

ACCOUNTANTS CRITICISE
DR. COOMBS. (Page 2)

NEW "PEOPLE'S PARTY"
IN QUEENSLAND.
(Page 2.)

THE PEOPLE DON'T LIKE
"BLANK CHEQUES."
(Page 3.)

A BETTER DEAL FOR
PENSIONERS? (Page 4.)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol.9. No. 49. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1943

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).

Three Dangers to Democracy on Home Front

This Absentee "Representation"

Trends in Public Service and Judicature

There has been much discussion, and many pointed remarks have been made in the press, about the political future of Mr. D'Alton, chairman of the Tasmanian Labor Party and Minister for Agriculture in the Labor Government of Tasmania. The Commonwealth Government has appointed Mr. D'Alton as Australian High Commissioner to New Zealand.

This position, so it is said, carries a salary of £2600 a year, plus an allowance of £2000 a year—which is very nice for Mr. D'Alton! But the point at issue is that Mr. D'Alton has affirmed his intention of retaining his seat in the House of Assembly as member and representative for the people of Darwin electorate, Tasmania.

Now, this is a matter of very great importance, because it undermines the whole idea of Democratic Government in this country. The theory of Democratic Government is that the people should have a say in the policy of the Government, and that each district elects a representative to Parliament to ensure that that policy is carried out, and also to look after their interests.

The question arises: How can Mr. D'Alton represent the interests of the people of Darwin electorate when he is resident in New Zealand doing an official job for the Commonwealth?

We know that there is a very great difference between the theory of Democratic Government and the actual practice. We know that the system creaks and groans under all sorts of burdens it was never designed to take. Political Democracy remains in most countries merely a pale shadow of what it was intended to be.

But it is all we have between us and a straight-out dictatorship. We cannot afford to make a laughing stock of it. We must hold on to what we have left. We are forced to try and make it work because there is no alternative but disaster.

Mr. D'Alton has not the slightest justification for holding on to his seat in Parliament and at the same time accepting a position in another country; that is too much of a joke. If high Government officials are going to play ducks-and-drakes with the law of this land, what are we to

expect from other people? If people find that there is one law for officials and another law for the rest of the population, then the "rule of law" must fall in disrepute.

It takes most of us all our time to run our own jobs; but there are men who appear to be able to run half a dozen jobs. If the ordinary workingman takes a few hours from his job now and then there is quite a noise about it. Even when he goes off sick, it is not considered to be in the best form.

But as soon as one moves in the rarefied atmosphere in which the New Aristocracy live and have their being and pass their rules and regulations for the guidance and discipline of the proletariat—well, then, anything can be done, and done with impunity.

One does not blame Mr. D'Alton so much as those who stand by and do nothing—members of the Labor Party who talk loud and long about Democracy and the rights of the working man, and who are continually engaged in making Democratic Government unworkable.

Democratic Government has its rules, which must be maintained, but those rules are only maintained by a strong and vocal public opinion, and they can only be worked by men who realise the importance of them.

Democratic Government cannot be enforced on a people; it must grow from the bottom upwards. If Mr. D'Alton knew

beforehand that the people of this country would not tolerate a Member retaining his seat in Parliament while living in another country, he would never have attempted such a thing. The fact that he has attempted it is a loud and striking commentary on what Mr. D'Alton thinks of the intelligence of the people of Tasmania.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE

During war emergency, the Government deems it necessary to interfere in one way and another with almost every form of human activity. This interference is carried out by a host of Government officials, some of whom have very great powers. According to Dr. Evatt, it is the Government's intention to hold on to many of those powers after the war, and a Referendum is to be taken to hold on to these powers and to retain such organisations as the Civil Construction Corps, whereby the Government can shift men about from one part of the country to the other.

The great powers Governments have acquired represent something new in our history, and it therefore becomes very necessary that the Government officials who exercise these great powers should be selected with the greatest care.

We do not put cart drivers in charge of locomotives, nor do we put a grocer in charge of the Hydroelectric Department; yet men are being drafted into responsible and technical positions in State employment who have not the remotest qualification for the jobs—other than that they are members of the Labor Party.

One of the worst cases on record in Tasmania was when Mr. Eric Ogilvie left the Cabinet and made himself Director of Social Services, at a salary of £800 a year, over the heads of the other public servants. This was not only a blow at the whole structure and principle of the Public Service, but it revealed in a striking manner the tragic apathy of the people who permitted such a thing.

Other appointments have been made in Government Departments which not only showed a grievous lack of any reasonable judgment, but showed profound contempt for those standards which are absolutely essential for men in a technical position of great responsibility. Men who wish to serve in one of the departments of State should have to do as other men do—train themselves for a highly specialised job and compete honestly with other men who have dedicated their lives to the job.

It is the function of Parliament to see that the Public Service carries out the wishes of the people. The Public Service should be under the control of trained and competent managers, who should be allowed to carry on their work without interference as long as they "deliver the goods."

The heads of the State Departments in each State have very great powers; on them falls the power of giving promotion to hundreds of civil servants. The Party in power also has very great powers, for they make the laws, which we are compelled to obey—and if we did not obey

(Continued on page 4.)

A New York report quotes U.S. Treasury official White as saying that "England and America are still far apart on a proposed world monetary stabilisation plan. The main disagreement is on the role of GOLD." But "he believed the chances of a formal conference of all united nations in Washington in January were good." So, this bankers' war aim is not yet achieved; which may indicate a substantial amount of public awareness. While there's life there's hope!

Planners' Gloomy Predictions

Last week Australians were treated, per medium of press reports, to an inkling of what is in store for them at the hands of our socialistic planners. We had the spectacle of Dr. Lloyd Ross, Federal Treasurer Chifley, and Professor G. L. Wood, all blaring forth on the "full employment" theme.

In the "Age" of November 29, Professor Wood says: "This reservoir of credit, backed by the enormous resources of gold in the U.S., would constitute the blood-bank for restoring the circulation of the world. The ability of other nations to maintain full employment would be dependent on the foreign policy of America." Wall Street control, per medium of the gold standard, par excellence!

Lloyd Ross, in the "Age" of November 30, says: "The answer to post-war problems would depend on the controls and restrictions placed on liberty. A major problem would be to see that everybody was in employment. There must be planners and bureaucrats if the problem was to be solved." The economic security of Pentridge prisoners, after having fought a war to preserve liberty!

Chifley, in the "Age" of December 1, states: "The primary aim of post-war policy must be a high level of employment."

Sounds like community singing! He fur-

A Vicious Fallacy

Perhaps the most vicious fallacy prevalent in these days is that a privilege is something taken from someone else. The idea is equivalent to saying that good health causes bad health. It is the basis of the idea that the poor are poor because the rich are rich, and its logical consequence is degradation for all. The only hope for the world is that every man shall be confirmed in his privileges, and that they shall be extended. That was Magna Charta. The perfect example of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, is a desert. Above that level, there is no liberty without inequality, i.e., privilege. — "The Social Creditor," England, October 2.

ther says: "After the war, to distribute equitably the additional wealth which full employment brings, we must have heavy tax rates. We shall need more direct and positive controls." He fails to state how heavy taxes are going to allow people to enjoy increased wealth, particularly in view of the fact that under the present financial system sufficient purchasing-power to buy all that is produced is never released through incomes derived from production. (The enormous creation of debt-money for the purposes of destruction, and the concomitant curtailment of commodity production during war temporarily offsets this fact.)

We have science continually and successfully striving to eliminate the necessity for labour-power, and to make possible more leisure for humanity, yet the best solution these economic savants can offer is "cart-horse" security, heavy taxation, and restriction of individual liberty! Socialism in excelsis! It is not difficult for any thinking Australian to see whence such policies are being directed. Lately we have been subjected to a high-pressure advocacy of a restoration of the gold-standard; Federal Union; international currency; "work-for-all"; heavy taxation; less liberty, and on the necessity for bureaucratic control.

As Eric Butler has said: "Unless a stand is made before long we may see a rout, with the final subjugation of civilisation to the Judaic philosophy, and another retreat into the Dark Ages." It is to be hoped Australians will realise the implications involved before it is too late—when they will no longer have any voice in the matter.

B.J. GOULDING

CURTIN'S CUNNING: Another "alibi" has been produced by Mr. Curtin as propaganda to aid the transfer-of-power plot. This time he is saying that the power is required to use the £100 million pounds' worth of war plant on civil production after the war. He says the problem is a great one. Well, if he hands this problem over to the auctioneers the plant and the problem will soon be disposed of. The Commonwealth Constitution expressly forbids the Government from competing with private enterprise. The framers of the Constitution evidently understood the inability of impractical theorists to handle such matters satisfactorily. Government war production bungling has demonstrated the sanity of the Constitution.

PRISON PARADOX: According to Mr. J. Bird, of the Seamen's Union, as reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of December 3, British seamen have been imprisoned in Hobart's 115-years-old gaol under filthy conditions, and without trial. It was resolved by the Union to urge the A.C.T.U. to press for the repeal of the un-British regulation, which permitted this Fascist tyranny. In the same issue of the "Sun" the Trades Hall Council is reported as objecting strongly against the action of the British Government in releasing Mosley, and the agitators for freedom for the seamen want Mosley re-imprisoned without trial! Can you beat that??? Perhaps it should be remembered in this connection that the imprisoned seamen have not criticised the ramifications of Jewry!

BANKERS' BACKING: The daily press reports that "the President of the Bank of Naples has been arrested as one of Fascism's leading financial racketeers. As a result of bribery his bank was one of the few institutions not destroyed. When the Germans retreated he co-operated with the Allies with the same enthusiasm as he had shown for Germany." This illustrates, once more, the fact that bankers back all the horses in the race. It is well known that big-gun bankers from all countries meet and control the world through financial manipulation, irrespective of which horse (ism) is winning the race (war). It is also well known that Montagu Norman, financial dictator of England, backed the socialist Nazis early in the betting for many millions. The banker only recognises the black flag of piracy.

MACAULAY'S MISSION: An address to Melbourne "Federal Union" movement (reports the "Age" of December 3) was delivered by the Rt. Rev. Dr. R. W. Macaulay, apparently to further the idea of World

Government. In reply to questions suggesting that powerful financial groups might attempt to control a post-war international police force, and that such a force might also interfere with the rights of self-government, Dr. Macaulay said that this could be overcome by carefully and definitely defining such powers. Fancy that, now! Who would control the World Police Force if it exceeded its powers—remembering that there would be no other armed force to handle the situation? Dr. Macaulay and others may plead the good intentions of their advocacy, but democratic citizens must protect themselves against possible bad results from good intentions. Some of our greatest social evils are the results of "good intentions."

CONTRACTS CURTAILMENT: Press reports of November 22 inform us that the U.S. Army is returning £3,900,000 to the U.S. Government as a result of curtailment in the size of the Army and cancellation of various contracts. Another press item of November 26, reflecting the ideas of key industrialists and some Government circles in U.S., states, "The president of General Motors has sought permission to get ready for post-war automobile production." Further emphasising this trend, Mr. Curtin is reported as being worried about finding work for Australian munition machines. Can it be that the third world war is not yet in sight?

MEAT MUDDLE: The "Countryman" of November 10 reported that "the central council of the C.P. unanimously approved a resolution that the Federal Government's meat rationing plan was a huge mistake, and would result in a serious shortage, which could be obviated by the increase of slaughtering and by making men available for this work." It was pointed out that a million sheep may be wasted unless the Government removes the bottlenecks in slaughtering, transport and cold storage. Govern-

(Continued on page 2.)

Big Business in U.S.A.

War supply contracts of more than 50,000 dollars each in value made in America between June, 1940, and November, 1942, totalled 59,558 million dollars. Seventy-point-one per cent, of this total went to 100 firms, and 19,534 million dollars, or nearly one-third, to five firms: General Motors, Curtiss Wright, Bethlehem Steel, Douglas Aircraft and United Aircraft. The Bethlehem Steel figure, of over 2900 million dollars, does not show this firm's supply of Steel to other firms, but only direct supply to the Government, mainly for shipbuilding.

In its November issue, the "Federal Accountant," official journal of the Federal Institute of Accountants (Australia), publishes two contributions, under the heading, "People and Planning," which show a realistic reaction against certain statements in a previous article by the Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction: —

Mr. J. Bradshaw, A.F.I.A., of South Yarra, Victoria, writes:

"The September issue of this Journal contains a contribution by Dr. H. C. Coombs, Director-General of Post-war Reconstruction, described as 'a presentation of the problems of reconstruction as seen by Dr. Coombs.' Although an editorial note indicates that the views expressed 'do not necessarily represent official policy in any way,' I think it is safe to assume that 'official policy' will be coloured by the philosophy enunciated by Dr. Coombs. In passing, it might be well to observe that all economic systems are founded on a philosophy of life.

"In my estimation, the philosophy underlying the plans and principles of Dr. Coombs is incompatible with his expressed desire that 'the environment to which our fighting men and war workers will return' shall be 'one fitted to receive them and which offers them the opportunities they deserve.' He declares that 'employment, instead of being a by-product of economic activity, should be in future the objective.' Such a view, to me, appears to consist of a perversion of means into ends, and is undoubtedly sisyphic in outlook.

"If the environment to which our fighting men and war workers will return is to be one worthy of their efforts and sacrifices, it must, surely, be one in which the freedom of the individual to exercise freedom of choice as between possible alternatives is increased rather than diminished.

"I submit that economic activity, so far from being the alpha and omega of human existence, should be regarded as simply a functional activity of men and women in the world: that the end of man, while unknown, is something to which most rapid progress is made by the free expansion of individuality. Therefore, economic organisation is most efficient when it most easily and rapidly supplies economic wants without encroaching on other functional activities. I further submit that the primary function of industry is not to provide employment, but to produce goods and supply services with a minimum expenditure of energy. In this connection, it is noteworthy that a commission of technocrats, which was appointed in the United States just prior to the outbreak of this war, returned a finding that all the necessary work of the whole world could be performed by the able-bodied men of the United States between the ages of 25 and 45 working for 16 hours per week. It is, of course, indisputable that the potential productive capacity of industry has been enormously enlarged after four years of war.

"Having regard to the foregoing, I contend that the problems of reconstruction in Australia (or in any other country) cannot be satisfactorily or desirably solved by any programme of planning based on the sisyphic ideology that 'employment, instead of being a by-product of economic activity should be in future the objective.'

"Peace can bring 'socially accepted objectives capable of absorbing all our resources' only if individuals regain or acquire freedom to accept or reject propos-

WEST AUSTRALIAN NOTES

Owing to the sad bereavement of our president and broadcast speaker, Mr. R. Rushton, whose wife passed away on November 23, our broadcast talks have had to be varied. Mr. F. Jones read two talks that were written by Mr. Rushton, and later, when Mr. Rushton was unable to prepare the talks, Mr. Wm. F. Andrews gave one talk by Mrs. Barbara Guthrie, following the next week with a talk by Mr. Jas. Guthrie, of Tasmania. It is to be hoped that Mr. Rushton will be able to resume his talks in the near future, but in the meantime, listeners will have the privilege of hearing further talks by Mr. J. Guthrie, per medium of Mr. Andrews.

My "Notes," published in the "New Times" of November 19, have caused several people who read them (but could not have heard the broadcasts) to get an impression that I certainly did not wish to convey. At the time I wrote them, I did not consider the fact that many who had no opportunity of listening to the broadcasts given by Mr. Rushton would, on reading my notes, come to a conclusion that they would not have done had they listened in. Therefore I now take the opportunity of stating that the broadcast talks given by Mr. R. Rushton were definitely not confined to money talks, but on the contrary (though money was often spoken of), gave a word picture of our present system, why it can't possibly work satisfactorily, and culminated in advice to all who had followed the logic of the talks, and wanted to change the system, to form LOCAL POLICY GROUPS, with the idea of contacting their representative in Parliament, and instructing him as to what they desire. Also, to contact as many neighbours as possible, get them interested enough to form other groups, and so on. In my previous notes, I was expressing the opinions of a few listeners, and invited commentary from other listeners. Thanking all who have written to me.

—Wm. F. Andrews, Hon. Secretary, The Electoral Campaign, 81 Barrack St., Perth.

als involving their economic and social activities and functions.

"The good life envisaged by Dr. Coombs cannot possibly be planned by 'some authority.' What is a 'good life' for A may be positively repugnant to B. Good lives can only be lived: they can never be planned by external authority. A good life for all, though it can never, I fear, be absolutely ensured since its fullest realisation depends on so many and varied contingencies, is likely to be induced, facilitated, by what I have described as the free expansion of individuality. It is the task of statesmanship to ensure economic conditions which will be conducive thereto." * * *

Mr. Gordon Sunter, F.F.I.A., of Adelaide, writes:

"In the recent article by Dr. Coombs (Director-General of Post-war Reconstruction) in the issue of September 25, there were two statements which astonished me.

"First, Dr. Coombs said, 'It has become one of the aims for which the war is being fought that, in the future, economic activities will have specific social objectives.' This is an extraordinary statement. The reasons for which we fight this war were in existence the moment we declared war. It is incredible to suppose that Dr. Coombs really means that as we go on with the war our reasons became different. Deliberately or otherwise, Dr. Coombs confuses why we fight, with what we might hope for in the future.

"It is this kind of muddled thinking which makes people disheartened and dis-

THE QUEENSLAND "PEOPLE'S PARTY"

At a meeting held in the Albert Hall, Brisbane, on Thursday evening, November 25, the policy and constitution of the new Queensland People's Party was adopted. Explaining the policy, the leader, Ald. J. B. Chandler, is reported to have said, among other things, "the Q.P.P. would seek to nourish and protect liberty of speech, religion and association."

The importance of Mr. Chandler's reference to "liberty of association" can hardly be over-emphasised because it is in relation to this question—freedom for the minor unit or the individual to enter into association with others, or to withdraw from an association, at discretion—i.e., to contract out (which is the very essence of democracy)—that the whole world is engaged in military conflict.

But, at the same meeting, it was also made public that compulsory unionism is one of the main principles of the new party's policy! That being so, one would like to know how the Q.P.P. can "protect and nourish liberty of association," whilst at the same time advocating regimented association!

How can the new party reconcile these two opposing principles? Apart from trying to meet the vital objections to party-political action of any sort, the sponsors will have a hectic time meeting that question at every turn!

Nor is it without significance that compulsory unionism has much wider implication than in respect to trade unions. For instance, National Socialism is simply a form of compulsory unionism. And the same can be said of "Federal Union" or "One World." Once in, you can't get out, no matter how distasteful the policy may become.

The Brisbane "Telegraph," which published "One World" (Wendell Willkie) in serial form, clearly indicates a wider application of the term. In its issue of November 26, the editorial strongly acclaims the new party, particularly for the inclusion of compulsory unionism as a main principle in its policy. The editorial states:

"... compulsory unionism is part and parcel of the social pattern of the Australian people, and the party has been wise in emphasising it..."

It is true, certainly, that under the plea of war necessity we have allowed ourselves, very unwisely, to be enslaved under a plethora of compulsory rules governing our associations; most "credit" for which

STABILISATION SUBSIDIES

In the British House of Commons on July 20 Mr. Tinker asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the articles that are receiving a subsidy to stabilise the cost of living; and what is the estimated annual cost for 1943 for the Treasury to meet?

Sir K. Wood: "As the answer is rather long, I will, with my hon. Friend's permission, circulate it in the 'Official Report.'"

Following is the answer: "The main effect of the stabilisation subsidies is to hold down the price of food, though to a much smaller extent the subsidies are applied to clothing also. In addition to the subsidies administered by the Ministry of Food and the Ministry of Agriculture, there are various forms of transport subsidy. The total cost of the policy for 1943 is estimated at about £210,000,000 if the special health schemes, for milk and vitamins, are included, or at about £188,000,000 if these are omitted. The foods, which are being sold below cost at the present time are: Bread and flour, potatoes, sugar, milk, meat, bacon, eggs, canned fish and tea."

illusioned after a war. It does seem a psychological fact that people, in order to put up with the rigours of war, promise themselves that after the war Utopia will arrive. But Dr. Coombs does neither himself nor this country a service by making his statement, which implies a promise.

"It is not necessary for me to say why we fight, although if called upon I would find it hard to improve on the statement that we, like all other peoples, are fighting 'for our country.' Nor is it necessary to question what is meant by the doctor when he says economic activities should have 'specific social objectives.' But I deny that we are fighting for this purpose, and I consider that he only does harm by saying so.

"Secondly, Dr. Coombs says, 'Employment, instead of being a by-product of economic activity, should be in future the objective.'

"Probably the doctor does not mean what he says. Let me quote the American 'Fortune,' which, in an editorial, recently discussed the questions raised after the publication of its famous post-war pamphlet. 'There should be no question any more of leaf-raking or even of work relief.'

"It is obvious that, if Dr. Coombs is to be taken literally, leaf-raking (or, in Australia, sand-shifting) would be 'employment.' The provision of employment is not and never can be in itself a proper objective. It must always be employment in an 'economic activity' which is reasonable. It is a hope of mine (not a war aim) that one day the world will, by machines, be able to provide so much of what we require for life that employment as such will never matter to anybody. For the immediate future I hope that 'every one able and willing to work shall have an opportunity to do so'—but at an economic activity that is not senseless. Quite possibly this is what the doctor even means. But even this must not be confused with war aims."

must be given to the Canberra socialists. A sound social and economic principle... wrote the Fuhrer of "The Telegraph," who, obviously, would be more at home in charge of a convict settlement than in charge of a newspaper!

However, no race upon earth has a more wholesome distaste for compulsion, in any form, than Australians, and it is not unreasonable to expect that the leaders of the new party, "The Telegraph," and other compulsionists (all of whom draw their inspirations from the same source), will be disabused in the near future.

—J. N. KIDMAN.

THE CASE AGAINST NATIONALISATION

By NORMAN F. WEBB, in the "Social Creditor," England.

(Continued from last issue.)

Let me risk the accusation of over-simplification in order to give as clear an idea as possible of this problem of unbalance as it directly affects Agriculture. We have seen that excessive predominance of one "interest" automatically leads to centralisation, and to the encouragement of all that tends that way. It follows that the statistical (grouping) mind is fostered by such conditions—the process of thought that runs naturally to combines and mergers and telescoping and all varieties of centralisation for the sake of unified control. As an individual thinks, so he will act—granted he has the power, either personally won, or else delegated to him.

It is the nature of such reasoning to see every industry, including Agriculture, more or less in terms of Henry Ford, and every retail establishment like Marks and Spencer. And ultimately (for so his mind quite logically sees his problem, which is to establish centralised control of all interests for his employing interest) he will plump for one single combine in each type of industry (the I.C.I. is almost that in the Chemical Industry, already, and Courtauld's seems in a fair way to achieving it in Textiles) as the simplest road to this object. In short, the figure-men have been projected by circumstances from their proper sphere and instead of co-operating with process, are taking control of it. The permanent official has swamped the Government proper, which has betrayed its trust to keep the balance, and we find ourselves threatened with the cult of the Supreme State—the condition to which we give the ugly name of Totalitarianism when it makes its appearance in other nations.

Now, this is not progress, in the sense of individual betterment, though we have been pretending to ourselves for a great number of years that it is. It is just increasing dis-equilibrium, arising from continuous logical action based on a process of one-sided thought. And the final, unbalanced claim, as I put it in my first paragraph, is for Nationalisation—a useful vague term, in fact covering and confirming in perpetuity all those "departmental powers," outside and above the law of the land, that so exercised the late Lord Chief Justice Hewart, which Parliament has conceded temporarily, in the interests of the war. It means the surrender on the part of the agriculturist, who, however limited his outlook may be, is the only complete expert at his job there is, of almost all that liberty of action and decision, within reasonable co-operative limits, which is the one known guarantee of efficiency.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

ment bungling and the desire of certain bureaucrats to make jobs for themselves, and to further regiment the people, are the major causes of the meat muddle. Electors should tell their members of Federal Parliament that they won't stand for meat rationing or any further bungling.

STALIN'S SOCIALISM: A Scripps-Howard press correspondent is reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of November 19 as saying that "Russia is turning to the Right in many important aspects of economic life. The trend is emphasised especially among war workers, who are said to be engaged in sharper competition than in competitive America. The backbone of competition among Soviet workers is the incentive system." "If it is true (as implied) that rewards are offered in preference to compulsions and penalties, we, in democratic (?) Australia, must have modeled "our" coercive methods on a different brand of totalitarianism. Can it be that Russian "socialism" and "monopoly capitalism" are really much the same thing under different names?

COMMO. CAPERS: The following report from the Melbourne "Sun" of December 4, dealing with the Commons debate on the Mosley affair, illustrates Communistic tactics to stir up strife: "It is true that there is detestation in the Commons of everything for which Mosley stands... Communists had done much to whip up passions against Mr. Morrison, who has never hidden his loathing for Communists." It's just another case of the Red Fascists using the unthinking dupes associated with them to further their own ends.

GERMAN GULE: Trevor Smith cabled an interesting suggestion to the Melbourne "Herald": "The Germans think that if they could check Russia, it would be worth allowing the British and Americans to reach Germany, thus ensuring an orderly Russian entry. This will be apparent from future German troop movements." So far the reverse appears to be the case, since more effective opposition is being offered on the Italian front than on the Russian front. However, Germany presumably could determine whether the Russians or the British and Americans reached Berlin first, by diminishing or withdrawing the appropriate resistance. And, of course, she can be relied upon to play one against the other. However, it's a safe bet that the international bankers behind scenes have all this worked out.

CHIFLEY CONUNDRUM: Sir Mark and Lady Sheldon, of Sydney, have made another loan of £10,000—free of interest—to the Government, (This makes a total of £30,000 in interest-free loans from these real patriots.) Mr. Chifley accepted this with appreciation, which seems to indicate that he is not really opposed to interest-free loans; yet he resists the issue of war finance on these terms through the Commonwealth Bank. Rather a puzzling attitude!

—O.B.H.

Must one apologise for putting this "case" philosophically? That practical men have been philosophers, our great gallery of proverbial sayings goes to prove. Why, the whole situation, which I am endeavouring to analyse here, is summed up perfectly in the old saying that "to the shoemaker there is nothing like leather." Yet, today the practical man, the industrialist, says that conditions give him no chance to think. If that is really so, then it appears to me that what conditions deny him today, is the chance to be practical. For the practical philosopher is no more than one who delves deep enough into his subject to reach its permanent, as distinct from its incidental features, and then formulates them. But what appears to be happening with our present civilisation is that practical affairs are rapidly being drained of all philosophical content, and as an inevitable reaction we cease to think about them. After all, if your farm is no longer governed, metaphorically speaking, by a pact between yourself and High Heaven and your immediate neighbours, and instead comes to depend mainly on supplies of "artificial" and feeding stuffs from God knows where, and to be ruled exclusively by orders (in triplicate) from Whitehall, which however well-meant, say one thing one week and its opposite the next, without even the warning of a red sunrise, to allow of the adjusting of plans (Continued at foot of next column page 3)

"New Times" Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home or elsewhere 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.

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

A Sub-Committee of the Federal Cabinet has begun a survey of constitutional powers, in order that the Government may determine its future course of action in approaching the States or the people foot-increased powers. Kites are being flown suggesting that the attitude of the Government on Constitution amendment is necessary so that: (a) Adequate plans for domestic reconstruction can be embarked upon, and (b) Australia can enter international commitments which will be necessary for post-war reconstruction.

It may be that there are anomalies in the Commonwealth Constitution, which may have to be corrected, in view of the enlarged responsibilities of the nation.

But to suggest that the Constitution is to be amended in order that unnamed and unspecified international agreements may be entered upon is rather putting the cart before the horse.

In more than 40 years of Federation the Australian people have shown a marked disinclination to give blank cheques for the amendment of the Constitution.

First attempt to amend the Federal Constitution was made when it was barely 10 years old.

The Fisher Government, elected with a substantial majority in both Houses, went to the people on a referendum a few months after taking office. It sought extended powers affecting the financial relationship between the States and the Commonwealth; extended powers over trade and commerce, both inter-state and intra-state, and extended industrial powers and extended powers over monopolies and combines.

All this, at the time, was said to be necessary for the proper working out of the Federal ideal. The people rejected the proposals emphatically. They felt at the time that the referendum had been sprung on them without warning.

The reaction was such that, despite the subsequent good record, the Fisher Government suffered defeat in 1913. At the election of 1913 it again submitted the referendum proposals, which were defeated in 1910. They were again emphatically rejected by the people.

The next attempt to amend the Federal Constitution was made in 1919, when the Hughes Government submitted proposals for an extension of Commonwealth powers, for a period of three years, for the purpose of post-war reconstruction.

The arguments that Mr. Hughes used were strangely similar to those, which accompany the present case for greater powers.

The Hughes proposal in 1919, reached as a result of a conference with the Premiers of the day, was to ask at the referendum for temporary powers for three years, and meantime to summon a Constitution Convention to revise the Constitution as a whole.

The 1919 referendum was defeated by a comparatively small majority in the aggregate. Three States voted in, favour of the proposals, and three against.

Nor was the Convention ever held. But we still lived on. The country grew and prospered.

The next essay to amend the Constitution was made in 1926, when the Bruce-Page Government sought to secure extended powers under the headings of "Industry and Commerce" and "Essential Services."

Both powers sought transfer of authorities from the States to the Commonwealth, again covering as many matters as might be legitimately included under the respective head-

Case Against Nationalisation

—if the universe takes on that aspect, one is bound largely to cease to be a thinking being and adopt an attitude of mental servility through sheer bewilderment. I defy anyone to construct a positive "saying" regarding Departmental Orders that could be guaranteed valid for ten months, let alone ten centuries.

Now, apart from the lack of balance in this demand for Nationalisation of land, it is not a practical proposition. There is no such thing as absolute ownership of land—though some individual or individuals own the use (or abuse) of everything, the fruits of control. For our national land-utilisation policy we can decide either that the control and use of the land be vested in a comparatively few individuals through large units, such as Trusts, and Housing Estates, and Commissions, and, under what we call "nationalisation," in the few predominant owners of the National Debt. Or else we can plump for what, with a curious, and as far as I can see, quite unreasonable disapprobation, is termed Private Ownership, which means nothing more than that the same use and control shall be vested in the greater, or greatest number of individuals, through medium-sized and small units.

That is not a particularly confused or mixed issue. And I cannot help feeling it would be quite clear, at least to every one engaged on, and with the land, if it were not that the figure-mind that has control of Government, and national policy and even avenues of information today, and strongly favours statistical centralisation, and the big unit, brings such a barrage of figures to bear on the situation that those who favour the small unit are bewildered and silenced. But their final discomfiture, if it were to be achieved, which hardly seems possible, would not necessarily be a triumph for wisdom and common-sense. It would rather be the triumph of dominant and inadequately opposed vested interest—of the shoe maker's predilection for leather, enabling him to "take powers" to apply it to our whole person; and the final proof that the Government proper, our representatives in the House had abandoned their trust, which was to hold the balance as between us all. (To be concluded.)

ings. And when they were examined they were found to be pretty extensive.

Both proposals were defeated by substantial majorities.

In 1928 the Bruce-Page Government referred to the people the only referendum that was ever carried. The referendum entitled "The States Debt Act 1927," authorised the financial agreement under which the Loan Council was established.

Next essay at Constitution amendment was in March 1937, when the Lyons Government asked for the transfer to the Commonwealth of all powers in relation to aviation and organised marketing.

These were approved by the aggregate Commonwealth vote, but were not approved by a majority of the States, which is also necessary.

All these defeated proposals of earlier years appear in various forms in the 14 items of agreement, which were reached between the Commonwealth and States at the Constitutional Convention held in Canberra at the end of last year.

At this Convention the State Premiers agreed that the States would transfer to the Commonwealth for a period of five years after the cessation of hostilities, powers that were set out in 14 items.

This agreement was ratified by N.S.W. and Queensland; was ratified in Victoria subject to unified ratification by all the States; was substantially altered by S.A. and W.A., and was rejected by the Tasmanian Legislative Council. The Commonwealth Government therefore faces the problem of how to get its desires on Constitution amendment. The following courses are open to it:—

(1) To endeavour to induce the States to ratify the agreement made in December last and transfer powers under 14 heads for a period of five years, after which they will revert to the States, or

(2) Ask the people direct for these powers by referendum.

If the latter course be adopted, the Government must then make up its mind how it can intelligibly refer to the people the great diversity and range of powers asked for. This may be done by means of a Bill asking for the powers in toto. In that event, one ballot paper will be provided asking for simply yes or no.

The danger of that from the Government point of view is that if the people disapprove of transference of one of the 14 powers sought, they may vote against the lot. The other alternative is to submit 14 different questions to the people, requiring 14 answers, yes or no, and a ballot paper as long as your arm. Either course is beset with thorns and prickles.

In the original Bill, as proposed by Dr. Evatt, a wide sweep of powers was sought by a simple method of writing a new part in the Constitution, entitled "Part 6—War Aims and Post-war Reconstruction."

It was a blank cheque, the effect of which would have been the transference to the Commonwealth of unlimited powers for an indefinite period—maybe for all time.

The rough handling that the blank cheque got when the Government met the Premiers and the general attack on it from one end of Australia to another, clearly indicated to Mr. Curtin and Dr. Evatt that the way to desired Constitution amendment did not lie along that road.

After 30 years of warning by Federal politicians as to the dire consequences, which may flow from the failure to amend the Constitution, the people of Australia have grown a little sceptical. They have come to wonder whether the repeated appeals for more power are more habitual than factual.

—"Truth," December 4.

GUARD AUSTRALIA'S INDEPENDENCE!

By L S BULL

In view of the important letter-campaign relative to plans for an "international currency," "Federal Union" or an "international police force," the following extract from Federal "Hansard" of October 7, 1943, pages 235-6, will be of interest to readers:—

MR. RYAN: "In view of the recent press reports that discussions have taken place in the United States of America regarding the establishment of an international currency, an international government, and an international police force, in the postwar period, can the Prime Minister say whether any commitments have been entered into on behalf of the Commonwealth?"

MR. CURTIN: "The Commonwealth Government has been represented at a number of these discussions, but no commitments have been entered into, in the sense that FINAL CONTRACTS have been made, either between other parties to the deliberations or by Australia. The discussions are still LARGELY in the exploratory stage. I assure the House that no FINAL settlement of these matters appears to be IMMEDIATELY in prospect." (My emphasis.)

Now that the subject has been opened in Parliament the time is opportune to pursue our letter-campaign with renewed vigour. I sincerely trust that all who can do so will take advantage of the demand forms made available by the "New Times." Another matter, which should receive the attention of campaigners, is to write a letter to Mr. R. S. Ryan, M.H.R., expressing appreciation of his action in the matter and urging him to continue interrogation further along these lines.

As a matter of interest, I append a copy of my letter to Mr. Ryan in this regard:

Mr. R. S. Ryan, C.M.G., D.S.O., M.H.R., Parliament House, Canberra. Dear Mr. Ryan,—I was very interested to read in "Hansard," October 7, pages 235-6, your question addressed to the Prime Minister concerning the establishment of an international currency, an international police force, and an international police force, etc.

There is no doubt that these proposals, if carried, would sound the death knell of Australian sovereignty, and it is heartening to note that at least one Federal Member has his eye on the subject.

I sincerely trust you will continue this line of interrogation. In this regard, may I suggest that it would be interesting to have the Prime Minister reply to a question somewhat along these lines:

"Pursuant to the Prime Minister's reply to my question relative to the discussions

"POWER POLITICS AND PEOPLE'S PRESSURE"

By L S BULL

THIS NEW BOOKLET TELLS. . .

- HOW dictatorship in Australia was narrowly averted.
- WHY the Constitution will again be attacked.
- WHO are the planners.
- HOW you can help defend Australian freedom.

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW.

Price, 1/1, post free, from The United Electors of Australia, 5th Floor, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

regarding the establishment of an international currency, an international government and an international police force, will the Right Honourable gentleman give the House an assurance that no commitments or contracts will be entered into by the Commonwealth Government until the Parliament has had ample opportunity of debating these proposals?"

"Will the Prime Minister assure the House that no contracts OR INFORMAL COMMITMENTS will be entered into by the Commonwealth Government without the approval of Parliament?"

You are, no doubt, aware that many students of international affairs are highly nervous of these proposals, and I feel that your interest in the matter cannot be too highly commended.

I have expressed my own opinions on the subject in a booklet entitled "Power Politics and People's Pressure." As a matter of interest I have pleasure in enclosing a copy for your perusal.

—With best wishes, yours sincerely, L. S. BULL, 6 Barina-road, Lane Cove, N.S.W., November 29, 1943.

SOLDIERS ARE BEGINNING TO WONDER

As the soldier watches the pattern of civil life change, he wonders where he is going to fit in when the war is won; provided he has the luck to survive the conflict. He is not reassured when he reads words in the "Economic News" by the Queensland Statistician and Director of the Bureau of Industry and Deputy-Director of the Department of War Organisation and Industry (Mr. Colin Clark).

A man with a title like that should carry some weight and his opinion is worthy of consideration. This is what he writes:

"Totalitarian ideas are beginning to make headway in the Commonwealth Public Service. Ambitious young men, engaged as wartime temporaries, envisage a totalitarian regime with permanent and important jobs for themselves; the wire pulling type of departmental head intrigues to suppress any parliamentary criticism of bureaucratic activities."

It is not encouraging to soldiers who enlisted to fight totalitarianism overseas to hear the Deputy-Director of War Organisation state that it is rapidly being established in the Commonwealth! The sentence, "Ambitious young men envisage a totalitarian regime," smacks almost of fifth column work somewhere.

Before the war commenced C. E. M. Joad published a book, "Why War?" in which he wrote:

"War throws into prominence and elevates to positions of power a managing

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From THE UNITED DEMOCRATS, of 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide. CHRISTMAS LUNCHEON: Our special Christmas luncheon will be held on Friday, December 17. Mr. C. L. Tucker will give an address to members and their friends, his subject being "Candid Camera." The luncheon charge will be 2/6. Come along and help make this luncheon a real success.

A BETTER DEAL FOR PENSIONERS SOUGHT: See special article in this issue.—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

PLANNERS POW-WOW

The tenth Summer School of the Australian Institute of Political Science, in association this year with the ECONOMIC SOCIETY of Australia and New Zealand and the Australian LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION, will be held at CANBERRA, during the Anniversary Day weekend from Saturday, January 29, to Monday, January 31, 1944. The School will be divided into sessions of three hours each, and at each session discussion will follow the reading of a paper. The subjects of the papers are as under:

"Australia's Post-War International Relations" (by Rt. Hon. R. G. MENZIES, P.C., K.C., M.P.).

"The Economic Aftermath of the War" (by Dr. H. C. COOMBS).

"The Change-over to Peace" (by Professor D. B. COPLAND, C.M.G.).

"A New Social Order?" (by Dr. LLOYD ROSS).

"Reconstruction and the Constitution" (by Rt. Hon. Dr. H. V. EVATT, P.C., K.C., M.P.).

One aim of the above-mentioned organisations is to bring together persons interested in the social, economic, and political problems of Australia, but ATTENDANCE at the Summer School is not restricted to members or to adherents of any political party or school of thought.

In view of the great deal of thought which is now being given to post-war reconstruction problems, members of the Institute who are interested in attending the series of lectures or in obtaining any further information in regard thereto, are invited to communicate with the Secretary, Australian Institute of Political Science, 34 Elizabeth-street, Sydney.

—"The Federal Accountant," November. (Our heading and emphasis.)

U.E.A. NOTES

The attention of supporters is directed to the letterform reproduced hereunder. This is being well received in industrial workshops, where it originated, and in other quarters. Supplies of this letter-form are now available from the United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne. No time should be lost in circulating them. Order your supplies NOW. Price: 1/6 per 100, post free.

"OPPRESSIVE TAXATION PROTEST."

"Mr..... M.H.R.

"Parliament House, Canberra, A.C.T. "Dear Sir,—

"The Taxation Department is asking now for the payment of income tax for 1943-44 on or before 31/3/44.

"Tax payers who pay their tax through deductions from pay envelopes would thus have to find an additional amount equivalent to about six or seven months' taxes, on top of normal tax instalments, to meet their assessments by that date.

"This is unreasonable and unnecessary, and is unacceptable to me.

"I therefore call upon you as my representative in Parliament to see that this further imposition is cancelled immediately.

"Yours faithfully,

"(Signed)

"Address

"Fed. Electorate

"Date"

and executive type of man very different from the young idealists who, in the early days, flocked so eagerly to the standards to fight for honourable ends. When the end of the war is reached, the executives are found to be in control and the idealists, if any survive, are derided and ignored." So it was in the last war. Will it be again in this war? The soldier does not envisage a totalitarian regime. Army training has not developed a love of regimentation in the soldier. He hopes for a free, not a slave, world.

—Sgt. Roald Gresham, in the "New Era," November 12.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The weekly broadcasts of the New World Reconstruction Movement (South Australian Division) have come to an abrupt end. You may wonder why. The reason is the usual one—lack of funds. You may not know that it costs 10/- a minute for these broadcasts. The Committee has, therefore, to maintain a never-ceasing effort to raise funds. Should they fail to raise £6 per week, they go off the air. This has happened now!

If you appreciated our broadcasts, will you help by writing at once to the New World Reconstruction Movement, Rechabite Chambers, Adelaide, enclosing your donation. The broadcasts were given every Sunday at 12.45 p.m.—"Victory Programme"—from 5AD-PI.

—W. E. Carruthers (Chairman), Lloyd G. Brown (Hon. Secretary), New World Reconstruction Movement (S.A. Division).

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir, —Even Dr. G. L. Wood is beginning to display some alarm at the trend of events. In the Melbourne "Age" of 29/11/43 he is reported as having spoken about the "WORLD" policy of America. Who is America? The mountains, rivers, valleys, lakes, and resources, which constitute that country, are not dangerous to anyone, and so when he speaks of America he really means some persons IN America. Why is he not straightforward about these persons?

The report in the "Age" opened up in this way:—

"How will America wield her immense economic and financial power after the war? Though he posed this question in a provocative address to the Institution of Engineers' Conference on political affairs on Saturday night, Dr. G. L. Wood, Acting Professor of Commerce at Melbourne University, did not hazard any categorical answer to it. But while he discounted the possibility that America would use her power—a power that would be greater than that ever wielded by one country in the world's history—for territorial aggrandisement, he voiced the fear that she might perhaps use it for economic domination in the interests of American pockets."

Have we not been officially told that it was the rulers of Germany who were seeking economic domination? Now, apparently, it is the rulers of America who are after it. And if it is a matter of American "pockets," then Dr. Wood must be aware that that is a matter of finance. What else could go into American "pockets"? Wouldn't it be a shame if these men who have been given the trust of the people for many years were to talk in simple terms that all could understand, instead of floundering in high falutin' abstractions!

In one of the earlier letters in this particular series, it was shown that the Jewish section of the Money Trust dominated not only America, but the commerce and industry of the entire globe. Did Dr. Wood not know that, or did he have some purpose in mind in withholding the information from the engineers' conference? This is the aspect on which we are trying to focus the light of truth, and the plans afoot to maintain such domination constitute a very real and increasing peril for all of us in the period after the war. Had Dr. Wood been on the look out for reality in this regard he would have seen a valuable pointer in the Melbourne "Herald" of 26/11/43, the day before he spoke to the engineers. This is what the "Herald" told us:

"The 'dollar-a-year men,' therefore, are leaving Washington for their own plants, which they naturally do not desire to see left behind in the post-war competitive scramble. Mr. Bernard Baruch has been quietly assuming control of post-war industrial planning, and has been gathering round him leaders of industry and finance. His right-hand assistant is an elderly banker, John M. Hancock, for years a stem critic of New Deal policies. Others on whom Mr. Baruch relies are the millionaire, Robert McConnell, the Treasury's post-war expert and a man with a colourful mining history; Grenville Bridgman, Republican head of the Metals Reserve Corporation; George Harrison, President of the New York Life Insurance Co.; Jesse Jones, millionaire banker and estate dealer, whom Mr. Roosevelt backed against Vice-President Wallace. New Dealers are conspicuously absent from Mr. Baruch's offices."

So it is to be a "competitive scramble" after the war, and Mr. Baruch has been "quietly assuming control" of the scramble. And have a good look at the type of "leaders" who are helping him to arrange matters!

Mr. Bernard Baruch was the most powerful man in America during the last war; he has been one of the most powerful men in the world since the last war; and even today is permitted to continue a similar role. Who is he? You, Mr. Editor, and most of your readers, already know. He could give a lot of information about such things as the humiliation of the people of the British Empire in the last war and after it; the imposition upon us, before we could have "finance" to proceed with the war to end war, of obligations entirely beyond our ability to fulfill; the domination of the "Peace" Conference at Versailles; the dictation of the financial policy that has led to worldwide ruin; and the formulation of the policy which threatens us with further disaster after the war. This man, with others of similar background and outlook, are "planning" for the continuance of a "competitive scramble," NOT for the sort of New Order for which our young men think they are fighting and dying.

This question of "background" and "outlook" has formed the subject of our recent attention, and last week, within the limited space available, important statements were quoted from great men of the past regarding the anti-social activities of Jews. These anti-social activities have been going on for thousands of years, and usury in particular has come in for universal condemnation. Usury seems to be a Jewish speciality. An appreciation of the position in this respect is important, and I therefore quote further instances taken from "The Social Creditor" of 7/8/43. As you read these, will you please bear in mind that they are not put forward as an attack on Jews; but simply as part of an effort to establish the nature and purpose of the POLICY which has been IMPOSED upon our forefathers, upon us and will be imposed upon our children unless we take steps NOW to save them from it

In the last century before Christ, Cicero

"New Times," December 10, 1943—Page 4

THE "LITTLE HITLERS IN OUR MIDST"

The power of War Agricultural Executive Committees in Britain to evict farmers without the option of appeal was described by Colonel A. Dower, M.P. for the Cokermonth and Penrith Division, as "un-English and unjust" when he spoke at Cokermonth recently.

He said that he wondered whether the County Councils could not have done just as well had they been given the powers.

The greatest cause for grievance, however, was the power of War Agricultural Executive Committees to order a farmer out of his possessions and into the street without having an opportunity of appeal. That was thoroughly un-English.

The right of appeal against any seemingly unfair decision had been the cherished right of Englishmen since the time of the Normans. Whether the farmer was right or wrong, he should have the Englishman's right of appeal.

Colonel Dower then warned his audience against the "little Hitlers in our midst." In Great Britain they had today, he said, well over a million Civil Servants spending their time ordering; other people around, and there were among them many thousands of "little Hitlers," some of whom were in that very county.

If he knew anything of the splendid characteristics of the Cumbrians, for whom he had the greatest admiration, Colonel Dower was sure they were NOT GOING TO STAND BEING KICKED AROUND BY THESE LITTLE TYRANTS.

Referring to the war situation, Colonel Dower said that it must be realised that we were fighting the whole of the German people and not just the Nazis. Germany, he declared, must never again be allowed to re-arm or to have the means of producing War materials. We must not allow our sons to face the same unfinished problems that we had had to face.

For the restoration of British industry and trade the only efficient method would be private enterprise. The State might indicate where such enterprise could be applied with the best advantage, but on no account should the State interfere with the working of private enterprise.

Grim confirmation of Colonel Dower's statement that farmers with British blood in their veins will "not stand being kicked around by these little tyrants" had already

Standard, London, 22/5/42, said: "Twenty-seven centuries ago the prophet Amos indignantly denounced cornering the market in foods, rebuking the rapacious merchants for their greed, their dishonesty, their meanness. A thousand years later the Talmud sternly forbade similar misdeeds. . . . Jewish participation in this and other offences has given rise to a grave defamation of Judaism and the Jewish name. It may make people forget that in the present battle of human freedom the Jew is doing his duty on every battle front and every theatre of war, on land, and in the air, on the sea and under the sea."

We do not want to forget that Jews are dying with our own sons, and we will not forget it; but we do want the Jews themselves to remember that unless something is done to check the activities of men like Baruch and his associates they will continue to die on battlefronts, just as our own sons will continue to die on them.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2. 5/12/43. (To be continued.)

A BETTER DEAL FOR PENSIONERS

The president of the Prospect Pensioners' Association in South Australia (Mr. J. Fitzgerald) having heard of the effectiveness of "pressure politics," consulted the vice-president of the United Democrats of Adelaide (Mr. M. E. Dodd), with the object of ascertaining whether the idea could be used to secure a better deal for old-age and invalid pensioners. A meeting was called and a combined leaflet and request-form was submitted. A Statewide campaign is expected early in the New Year. As it is desired to make the campaign an Australia-wide effort, the United Democrats (17 Waymouth St., Adelaide), would be glad to hear from any persons or groups in other States who would care to co-operate. The leaflet-request-form reads as follows:—

FREEDOM FROM WANT!

WHAT MAKES IT POSSIBLE?

Australians can produce sufficient food and clothing to adequately provide for the needs of all citizens.

But only if you have a sufficient money income can you be free from the fear of want. Would 27/- a week give YOU that Freedom?

Invalids and pensioners have to try and live on that paltry sum.

Senator Miss Dorothy Tangney, the first Woman to be elected to the Australian Senate, said this in Parliament on September 24, 1943:—

"We have at present a system of pensions, which, to my mind, are very inadequate. I do not know how I or any other honourable senator on either side of the chamber could exist on 26/- a week, with an odd 6d thrown in now and again. It is time that pensions were abolished, because we are all shareholders in this vast Commonwealth; there are 7,000,000 of us, and it is the duty of this Parliament to provide that men or women who have given a lifetime of service to the nation shall be given, when they reach pensionable age, not 26/- a week as a dole, but their share of the national dividend which they have helped, by their labour, to create over the years. I hope, therefore, that in this new scheme of social security, adequate provision will be made for those who have reached the eventide of life so that they may enjoy in peace and security those benefits which they themselves have helped to create."

What is your Representative doing about this matter, which vitally concerns you?

Illness may make you a permanent invalid or rob you of your "nest-eggs" which you had planned would make the eventide of your life comfortable.

Help bring freedom from want to the invalids and the aged by filling in the request below. Get your friends to sign also. This is an instruction to your Member of Parliament.

Remember that many Labor M.P.'s, including Dr. Evatt, have affirmed, "What is physically possible can be made financially possible."

Further copies of this leaflet can be obtained from Mr. J. Fitzgerald, President, Prospect Pensioners' Association, 3 Elizabeth St. Prospect South Australia.

To Mr. M.H.R., Canberra, A.C.T.

Dear Sir, —We consider the present old age and invalid pension rates inadequate to provide a reasonable living standard.

We request you, our Representative in Parliament, to do all in your power to ensure that a minimum of £3 per week shall be paid to each pensioner, without reference to a Means Test, and to permanent invalids. Furthermore, the cost of living must not be increased.

In doing this you will be assured of our cordial support. If you fail to act in this matter we will require your resignation.

Yours faithfully,

NAME ADDRESS DATE

.....

been provided as far back as 1944 by news-item from England which also indicated the kind of unfortunate extremes to which outraged Britons may resort—not necessarily without some success—when thus provoked (although the pretext of "war emergency" avoids a serious multiplication of such incidents—while the war lasts). The news-item, which appeared in the "Social Creditor" on August 3, 1940, was as follows:—

"The Hampshire War Agricultural Committee ordered the ejection from his farm of Raymond Warden, a 66-years-old farmer of Borough Farm, Itchen Stoke, near Airedale. It is said that he refused to plough up five acres of land.

"The police-constable who went to the farm to see that no breach of the peace was committed when Mr. Warden was ejected received shot wounds in both legs. The farmer made his home into his castle, barricaded the doors, and held the police at bay for 18 hours. The police, armed with shotguns, surrounded the house and tried to drive him out with tear-gas. An inspector and two more policemen were wounded, and more officers armed with service rifles were sent for. When the doors were broken down Mr. Warden continued resistance from a room in the house. The police offered not to shoot him if he put down his gun and walked out with his arms up, but the reply to this offer was another shot. The offer was repeated, and a policeman firing at the door of the room was answered by another shot. The offer was made again, and a few minutes later there was another shot. A police officer found Mr. Warden lying at the foot of the stairs with gunshot wounds in the right eye and temple. He was taken to hospital, where he died."

DANGERS TO DEMOCRACY

(Continued from page 1.)

them we would lose our jobs and our homes. If the Party Chiefs and the Departmental Chiefs all belong to the same Party, and depend on the same men for their positions of authority, then you have nothing short of a dictatorship of an all-powerful clique.

The danger and abuse of this combination has long been foreseen, and for this reason it has been the practice to keep separate the various departments of Government: the making of the laws, the administration of the laws; and the interpretation of the laws.

These facts are elementary and vital to any decent Government, and although large numbers of people have no understanding of them, it only needs a few watchful people to see that these fundamental principles are respected in this country.

THE JUDICATURE.

In order that the laws made by Parliament would be carried out impartially, judges were set up to interpret the laws. These judges were given good salaries for life, and they could not be interfered with by the Government. In other words, they had no need to fear anyone or look for favours from any man. The judges were expected to dedicate their lives to the job, and they were put in a better position than most men.

You would think judges of the High Court, receiving £3000 a year and a liberal pension, would be content to abide by the rules long established for the effective administration of justice.

But we find in Australia that three judges of the High Court have accepted good Government positions and higher social status than that enjoyed by the Bench. Dr. Evatt, Justice of the High Court, now wields more power than practically any man in Australia; Sir John Latham, Chief Justice of the High Court, accepted a position in Japan; and Justice Dixon is now High Commissioner in America.

Here you see a breakdown of those safeguards and checks, which prevent the Government from interfering with the High Court. And considering the momentous decisions which are required to be made by High Court judges—decisions of a very far-reaching nature—we begin to realise that behind the tradition and etiquette of the past lies something of supreme value, and that previous generations, in spite of all our education, appeared to know more of these things than we do.

It seems to be fundamental and beyond argument that a person who becomes a judge should dedicate his life to the service of justice and put aside all thoughts of political and social advancement.

In these days when the powers given to the Government Party are so large, and extend into the lives of so many people; when the Government has the power to make its own laws, to choose those who are to administer the laws, and choose those who are to interpret the laws; it would seem reasonable to expect that the people of this country would keep a critical eye on all Government appointments and demand that certain elementary safeguards be provided.

Until we get these safeguards I cannot see how the Federal Government can expect to be given the greater powers they are demanding for peace-time "reconstruction."—JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.