

"WATCH OUT FOR BAM-BOOZLERS. (Page 2)
SCHEMES THAT PLANNERS PLOT. (Page 2)
ANOTHER ELECTION DIALOGUE. (Page 3)
U.E.A. ELECTION GUIDE. (Page 3)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 9 No. 32 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, AUG. 13 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).

Dr. Evatt Saw The "Right Men" In U.S.A.

That "Unofficial Super-Cabinet"

"Why Evatt Saw the Super-Doopers" was the heading of a somewhat naive, but very revealing article, published on page 6 of the Sydney "Daily Mirror" on June 2, 1943. It provides striking confirmation of much that has appeared in these columns—e.g., the item in our last issue headed "Unofficial Super-Cabinet in U.S.A." Hereunder we reproduce in full the "Mirror's" article exactly as they printed it, except that we have reduced the sub-heading and following black-type paragraph from double column to single column, and we have reluctantly omitted photographs of "the Right Men", which included those of the Jewish representatives of Finance and Law:—

(From ELIZABETH RIDDELL, "Daily Mirror" Representative in New York.) New York, Thursday.—When Dr. Evatt visited President Roosevelt the incident was duly recorded by the press. But when he detoured to a White House side door to see Harry Hopkins, Samuel Rosenman, or James Byrnes, or sat with Bernard Baruch in Lafayette Park, the facts were merely noted and filed away in the memory of reporters, with the comment that Australia's Minister was seeing the Right Men.

These four—Hopkins, Rosenman, Byrnes, and Baruch—are so much the right men that they have become the super-dooper Cabinet, the top layer of the three layers of government. (On top of all three layers, of course, is the President, like the candle on the cake.)

The first layer is the official Cabinet, official in the sense that it contains the people who have the portfolios—for there is nothing in the constitution of the United States calling for a Cabinet of any sort.

They are the people who never resign, no matter how much of their work is gradually taken from them. They are Hull, of the State Department (Foreign Affairs), Stimson of War, Knox of Navy, Morgenthau of the Treasury, Perkins of Labour, Wickard of Agriculture, Jones of Com-

merce. They stick out the attrition of war at home and abroad.

The second layer has the alphabet men, the heads of the war agencies—Nelson of Production, Elmer Davis of News, Chester Davis of Food, Jeffers of Rubber, Ickes of Fuel, McNutt of Manpower.

Among the Big Four, who are all close friends of the President as well as his advisers, chief officers, consultants, and manipulators of the complicated machinery of government, there are two Jews—Rosenman and Baruch; one Irishman, Byrnes; and the Anglo-Saxon, Harry Hopkins.

I have not interviewed any of these four, and I probably never will. They do not hold press conferences, a strange thing indeed in Washington, where conferences are held at the drop of even a very small hat.

They do not go to receptions or cocktail parties or banquets. They simply work like mad.

Perhaps the most powerful at the moment is Byrnes—Jimmy Byrnes, of South Carolina, born on the wrong side of the tracks 68 years ago, a small, wiry, shrewd, sparkling fellow, the direct opposite of the big, bluff, hearty Ed Flynn type. He is described as a politician's politician.

Director of Economic Stabilisation, he has a consistent New Deal record, but is a strong fighter for clean-cut administration. He is the soother, the shepherd, the finagler, the manager, the builder-upper, and the calmer-downer.

Boiled down, his major job is probably keeping the President in touch with the American people. He is called the Assistant-President.

Rosenman—Sammy the Rose to F.D.R. and many others—is Mr. Justice Samuel Rosenman, of the New York State Bench, 47 years old, married, shy, quiet, cultured.

Rosenman was born in Texas. He was early a Tammany boy, one of a group of smart young lawyers, but he is no real politician, and he has never had an official Government position. He is just the man who works out ways of doing things, the planner for the Production Board, the National Housing Agency, the War Manpower Commission.

Sammy the Rose dreams them up, blue-prints them, hands them over, as well as being the guide to the President in his speeches and messages to the nation. Early in the war it was his mind which worked out the system of priorities, supply, allocation now in use. He took up the anti-inflation problem and resolved it, for the U.S., into the Office of Economic Stabilisation.

In Broadway language, he "makes with the brain."

"BENEVOLENT OLD BIRD."

Bernard Baruch is a well-born Jew from South Carolina, who lives on Fifth Avenue and presides like a benevolent old bird at the counsels of the super-dooper Cabinet. In his 73 years he has met most of the great or temporarily-great men of the last 40 years.

He came to New York as a Wall Street runner at five dollars a week, and before he was 30 had made and lost his first million.

How many millions he has made since then no one knows, but he quickly gave up losing them. Now he gives them away—the latest million, in war bonds, was a Christmas present to 15 different organisations.

He is a tall old man, 6ft. 4in., spectacled, with thick white hair and black eyebrows, who wears good dark clothes and woollen gloves in winter, and prefers to talk to people on a seat in Lafayette Park.

For in Baruch this is not considered eccentricity. He calls it his air-conditioned office. There is no indication of his fabulous career—fabulous in the sense of figures, rather than colour—and age and experience have given a facade of simplicity to a complicated intellect.

This is Baruch's second role of war adviser. In the last war he was chairman of the Raw Materials Board, possibly the most vital organisation of that period. In this war, the President, apart from listening to the benevolent advice of the great sage and financier, asked him to untangle the rubber situation, among other things. He is, of course, regarded with great veneration by Americans, for he represents what they think makes the nation so wonderful—immense wealth accumulated without open scandal, starting from scratch, and culminating in mild picturesqueness.

It is characteristic that when Baruch gave a party for his friend Hopkins and Hopkins' new wife, where caviar and fine champagne and other exotic viands were served, the anti-Administration critics turned not against Baruch, who gave it, but against Hopkins, who attended it.

The case of Harry Hopkins (53), three times married, long-faced and with stomach ulcers, is puzzling when it's not startling. Apparently he epitomises, for the U.S. people, all that they dislike about the New Deal, facet of the Roosevelt Administration. Hopkins is a sort of deluxe missionary or social worker. He came out of Iowa when he was a youth, with the burning intent to do good, and worked at the job practically in one slum after another. He has known the President since 1928, and of the four super-doopers he is probably the superest, for he and his wife and his daughter by his second wife all live in the White House as part of the Roosevelt family.

When Roosevelt took office and determined to do something for what he described as the "ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed one-third of a nation," he appointed Harry Hopkins to do the job. Hopkins was castigated as the world's greatest spender.

His official job now is to administer the Lend-Lease Act, which again makes his a highly-suspicious character to people who regard the Act as Santa Claus' programme to the world.

It was in reference to this job that the scandalous rumour of the emeralds was started. Lord Beaverbrook was supposed to have given Harry's bride, Louise Macy, an emerald necklace.

There is a theory that, with the approach of the fourth term, Harry Hopkins is being kept somewhat in the background, for if Roosevelt is not re-elected Harry will be one of the reasons why. But if Harry is not right out there in front with the President, he is back inside only a few feet—just behind the curtain.

We Must Save Parliament

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

One of the politicians, a man whose own political record will not stand investigation, has recently stated that the present Federal Election is the "dirtiest" on record. I agree with him on this point. I think that most decent-minded citizens in Australia are disgusted with the political spectacle in this country. The great danger is that many people may be inclined to doubt our Parliamentary institutions—which is just what certain people desire!

Since Mr. Ward conveniently introduced the subject of the "Brisbane Line," the electors of this country have had their minds distracted from the real issues and focussed on a fight about "defence policies." Intentionally or otherwise, Mr. Ward's accusations on the "Brisbane Line" were directly responsible for the Curtin Government facing the electors earlier than was intended and they also helped to divert people's minds from the problems of bureaucracy, debt and taxation. Needless to say, the "Opposition's" election programme is as negative as Labor's.

Now, readers of this journal know that I hold no brief for either Mr. Menzies or Mr. Fadden, but I do think that the tactics of some members of the Labor Party have been nauseating. Ward's showing on the "Brisbane Line" was shocking. A brief look at "Hansard" of a few years ago reveals that Mr. Ward is the last man to talk about defence. And further, I always thought that we have competent military experts to work out defence strategy. Electors should not allow themselves to get involved in tangled technical arguments on matters of administration. Mr. Ward's tactics were those of the gutter, while Mr. Curtin's obvious reluctance to deal with Mr. Ward, even after he himself had been forced to repudiate Mr. Ward's accusations, was disconcerting. Is Mr. Curtin afraid of the growing tyranny of the big centralised unions under the dictatorship of Thornton and his Communist colleagues? Mr. Ward has been the darling of the union bosses. In simple words, the story of the defence of Australia is as follows: The Menzies Government laid the foundation of our war effort WITHIN THE CONFINES OF THE PRESENT FINANCIAL SYSTEM. Please note what I have emphasised. The Curtin Government took over from the Fadden Government in October, 1941, and continued the war effort as started by the Menzies' Government, STILL WITHIN THE CONFINES OF THE PRESENT FINANCIAL SYSTEM. For Curtin, Ward and Co. to suggest that they alone were responsible for our existing war effort is lying nonsense. The same men who directed the Menzies' Government are directing the Curtin Government. The people of Australia, the manufacturers, the workmen,

the farmers, and the soldiers, have, in spite of many artificial restrictions, made our war effort. They have saved Australia from the Japs; the "internal enemy" has yet to be tackled seriously.

Mr. Curtin's hypocrisy on the defence issue can be judged by the following statement made by him on May 28, 1941. Mr. Curtin was speaking on the war effort of the Menzies' Government: "The war has been prosecuted to the maximum of Australia's capacity, and I doubt if any great improvements could have been made upon what has been done. . . ."

But, of course, there was no election about to come on when those words were uttered. I have been convinced for some time that it was a major disaster for Australia that the Curtin Government was put into office when it was. We at least knew where we stood with Menzies. Under Menzies the war effort would have still gone on, but Menzies would not have been able to force through some of the legislation introduced by Curtin. But, of course, it is a well-known theory of the bankers that they can always get a socialist Government to do their really dirty work. And readers will, I hope, have noticed that Mr. Coles, the "Independent" who made certain that Curtin would take over in October, 1941, has been maintaining his chain stores very nicely while small businesses have closed down as a result of socialistic legislation.

Needless to say, little can be done this month to repair what has happened. The policy of socialisation is going to be pursued no matter which Party "wins" the election.

Well might people say: "Then is the position hopeless? No, far from it. The electors must force their policies on their paid representatives. This paper exists to give advice to electors, to show them how they can beat the Party tyranny and the forces behind it. It is time that all decent-minded, loyal Australians came forward and helped their fellow citizens to save this country from the dictatorship which is already threatening our internal strength."

"Get Control Of Your M.P." must be our fighting slogan. We must save Parliament. Don't let the election distract us from the real task.

NOTES on the NEWS

The height of bureaucratic bungling is found in the admission by Mr. Rosevear that "while 48,000 pairs of boots and shoes a month were sent from Victoria to South Australia, the latter State was sending 15,000 pairs to other States—and 10,000 pairs to Victoria." This is another of the thousands of examples which prove beyond doubt that bungling bureaucratic control Boards consisting of socialistic theorists are a positive menace to our war effort.

FADDEN'S FRIENDS: The Melbourne "Herald's" finance writer, in the issue of July 26, once more "spilled the beans" thus: "Mr. Fadden's financial policy is supported by the 'Sound Finance League,' which generally reflects banking opinion." It should not be long now before he also informs us that the same goes for Menzies, Curtin and Earle Page. There is no substantial difference in the basic policy of these Party hacks—they just take turn about, alternately soaking each section of the community. It's about time the people refused to be played one against the other by their common enemy—the bankers' debt system.

SLY SLOGAN: Of the many misleading political slogans intended to confuse electors, the Communists' slogan, "Support the Labor Government. Vote for Communist candidates," is one of the most cunning. Obviously, if Communists replaced Labor candidates, there would be no Labor Government to support! Of course, there is not much difference between these cliques, as such, since they both favour conscription in all its forms, the bankers' uniform-tax and debt racket, the Powers, Bill to destroy State Parliaments, and crushing taxation, even on the lower income groups. Be it noted that the "United Australia" and "Country" Parties also favour these bankers' proposals. The Communists appear to represent being denied the opportunity of im-

plementing this bankers' policy. The rank-and-file of the Parties don't seem to realise that they are the innocent dupes being used to carry out the policy of High Finance. It's time they woke up.

FOOD FRONT: The new Victorian Minister for Agriculture (the former Minister, Mr. Hogan, was defeated on the Boards issue), opposed the Federal food-control plan on the grounds that the regulations gave power to the Commonwealth food-control to order any Australian to eat not more than one slice of dry bread, not later than 6.30 a.m. He stated that they also empowered the Government to control the time, quantity and state of food consumed—it could even prohibit the consumption of food altogether. These extraordinary regulations were gazetted on June 28, and were already operating, though they had not been submitted to Parliament. Mr. Martin seems to be well aware of the stupidity and dangers of centralised control, and it is to be hoped that he continues to oppose this socialistic idea of taking control by regulation, thus destroying our Parliamentary institutions.

NEW YORK NEWS: Washington reports state that "Mr. Hull has been on the defensive for many months, and that it is well known that he is particularly sensitive to attempts to question the wisdom of his foreign policy; many people are saying, that (Continued on page 3)

"WATCH OUT FOR BAMBOOZLERS"

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

Sir,—Every day provides confirmation that the international financiers have succeeded in their infamous plan to rob the people of their birthright whilst their backs are turned. To make sure that their backs ARE turned, careful arrangements are made for the attention of the people to be directed away from the financiers and their confidence trick towards other people and other things.

That is why Sir Keith Murdoch on Saturday last warned readers of the Melbourne "Herald" to watch out for bamboozlers. This is what he said: "This is a month of bamboozlement, and I suggest that we must watch out for bamboozlers, and particularly those who may bamboozle themselves." Sure enough, the bamboozlers are very active—they are at work in every party, and Sir Keith himself, is one of the very worst of them.

Economic independence is the one thing that the PEOPLE must NOT get. That would make them FREE. Members of the gangster class believe that "men are most easy to control when they have lost their economic independence," and it is their primary purpose to keep us struggling for money—the thing which they control. You will recall, Mr. Editor, that the American Bankers' Journal of August 20, 1924, contained a remarkable admission of one of the greatest infamies of all time. A copy of the journal containing the admission was presented to the Australian Monetary and Banking Commission for examination. Here is what it said:

"When through a process of law the common people have lost their homes they will be more tractable and easily governed, through the strong arm of the leading central power of imperial wealth, under the control of the leading financiers. A people without homes will not quarrel with their rulers."

It may have been the merest coincidence that that was the very year in which the Commonwealth Bank ceased to be a people's bank and became a bankers' bank. Three of the well-chosen men who looked after that little matter for the "leading financiers" were Stanley Melbourne Bruce, John Greig Latham, and Earle Christmas Grafton Page (two of them since knighted!). Sir Keith, of course, assisted.

But it is to that part of the infamous plan dealing with "dividing the voters" that attention should be invited at this particular time. Part of the processes to be followed were described in these terms:

"By dividing the voters in the political party system we can get them to expend their energies in fighting over questions of no importance. Thus, by discreet action we can secure for ourselves what has been so well planned and so skilfully accomplished."

How well they have succeeded is only too obvious. Aren't we expending our energies in fighting over questions of little importance? All parties profess to be concerned only with the welfare of the population, but all of them fight each other as though they were the bitterest enemies.

When Mr. Curtin appears in a city as Prime Minister someone whispers "He's a Communist," or "He's a Catholic," or "He's gone over to the Capitalists," and anyone of these whispers is sufficient to start others whispering. The same thing applied to the leaders of other parties. Mr. Menzies, it has been said, is intellectually dishonest, a Fascist and a banker's man; Mr. Hughes got a "present" of £25,000 from somewhere and betrayed Labor; Mr. Fadden is a "yes-man" for banking interests and advises all and sundry to call him "Arty"; and so on. Protestant fights Catholic; communists fight capitalists; socialists fight private monopolists; believers in Henry George's Single Tax fight believers in Major Douglas's Social Credit; the proletariat fight the bourgeoisie. We argue and fight about methods instead of joining together to demand the things we want. While our attention is thus concentrated in the wrong direction the rogues steadily collect the wealth. We send representatives to Parliament, where they take part in debates, but "the leading financiers" dictate the extent to which they may ACT. None of the parties intends to take this power away from the dictators, and consequently the only thing left for the PEOPLE to do is to seek out men not committed to any particular "party," men whose first aim is to focus attention on these "leading financiers" and the tricks they have been up to, so that effective steps can be taken to have sovereignty restored to Parliament through control of financial policy.

Is it not also strange how there is serious division even WITHIN the several parties? Within the Labor Movement there are several warring factions—the Curtin faction, the Lang faction, and the Communist faction. This division is due to questions of conscription and finance. Within the United Australia Party there are the Fadden (Country) faction, the Hughes faction, and the Menzies faction. One has charged another with such sportsmanlike conduct as "stabbing in the back." This division is due to questions of leadership, policy and finance. Within the Country Party there are the "United" faction and the "ordinary" faction. This division is due to questions of leadership and finance. Within the Services and Citizens Party there are the ex-soldiers faction and the U.A.P. faction. This division is due to questions of name and finance.

And now, even within the "United" portion of the United Australia Party the question of financial dictatorship is caus-

ing trouble. It is not new to see mud being thrown about the National Union in Victoria and New South Wales, but it IS new to see it being publicly thrown in a State like Western Australia. On July 22 the Melbourne "Sun" informed us that the Chairman of the National Party in Western Australia (Mr. J. J. Simons) had resigned, and that in doing so he had declared as follows: "How can we constantly rail against other political organisations about control from outside bodies when such practices in our own ranks are permitted? As things are at present, National Party candidates, if elected, surrender their freedom and become the creatures of an extraneous body, not answerable to the electors." The next day, the same newspaper announced that two of the party leaders (Senator Collett and Mr. R. R. McDonald, M.L.A.), denied that the party was dominated by an outside financial body, and said, "Before Mr. Simons resigned he received a very clear intimation that his presence in the party was no longer acceptable to a number of his associates." Apparently this little

flare-up followed some legal proceedings, the previous week, in which Mr. F. W. Downes sought an injunction to restrain Brigadier T. S. Louch and Colonel Paton from being endorsed as the Nationalist candidates in Western Australia for the Senate. In the course of his evidence before Mr. Justice Wolff, the secretary of the Nationalist Party (Mr. C. L. Harvey) told the court that the joint Senate team was being financed not by the National Party, BUT BY THE NATIONAL UNION! The judge, in giving his decision, said: "The evidence convinces me that, so far as Senate elections are concerned, no contribution for them is made from party funds. The whole of the expenses for Senate elections—money required for the furtherance of the candidature of candidates—is furnished by this National Union." The two men mentioned were included in the Senate team at the instance of the National Union, and were not "selected" in the normal way by members of the U.A.P. But then, of course, it is only the Trade Union Bosses who tell the Government what to do! In any case, such a body as the National Union would naturally be concerned only with the interests of the struggling farmers and the struggling citizens, and all their actions would be altruistic! Sir Keith Murdoch is not unacquainted with the National Union, the provision of election funds, and the making and unmaking of governments.

Truly, we must watch out for the bamboozlers!—Yours faithfully, Bruce H. Brown, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, August 8 1943

SCHEMES THAT PLANNERS PLOT

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

We are being lulled into complacency with honied words about security and freedom while we are being lured into the dread net of bondage by subtle schemes popularised by clever propaganda. In times of crisis when people are easily panicked; when distress from war and destruction renders them easy prey to charlatans, it is well to get our bearing by contemplating words of wisdom: "Beware of false prophets" —"Ye shall know them by their fruits."

Would-be leaders are springing up from every direction advocating all manner of schemes to further enslave the unwary; men who, if silence gives consent, were thoroughly satisfied with the wretched conditions of the hungry thirties, are now showing great activity in planning the future of those they so recently ignored. . . . The bureaucratic "planner" does not view the supply problem with the idea of ascertaining how MUCH we can supply, but on how LITTLE we can survive. Scarcity is an obsession with him, as with Sir William Beveridge, who drew up his report on the basis of providing the irreducible minimum standard for physical existence—rather than the absolute maximum standard of well-being possible.

In the report itself, Sir William uses the words "minimum subsistence" and "bare necessities of existence" and states that weekly food allowances "may reasonably be divided as seven shillings for a single man and six shillings for a single woman." Further, he states that such lavishness need not be extended to elderly people, however, "because of their failing mastication and digestion," and therefore their allowances are cut to "for a man six shillings a week and for a woman, five shillings and sixpence a week." This plan, to quote Sir William, is designed to bring the British people "half way to Russia." Can this be true, or is it merely a cunning device of Sir William to popularise his "planned poverty" on the

current wave of admiration for the brave and fearless Russian people?

This is the same concept as that of the international banker who, during the depression, told the people of the fabulously rich Australia that if they didn't accept certain financial terms, that would impoverish half their population, they could "stew in their own juice"—and they stewed. The same banker is likely still busy "planning" and in all probability, placing dollars before souls.

. . . . In a speech before the Fabian Society in London on November 21, 1942, Sir William advocated a new type of Freedom: "Freedom from Idleness," and that, in his opinion, "Freedom from idleness is more important than freedom from want."

These planners are progressing rapidly. At first it was "work or starve" but now it is "work, whether or not you starve." Seemingly they have never heard the story of the Irishman who tried to get his horse to go without food, but just when he thought he had it trained, the horse dropped dead. Surely they know, if they have the wit to see what happens in war-time that we have the production necessary to supply everybody with enough and to spare; but they begrudge the money, the figures in books, to make it possible. Once more man is to be crucified on the dollar sign.

These men pose as democrats as they build Hitlerism—for what difference is there between the near-starvation peonage of the Beveridge Work State; or the type of existence apparently favoured by Montagu Norman, "Poverty is good for you"—for "you" not for Norman; the "stew in your own juice" type of Australia favoured by Sir Otto Niemeyer; or the Nazi Germany advocated by Richard Walther Darré, former Nazi Minister of Agriculture, when he stated, "We actually have in mind a modern form of mediaeval slavery which we must and will introduce. . . ."

By way of contrast consider the utterances of Henry Wallace, Vice-President, U.S.A., who states: "This is a fight between a slave world and a free world." And further, "Men and women cannot be really free until they have plenty to eat and time and ability to read and think and talk things over."

Here is a glorious ray of light from the new dawn—freedom, abundance and leisure. Against that is the planned poverty of the schemers, with their compulsory insurance doles; compulsory work schemes; compulsory regimentation.

The issue is clear—it is the same issue that has been with us for centuries, but it has climaxed in the last twenty-five years. It is the issue of Christ as against anti-Christ; of freedom versus slavery; of democracy versus totalitarianism; of abundance versus scarcity; of leisure versus the work State; of the people versus money power; the constructive liberating forces of God against the destructive enslaving powers of evil.

We all must choose the side we take, for we're in this battle whether or no. All the would-be Hitlers are not in Germany, so in choosing we should first be sure to understand the issue clearly. The charlatans ever give lip service to high ideals. "We are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands," to quote Professor Arnold Toynbee, of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

This planning of your life and mine may be all very pleasant (and profitable) for the

planners, but what about the planned—the people? If these plans are put into force and we don't like them, what then? Who will control the planners? Hitler and Mussolini started off as pink parlour Socialists, but planning requires power and power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely," to quote the wise Lord Acton. The real problem seems to be to devise some plan for planning the schemers.

Why not solve the post-war problems by sane methods? As stated by Major C. H. Douglas, "The ideology begins very simply. We have to discard the idea that every child is born into the world to mind someone else's business, and substitute the fact that he is responsible for minding his own. That he should help, not meddle."

This planning business is an obsession, a disease, and those affected—the planners—those who suffer from the hallucinations from the planned economy virus—would turn us all into guinea pigs. They'd willingly put us into test tubes to experiment with us in the hope that they could thereby bring into being their special brand of regimented Utopia.

Not all the planners are that extreme. Most of them are well meaning, idealistic, seemingly harmless sort of individuals who have been only slightly touched, but the virus is there and it will grow. As with creeping paralysis, once an organism has been afflicted the whole is in danger. They get to believe in restrictions and regimentations for their own sake. They would start by rationing sugar and butter and likely end by rationing water. Not because there is no water, but because they have a nice "plan." They would sooner ration the water than turn on the pumps.

They believe in scarcity not because there is a lack but because "it's good for you." They believe in "sacrifice" not because sacrificing in itself helps win the war, but because "sacrificing" sounds patriotic, and anyway, it's part and parcel of "planning," together with "scarcity," "regimentation" and eventually "snooping." The planning type of mind just naturally trains you to make it your business to mind other people's—as against a normal reaction of making it your business to mind your own.

If in war time our industry can turn out millions of small arms, thousands of tanks and planes, hundreds of ships and build dozens of new towns, together with all the rest of the war production, and do all this with half of our workers in the armed forces and Government services—then let no one tell you that we in peace time and with all our workers available couldn't produce hundreds of thousands of new homes, thousands of miles of new roads, millions of cars, radios, and other devices for our comfort and happiness.

If in war time we can use all this production in defence of democracy and freedom, then in peace time we can use it to make this same democracy and freedom a reality.

This we can do without any stereotyped schemes hatched from the virile minds and sterile hearts of those who would enslave us by subtle plots designed to prevent mankind from entering the age of abundance, freedom, leisure, culture and happiness.

ALBERTA AND ABERHART

The following letter was sent to the Edinburgh "Evening Dispatch":—

Sir,—In your notice in Monday's issue of the "Evening Dispatch" there are two inaccuracies which I feel sure you would desire to correct.

You refer to the introduction of "Social Credit with the so-called Velocity Dollar." So far from the Velocity Dollar being based on Social Credit principles, it is a direct inversion of them; a particularly vicious form of capital levy. It was imposed on Mr. Aberhart by the Financial Adviser, Mr. R. J. Magor, Chairman of the (federal) Committee on Sound Finance in Government, on whose appointment the Federal Government insisted as a condition of assistance in the catastrophic situation to which "Sound Finance" had brought Alberta.

It is not at all doubtful that Mr. Aberhart would have been re-elected in 1940 had there been no war. He was re-elected against a coalition of every other Party, with one joint policy—to defeat Social Credit. In spite of corruption on a scale hitherto unknown in Canadian politics, he was re-elected with a substantial majority, and there is nothing in his policy which would not have been equally effective in the growing prosperity which in peacetime he brought to Alberta.

Mr. Aberhart is an historic figure whose importance was becoming recognised all over the American Continent, as well as in Australia and New Zealand. He may easily appear to the historian of fifty years hence as the most considerable Canadian of this era.

—Yours, etc., C. H. DOUGLAS, May 26 1943

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 1½d. (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.)

ANOTHER ELECTION DIALOGUE

Two weeks ago we published a very interesting and informative dialogue that had been broadcast from 7HO by two Electoral Campaign speakers—Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc., and Mrs. Barbara Guthrie. The discussion was resumed a week later in their next broadcast, the script of which has reached us since our last issue went to press and is published hereunder:—

B.—"This last week I have been meeting people all round town who kept asking me, 'How shall we vote at the elections?' I feel so helpless; I don't know what to say. What can I say? [Pause.] I am asking you a question—What can I say?"

J.—"How can I tell you how to vote when I don't know myself?"

B.—"But it is your job to tell people how to vote; you are chairman of an organisation which professes to have some knowledge of political matters. If you don't know how to vote, who does?"

J.—"Sometimes when you find great difficulty in answering a question you will find that you are probably asking the wrong question."

B.—"I should have thought that asking how to vote at election time is asking the only possible question just at the right time."

J.—"But I still think the question has no answer as you ask it."

B.—"All right, then, how would you ask the question?"

J.—"I should think that if anybody was really interested in how to vote, he would not leave his decision until a few weeks before the election. If he had enough grey matter to think it out for himself he would say: 'Now, this man who is going to represent us in Canberra is going to get £1000 a year for looking after our interests—the interests of the people here in Hobart. If he does what we want him to do then he represents us; if he doesn't do what we want him to do, then he is simply a disobedient servant who takes our money under false pretences.'"

B.—"That's reasonable enough. But I should think that a Member of Parliament who consistently refuses to give the people what they want would soon lose his job."

J.—"That's how it should work; that's how it is supposed to work—this theory of Democratic Government. But, unfortunately, it doesn't work that way, except in exceptional circumstances."

B.—"But when people get 'fed up' with one Government, they can kick it out and get another; isn't that a good thing to do?"

J.—"It's the best thing possible to do; I believe in that. But you will get no better results from the new Government unless the people can force their demands in an active manner. If they couldn't do it with the old Government, then they are not likely to do it with the new Government."

B.—"Well, what about the State Nationalist Party during the last Depression? They were kicked out, and things began to move; money was spent and new buildings went up all over the place; new hospital and new

J.—"And new bank and insurance buildings on every corner! There was quite a shortage of corners, in fact, such was the rush in buildings."

B.—"But previously there had been nothing done for years when the Nationalists were in power."

J.—"My dear lady, I do not want to rob the great Labor leaders of credit for their vast and wonderful statesmanship, but outside the Labor circle it is general knowledge that there was a depression in every

State in Australia, whether they were afflicted with a Nationalist or a Labor Government. Also—and here is the important point—that depression was broken at the same time in every State in Australia, when the banks decided to release credit to the Federal Government, to State Governments and to Municipal Governments, and also to employers of labour."

B.—"You mean that the Banks, which started to build their palatial offices on every corner site in 1934 could equally as well have done it in 1930?"

J.—"Of course they could!"

B.—"Then why didn't they do it?"

J.—"That's another story. All I shall say at present is that it did not suit the financial monopoly to break the depression until they had achieved their ends."

B.—"So you suggest that the Ogilvie Labor Government had little to do with the breaking of the depression in Tasmania?"

J.—"The depression would not have been broken yet had not the financial institutions decided to make loans to all State Governments, and to reverse their policy of restricting credits."

B.—"But what made the financial institutions reverse the policy of holding up the money supplies?"

J.—"The depression was broken because, firstly, it had gone too far and the public were becoming extremely hostile and critical of the Government; and, secondly, because of the work of men like myself who shot home the blame for the depression onto the right people—and that, incidentally, was the time when the Communists and the Socialists started to get very annoyed with us."

B.—"I realise that you and others did a splendid job in rousing public opinion to a realisation of the correct position. And, as you have said yourself, because of that work I don't think any Government will be able ever again to force another depression upon us; I think even the dogs in the street know now the cause of depressions."

J.—"Thanks to the expenditure of much energy and thousands of pounds!"

B.—"Public opinion, if it is supplied with accurate information, will do any job. I think it will take time, but it will be done."

J.—"The trouble is to get the facts to the public."

B.—"If the public are keen and are prepared to bring pressure on their Government, they can always win the day, no matter what Government is in power."

J.—"The Government must give to pressure or be broken. The trouble is that the pressure put on Parliament is mostly put on it by the Big Boys; the public do very little except on a very few occasions."

B.—"Is that the only way by which the people can get the conditions they want—by putting pressure on their Members of Parliament?"

J.—"There may be other ways, but nobody has told us what they are, or how to work them. We have only two alter-

esting reactions, which help considerably in ascertaining the mental attitudes of candidates and in assessing their worth. Quite a number obviously evaded the issue, under the plea of possibly receiving instructions contrary to their conscience. They evidently forget that they have the right to resign. Others think decisions should be left to them, because they are better informed than the electors, while others play safe by not replying at all. There are other alibis for not representing electors' majority wishes, which lack of space prevents us from dealing with, and so we simply provide the names of candidates who signed the 'Undertaking Form' without reservations."

CANDIDATES WHO SIGNED

In the following list, the names of the appropriate electorates appear, in black type, before the alphabetically-arranged names of those candidates who have signed unconditionally. (If the name of your electorate is omitted, that means that none of the candidates signed.)—

Balaclava: F. C. Barnes. Batman: A. McAdam. Bendigo: W. J. C. Banks. Corangamite: Edna M. Brushfield. Deakin: A. Coffey, A. A. Coles, D. Radclyffe, F. Williamson; Fawcner: M. E. Good, T. M. Jude, V. Margetts, Ruth Ravenscroft. Flinders: Mabel Brooks, R. Clark, M. H. Moyes, R. S. Ryan. Gippsland: G. P. Ashton, G. T. Bowden, M. C. Morgan. Henry: H. B. Gullett, B. H. Rees. Kooyong: J. A. Nimmo, Mrs. G. L. Noad. Melbourne Ports: E. J. Kerby, K. C. Miller. Melbourne Ports: E. J. Holloway, F. S. Preacher, Wimmera: Alex. Wilson. Yarra: A. J. Macdonald.

SENATE: Victoria: A. J. Amess, Vera Carr, B. J. Goulding, J. Smith.

natives—a dictatorship, whereby a small clique at Canberra tell us what we have to do, and how to do it, and when to do it—"

B.—"They mostly tell us what we mustn't do. We are not even allowed to make toys for the kiddies without a permit!"

J.—"We have the choice of two kinds of Government—one under which the people get the conditions they don't want, or one under which they get the conditions they DO want—and then we can say they have a Democratic Government."

B.—"Which means we have never seen a Democratic Government?"

J.—"We have not."

B.—"Well, then, how do we set about getting the kind of Government which will give us the results we want?"

J.—"I should think that if a person wants anything, the first thing to do is to ask for it. That is, if you can't get it yourself. If the people in an electorate do not state what they want, I can't see how they can expect their Parliamentary Representatives to give it to them."

B.—"Suppose, then, for argument's sake, that the people in Hobart decide to put their wants before their representative—how do they know he will carry them out?"

J.—"I am quite sure if there were sincerity and determination behind the demands of the people, the representative would have no alternative but to do as he is told. At any rate, we placed in front of each candidate in Hobart a declaration for him to sign, in which it was stated that he was willing to carry out the wishes of the majority of his electors when such was made known to him in a suitable manner."

B.—"Did both the Nationalists and the Labor candidates sign this declaration?"

J.—"Yes, they did."

B.—"And then what happened?"

J.—"Nothing happened. The people were not sufficiently interested to meet together to discuss how to control their affairs."

B.—"You suggested last Sunday that groups should gather together to discuss policy, so that when election time arrived they could state clearly what they wanted."

J.—"Yes, instead of waiting for the candidates to tell them what they wanted."

B.—"And you think the candidates would be quite willing to sign 'on the dotted line'?"

J.—"Yes, of course, if there were sufficient numbers and authority behind the demands, and the people understood what was being done."

B.—"At the present time people are muddled and divided; does that mean that they will have no control over the new government?"

J.—"No, certainly not. Whatever government is in power after this election, it will have many problems to face, and it will come into conflict with the people at many points."

B.—"And it won't have the power to create another depression?"

J.—"We'll see to that!"

B.—"And it won't be able to say, 'We ain't got no money'?"

J.—"I think we have exploded that funny story well and truly."

B.—"Yes, the future appears to be full of interesting possibilities."

J.—"And I don't think the socialist bureaucrats are going to get very gentle treatment from the public; they have proved a costly failure in every country of the world."

B.—"Including Russia?"

J.—"Including Russia. The American Ambassador, Mr. J. Davies, said that in Russia before this war the working man paid a week's wages to two week's wages for a pair of boots."

B.—"That's about £5 to £10 in Australian money for a pair of boots!"

J.—"How do you think the Sydney 'wharfies' would like that?"

B.—"I don't think they would be overjoyed with the prospect. Why are there so many Communists amongst them?"

J.—"Because they know as much about Communism as my dog does."

B.—"Isn't the Russian Army fighting for Communism?"

J.—"Is the Australian Army fighting for the Labor Party? [Pause.] Coming back to the question of controlling Parliament: No matter what system of Government we have, unless the people are prepared to show an active and intelligent interest in their affairs, our representatives will be swamped and over-ruled by powerful minorities. The people have lost faith in their own power and their own sovereignty. How many people in Australia have even paid the price of a postage stamp to write to their Member of Parliament?"

B.—"They just can't be bothered."

Notes On the News

(Continued from page 1.)

however, it is difficult to know just what Mr. Hull's foreign policy is. It's quite interesting to learn that Mr. Hull has a foreign policy—all his own—but perhaps the questioners could get more information on it from "Wall Street." Mr. Hull may be one of their big-noise spruikers, but that does not necessarily mean that he knows what their underlying policy is.

FISH FRONT: Mr. Maltby, M.L.A. for Barwon, in an appeal for the fishermen in his electorate, said "there had been a senseless withdrawal of manpower from the industry; also fishermen had experienced great difficulty in getting nets, other gear and petrol. Now (election time) the Department of War Organisation had promised to provide these essentials—but only to those who joined some organisation, apparently another form of compulsory unionism." Here is another illustration of how the war situation and Government departments are being used to further unionise and socialise the people, section by section. It is indeed a dangerous situation.

"GESTAPO" GANGS: During the hearing of an appeal against a conviction arising from alleged rationing irregularities Judge Book is reported in the press of July 2 as commenting on reprehensible methods adopted by police and rationing officers to secure convictions. It appears that policemen and policewomen made false statements to deceive the shopkeepers. Further, a rationing officer cut from the policeman's ration book some coupons, not then current, to create the impression that other shops had already accepted the non-current coupons. Policemen and others who act as agent-provocateurs in this manner should not escape penalty. That goes also for the rationing officers who should be dismissed immediately to prevent the spread of this contemptible form of "Hitlerism."

WORK WORRIES: Inspired propaganda is now appearing to build up a case for the retention of war-time bureaucratic departments. Each department scratches the other's back, and each pleads for the other. Mr. Chifley, of the Treasury, thus pleads and urges the Works Council as a means of speeding-up recovery, viz.: "The intention was to avoid chaotic (blessed word) conditions and to enable men and women to return to their previous places of living and find something useful for them to do in those areas." Now just examine that statement as a masterpiece of deliberate nonsense. Trams, trains, etc., took these people to where they are, and can quite easily take them back again. Surely these people can make their own adjustments and find plenty to do—of their own choice—without the aid of the Works Council. This sort of propaganda will increase as the war nears the end. Watch for it, and beware of it.

"NATIONAL" GOVERNMENT

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—It appears to me that as soon as the Federal Elections are over, an attempt may be made to foist a so-called National Government upon the people of Australia. It is felt by many people, including myself, that this would be a national tragedy, and would really amount to handing over the country to powerful groups behind the scenes. To counteract any tendency in this direction, it has been decided to form a No National Government Campaign, to issue propaganda, and give publicity concerning the many dangers inherent in such a proposal, and, if necessary, to exert pressure upon the sitting members. Persons in the various States who are interested in the proposal, and who are prepared to organise and form a movement are invited to communicate with the undersigned.

—Yours, etc., Vivian James, Box 2325V., G.P.O., Melbourne.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS, 1943

INDEPENDENT SENATE GROUP
Mrs. V. Carr, A. J. Amess, B. J. Goulding.
PUBLIC MEETINGS
Wangaratta Meeting, 8 p.m. (St. Patrick's Hall), Thursday, Aug. 12.
Outside Post Office, Kyneton, Sat., Aug. 14th, 10 a.m.
Outside Post Office, Castlemaine, Sat. Aug. 14th, 11.30 a.m.
Opposite Fountain, Bendigo, Sat., Aug. 14th, 3 p.m.
Sunday, Aug. 15th: Parking Area, Ricketts Point, 3 p.m.
Sunday, Aug. 15th: Mordialloc Pier, 4 p.m.
Monday, Aug. 16th: Colac Hall, 8 p.m.
Tuesday, Aug. 17th: Opposite Dandenong Town Hall, 2 p.m.
Wednesday, Aug. 18th: Ballarat, 8 p.m.
Thursday, Aug. 19th: Warragul Markets, 3 p.m.
Friday, Aug. 20th: All Metropolitan Shopping Centres.

TO ABOLISH TAXATION.
MAKE WHAT IS PHYSICALLY POSSIBLE FINANCIALLY POSSIBLE.
MORE AND BETTER SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS.
RAISE FIGHTING FORCES PAY TO BEST PAID ARMY IN THE WORLD.
FREE THE HOUSEWIFE FROM FINANCIAL WORRIES.

HEAR THESE SPEAKERS
Helpers Please Note: This is Your Fight!
—Advt., authorised by A. W. Bell, 390 Mt. Alexander Rd., Ascot Vale. Phone: FU6443

THE U.E.A. ELECTION GUIDE

In accordance with their usual practice, the following covering letter and "Undertaking Form" were forwarded by the United Electors of Australia to all Victorian candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate:—

Mr.....
Dear Sir,—The purpose of the U.E.A. is to provide electors with the opportunity of conveying to Parliament, through their Parliamentary representatives, that which they want Parliament to bring into effect. The electors' wishes will be made manifest by signatures to "Letter Forms." My executive wishes to know if you are prepared to represent the WILL of the majority of your constituents if conveyed to you in the above manner? We would be glad to receive the accompanying drafted letter, bearing your signature of acquiescence. If not received within ten days, it will be understood that you are not prepared to represent the wishes of the people as set out in the said "Letter Forms."—I am, yours faithfully,
.....*..... Hon. Secretary.

The Secretary, United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, Little Collins and Elizabeth Streets, Melbourne.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the ---- and wish to inform you that I quite agree with the contention that Members of Parliament are sent there for the express purpose of giving effect to the WILL of the people. This being so, I have no hesitation in undertaking to give effect to the wishes of the majority of electors for the Division of as manifested by them and conveyed to me as a Member of Parliament; provided only that the carrying out of such wishes is physically and constitutionally possible.—Yours faithfully,
* * *

The Campaign Director of the U.E.A. reports as follows.—
"As usual, the replies to this simple question brought forth many curious and inter-

Responsibility for all unsigned election comment in these columns is accepted by H. F. Allsop, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne, C. I.

"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.

PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

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

One of the ideas essential to any understanding of genuine political activity can perhaps be most easily expressed in the language of gambling. To the roulette player, "Rouge et Noir" is a game of chance. To the keeper of the Bank, it is a certainty. To the Stock Exchange gambler, gain or loss on a stock movement depends on whether he is a bull or a bear. To the Stock-Broker, all that matters is that enough people shall buy and sell stocks. In this case, his percentage is a certainty. To the racegoer who backs the favourite, the victory of an outsider means loss; to the bookmaker it merely means a larger gain than if the favourite won.

I do not think that the importance of understanding this principle can be over-rated, because the manipulation and perversion of the gambling spirit is of the very essence of International policy. The fundamental idea is always to play a long-term certainty against a short-term possibility, so that a win for the genuine gambler is at best or worst only a postponement of the inevitable final loss. It is called insurance.

I can imagine that someone who has not devoted much attention to the subject may observe that anyone who gambles deserves to lose. That is the Whig idea, propagated to justify the fact that Whigs only invest in a certainty. But, in fact, gambling is a special form of the adventurous spirit from which all progress is born, whereas insurance is a financial fallacy; and no greater disaster can overtake a community than to lose the spirit of adventure. That is why a mass of Law, which smother's initiative and substitutes a Beveridge insurance plan for the dividends of an advancing adventure, is a creeping death.

Now, World War, Parts I. and II., like all previous wars, is a gamble between A and B for the certain advantage of C. It is essential that the Programme of Part III. shall be the combination of A and B, for the elimination of C. Since the position of C rests on an abstract fallacy, his effective elimination is in sight.

The derivation of Bolshevism, as we have seen, covers a fairly lengthy period. Fascism, by which name it appears to be fashionable to designate anything which isn't labelled Bolshevism, is as a title contemporaneous with the rise of Mussolini. It is quite easy to show, however, not merely that its origin is identical with Bolshevism, but that it is merely Bolshevism wintering in the Mediterranean. Its aims are similar, and its technique, like that of "German" National Socialism, or

P.E.P. is localised centralisation in order to transfer power to International Centralisation—as you might say, "C." It is the second episode, in point of time, in the advent of gangster Government.

Now, it is important to observe that, subject only to modifications to suit the climate, the advent of the New Order in Italy followed almost exactly the same essential process as that which established Lenin and Trotsky. Italy has always been riddled with secret societies. She sustained heavy defeats in the 1914-1918 phase of the war, and these defeats were followed by social and industrial disorganisation, which culminated in the seizure by the "workers" of Italy's most famous engineering organisation—the Fiat Works at Turin. The seizure was complete, but the "workers" found to their astonishment that you can't eat motor-car parts, and that the banks require certain formalities to be observed in regard to the signature of cheques.

The Italian is no fool, and the whole of this "Communist" seizure of the Fiat factories has a curious air, more particularly since within a short period of time after the meek restoration of the works to the management, it became known that "American" interests had taken over Fiat.

But it was clearly a highly effective excuse for drastic action, and the financial controllers of Italy, Counts Volpi and Pirelli, produced a "Saviour" who had a long reputation as a Socialist. The March of the Black Shirts on Rome, led from behind by Mussolini in a "train de luxe" (a march which could have been stopped by a battalion of regular soldiers) announced the Dawn of the New Day, and, as in Russia, wages dropped to subsistence level and strikes became a thing of the past. Both Bolshevism and Fascism had a short way with strikers. . .

(All rights reserved.) (To be continued)

THE LATE WILLIAM ABERHART

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "SOCIAL CREDITER."

On Monday morning, May 24, 1943 I received a cablegram despatched on Sunday, May 23, from Edmonton, Alberta, reading: "Premier Aberhart died this morning in Vancouver Hospital after brief illness." On the same Monday morning the better-class British newspapers (all things are relative) published colourless but in the main accurate and inoffensive obituary notices. The others published news items reporting his death with that sense of good taste and consideration for the public interest which their general character appears to render inevitable. But the Press in general made no technical mistake. A great man had died, and that was front-page news.

William Aberhart was born on December 30, 1878 in Huron County, Ontario, and was thus 64 years of age—not unduly old as Prime Ministers and Premiers go. While, no doubt, the strain of the past few years has been heavy, he was healthy and of strong physique. He was a graduate of Queen's University, Toronto, and went west to Alberta shortly after taking a B.A. degree.

He was until 1935 head master of Crescent Heights School, Calgary. His career subsequent to his entry into politics in 1935 is well known, and need not be recapitulated here. The character of the man, and the nature of his historic and successful fight against the massed forces of Finance and corrupt politics are not so well known and have, of course, been misrepresented to meet the convenience of his reporters and critics.

To understand his problem, it is first necessary to realise that Canadian politics, even Federal politics at Ottawa, give to anyone familiar with Westminster a curious impression of immaturity. But the Social Credit members of Mr. Aberhart's Government when it was first elected in 1935 were good honest farmers, with about as much knowledge of affairs as they had of Greek particles.

FARM DEBTS IN CANADA

It was announced recently in Alberta that when representatives from the three prairie provinces and farm organisations saw Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, at Ottawa, on the question of farm debt adjustment, Alberta would send Mr. Maynard, Mr. B. MacMillan, Minister of Agriculture; Mr. J. E. Brownlee, K.C., who has been retained by the Government; Mr. A. J. Wilson, of the Alberta Attorney-General's department; and Mr. Tom Church, who would represent farm organisations. At the conference the resolution passed by the Saskatoon farm debt conference, will be given to Mr. King. A Bill for the consideration of the Dominion Parliament will also be given to him. The Bill was approved at the Saskatoon conference.

SOCIAL SCIENCE LECTURES

Owing to the elections this series of lectures will be suspended until Wednesday, August 25. This alteration will permit a better attendance of informed questioners at election-candidates' public meetings; but don't forget the resumption date.

GETTING "GOOD" MEN INTO PARLIAMENT

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—I always read Mr. Bruce Brown's letters with interest, although I do not believe that Monetary Reform is of paramount importance at the present time; but I was amazed at the child-like faith revealed in the concluding paragraphs of his letter, "The Parties and Public Finance," in last week's "New Times." He apparently still pins his faith in getting right results by working to put GOOD men into Parliament. What have we achieved by such faith in the past? Memory takes me back to the Monetary Reform writings of our present Prime Minister, Mr. John Curtin, and to his attitude since he has been in office; to Senator Richard Darcy, who always votes as a GOOD Party man should; to Mr. Alex. Wilson, M.H.R., who supports Curtin's Conscription policy; to Mr. J. Langtry, another GOOD Party follower, and to the Dean of Canterbury, who was such a GOOD Monetary Reformer; and there are others.

Now, having selected your GOOD, straightforward candidate, what does Mr. Brown suggest should be done to prevent him from following the footsteps of those I have mentioned? It seems to me that Labor was PUT on the Treasury benches by the Financial Group because they KNEW that Labor in office acts like morphia on the electors—i.e., they become politically dead, and anything, even Conscription, can be imposed upon them while these GOOD men are in office. But the electors would immediately become politically alive if Menzies and Co. attempted to impose Conscription, Government by Regulation, tax on low wages, etc.

Therefore, as the most essential thing in a Democracy is awakened electors, I hope that Menzies and Co. are forced to take the reins of Government IN SPITE of their sham fights.

I am certain that National Insurance would never have been defeated by the electors had there been a GOOD Labor Government in office at the time.

The "enemy within" knows this, and will keep Labour in office by hook or by crook until the Beveridge and other Socialistic Plans are put into operation.

—Yours, etc., F. C. PAICE, E. Coburg, Vic.

"REGULATION MANIA" AND THE U.A.P.

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—I notice that in attacking the U.A.P. for abusing the Labor Government's mass of unnecessary regulations, Mr. Bruce Brown states ("N.T.," July 30) that the U.A.P. could have blocked these Regulations in the Senate, where they have a majority. This statement shows that Mr. Bruce Brown is quite ignorant of Government procedure, and rather points to prejudice against the U.A.P., which has always upheld the best principles of government for all classes—for instance, it brought in child endowment, and we women thank them for that and lots more. Mr. Brown evidently does not know that these regulations he refers to were brought in by Ministers without going before Parliament, and that is why the U.A.P. would oppose the Government about them. I have read many interesting articles by Mr. Brown, but I suggest that he stick to finance in future, as he seems to be studying that matter.—Yours, etc., (Mrs.) L. BROWN, Geelong-road, Footscray, Vic.

[National Security Regulations come into force as soon as they are issued, even if Parliament is in recess; but they must be laid on the table of the House and may be disallowed within 14 days of the meeting of Parliament. Even if this were not done, every Regulation is published in the Commonwealth Gazette, and a motion for its disallowance could be initiated by any member as soon as Parliament assembled.—Ed.]

U.E.A. NOTES

Headquarters desire to thank those who so promptly responded with financial assistance to keep the fight going. Many inspiring letters accompanied the contributions, and we quote one of these which impressed us greatly:

"Last year I sent you 10/- towards the good cause. Herewith is another, being expenses saved through not attending amusements and pictures, which are not much loss anyway, it is much better devoted to the U.E.A. 'Bullet' Fund. I feel very strongly on the injustices of our social system, and would like my younger brother to have a far better deal than I had. He is another victim of the vicious system, and I wish I could help you more for his sake and others. I do not want to see them get that hopeless, driven look of frustration and repression such as older ones wear on their faces. I believe the nature of the U.E.A. educational work, by creating public awareness, and encouraging corrective action, will finally bring about a worthwhile society.—Yours cordially, Miss J.C., Ballarat."

That's the spirit we like to see, and surely it will inspire others. If YOU have not accepted your responsibility and contributed those "bullets," surely that letter will move you to action. Don't leave it to the other fellow; drop a line now to: The United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne.—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

NEW PLANNING BILL IN BRITAIN

The London "Times" states that the first Bill to be brought forward by Mr. W. S. Morrison, the new Minister of Town and Country Planning, is an interim development Bill, and its main purpose is to bring under planning control land which is not subject to a scheme or resolution under the Town and Country Planning Act, 1932. This will make it possible to secure more effective control of development, pending the coming into operation of post-war planning schemes in town and country.

The Uthwatt Committee, in its interim report, recommended that an essential preliminary to effective post-war planning was to vest in the Central Planning Authority the power to control "building and all other developments throughout the whole country by reference to national planning considerations and with a view to preventing work being undertaken which might be prejudicial to reconstruction."

A year ago Lord Portal announced that the legislation being drafted to give effect to this and other interim recommendations of the Uthwatt Committee was being postponed, to wait the final report of that committee, and also the report of the Scott Committee on land utilisation in rural areas. The final report of the Uthwatt Committee again emphasised the point that the control necessary to prevent prejudicial development during and immediately after the war should cover the whole country. Many important areas are not at present covered by planning resolutions, and the committee recommended as the most convenient method of achieving the object in view that legislation should provide that areas not already covered by operative schemes or resolutions to plan should be deemed to be subject to such resolutions.

Of other decisions already taken upon recommendations of the Uthwatt Committee, the Government have also promised to provide in forthcoming legislation for the appointment of a permanent commission to assist the Minister of Town and Country Planning. They have similarly announced the intention to confer on local authorities wide and simple powers for the compulsory acquisition of land.

—"The Social Crediter," May 8, 1943.

RECIPE FOR FASCISM

"Mussolini himself is the son of a Socialist, who named him after the savage Indian leader who slaughtered Maximilian of Mexico; he grew up to be an exponent of class-war and anti-Christian violence—while the 'nationalism' which he blended with his former principles to form Fascism was derived from the fanatical creed of Marzine and Garibaldi and the Carbonari, which glorified 'patriotic' murder, and justified every immorality, committed in the cause of Italy. Add to these a touch of Nietzschean paganism and war-worship, and you have the chief elements of the mixture from which the Fascist theory of the State is derived. Whether the Duce himself believed in it, who can say?"—Melbourne "Advocate."

There was another ingredient—Finance—without which Mussolini would have remained in the political wilderness.

INDEPENDENT MONEY-REFORM CANDIDATE FOR RIVERINA

R. L. McKenzie seeks the support of the electors of Riverina (N.S.W.) at the forthcoming Federal elections. This Independent candidate is a farmer in the Barham district, a Councillor of Wakool Shire, president and State delegate of the Dairymen's Assn., and chairman of directors of Koon-drook butter factory.

In his policy speech, Mr. McKenzie vigorously and effectively denounced Party Politics. "I stand as an Independent because I am independent of parties, but dependent entirely upon the wishes of the people," he said, and went on to explain that he is in favour of monetary reform, straight-out price of at least 5/- per bushel for wheat, decentralisation, greatly improved educational facilities for country children, practical steps to encourage a higher birth-rate, local government, etc. Mr. McKenzie declared that he is opposed to socialisation. "I hold that institutions were made for men and not men for institutions," he said. "If elected, I shall meet you periodically at various places in the electorate," said the candidate in concluding his policy speech.

Those who are assisting Mr. McKenzie in his campaign ask for active help from Riverina citizens interested in clean, non-party politics and monetary reform.

[—Adv't., authorised by James Gerrard, Barham, N.S.W.]

Douglas Social Credit Movement

(First Floor, "The Block," Elizabeth Street) Members and friends are invited to attend at the rooms on Tuesday next, Aug. 17th, to hear an interesting address, to be given by Mr. J. T. Smith—title: "Social Credit Principles." Don't miss this opportunity. The lecture starts at 8 p.m.

WANTED TO BUY

Barnvielder fowl, single comb, of pure strain Setting of eggs required. Write to L. V. Turner, Brookton, West Australia.

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