

FRUSTRATION OF MOTOR FUEL PRODUCTION.

(Page 2.)

ARE WE SERIOUS RECONSTRUCTION?

ABERHART REPLIES TO CRITICS. (Page 3.)

MODERN WOMAN AND HER 40 SLAVES. (Page 4.)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 9. No. 20. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1943

Work -For- All" OR 'Dividends -For-All'?"

This Post-War Reconstruction

By ERIC D BUTLER

"I AM COME THAT THEY MIGHT HAVE LIFE, AND THAT THEY MIGHT HAVE IT MORE ABUNDANTLY." (JOHN 10, 10.)

It is a remarkable thing that none of the great teachers, such as Christ, ever stated that they came that the people might have more work, more hardship, and wore "austerity." Christ, in whose memory the annual festive season is celebrated, stated quite definitely that He came in order that we might have life MORE ABUNDANTLY.

The "great leaders" are now telling us that they are determined that we must ALL get back to WORK after the war. These "great leaders," including Dr. Evatt and several others, are quite convinced that THEY know what is "good" for US. Christ also spoke about leadership—real leadership: "He that would be the greatest among ye must be the servant of them all." I wish some of our "great leaders" would imbibe that philosophy!

Now, frankly, do we all want to be "put to work" by the Government after the war, possibly in putting up great factories all over the beautiful countryside? Even thirty years ago there were sufficient producing units in existence, if allowed to work at full capacity, to supply us with a reasonable standard of living without drudgery for long hours. For thousands of years scientists and inventors have been trying to relieve man from the drudgery of devoting most of his time to food, clothing and shelter production, in order that he could really LIVE. James Watt's great work in 1765 tapped solar energy and made the world of leisure a practical possibility. But the cry continued: "We must provide work. It is good for you." Hitler led the world in the mad race to provide work—and war.

Apart from tapping solar energy, other important factors, such as what is termed the increment of association have provided the foundation for economic freedom. Although many examples could be given, the following extract from Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" will serve to illustrate my point:—

"To take an example, therefore, from a very trifling manufacture, but one in which the division of labour has been very often taken notice of, the trade of a pin maker, a workman not educated to this business (which the division of labour

has rendered a distinct trade), nor acquainted with the use of machinery employed in it (to the invention of which the same division of labour has probably given occasion) could scarce, perhaps, with his utmost industry, make one pin in one day, and certainly could not make twenty. But in the way in which this business is now carried on, not only the whole work is a peculiar trade, but it is divided into a number of branches, of which the greater part are likewise peculiar trades. One man draws out the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving the head; to make the head requires two or three distinct operations, to put it on is a peculiar business, to whiten the pins is another, it is even a trade in itself to put them in the paper; and the important business of making a pin is, in this manner divided into about 18 distinct operations which in some manufactories are all performed by different hands, though in others the same man will sometimes perform two or three of them. I have seen a small manufactory of this kind, where ten men only were employed, and where some of them consequently performed two or three distinct operations. But though they were poor, and therefore indifferently accommodated with the necessary machinery, they could, when they exerted themselves, make among them about twelve-

THE ELECTIONS, THE ELECTORS AND THE ELECTED

In the approaching Victorian State elections, the electors of Coburg, for example, are to be given the choice of electing a representative from at least three candidates: Mr. C. Mutton, M.L.A., the present representative, who is seeking re-election as an independent Labour candidate; Mr. Satchell who is contesting the seat as the official Labour Party selected candidate, and Mr. McDonald, who is standing as an Independent. Whom will the electors choose?

Some will vote for the selected candidate, quite content to delegate their thinking and choice to some Executive, the members of which are not even known to the great majority of those who vote on Party lines. These electors vote for the PARTY, not for the candidate who is supposed to represent them. Of course, he may be quite a good man, but however good he may be, the fact remains that he cannot represent the electors as a whole: for his first allegiance is to his Party, and if he refuses to obey THEIR instructions, he is expelled, just as Mr. Mutton and those who supported him were expelled.

Many others will support the independent candidates because they are sick and tired of the Party System, and believing that, by putting a "good man" into Parliament all their troubles will be over and that they need not bother any further once he is elected. Unfortunately, it does not work out that way. A good Independent is powerless unless he has the support of those who elect him, for it has been truly said that all things yield to pressure, and when the ONLY pressure on the member is exerted by vested interests, such as High Finance, Liquor Interests, etc., he must yield to it or be politically broken.

It is very nice and comfortable to know that the Representative is prepared to meet his electors every now and then to give an account of his stewardship and to take instructions from them, but experience has shown that whilst the Member is prepared to do his part, the electors, BECAUSE they have a "good" Member in Parliament, DO NOT THINK IT NECESSARY to attend these meetings or even to write and tell him of their wishes and opinions, and so he is forced, to do what he thinks is good for them, until, uncertain of the support

his electors would give him if he made a real stand, he gives way to anti-social sectional interests, who will use him to suit their own ends—and so another honest Joe or John comes on the scene, from whom the electors will take more anti-social repressive legislation, higher taxes on lower incomes, regimentation and even conscription, than they ever would from A REPRESENTATIVE WHOM THEY DID NOT TRUST. In other words, a "GOOD" representative is left to guess what his electors want, and in order to retain his seat in Parliament must sooner or later fall a victim to adverse pressure. The "good" member acts as a sleeping-draught to the electors between elections.

The problem, then, is, who to vote for? The policy speeches are drawn up carefully and attractively, promising this and that, with very little, if any, fundamental difference between them, all of them an advertising medium culminating in "VOTE THUS" cards. "Get elected, by hook or by crook," seems to be the slogan of most, and the majority of electors fall for it.

When will electors realise that the emotional upsurge of elections is cultivated in order to gull them into thinking that to get "your" man in ONCE IN THREE YEARS is all that matters? Electors will continue being gulled until they adopt the attitude of the employer—which, of course, they are—select the man they think will suit them, and say to him: "We have given you a good, well-paid job; never mind your promises, get to work, show us what you can DO, and we will judge you by the results."

Democracy in action is Government by public veto (negative action), trial and error: "You go and DO something, and we will tell you if we don't like it."

—F.C. PAICE.

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)

pounds of pins a day. There are in a pound upwards of 4000 pins of middling size. These ten persons therefore making a tenth part of 48,000th this might be considered as making 4800 pins in a day; that is certainly, not the 240th, perhaps not one 4800th part of what they are at present capable of performing, in consequence of a proper division and combination of their different operations."

And production methods have been revolutionised since Adam Smith wrote the above lines!

In addition to the division of labour in industry, the rapid elimination of human toil by automatic machinery has created an entirely new situation. Another outstanding aspect of the modern co-operative production system is that the production of the individual is in itself of decreasing use to him. A man who works a small farm could live—primitively, no doubt—by consuming his own production. But a highly-trained mechanic, producing some small, piece of machinery, can only live by putting his product into the common stock and drawing from that common stock a portion of the diversified combined production. The importance of this matter cannot be over-emphasised. It demonstrates that money can no longer be regarded simply as a medium of exchange; it is a "ticket system" for distributing goods from the common pool of production.

We now come to this question: "To what extent are individual members of a community entitled to draw from the common pool of production?" This question can be best answered by asking: "To whom, in equity, belongs the difference between the productive capacity of the people of today and that of the people of 5000 years ago?" It belongs to ALL the people. They are all entitled to share, whether they are required in production or not.

We can now summarise our facts:—

- (1) The modern productive system, with an ever-decreasing number of people

working reasonable hours can supply everyone with goods and services in abundance.

The main factors contributing to this abundance are the division of labour and power production by machinery. We will call this factor Science, the knowledge of how to do things, passed down, with additions, from generation to generation.

(3) Science belongs to everyone. Therefore the results of science, in our pool of production belong to everyone.

(4) Money is the only scientific medium of distributing the pool of production to the people.

It is obvious, therefore, that the only major problem confronting our Federal Government is to ensure that sufficient money "tickets" are distributed, unconditionally, to the people to enable them to draw from the combined production pool. Can Dr. Evatt truthfully say that there is any necessity to alter the Constitution, to "get people back to work," or for "the State" to control industry in order to do this? No. The Labour Party leaders, as they are never tired of telling us, speak as the representatives of labour. Well, the more labour there is, the more they represent! It is perhaps natural that they should urge employment as the chief interest of man because, as the representatives of the employed, their importance is thereby enhanced! Major Douglas has commented on this: "Now it is fair to say that our Labour leaders are, although they may not consciously know it; amongst the most valuable assets of the financial control of industry—are, in fact, almost indispensable to that control . . ." When we realise that we don't want more work, and that we want monetary dividends as our right, we will start to dispense with our Labour leaders, because there will be less and less labour for them to lead.

We will all be too busy enjoying the more abundant life.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Another alarming illustration of the danger and inefficiency of socialistic bureaucrats is found in the dumping of 1,500,000 eggs owing to deterioration due to prolonged storage. This criminal bungling rivals that of other "food-control" Boards, and it should surely arouse the fury of an over-patient public that these bunglers continue to attack the basis of our war effort by jeopardising the nation's food supply. The only way to prevent this sabotage is for electors to get busy immediately and write personal letters to their respective representatives in State and Federal Parliament demanding the abolition of these "food control" Boards.

WARD'S WILES: Evidence of the methods of Party hacks is to be found in the press report of Mr. E. J. Ward's statement that, "If the Labor Party were returned to power at the next election it would have to make the Commonwealth Bank a Government-controlled Bank." Since taking office the Labor Party has had ample power, under the Constitution and the National Security Act, to obtain all its war-finance from that source. But they have refused to do so, and thus relieve the people of the ever-increasing burden of interest that is reflected in taxation. Mr. Ward himself may be anxious to do so, but he is not the whole Labor junta; therefore it seems obvious that he is only throwing out another sop for the Party.

COMMUNISTS' CAPERS: The President of the Queensland Industrial Court, Sir William Webb, who is evidently aware of the local Communists' industrial strategy, is reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of May 12 thus: "The present dispute was deliberately organised, and it is apparent that the Communist Party is behind it—even as it is behind the C.C.C. dispute." Continuing, he said: "The Communist Party speaks with two voices—one which appears to be aiding the war, and the other, working in the dark to disrupt industry." That correct summary should interest those well-intentioned dupes who allow themselves to be used by a handful of noisy Red Fascists.

CLOTHING COUPONS: London press reports state that "Britain's clothes coupon system may continue after the war," and that experts (planners) are already drawing up plans for the wool-clothing trade (not for the British people), which aim, "firstly, to supply formerly occupied countries with clothes, and, secondly, to develop the export trade (not the home market), and the nation's trade balance." So the British people, in addition to the war sacrifice, are expected to continue to carry the burden for the benefit of other countries and the export-trade mania. Won't the British soldiers be pleased?

PRODUCTION PLANNERS: Another example of the mental attitude behind the world planners' blue-print of food-produc-

tion control is found in the stated objective of the "United Nations' Food Conference." It is intended to determine production possibilities, with emphasis on decreasing (restricting) so-called surplus crops. Presumably this is in order to avoid the glaring past errors of the shovelling of thousands of tons of Brazilian coffee into the sea, ploughing under U.S. crops, killing of stock, and the burning of wheat. "Sabotage At The Source" seems to be their motto now. They never consider DISTRIBUTING the abundance.

RUSSIA'S RESISTANCE: The following items of U.S. aid to Russia help to explain what the National Socialist gangsters are up against: "Aircraft, 328,975; Tanks, 178,820; Motor Vehicles, 229,802; Water Craft, 27,888; Industrial Products, 46,134; Agricultural Products, 316,733; Ordnance, 280,891." Added to this, there is the much greater British aid to Russia. It is certainly an imposing contribution by the "capitalistic" countries, and one, which certainly should influence Stalin in the matter of permitting the use of Siberian, bases against Japan.

EVATT ECHOES: Mr. Abbott, M.H.R., criticising Dr. Evatt's mission to U.S., is reported thus in the Melbourne "Sun" of May 7: "The aid to come had already been arranged by the Kenny mission, and was known to the Commander-in-Chief; but Dr. Evatt at a later date would claim that he was instrumental in obtaining it." Apparently it has not dawned on simple-minded Mr. Abbott that "seeking U.S. aid" could be merely an alibi for the visit, as it might be extremely "difficult" to attribute the visit to the purpose of committing Australia to the principle of the world-government plot for Federal Union.

GOLD GOSSIP: The international bankers' plot to restore the gold standard advanced another step when, under the guise of an "exchange debate," Sir Kingsley Wood introduced it to the Commons. During the debate he said: "We would act foolishly if we attempted to separate international trading from gold." Then, as a sop to meet the expected opposition from the few who understand the dangers of the-gold standard, he said: "On the other hand, (Continued on page 4)

THE FRUSTRATION OF PRODUCTION OF MOTOR FUEL IN AUSTRALIA

(Continued from last issue.)

The Queensland Government Mining Journal for October, 1936, contains a report on Blair Athol Coal-field, by Mr. J. H. Reid, A.S.T.C., District Geologist, in which it is stated that the thickness of the big seam has been recorded as follows: "B.A. No. 2 colliery, 93 ft.; B.A. No. 3 colliery, 78 ft.; Newcastle main shaft, 73 ft.; Newcastle West shaft, 61 ft.; Bluff colliery, 40 ft. These sections are apparently all without any included stone bands.

"The actual reserves in this table are likely to be increased at the expense of the probable reserves when further shafts or bores are sunk to the floor of the big seam. The probable reserves include 33,750,000 tons, estimated on a probable increase in thickness of seam from 50 ft. to 65 ft. This is probable over the area of 1500 acres in which the actual reserves are calculated, when data becomes available as to the total thickness of the seam in additional areas."

BLAIR ATHOL COAL RESERVES

| Coal Seams | | Actual Reserves Calculation based on thickness and extent | | Probable Reserves Approx. Estimate | | Possible Reserves |
|------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| NAME | Thickness Ft. | Area Acres | Long Tons | Area Acres | Long Tons | |
| Top | 4 | 650 | 3,900,000 | 990 | 6,000,000 | Very Small Comparatively Small |
| Big | 50 | 1,500 | 112,500,000 | 850 | 84,000,000 | |

Sir Edgeworth David, in his explanatory notes to accompany a new geological map of the Commonwealth, estimates the coal reserves of Queensland at not less than 100,000,000,000 tons.

Mr. James (Hunter) stated in the Federal House on 23rd November, 1939: "The late Prime Minister (Mr. Lyons), in replying to a question which I asked in this House, said that the cost of erection of such a plant (hydrogenation from coal) would be £11,000,000. I refer honourable members to the report of the debate in the House of Commons on the 25th February 1936, at page 276. Mr. George Hall asked the Secretary for Mines if he could give the total cost of the works at Billingham up to date. In his reply, the Secretary for Mines, the Honourable Captain Crookshank, said:

"I am now able to give the following information with regard to the present position. Up to the present time a total of about 80,000 tons, or 24,000,000 gallons, has been obtained, of which approximately 36,000 tons were produced during the three months, October to December, 1935, or practically up to the full capacity of the plant as given in the earlier statement referred to."

"Multiplying that 36,000 tons by 4, we arrive at an annual output of 144,000 tons, or not less than 43,000,000 gallons. The Ministers reply continued:

"I have no information about the cost of the works beyond what was announced by the Company in October last, when the plant was officially opened. It was then stated that the new capital expenditure amounted to about £3,000,000."

"That is a very different figure from the £11,000,000 mentioned by the late Prime Minister.

"Statements have been made by responsible members in the British Parliament that practically the whole of the oil used by the Air Force and the Navy is extracted from coal and shale. Although, from time to time, I have placed before the House the fullest information in regard to the extraction of oil from coal and shale, my remarks seem to have cut no ice with the Government.

"Representations have been made to the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) on behalf of Phoenix Oil Extractors Limited, and the Minister for the Interior (Senator Foll), in company with other honourable members, has visited the plant established by that firm. The directors of the company claim that they can produce petrol from coal at the cost of 7d a gallon. The same claim is made by Imperial Chemical Industries Limited, in respect of their hydrogenation process. The Government says that these are not commercial propositions. I ask the Government: Is the building of a warship, a battle-plane, or any instrument of war a commercial proposition? What use would they have if there were no petrol to supply them with motor power? The Government has an obligation to do something definite to solve this problem, because if this war continues as long as the last one, and Australia is cut off from oil supplies, not only the present but also future generations of Australians will curse the inefficiency of the present administration."

MOTOR FUEL FROM SHALE

In "Labour's Plan for Oil from Coal," previously referred to, it is stated:

"Scottish shale has been an indigenous source of oil since 1860. In the early days of the industry, the yield of oil per ton of shale was about 40 gallons, but with the exhaustion of the best deposits, the yield has fallen, until today it is only about 22 gallons per ton of shale.

"In recent years there has been a marked change in the balance of refined products obtained from the crude oil. The increase from 1d to 8d a gallon in the tax on imported heavy oil used in road motor vehicles, which was enacted in 1935, gave a great impetus to the production of "Diesel" oil from shale, and this trend has since continued. The production of "Diesel" oil involves a diminution in the quantity of motor spirit made, but in balance it is advantageous to the industry. The amount of refined motor spirit produced from shale was 14½ million gallons in 1934; 10½

million gallons in 1935; and 6¼ million gallons in 1936."

In the Federal "Hansard" of 1939, page 2109, Mr. Holt stated: "Glen Davis is already a hive of industry. The mine has been driven into the side of the mountain a distance of over 4000 feet. The shale exposed is of excellent quality, yielding over 100 gallons of oil to the ton, from which about 60 gallons of petrol can be produced."

On page 2272, Senator Foll stated: "Mr. G. F. Davis, of National Oil Proprietary Ltd., is now investigating the possibilities of increasing production from 10,000,000 to 30,000,000 gallons of petrol per annum. There are large deposits of oil shale in Australia, particularly in New South Wales, the limits of which are not known. Geologists tell us that there is a big saucer of shale lying westward as far as Mudgee, northeasterly to Murrurundi, with other undefined limits. It might well be, therefore, that if Mr. Davis can successfully pro-

duce 30,000,000 gallons of petrol per annum, this production will be largely augmented from other sources. Under present known conditions petrol cannot be produced from shale as cheaply as from flow oil. It is estimated that its cost will be about twice that of the pre-war landed price of imported petrol, but it is conceivable that our technicians will be able to reduce this gap. Shale, however, has one very pronounced advantage over flow oil: that we are able to measure seams, analyse their content, and determine accurately what quantities of petrol we shall be able to obtain over a period of years, whereas supplies from oil wells are likely to diminish or become exhausted at any time."

On page 227, Senator Amour said: "I am very much concerned with what might happen to the workers engaged on this venture (Glen Davis). Who knows what influence might be brought to bear to destroy the enterprise? I am fearful of what might be done by the major oil companies."

Senator Cameron: "They have done considerable damage in America."

Senator Amour: "They have done much damage here. What happened in the Wolgan Valley when an endeavour to produce oil from shale was being made by Treganowan and Chambers? Those people were told by the major oil companies that unless operations at Wolgan Valley were discontinued, oil supplies would be cut off from the firm's enterprises in Victoria. The Minister in charge of Development could do nothing to assist them. I fear that similar pressure might be applied in the future in connection with this venture. It is a fact that when Mr. Fell was working at Newnes (now Glen Davis) he paid men to cut timber and stack it in the tunnels. He then set fire to it, and claimed to be waiting for the oil to flow out. Just imagine that! The real reason was that he wanted to destroy the shale; but did not succeed in doing that. To cover up his real activities, he claimed that he was waiting for the oil to flow out."

(To be continued.)

(The foregoing is reprinted from a booklet, by A. W. Noakes, entitled "The Frustration of Motor Fuel Production in Australia," which is obtainable from The Electoral Campaign of Queensland, 142 Adelaide Street, Brisbane. Price 6d, postage 1½d.)

THE "LAND FOR THE (Chosen) PEOPLE" RACKET

By C. H. DOUGLAS in the "Social Creditor" England (Continued from last issue.)

To say that an estate is managed by an Agent may mean, however, several fundamentally different systems. The resident Agent, or Factor, directly responsible to an owner WHO IS NOT SO MORTGAGED TO SOME FINANCIAL INSTITUTION THAT HE HAS NO FREEDOM OF ACTION, is one thing. Management by a Firm of Estate Agents acting for several owners is quite another, and begins to approximate to bureaucratic management—so much so, that in fact it is not infrequently a branch of the business of country solicitors.

Where, as in perhaps the majority of cases in Scotland, the so-called proprietor is hopelessly in debt to a bank or an insurance company, the Agent is in fact concerned neither with the interests of the land, the proprietor, nor the tenants, except in so far as they maintain the security behind the debts, and ensure the due collection of the interest. He is frequently resident in the bank itself. To apply the term "private ownership and management" to this state of affairs, is nonsense.

The essential point to grasp is, I think, this: The possession of legal title to land, and the drawing of rents from it is an entirely separate question from the merits or otherwise of the control and administration of land by genuine private ownership, which does not necessarily involve residence, but does imply knowledge and initiative.

In regard to the first, it is merely necessary to repeat that land does not either grow or exude money. It would be quite possible, and indeed is rapidly becoming an accomplished fact, that the legal title of the landowner is bought at bargain prices by camouflage bank credits so that the institutions are in a position to nominate the titular owners as well as to control the administration. In itself, this solves little or nothing—certainly not the question of State versus private control.

At bottom, there is little doubt that there are two irreconcilable ideas in conflict.

The first of these is that the world in which we live is an organism, and that men and animals have intricate relationships with the earth—not amorphous but specific and infinitely varied, which can only be disregarded at the peril both of men and the earth they live on. I do not mean in the least by this that a universal back to the land movement is either necessary or even desirable, but I do think that the idea that the earth is merely something to be exploited and "lived on" is quite fatal.

The second and antithetic idea, is that the world is merely the raw material for a factory, that the nearer agriculture approximates to Mr. Ford's conveyor-belt principles, and towns emulate Stalingrad, the better we shall be. I do not think I am unduly squeamish, but I have to plead guilty to a wave of real nausea at the description, as progress, of egg factories in which hundreds or thousands of hens are kept under electric light from birth to death, confined in little boxes, never allowed out, laying eggs. I don't want to eat those eggs, and I have a strong conviction that they are not good to eat, whatever their superficial taste may be. The idea—the Encyclopaedist idea—that everything can be put into a nice watertight compartment, and card indexed, is the philosophy of a frozen Hell.

It is this unresolved antithesis, which makes the Planners so dangerous. No one with ordinary intelligence would contend that, when you are quite sure that you want to go from London to Leeds, you should not "plan" your journey, within certain well defined limits. But if all you know is that you want to go from London to a health resort, you are very foolish if you allow the Leeds Association of Boarding House Keepers to say that Leeds is the only health resort, and anyway, they are going to take off all the trains to anywhere else.

Before the land question is capable of any "solution" which will not make things worse, if possible, than they have been made by the activities of the wreckers, certain sedulously propagated theories simply must be cleared out of the way. The first, of course, is that it is the business of the Government to "put the people to work." Perhaps the shortest way in which to deal with this is to say that, if the facts of the case require that an individual must work before it is possible for him to obtain those things of which he has the need or desire, then he shall in no case be prevented from working by artificial restrictions. But if, without injury to others, he can be provided with these things without working, the fact that he has not worked for them shall be recognised as a matter of no consequence whatever.

Now I consider that this question is so important that I should regard as perhaps the most hopeful event of the last few years the obvious breakdown of what is known as the Means Test. The issue of purchasing power to a limited minimum, "tout court," immediately frees nearly every social question, including the land question, from the devastating misdirection involved in claiming "the right to work," not because you want to work, but because you must be paid. At one sweep, it clears away hundreds of thousands of people who would not know what to do with land if they really controlled it. And I think that it enables us to see dimly that the curious atmosphere of scarcity, with which, in common with everything else, the land question has been surrounded, is, or could be, a delusion also. It might be useful to recall

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From THE UNITED DEMOCRATS, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

THE OFFICE: We are glad to welcome Mrs. Hopcraft back again after three weeks' absence, which she spent with her son, on leave from the north. The office is now open as usual.

THE Y GROUP sustains the loss of Mr. John Chappel, the prime mover in the Group's formation, and one of its most active workers throughout. Mr. Chappel, now in the Air Force, will also be missed by the United Democrats. We wish him well.

THE GOLD STANDARD will be kept flying if certain enthusiasts of New Orders and Old Currencies have their way. Miss M. H. Gray has written pointing out the dangers we run of being controlled through an international economy based on gold. It may be Federal Union's new cloak. Remember, the country with the most voting power would dominate the world through Federal Union. Money is a system of voting for the things you want; and those who control money . . . !!! And is it Australia who holds the world's gold? It looks as though the Big Idea of the Planners is to fashion a double-ended Big Stick with which to drive us into the Promised Land. If you have your doubts also about these schemes, watch them closely, and keep in touch with your Member of Parliament. —

M. R. W. LEE Hon. Secretary.

Dr. Goddard's Broadcasts

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —I would like to publicly thank Dr. Goddard, who broadcasts from 3UZ, Melbourne, for the talk he gave on Sunday last, May 16, between 6.28 and 7 p.m., in which he scathingly criticised Dr. Coombs and his dangerous ideas on post-war reconstruction.

Dr. Goddard, apparently, has no illusions about the part the international financiers are playing at the present time, and the part they are trying to play in sabotaging progressive plans for post-war reconstruction.

This commentator is on the air every Sunday, between 6.28 p.m. and 7 p.m., on Station 3UZ. I commend his session to all, as a tonic and a change from the usual "tripe" one gathers from the ether.

—Yours, etc., VIVIAN JAMES, Ascot Vale, Vic.

ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

(Obtainable from New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.)

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE," A short history of the Bank of England. Price, 6d Postage 1d. (4/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 9d Postage 1½d. (6/- per dozen, post free.)

"New Times" Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home every week are as follows: —

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. (HALF rates for members of the A.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F., etc.)

Payments must be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION RALLY

KING O'MALLEY

To Deliver Historic Message to the Nation
MELBOURNE TOWN HALL
Thursday, May 27, at 8

FILM SKETCH—TABLEAU—MASSED BANDS

Other Speakers Include — Mr. Bruce H. Brown, Senator Darcey, Councillor B. A. Longfield, Mr. C. K. Cutting and Mr. F. Gilbert (Free French Movement).

Avoid Disappointment, Book Early at Allan's — Seats Free (Booking charge, 6d.)

NEW WORLD RECONSTRUCTION MOVEMENT

Help to Win the War and Win the Peace!
Listen to 3AK Every Sunday, 10.15 pm,
— Advt.

that Mr. now fittingly, Lord, Keynes, predicted that owing to the disappearance of Russian wheat from the European market, wheat would rise to £5 per quarter, and would be practically unobtainable; the event being that there was so much surplus wheat in Canada and the Argentine that it was burnt for fuel and the growers were financially ruined by the fall, to the lowest on record, of the price.

But we shall not get very far by the naive method of dividing the area of the land by the number of the population. (All rights reserved.) (To be continued.)

ARE WE REALLY SERIOUS ABOUT "RECONSTRUCTION"?

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

Sir,—Well, what ARE we to do about it? Some think we can only effect the changes we desire by violence, i.e., by bloody revolution, but I cannot subscribe to that idea. There is no need to cut anyone's throat—not even the throats of those who have so often helped by financial pressure to crucify so many of the long-suffering people, especially the farmer, the small business man, and the wage-earner.

What we should do is to get the men who have failed us removed from positions in which they could help to do it again. Although it seems incredible, it is a fact that men who did not know how to distribute plenty to a hungry populace a few years ago, are still in positions of authority in which they help to formulate Government policy and to implement unnecessarily restrictive measures on the community.

Parliament has the necessary power to remove these men, and Parliament exists to give effect to the will of the PEOPLE, not the will of the controllers of the money supply. The PEOPLE should therefore tell Parliament, through their elected representatives, that they do not want their post-war conditions arranged by men who failed so miserably in the period before the war. Every responsible Australian citizen owes it to himself and to those who come after him, to write immediately to his representatives in Parliament, both Federal and State, and I suggest that a letter somewhat along the following lines would be appropriate:—

* * * * *

Dear Mr.....

As plans are now being formulated for "reconstruction" after the war, it is most important that the greatest care be taken to ensure that men who have failed the community in the past shall not be permitted to have any controlling part in shaping or implementing post-war plans.

One of the essential needs after the war, indeed the most essential of all needs under present calculations, will be FINANCE to develop our resources, to pay our workers, and to provide maximum opportunities for consumption by our people. There was an identical need during the period of the depression. We had the resources and the workers, but insufficient money. The men in Australia who were responsible for that shortage of money, and who refused to remove it" when called upon by the Government, are still in control of our financial arrangements, and as things stand, they will automatically take charge of Australia when the war terminates unless something is done about it now. As doubtless you know, the Commonwealth Constitution provides that only in wartime shall the Commonwealth Parliament be free from financial control through the Loan Council. In practice, the Loan Council has only been another name for the trading banks speaking through the members of the Commonwealth Bank Board.

IN 1931, the then Prime Minister (the Right Honourable J. H. Scullin) made the following official declaration in the House of Representatives:—

"Recently, there came a VERY SUDDEN DROP in the price of exportable commodities, together with a complete cessation of borrowing overseas, and these two factors have greatly aggravated the financial and economical depression. The Government has endeavoured, during the last year or two, to arrest the deflation, which has been going on. We have endeavoured to prevail upon the banks to extend credit in order that unemployment might be arrested. Failing to obtain bank credit, part of the plan was to pass a fiduciary Notes Bill to assist the wheat farmers and the unemployed, but that measure was rejected in another place."

That other place was, of course, the Senate, and the members of the Commonwealth Bank Board were responsible for this rejection. Note particularly, that our

difficulties and sufferings of that period were all the result of financial considerations. They had nothing to do with the failure of our productive resources or lack of ability on the part of our people. The "very sudden drop" in the price of exportable commodities had been brought about by action on the part of the Bank of England, vide paragraph 93 of the report of the Monetary and Banking Commission. The "complete cessation of borrowing overseas" was also the result of similar action by the same institution.

The Official Year Book of the Commonwealth for 1932 contains the following (see page 842):—

"April 2, 1931. —Letter from the Commonwealth Bank to the Chairman of the Loan Council stating that it was unable to finance Governments beyond the outstanding £25,000,000 in England, and the limit of £25,000,000 in Australia. This limit in Australia was bound to be, and was, in fact, reached within three months.

"January, 1932. —Letter from the Commonwealth Bank to the Chairman of the Loan Council calling attention to the growth of the floating debt and suggesting that National finance might be refused."

It will be seen that, despite the sufferings of the people and the unparalleled difficulties of the Government, the Bank Board went so far as to refuse finance to the supposedly sovereign Parliament. It will do so again if permitted.

In order to prevent that sort of treachery from being repeated when the war terminates, I am hereby instructing you, as my representative in Parliament, to institute steps immediately to have all men who took a leading part in imposing those conditions upon the people, or in persuading the people that such conditions were good for them, removed from all public office of responsibility. These men include the members of the Commonwealth Bank Board, Professors R. C. Mills, D. B. Copland, L. F. Giblin, L. G. Melville, J. B. Brigden, and G. L. Wood, Dr. H. C. Coombs, Sir John Latham, Sir Earle Page, and Mr. S. M. Bruce.

I am also anxious that in having such men replaced, care be taken to ensure that they are superseded by men of high integrity and personal capacity—men who have a proper realisation of the difference between wealth and money, and who will see that our post-war plans are based upon the natural resources of our country, the productive ability of the people, and the needs of the community, not upon the "availability of funds."

—Yours faithfully,

* * *

The accuracy of the information given in the suggested letter can be vouched for, and unless we, as a people, are prepared to act together constitutionally and to stick together in seeing that our wishes are respected in Parliament, we will assuredly become mere slaves in a Slave State.

—Yours faithfully, Bruce H. Brown, 189 Hotham St., East Melbourne, C.2. 16/5/43.

ABERHART REPLIES TO CRITICS

Speaking in the Throne Speech debate recently, Premier Aberhart, in the Alberta Parliament, vigorously answered critics on the opposite side of the House. Answering those who had charged failure to implement promises, Mr. Aberhart declared: "These promises will stand, and they will be fulfilled as soon as Mackenzie King fulfils his, made the same year, at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan."

The Premier recalled that at Prince Albert, Mr. King said that if the Liberals were returned to power in Ottawa, Alberta would be given every opportunity to introduce Social Credit, and that if Alberta was successful, Social Credit would spread like a prairie fire.

"Did the Prime Minister keep his promises? Just read the story of disallowances and ultra vires and you will know the answer. How unfair and utterly foolish is the belated cry, 'You didn't keep your promises.'"

Dealing further with the question of disallowance, Mr. Aberhart said that the Opposition leader had, in his remarks, given the impression that it was generally conceded the courts should be supreme.

"I have always felt that the courts were expected to administer the laws enacted by legislature. If the courts are to rule, then as the judges are not elected, we cannot claim to have representative Government, much less democratic freedom," declared the speaker.

"I have here the 'Canadian Bar Review,' the monthly magazine of the Canadian Bar

Association, published in Toronto, Ontario. This copy is dated January 1943—so it is quite up to date.

"On page 52, we find a letter from Professor John Willis, Acting Dean of Dalhousie Law School, in response to an invitation by the editor of the 'Canadian Bar Review' magazine, for members of the profession to declare their opinions regarding the real problems of the future, from a constitutional point of view.

"I shall not take your time by reading the whole letter. One paragraph will suffice. Listen:

"The unseemly fights between the Alberta Legislature and the Supreme Court of Canada; between British Columbia marketing authorities and the British Columbia courts, are an inevitable result of the mistaken attitude of the courts, and I know nobody except lawyers and people who wish to preserve their own status quo against the declared policy of legislatures who would have anything but the utmost contempt for the record of the three appeal courts in the disputes just mentioned.

"I believe that declaration with all my heart," said Mr. Aberhart.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: FABIAN AIMS

Notes on an address by Alderman Emil Davies, of the London County Council (formerly Chairman) to the Bristol Branch of the Fabian Society. The speaker had just returned from America:—

Mr. Davies first described the different types of local government, viz., Parish Council, Rural and Urban District Councils, Non-County and County Boroughs and County Council.

Of the Borough he commented that many of them retained powers they ought not to have, e.g., Totnes—with a population of 5000, it was ridiculous that they should control their own police—about 5 men—who are liable to get far too friendly with the local inhabitants. The County Council was over all smaller authorities except the County Boroughs. The recent, and in his view, correct tendency had been to give more power to County Councils at the expense of District Councils. A County Borough had all the powers of the County Council, and did not contribute a penny in rates to the County,

To keep the local touch, which at first had been lost, the L.C.C. had formed local committees, on a Party basis, one for each local hospital, or other institution (mental hospitals seemed to be referred to most of the time!). They were not executive, but made recommendations which were sent up to the L.C.C. Hospitals Committee; but they felt that they were really talking to the local people and making contact with them.

All these things were only suggestions, but the desirability of many Fabians getting on local Governments was pointed out, with the comment that they usually ended up there without quite intending to!

The Powers of Government ought to be divided up as follows:—National Government should control a lot of things now local, e.g., Fire Brigades, formerly 1300 in number, had now been reduced to 37; the same ought to be done with water, main transport and so on. Provincial or Regional government should control Education from the age of two. The difference between elementary and secondary education should disappear. The Regional Government should also control drainage, regional transport, development of Garden Cities, etc. Districts might retain control of baths, cemeteries, streets (but not the naming of streets), and other very local affairs.

The Big City was a cultural amenity. Smaller places were not big enough to provide a West End—concerts, opera, world-famous artists, places like the Corner House, open day and night, where you could meet people. He thought a population of one million the minimum necessary to provide these amenities, although in pre-Hitler Germany, Frankfurt, with only 300,000 inhabitants, provided all of them.

He personally was so much in favour of the Garden City idea that he had gone to live at Welwyn, where there had now developed a centre of industry, with many factories including I.C.I., and some very big American firms. The I.C.I. staff transferred from the City were not all going back after the war, as they had found that their business in the City could be sufficiently well conducted by telephone. Finally, he repeated that these were only suggestions, but if Fabians would get on to Councils their advocacy of them would help in the making of opinion. With regard to the problem of rates, he favoured an attack on Site Values and the institution,

(Continued on page 4.)

although the towns were usually the most prosperous parts of the area.

The present system of government was "unscientific": Lancashire, with one million acres, contained 17 County Boroughs, and the administrative county still contained a population of two million; but Rutland had only 17,000 population—how could it supply education, hospitals, police, etc.?

Of course, we did not want democratic local government superseded by Regional Commissioners, which system was purely a war emergency measure, but Regional Government might stay without government from above. We should not lose contact with populations; almost personal contact between rulers and governed was necessary—although at first glance this seemed almost impossible with larger units.

County Boroughs were a nuisance, but there were so many of them that they would have to stay. Fabian aims were to establish eight or nine "conurbations," great centres of populations, as Regional Governments. The County Borough Authority must control the country round it. The larger area would remove the inequalities of rating.

The little authorities were putting up tremendous opposition to the changing of the "status quo." True, larger units would mean a certain amount of what is called red tape and bureaucracy, but there were many compensations—the London County Council, for instance, employed 24,000 teachers, and could afford to employ the best lecturers, to hire a first-rate orchestra to go round the schools, and could employ the best type of official, as the small councils, which could not afford to pay large salaries, could not. Out of 1730 local authorities, over 1000 employed less than 50 employees.

A larger area would remove inequalities; what we needed was to divide the country into "units," each with a County Borough, and a large area of country around it. In addition, we needed Regional or Provincial authorities to relieve Parliament of some of the duties with which it was over-burdened. The Regional Council should consist partly of delegates nominated by the smaller authorities within its area, and partly of representatives elected directly. In each Region should be a Department of the Ministries concerned with Local Government, with powers delegated from the Central Government.

Fabians influenced legislation out of all proportion to their numbers. When any new legislation was proposed, the Government Departments concerned usually sent for the latest Fabian literature on the subject, and often adopted many of the proposals, though not, of course, all. That explained why they seemed to publish such a lot more than some people saw the reason for!

In the Regional governments the human touch was necessary combined with that efficiency which only comes from a big central authority. This problem had been almost ideally solved in London, e.g., the Hospitals. One hospital used to send patients to bed at 6 p.m., another at 8 p.m. Some gave the old ladies some tea, others not. Some spent far more on libraries, entertainments, etc., than others. What the L.C.C. had done was to make all that uniform. The great advantage of centralisation was uniformity.

FRANK DEVLIN
For
Better Tailoring
THREE-GARMENT SUIT
Hand-Tailored to Order
ALL-WOOL WORSTEDS from **£7/7/-** 42 Coupons
ELIZABETH HOUSE,
Second Floor
340 LITTLE COLLINS ST.
MELBOURNE
Phone: M 5177

THE MODERN WOMAN AND HER FORTY MECHANICAL SLAVES

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

Dr. Maude Royden has an article on "Women and the Mass Mind" in the January number of "Homes and Gardens," "Perhaps I liked the last sentence best of all: 'Do not let us feed: let us eat,'" concluded Dr. Royden, setting forth in those few simple words the world of difference between the cattle-trough of the cafeteria and the Christian table set with bread and wine, where every meal is a sacrament.

Dr. Royden's article is in part a criticism of "Working Class Wives," a Pelican Special by Margery Spring-Rice. Mrs. Spring-Rice speaks of "the great difficulty, which occurs in persuading women to go into hospital for their confinements. Although trained home helps can be provided to look after the father and children, the mother shows an inherent disinclination to entrust her home, even temporarily, to the care of someone else. Again, mothers themselves have often been the first to oppose the granting of school meals for children; holding that it is unnatural for the children to eat away from home and that they prefer to prepare the food themselves. Another example is the opposition from many parents with which the Ministry of Labour met in the initial stages of their scheme to remove adolescent wage earners from the distressed areas. . . . The Ministry has had to devote much time and propaganda to breaking down the parental prejudice against this 'unnatural' disintegration of the family."

And from the same book:—"Although with the increasing opportunities and complexities of social organisation, the activities and interests of the other members of the family tend to multiply, the magic of the hearth remains unchallenged. Undoubtedly it is rooted deep in all human nature, but the mother is the human anchor which holds it fast."

"The odd thing is," says Miss Royden, "that the writer of these words, Mrs. Spring-Rice, seems to regard this tendency, though 'rooted deep in all human nature,' as a vice to be combated." Miss Royden disagrees with this view, thinks women have not got the mass mind, don't want it, and are much more valuable without it, adding that the remark of a girl in a very "enlightened" factory is worth pondering: "You couldn't call your soul your own, they welfared you to death!" —("International Women's News," July, 1942, p. 183.)

This article of Miss Royden's is interesting to me because she sees clearly that the system of factory mass-production wherein the "hands" are welfared to death, has only one logical end—the totalitarian State. The explanation, of course, is simple. The industrial organisations upon which mass production of so many articles depend—from cars to tooth-paste—have too much power over the lives of those who work in them, especially in the United States. In the words of Major Douglas, they "arrogate to themselves a right of supervision over the private lives and morals of their employees far exceeding that which would have been exercised by a British landowner at any time, or tolerated by his tenants, and this is accompanied by a close-knit organisation for card-indexing every applicant for employment, and penalising by unemployment and starvation anyone daring to rebel against the rules. But we do not hear of organised attack on these things."

Miss Royden thinks one of the first fruits of mass production has been much greater comfort for women, in the form of ready-made clothes, ready-made food, and ready-made gadgets of all sorts, which have enormously raised the standard of comfort in the home. But the end is the totalitarian State! And she asks, "At what point, then, are we to stop between the good beginning and the bad end? Frankly, I don't know."

But was it a good beginning? Was it not in reality a step in an entirely wrong direction, which could lead to nothing but misery for men and women, too? "Circumspice." Men do not gather grapes of thorns.

It is a question how far mass-production is not a perverted means that must tend to an undesirable end. We have passed from the steam age to the age of the dynamo, and whether in war or peace, there is available, in this country alone, the potential power of at least forty mechanical slaves for every member of the population, Who has decided, and who is still deciding, to what use this power shall be put? Surely no one would maintain that those who live on the products and receive the wages of mass-production have any voice in the matter?

I have not read Pearl S. Buck's "Of Men and Women," to which Miss Royden also refers. But if it is her considered judgment that mass-production has taken from American women all that gave them value, then I don't think this is very difficult to understand. I should say that it is perfectly possible to keep a whole people in the lap of luxury and to produce at the same time a nation of nervous wrecks by the simple expedient of removing from them all power of choice.

At first sight there is a bewildering variety displayed among mass-produced articles. But to the discriminating the "ready-made" reveals itself at a glance, whether in food, clothing or shelter, as a clever mixture of the shoddy and the showy, with a dash of the Corner House thrown in. "We give the public what it

wants," used to be the cry, "for nothing else will sell." This sounds very well; but it must be remembered that the choice is strictly limited by the power of the purse strings. Impress well upon a woman's mind that correctly hand-made shoes are not for her, and that she can buy a smart mass-produced article "just as good" at a quarter of the price, and she will cease to consider the matter. Yet expressed in terms of human satisfaction, is there the slightest doubt that three pairs of bespoke shoes out value and outlast at least ten pairs of the mass-produced variety, and give infinitely more satisfaction to the man who makes them? Mass production is, as at present practised, a colossal sabotage of the fruits of the earth. Major Douglas has spoken with horror of the "egg-factories." Mass production means the same process applied to the whole of our lives—bed, board and clothing. Applied to food, it simply means that we shall feed. As Miss Royden has so justly remarked, "Pigs feed, and cattle."

If what Pearl Buck says is true—that American women are the unhappiest in the world, that their lives are empty and frustrated because their homes are flooded with ready-made clothes, food, and gadgets, and that as a result they have nothing whatever to do, and simply pretend to be busy all day long—I should say it was time the American people inquired whose policy is being implemented by the forty mechanical slaves. And whose policy sets the fashion, which, as everyone knows, is not a mere question of the design of a frock, but a whole way of life, from dawn to dark.

When all is said and done, the feel of the carpenter for the wood, of the violinist for the bow on the string, of the cook for

INTIMIDATION BY BUREAUCRATS

Mr. J. H. Wootton-Davies, Conservative M.P. for Heywood and Radcliffe (England), in a letter to his constituents, alleges intimidation of voters by Ministry officials. In asking his constituents to write to him freely, the member says:

"This privilege of yours is too precious to let go lightly, and is one that you should guard. I am not going to be intimidated by anyone. And I certainly won't let you be intimidated. You are entitled to put complaints or suggestions before your member. Do not let any official attempt to rob you of your privileges. And, if anyone does, let me know and I will deal with him."

In conversation with a newspaper representative, Mr. Wootton-Davies said constituents had told him that following his contacting the local office of a Ministry, an official visited them and asked questions to the effect of "Why have you written to your member? You do yourself no good."

Mr. Wootton-Davies went on: "If people are not to write to their M.P., who else are they to write to? This is still a free country, and I intend to guard the rights of citizens zealously." If there were any more complaints of interference by Ministry officials he would most certainly raise the matter in the House of Commons on the question of privilege.

THE WISDOM OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. John Murray, Principal of the University College of the Southwest (England), gave an address on "The United States of America" at Okehampton, Devon, recently. In the course of his address he said:—

"It is refreshing and salutary to read what was written by American leaders in the early days of the Republic. Thomas Jefferson, for instance, has a message for us in England today. His doctrine can be summed up simply: 'Take care of the pence, and the pounds will take care of themselves.' By the pence he means the ultimate local units of responsible free citizens, intimately acquainted and managing their own affairs, neither ruled by officials in their midst nor superseded by other officials at a distance or at headquarters."

"By the 'pounds' he meant the concentrations of political or other power in central Governments and Government offices. He thought the 'pounds' would always look after themselves at the expense of the 'pence.' 'What,' he asks, 'has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every Government which has ever existed under the sun?' His answer is: 'Concentration of power.'"

"Here are sayings of his: (a) 'were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread'; (b) 'every Government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone.' He was all for the country and distrustful of big towns. The England of today, with overgrown cities and a strong urban bias prevailing, for example, in its education, would have dismayed him."

the butter and sugar in the bowl are only different aspects of the same thing, and to pretend that one is "higher" or "lower" than another is poisonous nonsense. What is more, every man and woman has a right to the free expansion of individuality; and I find it impossible to believe that a satisfactory life can be lived without material contact with reality through the hands. This is the problem before the American people, and before us, too, in a lesser degree; but it will not be solved until those who work in the factories are in a position to choose whether they will or will not take part in whatever project may be set before them.

Strangely enough, it is usually those who are most anxious to set the whole population to work who also assert that mass production is the only way to feed the enormous populations of the modern world, or provide them with clothing. They leave out of account the hundreds of thousands of people who are sick to death of making little marks on pieces of paper, and who, from every point of view except that of obscurantist financiers, are completely and criminally wasting their time.

"The common factor of the whole situation lies in the simple fact that at any given period the material requirements of the individual are quite definitely limited—that any attempt to expand them artificially is an interference with the plain trend of evolution, which is to subordinate material to mental and psychological necessity; and that the impulse behind unbridled industrialism is not progressive but reactionary, because its objective is an obsolete financial control which forms one of the most effective instruments of the will-to-power, whereas the correct objectives of industry are twofold: the removal of material limitations, and the satisfaction of the creative impulse." ("Economic Democracy," p. 73.)

That women are perfectly capable of deciding for themselves how best to use the power of the forty slaves I have not the least doubt, but, again, a pre-requisite is ability to choose whether they will or will not assist in whatever project may be set before them.

MR. SIEFF AND THE "LITTLE MAN"

"Mr. M. Sieff, vice-chairman of Marks and Spencer Limited, is reported to have told the Senate Small Business Committee in Washington that maximum utilisation of Britain's resources for war has been prevented by the 'rugged individualistic' British shopkeeper's dislike of Government interference."

"If Mr. Sieff intended to convey that because of their rugged individualism, small and medium retailers have hindered the war effort, his accusation will be treated with derision and scorn."

"It was not shopkeepers of that size who paid big commissions for supplier's quotas or who bought very large quantities of goods from vendors illegally selling them."

"The public must not be forced into 'chains.' Nazi chaiming is quite sufficient." —Editorial comment in the "Drapers' Record," London, December 26, 1942.

"[Mr. M. Sieff,] referred to above, is identical with Israel Moses Sieff, whose organisation, P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning), according to C. H. Douglas, 'appears to have supplanted the Government of Great Britain.' Marks and Spencer Limited is a big chain-store organisation operating in (and on) Great Britain. —Ed. "N.T."]

QUEENSLAND NOTES

(From THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN, 142 Adelaide Street, Brisbane.)

Action is already arisen from our booklet on the oil racket in this country. The Bardon Progress Association, at its last meeting, passed the following resolution to be sent to the Federal Member for the district:—

"In view of the information disclosed in the booklet, 'The Frustration of Production of Motor Fuel in Australia,' we request that you, as our representative, take immediate action in the House of Representatives to have the Lakes Entrance oil field brought up to its full producing capacity to provide motor fuel for our war machines. We view with alarm the action of our Federal Government in spending approximately two million pounds in the establishment of power alcohol distilleries in the wheat-growing areas when it had in its possession the knowledge that high-grade oil existed at Lakes Entrance."

It was also decided to send a copy of this resolution to the State and municipal members of the district, requesting that they take immediate action to bring pressure to bear on the Federal Government to have this resolution put into effect without delay.

A letter embodying this information is being sent to a number of our key workers throughout the State, suggesting that they may be able to have action taken on these lines in their districts by individuals and associations.

All Federal and Queensland State Members of Parliament will be supplied with a copy of the booklet, so that all you need do in writing to your representative is to refer to the booklet by name.

The present unsatisfactory conditions will continue and become worse unless the people take action for the reforms they need. Action by the people was never more necessary than now.

—A. W. NOAKES, Hon. Secretary.

NEW BOOKLET

"THE TRAGEDY OF HUMAN EFFORT." (Major Douglas's Liverpool Speech, 1936.)

Recommended by the Social Credit Secretariat as especially suitable for distribution at the present time.

Price: 7d each, 4/6 per dozen, post-free.

Obtainable from: The Electoral Campaign, N.S.W. (Women's Division), 3rd Floor, 296 Pitt Street, Sydney.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: FABIAN AIMS

(Continued from page 3)

of a municipal income tax, as in pre-war Germany: e.g., in Cologne, where it was 25 per cent, of the national income tax. He also praised arrangements at Nuremberg, where, according to the "Lex Addicke," introduced by the burgomaster of that name, the city had powers to take any land it wanted in exchange for an equal area elsewhere.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued front page 1.)

we do not think the rate of progress of each country's international trading should be determined entirely by the stocks of gold it possesses." So the plot thickens.

"SECOND" FRONT: Press reports indicate that the negotiations are proceeding with Russia for the use of Siberian bases to facilitate the opening of a "second" front against Japan. It is pointed out in this connection that such a move would permit a full-scale attack on bases from which the Japanese claim, to have sunk 50,000 tons of shipping in nine days. It is further suggested that the colossal quantity of Lease-Lend war materials sent to Russia (a table of which was published) should influence Stalin towards a favourable decision. Perhaps this is the "second" front that the local Communists are so keen about?

FRENCH FINANCIERS: A very rare press account of plotting by international financial gangsters is contained in the Melbourne "Sun" of May 11, under the above heading. The report makes it clear that under the pretext of protecting French funds from the Nazis, the real purpose was to provide Germany with foreign credits. Algerian financial groups, having advance information of the Allied invasion, cashed-in on the operation. The rumblings from this intrigue may yet lead to an investigation of the privately-owned international financiers' machine, the Bank "of England," which not only financed Hitler before the war, but bought-up and closed British ship-building yards, and in general disarmed Britain.

NATIONAL ANTHEM: An interesting story relating to Australia's anthem, "Advance Australia Fair," is reported in the daily press. It is said to have been composed by a former elder of the Presbyterian Church, and that neither he nor his widow received any great amount from royalties, which on his death passed to the Church as legatees, and are now returning substantial sums to the N.S.W. Presbyterian Church. All attempts by a Mr. F. Mathews, who claims to have bought the copyright from the composer, have failed, as the Church has established its legal right to royalties and performing rights. —O.B.H.

Social Credit Movement of South Australia

The next monthly meeting of the Social Credit Movement of South Australia will be held in the Rechabite Hall, Grote-street, Adelaide, on Thursday, May 27, at 8 p.m. After general business, a lecture entitled "God or Mammon—Which?" will be given by Mr. C. Jackson.

Overdue subscriptions will be thankfully received, so that we may carry on the good work.

—J. E. BURGESS, Hon. Secretary.