

INSURANCE ADVERTISING
MISLEADS (Page 2)

C. H. DOUGLAS ON THE LAND
QUESTION (Page 3)

ALBERTA DEBT ADJUSTMENT
ACT BEFORE PRIVY
COUNCIL (Page 3)

BUREAUCRATIC REGULATION
IN U.S.A. (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 9 No. 24 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JUNE 18 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).

What Should Replace the Party System?

Electors Can Make Democracy Work by United Non-Party Action

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

In reviewing the Australian political scene in these columns last week, I pointed out that the growing crop of new political parties is indicative of the break-up of the major parties. Apart from these new parties' candidates, we can also expect a great number of "independent" candidates to stand at the coming Federal Elections. But, as I pointed out last week, there is no guarantee that a break-up of the present parties into smaller groups will benefit the people. Even seventy-five "independents" at Canberra would not necessarily mean any change of fundamental policies in this country. We all remember Mr. Spender, a man who, prior to his election to Parliament, gave his written pledge that he stood "four-square" for monetary reform!

While we want members of Parliament to be independent of party juntas, we don't want them to be independent of electors. The crux of the matter is this: Real democracy, both economic and political, means that complete power resides with the electors. Any move to take power further away from the people is a blow against democracy. The first and immediate task confronting the electors is to bring their institutions, political and economic, under effective control. No reform movement which will not face this issue is of any use whatever. Electors must be shown that no one else can "give" them real democracy. They themselves must develop their own initiative by working for it. Byron put the matter clearly to the enslaved Greeks early last century:

"... know ye not

Who would be free must strike the blow?"

We must strike our own blows. But how? Before outlining how we can act effectively, let us briefly examine certain facts. Can we all agree with the following propositions? I think we can:—

(1) Parliament should consist of a number of men representing the electors.

(2) While it is impossible for electors to agree about and understand administration—i.e., how to get results—they can agree upon and understand the results they desire—i.e., their policy. (Those who think that the electors can agree about administration would do well to look at the dozens of reform groups in this country.)

(3) The party system has divided the electors into warring groups, all arguing about administration, to the exclusion of the fact that a majority of them want the same results.

(4) If electors in each electorate would unite, in saying what they want, or in re-

jecting some legislation they do not want, they would place the onus on their Member of Parliament to do as instructed. Not being a mind reader, he cannot know the policy of his electors unless they state it to him clearly.

(5) Members of Parliament are primarily concerned with knowing how much voting strength they have behind them. While electors vote slavishly for this or that party's candidate, candidates do as the party junta orders and make certain that they obtain pre-selection. Where electors are tired of party politicians, they sometimes vote for an "independent"—and then forget all about him. The "independent" then proceeds to do as he likes, or as he is told by vested interests. The electors then reach a state of despair at ever getting any improvement. So democracy is undermined.

(6) If the electors take the initiative and make it definite that they are determined to give instructions and get those instructions obeyed, members of Parliament will either have to do as they are told or be removed at the next election. We either agree that the electors can get what they want, or we don't. All democrats believe that the people can and must govern. Anyone who opposes this viewpoint, who believes that the people should not have supreme power, is a would-be dictator—no matter what label he wears.

We now come to how we, the people, can control our members of Parliament. Let us assume that the people of Australia are almost unanimous in their opposition to military conscription for overseas service, heavier taxation, food rationing, or any of a dozen things. Members of Parliament, then, must re-present those wishes of their electors. But they cannot do this until they know the wishes of the electors. The electors must say what they want. As they cannot see their particular member personally, there is only one way to inform him of their wishes—a signed letter to him. Or a telegram. There is no other way of making democracy a reality. It will never be a reality until the electors develop enough personal initiative to unite and state their desires in black and white. Should any member disregard his electors—not many men can defy an aroused and enlightened public opinion—he could be voted out at the first opportunity. Such a procedure would soon produce members keen to represent the electors, and thus retain their jobs. Social crediters are endeavouring to unite the electors to demand desired results. It is all a question of power. There are only two possibilities before us: Either the people start to obtain power along the lines I have indicated, or powerful groups are going to take it further away from the people. We have reached a serious position in this country. The choice is ours to better it.

WASTAGE OF MANPOWER

Due to the lack of any plans to study the effect on war-time production resulting from almost indiscriminate call-ups, there is a serious wastage of man-hours which needs early rectification. Here is one example which illustrates the position:—

Near Melbourne, large workshops which in peace-time employed 300 hands are now employing more than 2000. Pre-war, a bus service connected these works with the tramline, or, alternatively, a suburban railway station. One of the companies runs a transport bus for travellers by air. This bus, now in the hands of a young woman driver, does the trip to the heart of the city in 20 minutes.

Due to the call-up of bus drivers and mechanics, the bus services could not be increased to take care of the jump from about 300 to over 2000 workers, so it was decided to extend the tramline. The tram journey to the city, due to its devious route, takes 41 minutes, or 21 minutes longer than a straightout bus service from the works to the city.

The majority of workers have to reach the city to connect up with their local transport, which conveys them to their homes, so these 2000 hands are idle 21 minutes in the morning and 21 minutes after their work finishes, a total of 42 minutes lost per day in slow transport—a loss, based on 2000 workers, of 1400 hours, six days a week.

Now it seems reasonable to assume that these workers would be glad to earn wages for an extra 40 minutes work a day, instead of wasting it in slow transport to and from their work.

It must be remembered that men have to be employed on the trams to convey these men and women workers, and had the same number of men, or fewer, been passed over to operate a direct bus service, then at these works alone 1400 extra hours of productive work would have been available every day. This would equal 150 additional hands.

A tram will seat 50 and standing passengers 60, but we have available articulated buses which will seat 120, so it is quite obvious that the same number of tram hands, if not more, would be employed, as there would have been bus drivers.

The new tramways system, which, by the way, has just been completed, absorbed many hundreds of tons of steel, employed many men for months laying the additional track, and it also required some miles of overhead copper cables.

Approximately 100 feet of light steel girders would have been required to construct an articulated bus, or about 1000 feet for ten buses, against upwards of 20,000 feet of steel rails, plus much road work, absorbing quite a big staff of men for some months.

As the Tramways Board desires to retain as many through passengers as possible, those who wish to divert to the near suburban railway have 15 minutes or more to

wait to connect with the first train they can connect with after leaving the tram. The rail-bus service which was in operation takes approximately 29 minutes against 41 minutes, whilst a direct bus service from the works to the city would occupy 20 minutes, and, as before stated, 41 minutes by tram.

This is only one of hundreds of examples of how manpower is being wasted and hours of production lost.

Apparently no one has studied the time factor in getting to and from work, and it is time that the Department of War Organisation of Industry and the Commonwealth manpower authorities studied economics in this direction.

There are ample chasses suitable for the extension of such bus services at present in stock, having been brought to Australia for essential purposes associated with war under Lend-Lease planning. Even if the bus services had been increased to meet demands between the railway and the works, a considerable number of man-hours would have been saved every day.

No one, apparently, has studied the loss of manpower caused by the stoppage of delivery of domestic supplies. Under war conditions most of the agile members of families are engaged on war work, and unless someone stays away from work the household cannot obtain the necessary food supplies, and in Melbourne manpower is necessary in the home to find and carry home firewood.

The result is that restaurants are crowded with foodless workers, who are forced to pay the "austerity" price for meals because most restaurants feel entitled to charge the full legal price and reduce the menu.

A typical example, and one of thousands, is, for instance, a family of four who formerly had their meals in their own home are now all on their way to work before the shops open, and, due to the transport chaos, the shops are closed when they pass the shopping centres at night. The result is that unless some member of the family is absent from work two or three times a week, there would be no food in the house: so this family, which is typical of thousands, is spending upwards of £4 a week in meals alone, a sum which would probably exceed what food would have cost them in their own home. In addition, through the lack of food in their own larder, no cut lunches can be carried, which is another added expense to the family food bill. . . . And so we could go on giving illustrations of the absolute disregard by the authorities of the economics associated with manpower call-ups which actually decrease the nation's war-time aggregate production.

—"The Australian Motorist," June 1, '43

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Although the daily press had no space to spare to reasonably report the earlier rally of 3000 people protesting against the debt-finance system at the Melbourne Town Hall, it found considerable space and big headlines to report a relatively small gathering of 600 people who advocated "one army for Australia." The only statements worth reporting from this latter meeting were these: "The word Fascism has lost most of its meaning, because it is applied to all people and institutions opposed to Socialism and Communism." "Whilst we have the greatest respect for the Russian people, and their experiment, we prefer the experiment which the British people have been making for a thousand years."

BUTTER BUNGLE: The Melbourne "Sun" of June 8 debunks the alibi advanced by our socialistic planners to cover up their bungling of the butter supply. The paper says: "The present shortage is NOT due to increased demands from Britain. On the contrary, our exports to Britain of both butter and cheese have been well below the level of the first year of war." Continuing, the "Sun" says: "We formerly produced so much butter that to find markets for our exportable surplus we had to resort to subsidy schemes. The shortage of this essential commodity is due to the short-sighted manpower policy." The only remedy is to put the practical men back on the farms—and let some of the planners and bureaucrats replace them in the armed forces.

WAR WORKERS: Despite socialistic bungling, it appears that munition workers have overproduced, and, according to Mr. Makin, are now to be switched to other work "to avoid depression." The vacated machines will be maintained while some thousands of workers will be diverted to aircraft maintenance (not aircraft production). Although aircraft production is said to be our most urgent need, for some mysterious reason only skeleton production is being carried out; all the emphasis being placed on maintenance. Whether or not aircraft production in Australia is restricted by Lease-Lend arrangements is difficult to say; but if so, the sooner the obstacle is removed the better. Members of Parliament should be asked to advise their electors on this point.

PRESS PRATTLE: In an endeavour to fill the gap in military operations, the daily papers are building up the idea of attacks on Italy—or what they term "the jittery war." Since under modern war conditions the aeroplane makes possible the observation of ground force movements by both sides, obviously such preparations will be known to all concerned. Hence the futility and stupidity of the "wordy war." Obviously, neither side makes known to its enemy what it intends to do or where it intends to strike; so it is fairly safe to say that

Italy will not be the scene of the major invasion attempt, even if a feint is made in that quarter.

INSURANCE INSULT: Another insurance ramp is ready to be foisted on the people—under the guise of a benefit. It is to be called "social insurance." It is said that it will "cost the Government £10 millions per year." That's a lie to begin with, since the people—NOT the Government—will be taxed in advance to pay it. It is simply a resurrection of the infamous "National Insurance" racket, which was rejected by the people, who swamped their political servants with "protest letters" and successfully insisted on the rejection of the bankers' snare. Electors should start now writing to their Members of Parliament, and insist that they resist this levelling-down plot.

POWER PERIL: Mr. R. G. Henderson, President of the Newspaper Proprietors' Association, is reported in the press thus: "We are told we cannot fight a totalitarian war unless we adopt totalitarian methods. That is like saying that you can only destroy tyranny by acting like a tyrant—as false as would be the claim that you can only achieve honesty by practising dishonesty." Fancy a press-magnate saying true things like that! How it must have annoyed Mes-siah Murdoch!

TAX TERRORS: An indication that many taxpayers are unable to maintain the rake-off to bankers and bondholders is seen in the fact that 1000 appeals for relief, totalling £70,000, have been lodged with the taxation department in respect of last year. Another interesting fact is that for that period members of the fighting services, in addition to risking their lives, were mulcted of £3 million. Many of these are quite unable to pay their pre-war taxes from the pitance they receive for defending their country, but they will be expected to take up the burden when the "knock-off" whistle blows. It will indeed be a land fit for heroes to live in then—especially the heroes who filled the war loans.

(Continued on page 3)

FAITH TO MOVE MOUNTAINS

By RALPH L. DUCLOS, in the "Ottawa Evening Citizen."

The technique for keeping "the people" quiet is changing, but the policy of those who would control remains the same. The doleful whine of the hungry thirties that "there is no money" is changed to loose promises of freedom, security, social justice and what not. "The world with a fence around it is yours if you follow me," is the style of the day. Plans and super, plans are being produced from every direction designed to be attractive rather than effective. The people, however, are becoming wary. They seem to sense that intangible promises mean little if the plans surrounding the promises are based on methods which in the past have produced the opposite results.

The promise of freedom and security by means of a work State doesn't "hold water." It didn't in Germany, Italy, or Japan. The work State may give you security, the security of the slave, but never freedom. Canada can be turned into a national ant hill, but when ant methods are used, Canadians will live ant lives. Ralph Waldo Emerson expressed it thus: "The end pre-exists in the means." You can't get right results by wrong methods. You can't get freedom by regimentation or bureaucracy; you can't distribute abundance by the economics of scarcity; you can't get social justice by planning other people's lives; you can't get universal peace by continuing economic war, by a scramble for foreign markets; you can't have a democracy with a Gestapo or an Ogpu. Those who look for a great leader to do their thinking for them—a sort of Moses to lead them out of Egypt—invariably end up with a Fuhrer.

These facts are more or less obvious, and in view of the tremendous amount of knowledge available to anyone interested it is difficult to understand why any people are attracted by the "planners" schemes. This may possibly be explained by a peculiar phenomenon in our phase of evolution. This vast amount of knowledge is accompanied and counteracted by an intense lack of belief, of faith, not in a religious sense, but faith in ourselves and our powers of doing things.

Little birds would never fly or babies walk if they didn't believe they could; Stephenson wouldn't have driven his locomotive or the Wright Brothers flown their plane, if they hadn't believed it possible; Edison wouldn't have invented the incandescent light, Marconi the radio, or Bell the telephone if they hadn't believed.

Said Sir William Osler:—"Nothing in life is more wonderful than faith—the one great moving force which we can neither weigh in the balance nor test in the crucible."

We "know" but "disbelieve." We have knowledge without conviction and thereby suffer from a scarcity complex in an age of plenty. It has produced poverty, destitution and misery in the past, made war possible and it is now materially hampering our war effort. We "know" that in this day and age of science, power and automatic machinery, there is a tremendous productivity, but somehow or other we don't "believe" that that productivity can be converted into a superabundance for everybody.

We are just now, after three years of war, beginning to believe that our production can be accelerated to yield unprecedentedly great quantities of war materials and supplies, but we cannot divorce ourselves from a sense of lack and national poverty. We know that money really isn't wealth that it is largely figures in books, that our money system is merely a bookkeeping system with currency as tickets for petty cash, yet we don't "believe" that we dare do anything about it and we hang on for dear life to "balanced budgets" that won't balance.

"When a bank lends or invests it extends credit—i.e., creates cheque-book money,"—Professor Irving Fisher, Yale University.

We know that money is created "out of nothing," that it should be created according to our needs, but we believe in terms of "where will the money come from?" and frighten ourselves with un-economic tax schedules. We know that a war is paid for in "blood, sweat, tears" and materials, yet we raise our blood pressure worrying about a pyramiding debt.

We know that "what is physically possible is financially possible," in other words, that we can fit our bookkeeping system to suit our needs, yet we still think in terms of millions or billions of dollars instead of thousands of tanks, planes and guns or corvettes. We frighten ourselves into impotency with astronomical figures in dollars when we know, or ought to know, that a money system should do its job or be scrapped for one that will. Sir Stephen Demetriadi, K.B.E., president of the London Chamber of Commerce, has declared: "The world's problem is no longer one of production, but merely one of distributing that production." We know that war debts have never been paid in the past; that the British

are still paying interest on the debts incurred for the Battle of Waterloo, yet we don't "believe" that debt can be avoided and are seriously worried about how to pay off the current war debt and think that taxes will likely be higher after the war for that purpose.

We "know" that "the purpose of production is consumption"; that it is useless to make shoes unless they go on feet; that houses are valueless unless people live in them; that food just rots unless it is eaten. We also "know" that we are capable of producing almost limitless quantities of all these goods. Yet we don't "believe" that people can have them, because of this and because of that, and we trot out all the stumbling blocks that we really do believe in, hailing from the age of scarcity; like "no money," or "the poor are poor because the rich are rich," or "we'll have to create work," etc., and etc.

Our knowledge is of the present but our beliefs are of the past. Present-day economic and scientific knowledge and achievements have failed to register on our subconscious minds and, as a result, our beliefs lag behind in the dead past of yesterday. Thus we blunder from catastrophe to catastrophe like a high-powered motor ship floundering on the rocks because its master doesn't "believe" in his compass.

We know that Japan captured world markets and built up a huge war machine by using her national credit to undersell all competitors. She used her credit to finance consumption in other countries—to achieve diabolical aims. We don't connect up the process and realise that the same technique could be used to finance consumption in our own country—to achieve the greatest possible good and highest aims. The fact is we don't "believe" it possible.

We are dimly aware of the vast production proved possible by the war but we fail to realise that it may be used in the future to usher in an era of leisure and culture. Leisure? We tremble at the thought of leisure because we "believe" in "work for work's sake." We don't realise that culture is the product of leisure well spent; that work slaves do not develop a culture—they have no time for such "non-sense"—they must work. Hitlerism is incompatible with leisure just as democracy is incompatible with a work state.

Said Donald M. Nelson, war production chief, U.S.A.:—"Poverty is not inevitable any more. The sum total of the world's greatest possible output of goods divided by the sum total of the world's inhabitants no longer means a little less than enough for everybody. It means more than enough."

We "know" that by the use of solar energy and science we've attained the power age of super-abundance, that there can be more than enough for everybody, but actually we don't "believe" we can break away from scarcity. This truly is the age of "knowledge and disbelief."

We now have the results of thousands of years of knowledge, discoveries and inventions and we haven't the faith to apply those results. Lack of belief paralyses action and instead of abundance we cling to want. Instead of wealth and happiness we, by our disbelief in what is possible, cling to penury and wretchedness.

We are commencing to believe that people should not starve, so we initiate unemployment insurance, old age pensions and the like—all at bare existence level. We raise the standard of poverty instead of eradicating it. We know we can produce enough for everybody and more, but we cleave to the past and somehow don't believe that poverty can be abolished. Yet Professor A. H. Hansen, of Harvard University, states: "We can afford as high a standard of living as we are able to produce."

What we grudgingly do is done by taxing some to help others. We rob Peter to pay Paul. We "know" that money can be increased or decreased at will and almost costlessly, yet we don't "believe" that it's safe to make the system work. We frighten ourselves with the inflation bogey and desperately cling to the system of taxes, debts, poverty and misery.

We're afraid of abundance. We actually tremble at the thought of what abundance will do—to the other fellow. Of course, it won't hurt us—but the other fellow—? Besides, if there is plenty of everything,

who'll do the drudgery? We avoid drudgery pretty well ourselves but we don't "believe" it can be avoided by all. We "believe" more in scarcity and drudgery than we do in abundance and freedom. We don't "believe" in our fellow-man. At another epoch in man's history when doubters wouldn't "believe" the doctrine of freedom and abundance their Lord and Master in exasperation exclaimed: "Oh! Ye of little Faith!"

When we believe that the knowledge available can be applied, that the kind of life we want is possible and then want it hard enough, public opinion will become so strong that no government on earth, Grit, Tory or what you will, would dare refuse to implement our wishes.

"It is the business of government to yield to pressure," stated President Roosevelt. That in a sentence tells the secret of a successful democracy. It is the only method

that ever obtained the results the people wanted. That was how the great reforms of the past were achieved: The Magna Charta, the trial by jury, the abolition of slavery and child labour, the universal suffrage, the six-day week, votes for women, and many, many more. All were attained by the people "believing" them possible, wanting them hard enough and applying the necessary pressure, regardless of the cost.

If we "know" we have the means, "believe" that what we want is possible and apply the necessary pressure, we'll get the results we want. That is all the "plan," all the "planning," we need. In fact, it is the only "plan" that is effective—it has never failed in the past.

—Reprinted from the "Ottawa Evening Citizen" of January 16, 1943. (Mr. Duclos is president of the Douglas Social Credit Bureau of Canada, Inc.)

INSURANCE ADVERTISING MISLEADS

(A letter to the Editor from BRUCE H. BROWN.)

Sir,—One of the things for which I have not been able to find a satisfying explanation is the strange way in which so many of the men who have been "honoured by the King" continue to allow their names and titles to be used in advertising matter which is studiously designed to mislead the ordinary people. A rather shameful example of this dishonourable behaviour was to be seen in the "Argus" of 8/6/43. It was part of an advertisement for the A.M.P. Society, and read as follows:—

"We Australians can have the sort of world we want if we are prepared to make sacrifices for it in the living of our every-day lives. There are two immediate objectives worthy of us: (1) To strengthen our fighting arm, (2) To avoid the economic error of thinking that we can take more out of a pint pot than we put into it."

That bears the name of the Hon. Sir Arthur Robinson, K.C.M.G., as Chairman of the Victorian Board. Men who know Sir Arthur personally tell me he is a gentleman, and I must believe them. But what I cannot reconcile is how a gentleman could consciously be a party to something which helps to bring harm to his fellow-countrymen. It may be that Sir Arthur is not conscious of the harm he is doing, and is himself the unwitting victim of "economic error!"

What precisely does he mean by the sentence: "We Australians can have the sort of world we want if we are prepared to make sacrifices for it in the living of our every-day lives"? The sort of world most of us desire is a world in which every family will have a full share of necessities and amenities. A world in which there will be no need for one person because of his own shortage to steal from another person. A world in which the wonderful benefits of medicine and surgery will be available to all people without favour for any. A world in which slum conditions and wars will be things of unhappy memory. We already know how to make use of the gifts of a universally beneficent Creator to adequately meet the physical needs of such a world, and what is more, to do it without sacrifice of any of the material things we now enjoy. That being so, to what sort of "sacrifice" does Sir Arthur refer, and to whom is the sacrifice to go after we make it? It has already been demonstrated that prior to the outbreak of the present war, production was sufficient for every family to have a standard of living equal to an income of more than £10 per week. But as most of the people did not have sufficient money to buy the production, they had to go without a proper share of it, and so it was destroyed instead of being used. Does Sir Arthur mean a continuance of that sort of blasphemous sacrifice? One thing is definitely certain, and it is this: if we continue to take part of the working man's wages for the confidence trick called "insurance," we certainly will NOT get the sort of world we want.

And what precisely does he mean by the phrase "to avoid the economic error of thinking that we can take more out of a pint pot than we put into it"? Will he name anyone who, to his own knowledge, has claimed that we can do such a thing? Both actually and potentially our productive capacity is enormous, and we do not need to attempt to put it into any pot, unless, of course, we choose to consider our stomachs as pots. What we need to do is to give people full access to the plentiful production, and the means by which they gain that access is through regular supplies of money. Now, it is only in connection with the supply of "money" that dishonourable men introduce the analogy of the pint pot. They have become so accustomed to attempting the absurdity of forcing a gallon of production into a pint of money that they have become stupid about it.

The whole purpose of "insurance" is just that—to prevent the people from enjoying the goods now available, and forcing them into perpetual indebtedness to financial institutions which act as deflation agents for the bankers; i.e., reducing the volume of production to fit into an inadequate supply of money. The A.M.P. Society is part of the present fraudulent financial system, and its job is to persuade people that money must be "saved" now if they wish to have any in that "rainy" day when they become older. Indeed, the Society helps to impose the NEED for what it calls "savings." The position may be explained as follows: The income we receive now is in respect of

present production. If we "save" part of it, it means that we are not using part of the money which was included in the cost of the production in respect of which our income was distributed. Part of the production must therefore remain unsold. If we hoard the savings, then obviously the corresponding costs of the production referred to are not covered and we have insolvency. If we "invest" the savings, then they are applied to secure new production with a corresponding set of new costs. Consequently, the amount of savings thus distributed by way of investment is sufficient to buy the unsold balance of the old production, OR the new production, resulting from the investment, BUT NOT BOTH! This is one of the great errors brought about by "savings" and "insurance." Under a sensible money system it would not be necessary for any individual citizen to provide money for the future. His job, if any, would be to take his place in producing things to meet the community's needs. It would be the Government's job to see that the tickets of claim called money corresponded with the things which had been produced. Without robbing Peter to pay Paul, the Government would also see that "unemployed," elderly, widowed and sick citizens received, as a right, at least sufficient money to claim an adequate minimum standard-of-living, commensurate with the available abundance.

In the light of the foregoing, I appeal to Sir Arthur Robinson, and also to all other men who have been honoured by the King, to discontinue allowing their names and titles to be associated with anti-social activities, and instead to join with those who are endeavouring to expose the greatest enemy of God and man. There is really nothing creditable in trying to ensure an unreal financial future at the expense of a very real productive present.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne. C.2.
13th June, 1943.

Cooks and Conquerors

"The newspapers here [New York] give the impression that the war is being fought by France and Canada. At a popular theatre, one of the scenes depicted nightly is of Canadian troops returning from the battlefield to their meals, which are being cooked for them by British soldiers."

No, Clarence, that is not a report of the winning of the Battle of Egypt. It is an extract from a cable to Sir Edward Grey by Lord Northcliffe, on September 1, 1917.

"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.I.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.

NEW BOOKLET

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

Recommended by the Social Credit Secretariat as specially 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.

AVAILABLE SHORTLY

Major Douglas's Latest

The new series of articles by C. H. Douglas, entitled "The 'Land for The (chosen) People' Racket," now appearing in the "New Times," is also being published in book form by The Democratic Federation of Youth, Room 9, Floor 3, 296a Pitt-street, Sydney, N.S.W., to whom orders and remittances, for copies of the book, should be addressed.

Price: 2/- (plus postage).

ALBERTA DEBT ADJUSTMENT ACT BEFORE THE PRIVY COUNCIL

As previously reported in these columns, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in dismissing an appeal by the Attorney-General of Alberta from a majority judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, held that the Debt Adjustment Act, 1937, of Alberta, as amended to 1941, was "ultra vires" the Legislature of Alberta.

The Act, inter alia, constituted a Debt Adjustment Board, with powers to make inquiries with regard to the property of any resident debtor or resident farmer, and provided that, with certain exceptions, actions, suits, and proceedings to enforce payment against resident debtors in respect of debts created before July 1, 1936 should not be begun or continued without a permit issued by or on behalf of the board. The board was also empowered, on request, to conduct negotiations to bring about agreements between resident debtors and their creditors, with the object of reducing debts so as to bear some relation to the debtors' ability to pay. Further, a resident farmer, who was in default on a proposal formulated and confirmed under the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act, 1934 (a Dominion Act), could not be proceeded against by his creditor without a permit from the board.

Mr. Wilfrid Barton, K.C., and Mr. J. Leonard Stone appeared for the appellant; and Mr. D. N. Pritt, K.C., and Mr. Frank Gahan; Mr. J. W. Estey, K.C., and Mr. F. W. Wallace; Mr. Charles Romer, K.C., and Mr. J. Leonard Stone; and Mr. C. F. H. Carson, K.C., for various respondents and interveners.

JUDGMENT

Lord Maugham, giving the judgment of their Lordships, said that distress of a very serious nature was rife in Alberta and the adjoining prairie Provinces from at any rate the year 1920, and the Act now under

* Mr. Estey is Attorney-General for Saskatchewan. It was reported in the Alberta press that representatives of Manitoba, Ontario, and New Brunswick would also support the appeal.

consideration was the last of a series of legislative attempts to relieve the distress of resident farmers and others, while keeping within the legislative powers of the Province as laid down in the British North America Act, 1867, as amended. The question before their Lordships, however, was not as to the expediency, still less the wisdom, of the present Act—the Debt Adjustment Act 1937; it was as to the power of the Province to pass it.

In the opinion of their Lordships there could be no doubt as to the pith and substance of the Act. It was legislation in relation to insolvency that was, in relation to a class of subject within the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada under section 91 of the British North America Act, 1867. Its plain purpose was to relieve persons resident in the Province and their estates from an enforceable liability to pay debts incurred before July 1, 1936 and in many cases to compel the creditors to accept compositions approved by the board. That was effected by precluding persons from any access to the Courts of Alberta to enforce their rights against any persons resident in the Province without the permission of the board, which might never be obtained.

Their Lordships had come to the conclusion, in agreement with the Supreme Court, on the one hand, that the Act as a whole constituted a serious and substantial invasion of the exclusive legislative powers of the Parliament in Canada in relation to bankruptcy and insolvency, and, on the other hand, that it obstructed and interfered with the actual legislation of that Parliament on those matters.

The case was tried before Lord Maugham, Lord Russell of Killowen, Lord Macmillan, Lord Romer, and Lord Clauson.

THE "LAND FOR THE (Chosen) PEOPLE" RACKET

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

A few weeks ago, one of the most famous herds of Pedigree Shorthorn cattle in the world, domiciled in the South of Scotland, developed some cases of Foot-and-Mouth disease. Money values really mean very little in connection with unique specimens, but the herd was conservatively valued at about £20,000. It had been formed by an owner who was an acknowledged authority. His whole life's work and interest was bound up with his cattle. Every possible argument was brought to bear upon the Board of Agriculture, without effect. Every animal, sick or well, was slaughtered. The owner died of a broken heart a few days later.

Although comment was stifled, it was not wholly prevented, and several disinterested persons with cognate experience obtained publicity for the expression of grave doubts as to the justification for this rigid policy. One lady, a member of a family with a long hereditary experience of cattle breeding, but with no interest to serve but that of farmers, claimed, not only to have a cure, but to have demonstrated it beyond any possibility of refutation. The Ministry of Agriculture was not even interested, and refused reasonable facilities for a re-demonstration. It will be remembered that the Duke of Westminster expressed disbelief in the official policy some time ago, and as a large landowner in probably the most famous dairy country, Cheshire, he was doubtless drawing upon first-class information.

There is in this policy evidence of that soulless crudity which many people have come to recognise in Marxian ideology. If it were justified by results, it would still be suspect as containing the seed of further trouble. But it is grossly ineffective. Information as to the number of head of cattle in the United Kingdom in 1942 is not available to me. It seems highly probable that it is far less than at the beginning of the war. But the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth were 99 in 1939; 160 in 1940; 264 in 1941; and 670 or nearly seven times as many, in 1942. The number of cattle slaughtered under the Order was 12,029 in 1939; 19,058 in 1940; 27,128 in 1941; and 56,515 in 1942. Comment would appear to be superfluous.

Many persons who have taken up this matter do not hesitate to give their opinion on it. They say that there is some vested interest involved. In the sense in which this is usually meant, I can offer no special view, since I am not closely in touch with the problem. But I should, a priori, be much more inclined to regard it as the policy of a philosophy. Israel Zangwill, the Zionist leader, was profoundly right, and was no doubt speaking from inner information, when he said at the "Hands off Russia" meeting at the Albert Hall on February 8, 1919: "The British Government is only Bolshevism in embryo, and Bolshevism is only Socialism in a hurry." It does not require much imagination to see that the type of mind which regards mass slaughter of cattle as the least troublesome way in which to deal with a curable disease is the same type of mind which regards the mass liquidation of

millions of Russian farmers as the easiest way to stamp out opposition to collective farming. I hope no reader of these lines will miss the implication of them.

Perhaps at this point I may be permitted to emphasise once again the evident collapse of the episodic view of events. Our sense of realities has become so perverted that we only see with difficulty the direct connection between the murder of millions of Russians in 1919, and the mass killing of unknown millions of Russians, as well as other nationalities, in 1942. The pseudo-scientists of dialectical materialism appear to be determined to distract attention from the first Law of genuine science: Action and reaction are equal, and opposite. Still less, therefore, do we see that, in allowing these mass, collective "remedies" to become familiarised, we are preparing a psychology which can only have appalling results.

To anyone who is not willfully blind, it must be obvious that man's interference with nature, if it is not to be catastrophic, must be inspired by something very different from the rigid formalism of a Government Department. The modern Government Department has its roots in the departmentalised pseudo-science of the Encyclopaedist fore-runners of the French Revolution and its lineal descendant, Russian Bolshevism. The curious, shallow, and largely bogus generalisations of Russian intellectuals (e.g., that all human behaviour is derived from four "conditioned reflexes") have the same unhealthy phosphorescence. No sane individual would contend, I should suppose, that either genuine scientific research or its application within the sphere in which it can be controlled—inorganic—is in itself undesirable. Only megalomaniacs could claim that we have accumulated sufficient knowledge in about one hundred years to warrant us in undertaking the modest task of rectifying on a grand scale the errors of a Life Process which has evolved in untold millenniums. Nor does the initial result of our activities appear to justify the mass application of our theories. We have begun to Plan the animals; and the Big Idea is Death.

(All rights reserved.) (To be continued.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

PLANNERS' PLOTS: London reports state that "the battle against Germany and Japan will be succeeded by a battle between Planners and anti-Planners, arising from the position that hundreds of thousands now have some form of complaint against red tape." It is encouraging to learn that the menace of the bankers' stooges is realised, and that the people will contest the issue. It has been said that the battle for freedom will commence when the war is over; but there is no intelligent reason for delaying action on this vital front. Our fighting forces certainly would not appreciate the "enemy within" being allowed to dig-in.

REGIMENTATION RESISTED: Press reports of June 4 state that "ten N.S.W. women workers accused Mr. Ward and Mr. Bellemore of attempting to intimidate them into joining a trade union." Mr. Bellemore told them that he had come to try to persuade them to join the union, and "simply that he had the power to send them to Bourke if necessary." The women concerned, however, could not be cowed by this dictatorial form of pressure, and asked him a long list of questions, which evidently upset his bullying tactics, because he complained that they had obviously obtained legal advice before his arrival. What a shame! These women are in the factories to assist in defeating dictatorship, and must not be bullied about by bureaucratic upstarts, who may cause trouble by incensing democratic workers to such a pitch that they may take forcible steps to protect women from such tyranny.

FRANCE'S FUTURE: Press reports inform us that the administration being set up to administer French affairs after the war is to be known as "French Committee of National Liberation." Commenting on this, the reports state that "such a committee with energetic and ruthless commissaires earned a great reputation in earlier French history." All this is being arranged by men who fled from the clutches of the invader, without reference to those who stayed with the sinking Ship of State or the people who have suffered the tyranny of the invasion; but maybe these French patriots will have something to say about this—later on.

PRELIMINARY PROGRESS: The Victorian Public Service Association has listed a motion which indicates that they have been slightly demoralised in the matter of finance, viz.: "That advances be made by the Government of interest-free marriage loans and 100% advances to public servants for the building of homes." It seems that this body will press its claims against the State Government, which is supposed to have no jurisdiction in the manufacture of money, on the grounds that that power resides legally only in the Federal Government. There is room in this organisation for more actionists who understand these matters, to assist them in pressing the correct button.

FEDERAL UNION: An indication that the Labour Party, along with all others, is consciously or unconsciously helping the international financiers is to be found in the following advocacy of Federal Union contained in a statement by the British Labour Party's executive committee: "Britain, U.S., China and Russia should constitute a world political authority" (Federal Union). Now, isn't that just what the international bankers are advocating? It will be interesting to note the Labour Party's pronouncement on the restoration of the gold-standard (the bankers' number two war aim—and peace aim).

GOLD GOSSIP: A Washington report states that "confidence is expressed that differences between British and American plans for post-war international monetary practice will be cleared up without difficulty." Discussions in progress with other Allies are understood to have reached a point where lasting agreements may be considered. As an after-thought the report stated that "Australia had been constantly consulted." Will anyone in Australia who HAS been consulted (not insulted) kindly advise the "New Times" immediately?

REDS RE-ORGANISE: Under this heading, a press item informs us that for the first time Russian factories are using the "assembly-line" system, and that one factory had reported a production increase of 41%. Other reports state that Russian battleships have been completely re-fitted with British guns and armour. Russia has apparently realised the fact that she has a long way to go to attain the standard achieved by Western countries not completely befogged in socialistic bureaucracy. If she continues to avail herself of advanced Western ideas, applying them to the almost unlimited resources and manpower at her disposal, she will indeed become the dominant Asiatic power.

—O.B.H.

THE FIRST STEP

"My main interest now is . . . the problem of how to maintain employment and avoid mass unemployment in Britain after the war. As the first step I am going to the United States and Canada." —Sir William Beveridge to the American Outpost in Great Britain.

THE INDIAN QUESTION

From the "Social Creditor," England, February 13, 1943.

It is daily becoming more obvious that there is very, very Big Money behind the agitation in the United States against the British Empire, and particularly against British control of India. And anyone who remembers the part played by German-American-Jewish bankers, until they were bought off by an undisclosed bargain in 1917, will have no difficulty in locating its origin.

There are two marked characteristics of the American general public—we are not referring to the peculiar populations of New York and Washington, or even Chicago, but to the great mass of farmers and artisans who make up probably one hundred out of the hundred and thirty millions who call themselves Americans. The first of these is abysmal ignorance of world affairs, combined with both lack of interest in them and a strong desire not to be mixed up in them. And the second is a sublime belief in their divine mission to point out their neighbour's sins. These two characteristics can be worked upon, and are being worked upon, to provide an instrument of blackmail, just as Great Britain, in 1917, was blackmailed. Not one Middle West American in a million would do one serious day's work to implement his infantile views on the correct policy to pursue in regard to India, but he can be roused quite easily to "barrack" anyone who is engaged on the problem—in fact, his idea of a game is an organised opportunity to hurl abuse at the players.

We have received from a Californian address what purports to be a reprint of an article by Frances Gunther in a magazine called "Common Sense." The title of the article is significant—"If India Loses, We Lose." Who is "we"?

Amongst the usual mass of distortions, half-truths, and plain lies, the following remarkable paragraph occurs: "Anyonewith an inkling of Anglo-Russian and Anglo-Chinese relations for the past 150 years must realise that the elimination of English domination from India is and will remain [our emphasis] a vital factor in the national policies of both Russia and China." If that sentence means anything at all, it means that Indian affairs must be dominated by Russian and Chinese policy, in place of British.

We have no doubt that "appropriate official circles" in this country have seen this poisonous and dangerous rubbish, which reached us uncensored through the mail. We are making sure of it, however.

In Britain's Parliament

The Debate on Economic Policy in the House of Commons on February 2 showed, nesting together in the minds of M.P.s, (1) the determination to make Full-Employment-for-All the explicit objective of the State; and (2) the realisation that war stimulates the development of industrial processes to greater efficiency and production both at home and in countries which formerly imported manufactured goods.

Little birds in their nests don't always agree: one of these notions may cuckoo the other out. Which?

Sir Kingsley Wood's "constructive" suggestions were:

(1) "First we need a policy of expansion so that employment is maintained and production serves the ends of consumption...."

(2) "Secondly, we need a strong effort to prevent those disastrous swings in the prices of the raw materials and primary products of the world...."

(3) "Thirdly, we need an international monetary mechanism which will serve the requirements of international trade and avoid any need for unilateral action in competitive exchange depreciation."

(4) "Fourthly . . . there is another phase of international economic co-operation . . . which we hope will be of increasing importance—the work of the International Labour Office...."

(5) "Finally, as the world begins to settle down after the war . . . we may well need some international organisation for assisting the direction of international investments for development."

International, anyway.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From THE UNITED DEMOCRATS, of 17 Weymouth-street, Adelaide.)

LUNCH HOUR ADDRESS: On Friday, June 25 Mr. D. J. Amos will speak on "Alberta and William Aberhart." This will be well worth hearing, and we hope that we shall have a good attendance.

—M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Secretary.

S.C.M. OF S.A.

The next monthly meeting of the Social Credit Movement of South Australia will be held in the Rechabite Hall, Grote-street, Adelaide, on Thursday, June 24, at 8 p.m. At the conclusion of the general business a discussion on general topics of the day will be the order for this month. All members are requested to take their part, so please be prepared.

—J. E. Burgess, Hon. Secretary.

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 lid. (4/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 9d. Postage 1*d. (6/- per dozen, post free.)

BUREAUCRATIC REGULATION IN U.S.A.

The United States is a land of extravagant contrasts and exaggerations. If things "stick out a mile" with us over here, they are apt to stick out two in America. When America plans, she plans. Besides which, it is to be remembered that next to Germany, she is a pioneer in planned economy. That she is rapidly overtaking Britain in that war-within-the-war euphemistically known as "emergency control" is shown by the following comments quoted from a long and witty editorial from the "Textile Colorist" (New York) for October, 1942—

"The Federal Trade Commission has laid another egg, which the Office of Price Administration is endeavouring to hatch, and this one was laid in the nests of the textile and dye industries.

"Some one, who seemingly never made, dyed, finished or sold a textile fabric, concocted a document that is as useful as fly paper in an aquarium.

"... He formulated his nightmare into a collection of rules and handed them to the Federal Trade Commission, which organisation conferred with the Office of Price Administration.

"Then, with much waving of the flag, they broadcasted multigraphed copies of the hodge-podge with instructions that they must be adopted at once as a war measure, but how advising the purchasing public as to the relative fastness of dyes would win the war has not as yet been explained.

"... The rules set forth 32 different degrees of fastness to light, 16 different degrees of fastness to washing (or laundering), three degrees of fastness to pressing (dry or wet), three degrees of fastness to perspiration, two degrees of fastness to crocking (rubbing) and two degrees of fastness to gas.

"... Consider the textile manufacturer. He will make 10,000 yards of a fabric of one or more textile fibres containing four or five different colours, each having its own peculiar idiosyncrasies with regard to fastness. After the goods are made, but before he can offer them for sale, he must test them for seven different fastness properties...

"... It is quite evident that whoever formulated this extraordinary document has an idea that all textile fibres possess the same chemical and physical properties and that each dye is capable of dyeing every fibre in the same manner and with identical colourfastness.

"Anyone conversant with the most elementary properties of textile fibres and dyes knows that the above quotation from the rules is alone sufficient to make them inoperative.

"The Federal Trade Commission states: The need for such rules is accentuated by war-time conditions which is necessitating the conservation of critical dyestuffs. . . .

"Even Solomon with all his wisdom and his many wives, each one of whom undoubtedly continually worried him for new coloured dresses, could not have found

a single thought in the entire document which will decrease the sale of dyes or effect the quality or quantity of dyes used for war purposes.

"The taxpayers, whose financial burdens are becoming greater every day, naturally wonder why their money should be expended for such purposes, when every dollar and every person on the Government's pay-roll should be directed to winning the war."

The whole picture, most graphically drawn, is much worse than that. The appreciation of the inherent impracticality of such schemes is quite well developed in the editor of the "Textile Colorist." But the vital question is—To what extent is the public mind in the United States (so deeply infected with propaganda and so standardised in thought) equipped to resist the apparent "inevitability" of this sort of thing, and to realise as the writer of the above dimly sees, that the war is being made an excuse for putting over a standardisation of industry that it was desired to instal long before there was a war; and that the insistence on doing so is going seriously to slow up war production and perhaps ultimately, if it is allowed to cripple the war effort.

The situation is really serious, for American industry is much more highly centralised than ours, and its collapse, if it should be brought about by the attempt to utilise the occasion for this sort of thing, would be proportionately more sudden and complete—a comparison might be drawn between America and Britain during the 1929-32 financial collapse. To be pessimistic for a moment, and just to lend an added sense of realism to the fight that Social Crediters are waging against the "nazification" of the Home Front, imagine a collapse like that happening in the States and Germany dug in and concentrating on the U-boat campaign!

Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, managing director of Messrs. Marks and Spencer, is reported to have complained before the Retail Commission in Washington, according to the editor of the "Drapers' Record," that the "rugged individualism" of the British shopkeeper was hampering the war effort over here. But what of the obstruction caused by the 'polished' (not to say oily) individualism of the Government adviser who puts over such schemes as these?

—N.F.W., in the "Social Creditor."

ther oil is present, in commercial quantity in an apparently suitable trap can be determined only by drilling. Indeed, oil deposits, of great magnitude have been, and are being, discovered by random drilling. There is no fixed formula for discovery—and, important as our advanced and advancing technique of prospecting may be, we are, nevertheless, indebted for a large part of our reserves to discoveries made by the thousands of wells drilled at random. Not only new pools, but occasionally new regions and new types of pools, are discovered through ventures regarded as too risky to attract the skilful prospector. Even

among the most experienced technical men there is often diverse opinion as to whether a particular prospect may be attractive enough to justify the expense of drilling.

"That indicates clearly the limitations of geology in connection with the search for oil. It is a mistake to depend too much on the science of geology. I trust that the Government will deal at once with the situation in a practical way, and will regard this particular proved area as a field for drilling engineers and production experts rather than for geologists."

(To be continued.)

"PASSED TO YOU, PLEASE"

Every civil servant who has retained some measure of individuality, and probably most other people, must, on reading the title, smile in pleasant expectation as to the contents of this book.* What a feast it should be! Alas, what a disappointment awaits them—the farther the reader gets, the more puzzled he becomes at the point of view of the author.

The book is mainly concerned with the War Office and the new war-time departments which are attacked chiefly for their inefficiency during periods of expansion. Every time there is a war certain arrangements break down. The author blames the men at the War Office, men who at the time were probably faced with overwhelming labours and with many tasks of varying importance. The great importance of something after the event is often very different from its apparent importance before the event. At such times things are bound to go wrong and that the author should go fishing in such troubled waters is strange. This is especially so, as invariably wars have been preceded by periods of retrenchment during which the financial powers have by their deliberate parsimony ensured that the existing organisation would break down to some extent when the real strain developed. This financial preparation is not given any limelight in the book at all.

Where it is obliquely referred to, incidents in the seventeenth century are chosen: "Money was supposed to come by vote of Parliament, but so little was doled out, that . . ." etc. A number of these incidents are obviously attempts, some successful, by Parliament to curb the warlike aspirations of some sections. That is inefficiency, only if war is the normal policy of a country. At the time in that century when British arms were deficient and the armies in arrears with their pay, the Dutch army and navy were lavishly equipped. There is no hint at the financial pressure being a deliberate policy by

* "Passed to You, Please," by J. P. W. Mallalieu, Gollancz.

the controllers of finance. Cromwell, "our" Hitler, seems to have been favoured by those powers and hence is considered by some more "efficient."

More remarkable than the choice of examples and the point of view from which "efficiency" in the civil and other services is judged, are the author's conclusions. There is no hint that the kind of inefficiency typified by the title of the book is inherent in bureaucracy. It is actually suggested that a kind of Gestapo reporting inefficiency and drawn from "a well organised Labour Party and a well organised Trades Council" should be set up. The reason for the inefficiency is given—i.e., as follows: "So long as Britain is ruled by a small owning class, so long will the State machine be directed to serve the needs of that class. Only by overthrowing that class can the great mass of the people hope to secure a machine that will cater to their needs."

As this passage indicates, the book finally degenerates into Socialist propaganda. The unconscious humour of this is lost on the author.

The book has an introduction by Harold J. Laski, who uses this opportunity for still more Socialist propaganda. One passage seems to be a fitting epitaph and to summarise the purpose of the book: "It is because the survival of democratic government seems clearly to involve what Mr. and Mrs. Webb have called 'planned production for community consumption' that I believe the adjustments the post-war civil service will require are likely to be profound." In plain English, "the survival of democracy can only be secured by its abolition."

—H.R.P., in the "Social Creditor."

THE FRUSTRATION OF PRODUCTION OF MOTOR FUEL IN AUSTRALIA

(Continued from last issue.)

Hereunder we publish a further instalment from the remarkable sixpenny booklet by A. W. Noakes, the title of which is the same as the above heading, and which may be obtained from The Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide Street, Brisbane. Last week's instalment consisted of an extract from a speech made in the Federal Parliament on November 23, 1939, by Mr. Patterson, the Member for Gippsland, who referred to the Lakes Entrance oil-field. Speaking of the same field, he continued:—

"Let us return now to the small company which has interested itself in this enterprise. What is it asking from the Government? In the first place, it is asking the Government to make available the advice and collaboration of its technical drilling expert, a Canadian brought over to Australia some time ago by the Oil Advisory Committee. They want this man's advice and collaboration, to assist them in drawing up a programme of future development. I believe that the Oil Advisory Committee is opposed to the giving of such advice by the Commonwealth officers, on the ground that it is not their business to give technical advice to companies; but, I ask, to what better use could this man's expert knowledge be put at a time like this? The Oil Advisory Committee has recommended that six small bores should be put down about two miles apart, and that cores from the bores be sent to England and the United States of America for examination. I understand, further, that it is proposed that this drilling shall be done with some old-fashioned State drilling plant about 70 years old.

"This plant is capable of doing effective work, but it is extremely slow. Nearly twelve months have already elapsed since the release of the report of the Advisory Committee containing its recommendations in regard to this area. If its advice is followed, and new bores are put down with an old plant and cores sent overseas for examination, another twelve months must elapse before anything is known, and possibly the information which would then be obtained would be of more interest to the geologists than to anybody else. I urge the Minister to take a shorter cut, and immediately to concentrate action on this area where oil has been, definitely proved.

"I appreciate the interest shown by the Minister for the Interior (Senator Foll), and his predecessor, the Honourable Member for Indi (Mr. McEwen). Both have visited the field. I do not blame either of them for the irritating delay that has taken place, because, though a Minister must accept complete responsibility for matters connected with his Department, I realise to what extent a layman is in the hands of his technical advisers in matters of this kind. However, when those advisers profoundly disagree among themselves, the Minister must either accept the advice which appeals to his common sense, take a line of his own, or he must get fresh advice. The Government of Victoria has taken action to make possible one unit control for a repressing programme. I hope the Commonwealth Government will now take immediate steps to put this programme into effect.

"I have here a book entitled: 'The American Petroleum Industry,' published by the American Petroleum Institute, an organisation with a world-wide reputation. This is what it says on the art of discovering oil:

"New oil pools are found only by the drilling of wells. All geological and geophysical work serves only to indicate the existence of traps—of underground conditions suitable for oil accumulation. Whe-

ART IN A PLANNED WORLD

By B. M. PALMER, in the "Social Creditor," England.

After reading the article on this subject in "Garvin's Gazette" by Christopher Martin, Administrator of the Arts Department at Darlington Hall, one is inclined to ask, with Tolstoy, "What is Art?" Though it is certainly beyond the scope of the writer to attempt to answer a question which is probably unanswerable in the present stage of civilisation, a definition by the Planners of the purpose of Art would be helpful. For they certainly have an answer of their own. We are beginning to experience the results of their beliefs.

Christopher Martin writes:—"I have known Darlington all my life, and I well remember it before the war as a cheerful, very beautiful place, part ruin, part farmyard, part manor. The gardens, though full of shrubberies, odd corners and exciting places for hide and seek, were not, I suppose, as spectacular as they are now. The courtyard was full of chickens, hay stacks and pigs. The barn, theatre was piled with hay at one end, with farm implements at the other; among them I remember a brand new reaper and binder."

Now the buildings are "transformed out of all recognition into one of the most stately quadrangles I know of in all England."

Yes, Christopher Martin is an honest believer in planned art. He writes so sincerely, that his choice of words gives another picture in the background, like one photograph superimposed on another. So the result is "spectacular" and "transformed out of all recognition." It is not surprising to learn that the quadrangle impressed another who knew Darlington well, as "very beautiful, but so Americanised that what little atmosphere is left is utterly theatrical. The buildings have been entirely revolutionised and the whole thing brings vividly to mind 'The Ghost Goes West.'"

Restoration of ancient buildings betrays more clearly than any other branch of the applied arts the philosophy of the age. Until within the last hundred and fifty years nobody bothered to restore anything. And why should they? Haddon Hall was five hundred and fifty years in growing. Its founder did not set out with a plan of the finished article. Lacock Abbey is built in four different manners, covering four centuries, but all in Bath stone, thus attaining a natural unity. Repairs and alterations were made in the style familiar to the period. As a result, these English country houses and hundreds of others like them, fitted into their background, completing perhaps one of the most beautiful landscapes that has ever existed. Darlington seems to have been built be-

fore 1650, during the best period of the manor house. Then came the destruction wrought by Cromwell, followed in the eighteenth and nineteenth century by the gradual decay and loss of real comfort so feelingly described by Cobbett. Towards the close of the nineteenth century, when economic destruction was in full career, restoration and preservation became a serious architectural study, not always with the happiest results. The tide flowed on. It could not spare the Adelphi terrace, yet this loss seems as nothing in the light of the London fires, which were in reality, the logical result of the economic destruction of the previous century. Not many years before they were burnt, a Bishop of London had suggested the destruction of the London churches for their site value. Restoration in harmony with the spirit of the past (I think the word is reverent) is one thing; restoration in accordance with some imaginary future which exists only in the minds of a few men, who yet have the means to compel us to go with them, quite another. And if these people believe, as they usually seem to, that you can add "Beauty" to things in much the same way as you can add icing to a cake, why, there you have your dangerous idealist, and if in addition you have foolishly allowed him the control over several million of pounds, then so much the worse for you.

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," which is 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.

THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS

Printed by M. F. Canavan, 25 Cullinton-road, Hartwell, for The New Times Ltd., McEwan House Melb.