part of the brave new World."

Few people would suspect a Quaker origin for the following sentiments:—"Just as the whole of the development of a person from, say, minus six months to 20 years of age, ought to be entirely the concern of one department of the State—the Board of Education—with, of course, the ready co-operation of the Ministries of Health and Labour and the Treasury; even so, we need far more co-ordination. . . . The word elementary should go and primary education might well be uniform for all [A new Act of Uniformity?] without class distinction. . . . Salaries should be the same for all teachers." There is even a suggestion of new kinds of schools, and, rather abruptly, the single word "International" is introduced to describe this new kind. What is an "international" school? The quotations are from a letter to Friend Teachers, and is signed by Francis H. Knight.

One-Man Gas-Works Beats "Grid"

It is usual to think of the supply of gas for cooking, heating and lighting as the prerogative of large concerns or municipal undertakings, but Seascale—an English seaside village on the Cumberland coast (population about 550) can show what a more genuine form of private enterprise can accomplish.

The present Gas Company dates from 1929, when the previous suppliers went out of business, but although this failure made the proposition unattractive, the inhabitants of the village did not allow the property to become derelict and, acting on the advice of the incumbent of the parish, certain of them formed a private company and took over the plant and property as a going concern.

The company consists exclusively of village residents, whose business supplies gas to about 150 premises; houses, boarding houses and shops. The nominal capital is £2000, of which £1200 has been called up. No individual may hold shares of more than £100, but many of the householders own small amounts from £5 upwards, all shares being held within the village. The Board of Directors, of whom the parish clergyman is chairman and managing director, draw no fees. The policy of the company is to sell gas of good quality to all who require it: to provide replacements and improvements to the plant; and to pay dividends. Since 1929 nearly the whole of the plant has been renewed, the buildings renovated, and a dividend of 5 per cent, has been maintained.

The staff consists of one man. This Working Manager runs the whole plant. He unloads the coal from the railway trucks; wheels it to the retort house; draws and charges the retorts once or twice a day; sees after the gas engine which operates the pumps; cleans the purifiers; clears the syphons and controls and operates the flow of gas at the correct pressure. He carries out extensions to service pipes and repairs to mains and internal services throughout the village, and fits new stoves as may be required. He also collects accounts and clears slot meters. In his spare time he cultivates his garden on land outside the retort house, and at any time of the day may be seen swimming, fishing, or paddling his canoe on the fringes of the Irish Sea. Within limits only defined by the requirements of his job he is free to come and go as he will.

The centralised Electric "Grid" system supplies Seascale with current for all purposes. The Gas Company is not a serious competitor as regards lighting. For heating and cooking the charge for electric current for this purpose is 1½d. per unit, which equals 3411 British Thermal Units; whereas the price of gas is 8½d. per 1000 cubic feet (calorific value 500), i.e., 1½d. per 100,000 B.Th.U. (therm). Reducing these figures to a common denominator, it will be seen that the Grid supplies 2274 and the Gas Company 5000 B.Th.U. per penny. That is to say, for the same money the Gas Company supplies in terms of heat units, more than twice as much as the "Grid."

Comparison with other Gas Companies is complicated by the absence of plant whereby by-products are extracted to the maximum permissible within Board of Trade standards, and Seascale thus lacks revenue accessible to larger gas producers; but comparison of results is possible.

The considerations advanced to induce the concentration of industry are based on efficiency—overheads will be massed and staffs cut down: large-scale buying will reduce the cost of materials: the operation of large-scale plant is less costly per unit of product: so it is said—but efficiency means nothing unless it appears in the net results experienced by the consumer and the shareholder. Seascale sells about 3½ million cubic feet of gas a year contrasted to the 50¼ thousand million supplied by the London Gas Light and Coke Company.* In so far as efficiency is related to size there should be some sort of relationship between the amount and the price of the product sold. Advantages gained by increase in size should be reflected in decrease of price; it might be assumed, for example, that for every additional 10 million cubic feet of gas sold prices should decrease by 1 per cent., which in the household quoted would mean a reduction of one halfpenny in the weekly account. On this modest assumption the price to the London householder should be 50 times less than at Seascale, and his weekly bill less than a penny,

SIR JOHN ORR-THEN AND NOW

A letter in the London "Times" from Sir John Boyd Orr, M.D., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S., raises the whole question of the relative position of the expert and citizens demanding results. If the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, nowhere is it more necessary than in this relationship. We need, in addition to a constant preoccupation with the nature of grapes, shrewd and tenacious memories to check results so far delivered.

On September 23, 1937, Sir John Orr broadcast on the subject of "Scotland and the New Age of Plenty." This speech was published in "The Fig Tree" in December, 1937, by permission of Sir John and the B.B.C. These were some of the statements made:—

"If we think in terms, not of money, but of things we use and consume—food, clothing, housing and even luxuries—the modern world is almost inconceivably wealthy, because we have the power to produce these in abundance for the needs of everybody. . . .

"Our material wealth is so great that our economic system, which was devised to suit the past age of scarcity, cannot distribute it quickly enough; and to safeguard the present economic system and the vested interests which it represents, we have actually devised schemes to limit production, as, for example, our quota schemes for rubber and other commodities. These schemes adjust output, not to the needs of the community, but to the purchasing power of the community. They are intended to prevent the glutting of the markets with goods which cannot be sold at a profit. We have even devised schemes to control and limit the production and sale of food.

"These must be only temporary measures. . . .

"We can now try to imagine what the new age of plenty will be like. Every family, even the poorest, will have an abundance of good food, plenty of clothes and a good house. . . . This is a Scottish broadcast. . . .

"We cannot blame our politicians. In a democratic country the politicians give us what we ask for. If there is any blame, we must blame ourselves for our lack of national spirit. When we make up our minds to build a new and better Scotland, nothing will stop us."

On September 29, 1942, Sir John Orr had this letter in the "Times":—

"Some of your correspondents do not get to the root of the matter. The standard of food requirements necessary for health is already sufficiently well known for all practical purposes. It is also well known that the diet of about one-third of the population of this country, and a much larger proportion in most other countries, does not come up to this standard. The only nutrition council competent to deal with this vast question, which profoundly affects the whole social and economic structure, is the Cabinet itself.

"The first question to be decided is whether the Government is prepared to adopt a food policy which will make a diet adequate for health available for every one of his Majesty's subjects, not only in the United Kingdom, but in all parts of the Empire. This would be a revolutionary policy and its application would raise very wide issues. Before the war the total food output of the Empire fell short of what was required to bring the diet of the whole population up to the standard. Where is the additional food to come from? In this country, to what extent shall we expand and modify British agriculture and to what extent import food in exchange for exports? Then social surveys have shown that a diet adequate for health is beyond the purchasing-power of many families. How can we make an adequate diet available? Shall we subsidise the basal foods, or shall we increase the lowest income by raising wages and increasing the dole, old-age pensions, and poor relief? Shall we adopt family allowances to assist large families? If, as you suggested in your leading article of September 14, such a policy should be applied throughout the world, what international organisation we should set up to carry it through, and how will it be

whereas in point of fact prices are much the same.

The advantages claimed for the concentration of industry have not materially reduced the price of this product to consumers. Nor has this imagined benefit accrued to the shareholders, for in both cases cited the dividends are around 5 per cent. With all its £45,000,000 capital and revenue derived from by-products, the most that can be said is that the London Gas Light and Coke Company have maintained approximately the same standards in net results to consumer and shareholder) as Seascale. In so far as electric power competes with gas for cooking and heating so much cannot be said for the "Grid."

Who benefits from such centralisation of industry? Neither the public as consumer, or shareholder, nor yet the employee, for all such concentration is destructive of initiative and the possibilities of individual development.

*The London Gas Light and Coke Company is quoted as a convenient comparison, but the argument will apply to any large concern. The figures are those for 1937.

financed? The suggestion that these political, economic, and financial problems should be dealt with by a committee of the M.R.C., or any other body of scientists, shows a lack of appreciation of the nature, the magnitude, and the complexity of the problem.

"If the Government did decide to adopt a food policy based on human needs, then there would be a need for a council to consider and advise on the measures to carry it through. The council should be composed of men who have wide experience and knowledge, and who have sufficient enthusiasm not to be daunted by the very great difficulties which would be encountered."

The correct approach of any citizen to this letter is:—

"What business is this of mine? Clearly the statement, 'Before the war the total food output of the Empire fell short of what was required' is very much my business, and if it is correct demands an explanation which either Sir John does not know or does not think fit to give. Is it to be found in his broadcast speech? The remaining queries in the letter are the business of the experts after they have received their orders, with the proviso that I have already experienced the results that accrue from increasing poor-law relief, under which heading doles, old-age pensions and family allowances may be included; and with inter-nationalism I will have nothing to do until 'those interests which individuals have in common can be made effective in action.' ("Economic Democracy," Chapter XI.)

No explanation is here suggested for what appears to be a re-orientation of the philosophical outlook of one of our most eminent doctors, but if, any means exist whereby he may be required to give an explanation to those members of the public before whom his views are placed, they should be used.

—B. M. Palmer in the "Social Crediter" (Eng.).

SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS AND THE WAR

Sir Stafford Cripps, October 14, 1935:—

"If war comes, as come it may, that war has to be used for the destruction of capitalism. It will have to be used for the workers in this country to undermine the whole system."

Sir Stafford Cripps, July 16, 1942:—

"The war is a stage in the efforts of the peoples of the world to readjust themselves to new economic and social conditions, and, in that sense, it must be revolutionary in its effects on our civilisation." —Quoted by "Reynolds News."

NEW PAMPHLET

What is Democracy? What is Totalitarianism? What is Communism? What is Socialism? What is National Socialism? What is Fascism? What is the choice before us?

All these questions are answered, briefly and clearly, but in a fundamental way, in the excellent pamphlet, "DEMOCRACY AND THE ISMS," the substance of which appeared in the "New Times" of November 6. Copies are now available from The United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C. I. Price: One shilling per dozen (postage 1½d.).

Every democrat should get at least a dozen copies, and circulate them as widely as possible. ORDER NOW.

BOOKS TO READ

(Obtainable from the United Electors of Australia, Room 8 5th Floor, McEwan House, Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C. I.)

"Federal Union Exposed": A book you MUST have By Barclay-Smith. Price, 1/.

"Banks and Facts": How to Finance the War for an All-in War Effort. By Bruce H. Brown. Price, 6d. each.

"Money": What it is and how the Money System Works. By S. F. Allen. Price, 1/.

"Story of the Commonwealth Bank": The Story of the People's Bank and How it Could and Should be Used. By D. J. Amos. Price, 1/ each.

"Victory Without Debt": Showing that Victory can be Won Without Creating a Huge Burden of Debt to be Paid Off After the War. By Barclay-Smith. Price, 1/ each.

"Answer to Tax Slavery": Explains the Taxation Racket, and shows WHY we Really Pay Taxes. By Barclay-Smith. Price, 1/.

HOLLINS ON C'WEALTH POWERS BILL

During the debate on the Commonwealth Powers Bill in the Victorian Legislative Assembly on December 16 considerable opposition was apparent. Members criticised from various angles this move to further centralise administrative power at Canberra without the consent of the electors. The most pertinent comment came from the Member for Hawthorn (Mr. L. H. Hollins), who said, inter alia:—

I oppose the Bill. . . . In my speech to the joint meeting of the Houses a few weeks ago I emphasized the fact that the Commonwealth Parliament already has powers to cope with every post-war problem.

It has been rightly said that "Government is finance and finance is government." Section 51 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act provides—

"The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to-----" and a number of sub-sections are set out.

I wish to refer to sub-section (12), which relates to—"currency, coinage, and legal tender," and to sub-section (13), which deals with—"banking, other than State banking, also State banking extending beyond the limits of the State concerned, the incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money." I believe that if any amendment is necessary, sub-section (12) should be amended to read—"currency, coinage, legal tender, AND FINANCIAL CREDIT."

In my opinion, sub-section (13) gives the Federal Parliament all the power it needs over finance. If the amendment I suggest were made it would be violently opposed by financial interests, and because the great bulk of the people in the Commonwealth do not understand finance, they would, because of the barrage of criticism that would be levelled against the amendment by the press, vote against any Government that attempted to introduce it. Thus, the Federal Government is placed in a most invidious position, and is compelled to bolster up a system which has failed miserably; a system which has plunged the world into war time after time.

If I am to judge from the statements made not only by Dr. Evatt, but also by many other leading members of the Federal Government, they are fully aware of the truth of what I am saying. As a matter of fact, only a fortnight ago Dr. Evatt made a speech in Sydney in which he emphasised that he recognised the power of finance, and the great difficulties with which the Federal Government is faced.

. . . . I contend that the Federal Government, while aware of the powers it possesses, is not willing to implement them because of the repercussions which would necessarily follow. This, principle was emphasised almost 100 years ago, when the late William Gladstone said—

"From the time I took office as Chancellor, I began to learn that the Government itself was not to be a substantive power in matters of finance, but was to leave the money power supreme and unquestioned."

No member would challenge my claims that finance is a prerogative of the Crown. . . . But the power of finance is the power of government, and if the Federal Government is not prepared to use its powers now, it will not be justified in having powers to prop up a system which is wrong. But that is why it is asking for the powers enumerated in this Bill. The great bulk of money used to-day is in the form of financial credit created by private banks, and, as a result, this Constitution, which makes no reference whatever to financial credit, enables these banks, operating within the law, to create financial credit, which serves all the purposes of money. Sub-section (13) of section 51 gives the Commonwealth Government power, I believe, to prevent that state of affairs. It may be said that the private banks are not able to create money, but I would refer to an eminent authority on that point, the Right Honourable Reginald McKenna, Chairman of the Midland Bank, England, and ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, who stated in his book, "Post-war Banking Policy"—"The amount of money in existence varies only with the action of the banks in increasing or diminishing deposits. We know how this is effected. Every bank loan and every bank purchase of securities creates a deposit, and every repayment of a bank loan and every bank sale destroys one."

Because this community prefers to use financial credit in the form of cheque money, financial power has come into the hands of the greatest private monopoly the world has ever known—it has the powers of Government and the power to dominate Governments. This Bill is an attempt to obtain sufficient powers to bolster up that system without striking at the root of the trouble, and that is why I am opposed to the measure. Professor Soddy, one of England's leading scientists, and a great economist, made the following comment on the cheque system—

"The cheque system, itself beneficent, has enabled the banks continuously to create and destroy money, at will. It is the power of the private mint which imperils the future of scientific civilisation, which makes politics a sorry farce, and reduces Parliament to a sham."

There can be no question about the Commonwealth Government or the Commonwealth Bank of Australia having power to create the necessary money. Every problem that will confront Australia in the post-war era will be primarily related to finance. In the report of the Royal Commission

on Banking in 1936 at page 196 section 504, this statement was made:—

"Because of this power, too, the Commonwealth Bank can lend to Governments or to others in a variety of ways. It can also make money available to Governments or to others free of any charge."

That is a statement that completely substantiates my claim that the Federal Government has all the powers it requires, and there is no justification for surrendering certain State powers to it. Paragraph (a) of Clause 2 of the Bill provides for the reinstatement and advancement of those who have been members of the fighting services of the Commonwealth during the war, and the advancement of dependents of those members who have died, or have been disabled as a consequence of the war. Quite frankly, I cannot think of one single problem that we shall have to confront after the war, or one single difficulty that will be encountered in achieving the end outlined in paragraph (a) of clause 2, that cannot be overcome with finance. It may be suggested that we need huge housing schemes inaugurated in the Commonwealth, but I suggest that we, in Victoria, are better able to decide what kind of houses we want to build in this State than, say, the representatives of Queensland, Western Australia, or any other State. We know the local conditions, and I believe that in any scheme of housing, of public works, or of irrigation, or with any of the other undertakings confronting the States, the details should be considered by the State concerned, and the finance should be made available by the Commonwealth, as that Government can make it available under the Constitution at the present time.

We do not want to be regimented. We do not want to be told that we must have a standard type of house throughout Australia. We want individual freedom, in security, to choose or refuse anything. We should be free as individuals to choose the kind of homes we want, and the kind of work to undertake, and I believe that those things can be achieved when finance is made available. I do not think for a moment that the States would oppose such a plan. It has been suggested that the Commonwealth Government might make the money available only under certain conditions that would not be acceptable to the States. To my mind that is unreasonable. If the Commonwealth Parliament is prepared to make the money available for housing schemes, for irrigation, or for any other purpose, it is perfectly safe to leave the undertakings in the hands of the State Parliaments to decide how the programme shall be implemented in accordance with the wishes of the people of the State.

I could deal with every single problem outlined in the Bill, but I cannot find one of them that cannot be solved by finance. Finance is government, and government is finance. Unless we are prepared to face this issue I am not prepared to give the Commonwealth Government power to do something that is wrong. To prop up the structure with rotten props will cause greater difficulties later on. Let us face the issue intelligently and recognise that in the Commonwealth Constitution, as it exists to-day, there is all the power necessary for post-war reconstruction of a standard that we hope and believe is possible in Australia.

U.E.A. MESSAGE

Fateful 1942 has now passed, and doubtless supporters will be asking, "What will 1943 bring forth?" The answer is, "It's up to YOU—it is you who must make things happen." During the past year large quantities of literature has been distributed in fruitful channels. This educative work has been accompanied by continuous pressure on political representatives, thus keeping them aware of the fact that watchful eyes are on them. In connection with unwanted food-marketing boards, as you know, some success has been obtained. Headquarters strongly urge you to obtain more "Letter-Forms" and maintain this pressure; also to keep up the distribution of educative literature, ample supplies of which are available. Along with other sundry amounts we wish to gratefully acknowledge the anonymous donations of £2 and £1, forwarded a few weeks ago. In wishing all campaigners the best that can be made of 1943 Headquarters urge YOU to go to it and to keep at it, until victory is won.

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

APATHETIC NATIVES

All three "American" parties have declared their "determination to combat racial bias and discrimination," and, in the State of New York, all three nominated a Jew as candidate for the Attorney-Generalship. "It seems that the leaders have taken particular pains to secure a Jewish nominee," says the "Jewish Chronicle." The Natives are quiet and have shown less interest than might be expected.

—"Social Crediter," Oct. 10.

Notes on the News

(Continued from page 2)

Curtin that "existing control measures should be continued after the war—to prevent people from engaging in a buying rush." That should please the merchandising sections! Further, they say that these controls will be necessary for some years after the war to prevent inflation. Irrespective of party labels, in the past, the Bankers have imposed their policy of false "scarcity economics," and unless the people take a hand and throw out the party hacks the bankers will continue to dominate our lives.

FIREWORKS: Following strong criticism of the Allied Works Council at a Clerks' Union meeting, four clerks in that Department moved resolutions calling for an enquiry into certain charges, and the Clerks' Union is investigating an alleged request by A.W.C. officials to the staff asking them to dissociate themselves from a newspaper article relating to charges against the A.W.C. A memo attached to the request is said to have directed section leaders to see that the declaration was signed, and to note the names of those who refused to sign. It certainly sounds like a fishy situation and one that would not have arisen had A.W.C. works been left to private enterprise, as they should have been.

CURRENCY CAPERS: Mr. Chifley (Fed. Treasurer) reports that because the Royal Mint is unable to meet the demand for silver coins, the U.S. Treasury is producing them for us, and that our copper coins are being produced in India. He also stated that the average coin costs about half its face-value to produce, and that profit on the year's coinage will greatly exceed £1,000,000. But when we come to our £1 notes, which cost 2d. per dozen, with no extra charge for additional noughts, you will see that a one million pound note would be almost costless—whilst a banker's cheque for, say, £10 millions, would cost even less. This should encourage everyone to enquire why we are ever short of money, and what was wrong with our money-factories during the "depression" period.

"CHANGE OF HEART": Senator Cameron is reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of December 18 as denouncing conscription thus: "In 1916 John Curtin said: 'I am a young man. I am single. I am eligible. I call upon the Labor move-

ment to protect me and men who think like me. I ask it to fight against conscription.' This 'change of heart' of these conscription advocates recalls Mr. Menzies' famous explanation as to why he thought it better to let the 'other fellow' fight the last war: 'I had very special reasons for not joining up.' Well, so had Mr. Curtin—and both had every right to decide such an issue for themselves. But, why are they denying that right to others to-day?"

POPE SPEAKS: The last murky chapter of 1942 was brightened by the Pope's denunciation of the evils of socialism, which he described as "the State regarding the people as hers." Continuing, he said: "The Catholic Church has always condemned Marxist socialism, and to-day reaffirmed that condemnation." Socialism (centralisation) is undoubtedly the real enemy of British democratic principles; therefore, irrespective of denomination, this reminder should inspire all true democrats in the fight against State tyranny.

—O.B.H.

LAWYERS' ARTIFICES

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—It is doubtful whether the careful philosophical research which Jeremy Bentham undertook regarding the precise use of words, especially in the legal framework, has been sufficiently understood. People in the Australian States may be well advised to reject any move for the recasting of the Federal relationships until time and care can be given to look deeply into the reasons why the more we multiply Acts of Parliament, the less is justice found to prevail.

Jeremy Bentham wrote: "Behold, here one of the artifices of lawyers. They refuse to administer justice to you unless you join with them in their fictions; and then their cry is, see how necessary fiction is to justice. But how came it so, and who made it so? As well might the father of a family make it a rule never to let his children have their breakfast until they had uttered each of them a certain number of lies, curses and profane oaths; and then exclaim, 'You see, my children, how necessary lying, cursing and swearing are to human sustenance.'"

—Yours, etc., C. H. ALLEN, Ashleigh-grove, Millswood, S.A.

Clash in House of Commons Over Social Credit

The following passage is taken from column 1586 of the Official Report of House of Commons Debates (British "Hansard") for October 13, when the question of the Bank of International Settlements was raised on the Adjournment; and the comments in brackets are those of the "Social Crediter," official organ of the S.C. Secretariat:—

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson: ". . . The second point is the question of whether the Bank for International Settlements is likely to be a useful instrument in post-war time. Certainly, even with the most uninformed mind, one would think it is likely to be, but it is rather a technical matter, and I should think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would, naturally, be guided by expert opinion thereon. I should imagine he would naturally consult the Governor of the Bank of England, and possibly people in the Treasury like Lord Keynes and Lord Catto, who really do know something about this subject. I hear some signs of dissent, and I have no doubt, for instance, that the hon. Member for Lowestoft (Mr. Loftus) would desire the Chancellor to consult his Grace the Duke of Bedford and Major Douglas."

[NOTE: Quite apart from Mr. Hely-Hutchinson's confusion of national policy, which is not at present the subject of expert ascertainment, let alone expression, with banking technique, concerning which judgment of Mr. Montagu Norman's expertness can only be assessed with full knowledge of the policy he has been trying to pursue, it is clearly his intention to associate the Duke of Bedford with Major Douglas. Economics is by no means a subject of restricted scope, and it is quite possible that Mr. Hely-Hutchinson knows some of the facts of economics, and may even understand their meaning. The same might be said of almost anybody—for example, the Duke of Bedford. But knowledge of some of the facts of economics, even when accompanied by a correct apprehension of their meaning, does not constitute an understanding of Social Credit, and there is nothing that we know in the published statements of the Duke of Bedford that would justify attachment of the label Social Crediter to him. Upon other matters the Duke of Bedford is known to hold highly unpopular opinions and Major Douglas highly popular opinions which find increasing expression even in the House of Commons.]

Mr. Loftus: "Can the hon. Member quote any speech or any statement I have ever made in my life advocating the policy of Social Credit? I challenge him to do so. I challenge him also to withdraw his statement if he is not able to give the quotation."

[NOTE: Mr. Loftus's candour might suitably set an example both inside and outside the House of Commons. That Mr. Loftus has never advocated the policy of Social Credit may open the minds of "friends" we could do better without to the now acknowledged and highly dangerous possibility of making monetary reform the tool of totalitarianism in one of its forms—New Deal, National-Socialist, International-Socialist, or

some other to which no permanent label has yet been affixed, already prepared, and possibly well-known to the denizens of the political underworld.]

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson: "I have in mind a number of cases where the hon. Member has advocated the doctrines which are set forth by a body called the Economic Reform Club, which, I think, is largely associated in most people's minds with the principle of Social Credit."

[NOTE: The association is, in all significant respects, a false association. On this point nothing is more conclusive than the studious disregard in every quarter even remotely connected with the argumentative body named to the plain indication of Douglas: "I am satisfied that further argument upon technical matters will achieve little or nothing, and certainly not in the time available, and that the only hope of civilisation lies in forcing a new policy upon those who have control of the national activities, of whom the bankers and financiers are by far the most important. We do not want Parliament to pass laws resembling treatises on economics. What we want is for Parliament to pass a minimum of laws designed to penalise the heads of any great industry, and banking and finance in particular, if they do not produce the results desired."]

Mr. Loftus: "The Economic Reform Club advocates no specific remedy of any kind, and its lists of vice-presidents and supporters include all classes of economists. I again ask the hon. Member to substantiate his charge or to do the usual thing and withdraw it."

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson: "I think that matter will have to settle itself by reference to the Official Report . . ."

Later in the debate Mr. Loftus said: "The hon. Member accused me of being an advocate of the solution known as the Douglas Social Credit system. In my first speech in the House I made it clear that I did not advocate that solution, and since then I have made that clear in speech after speech. Then I challenged the hon. Member to withdraw or substantiate his charge. He attempted to do so. How? He said I was vice-president of the Economic Reform Club, which advocated the Douglas Social Credit system. I share the vice-presidency of the Economic Reform Club with distinguished Members of the Upper House—Lord Northbourne, Lord Sempill—and also with Lady Snowden, and others. The constitution of that club specifically lays down that it does not advocate any particular solution."