

The "New Times" is a really independent, non-party, non-class, non-sectarian weekly newspaper, advocating political and economic democracy, and opposing totalitarianism in all its forms.

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. No. 10. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1944.

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).

The "Pay-As-You-Earn" Tax Trick Exposed!

A Labor Broadcaster Explains

In the "Voice of Labor" session, broadcast from 3KZ on Sunday afternoon, February 27, a speaker dealt clearly and trenchantly with the Federal Government's much-discussed "pay-as-you-earn" taxation scheme and the related matter of the alleged "tax lag." Inter alia, he said:—

According to our newspapers, the introduction of a system of taxation called pay-as-you-earn has been definitely decided upon.

At the outset I will say that if the projected action can be legally enacted within the powers of the Constitution, then there is absolutely no limit to the powers invested in the Government under the Constitution, and there is no limit to the acts, which the Government can do if it so desires. Furthermore, let me say that the proposals are nothing more nor less than a direct attack upon the wages and salaries of the worker.

One phase of the matter which has evoked much comment is the question whether, in fact, there is a lag of one year in the payment of taxes, it can be most emphatically averred that there is no lag, and I now challenge anyone to prove that there is.

Income taxation as a means of raising revenue required by the Commonwealth Government was introduced to finance the

war of 1914-18. The first law was passed by the Commonwealth Parliament in September, 1915, and it enacted that all persons liable for taxation should pay tax during the year ended 30th June, 1916. The basis of liability was the income derived in the preceding year, which was the year ended 30th, June 1915. Every income taxation Act since the original Act of September 1915, has always stated the basis of liability as the income derived in the previous year. It would have been just as easy to have deferred the basis of liability as some other period, but the fact remained, that it was stated in that form, and that form has been used up to the present.

Now, if I or anyone else—and no doubt there are many people who have done so—have paid an amount of taxation for each year since the original law was enacted, how can it even be thought for one moment, let alone seriously contended, that there is a lag in our payments?

Let us look ahead and consider the position, as it would be for the year ended

30th June 1945, if the existing law was not altered. After the 30th June, 1944, a notice as required by the law would be published, calling on all persons liable to do so to lodge a return of their income, in the case of wages and salary earners before the 31st July, and for all other people before the 31st August. That is the first discrimination against the worker, and it is illegal. There is no power or authority to permit any discrimination between the people of the States. It is undeniably unconstitutional. But let us pass over that minor matter and proceed.

Until the Commissioner or one of his officers makes an assessment of the liability of each worker and individual and notifies that person by sending him a copy of an assessment notice no liability exists. You may not get an assessment notice for 12 months or two years, or perhaps you may never receive a notice of assessment. But until you do, under the law, there is no liability.

In the case of the wage and salary earner, however, the Commissioner directs the employer to deduct from the weekly wages and salary beginning from the 1st April, 1944, a weekly amount, and to pay that amount deducted to the Taxation Department. The deductions from your wages and salary begin on the 1st April 1944, although you are not bound to make a return before the 31st August 1944 (the Commissioner says by the 31st July, 1944, but that is illegal), and you will not be liable for any tax until you receive a notice of payment which, at the earliest, cannot be before November or December of 1944, and, in fact, you may not be liable to pay any tax at all.

You see the position. Five months before you are even due to lodge a return, the Commissioner does not merely ask you to pay some tax; he goes to your employer and tells your employer to retain so much of your wages or salary and amount to him!

Wages and salaries are, as a general rule, fixed by some governmental authority, such

as a Wages Board or Arbitration Court or some such tribunal. Now, all these several wage-fixing authorities have the sanction of the law, and they were instituted for the purpose of determining and fixing a fair rate of remuneration for the worker. Another individual comes along and says to the employer, "Do not pay that amount of wages to the worker, but deduct so much from it and give him the balance." The first authority says to the employer, "If you do not pay that amount of wages you will be subject to certain penalties." The second person says to the employer, "If you do pay that amount of wages to the worker you will be subject to certain penalties." The employer, in effect, says, "It is no concern of mine, I will take the path of least resistance and deduct the amount. If I am brought to task the respective bodies can settle the matter between themselves." The worker, of course, is the only one who suffers. Now, if the amounts deducted bring his weekly wage down below a living wage he has no redress.

I suppose you read in the papers recently that alter taxes had been deducted certain employees were receiving £3 and less a week. They can get no redress. Their tax is taken out of their wages before they are even due to make a return. The provision of being granted time to pay, is not extended to them, yet others whose weekly income is many times in excess of £3 a week are given the special privilege of having time to pay, over and above the period of their actual liability.

But, over and above such trifling matters as that I have referred to (after all, they only affect the wage and salary earner!), we are now faced with this position for the year from 30th June 1944. For that year, the liability under this pay-as-you-earn scheme will be fixed, on the income derived in that year, and not, as in every other instance, on the income of the preceding year. As I have said, it will be most instructive how the liability is legally enacted. Probably—but it will be

(Continued on page 4.)

Guard Australia's Independence!

By L. S. BULL,

I am indebted to the United Democrats, Adelaide, for the following copy of a very interesting letter, addressed to their honorary secretary, which they have received from the South Australian Chief Secretary:—

Chief Secretary's Office, Adelaide,
February 5, 1944.

Dear Sir, — In reply to your correspondence and the pamphlet entitled "Power Politics and People's Pressure," I desire to state that I have perused the pamphlet and that as regards the question raised on page 13 the answer of the Crown Solicitor, to whom the question has been submitted, is as follows:—

"The effect of the adoption of the Statute of Westminster by the Commonwealth Parliament is to give that Parliament the legal right to secede from the Empire, and to become legally independent of His Majesty the King and the British Parliament, by taking the appropriate legislative steps, without any necessity to have the concurrence of any State Parliament, and without any State Parliament which disagrees having the legal right to prevent the secession."

—Yours faithfully (Signed) A. LYELL
McEWIN, Chief Secretary.

By way of comment, the following quotation from "The King and His Dominion Governors" by Mr. Justice Evatt (page 298) is not without significance:—

"The Parliament is the Parliament for the time being only, and it does not necessarily reflect the will of the electorate for all purposes and at all times. It will therefore have to be considered by the Dominion Peoples whether special safeguards are not required to prevent a complacent Parliament from surrendering constitutional powers by the method permitted by section 4 of the Statute of Westminster and without the consent or authority of the Dominion people concerned. By way of illustration it will

be remembered that the Newfoundland Act, 1933 (24-25 Geo. V., c. 2.) took away from the people of Newfoundland important rights of self-government, at the request, not of the electors, but of the Parliament for the time being."

Those words of warning were written in 1936 by Mr. Justice Evatt, eminent jurist. In October 1942, we had the ironical spectacle of Dr. Evatt, professional politician, rushing the Federal Government into the adoption of the very Statute, which has been the bane of Home and Dominion Statesmen ever since Lord Balfour drafted the 1926 formula.

With the adoption of the Statute of Westminster has followed a quick succession of proceedings that will only result in whittling down the Sovereignty of the Australian people. In particular I refer to the "Powers Bill," the "U.N.R.R.A." Agreement, and the recent Australia-New Zealand Agreement, 1944.

Thanks to the moral stamina of some of the smaller States, the Powers Bill, for the time being at any rate, has been successfully checked; and, in my opinion, there is little doubt that the forthcoming referendum will result in an abysmal defeat for the arch-centralisers.

But these international agreements are a different proposition. "A complacent Parliament is surrendering our powers of self-government without our consent or authority."

No matter how altruistic they are claimed to be, the net result of all these international agreements is the setting up of a new international bureaucracy over which we have no control or sanctions whatever. While on the other hand, it is plain for all to see, the international bureaucracy will ultimately be backed by the stark force of an international police power. A police power controlled by no one particular nation will thus be at the entire disposal of the inaccessible and therefore irresponsible international bureaucracy. A dark and foreboding future, indeed.

There is at least one more international agreement, which we may anticipate with a full measure of certainty; that is an "International Currency" agreement. This agreement will set up the supreme of all the bureaucratic tyrannies — the International Money Bureaucracy. With this will go the last vestige of any power of self-government.

All those democrats who are fully cognizant of the despotism which will assuredly follow in the wake of this final "Deed" of treachery should write regularly to members of Parliament, both Federal and State, and induce others to do so; demanding that no "International Currency" or similar agreement shall be signed by the Commonwealth Government without first submitting the matter to a referendum of the people.

NOTES on the NEWS

The many phases of the coal strikes, including the conscripting of strikers into the Army, are but the consequences of the policy being carried out by the Government: namely, destroying the miners' incentive to work by crippling taxation. The position is that the miners can strike or absent themselves from work for three or four months of the year and yet be relatively better off financially, than they would be if they worked for the whole period. The answer to the problem is to remove the vicious taxation, and thus restore the incentive. Unless this is done, it will be rather obvious that the Government prefers extra taxes to extra coal. In any case, insofar as the miners avoid the higher rates of taxation by strikes and absenteeism—or by transfer to the Army—the Government gets neither the extra taxes nor the extra coal!

PRESSURE POLITICS: The proposal to assess taxpayers an additional 25% on the "grab when you are paid basis" has caused such consternation, and hardship where it is already operative, that all sections of the community are "up in arms" against it. The latest development is that the Taxpayers' Association of Victoria is advertising in the Melbourne press, advising all and sundry to "protest to your Member of Parliament—now." The adoption of the Electoral Campaign principles by this and other bodies is positive evidence of the value of persistent educative work of E.G., organisations, who have carried the idea into so many quarters. Results have justified the policy.

POWERS PERIL: During the debate on the "Powers Bill," vide "Hansard" for February 11 (p. 143), Mr. Anthony voiced the opinion that "it was possible that conditions may be created in the five-year period which will make it impossible to return to the pre-existing order." Even Dr. Evatt could not deny this grave danger, and he replied thus: "In one sense what Mr. Anthony says is quite true." There is a tendency among unthinking people to be fooled by the statement that we can easily recover the position if not satisfied. Let such people be warned by Dr. Evatt's own answer. Under these circumstances even a five minutes' period is far too risky.

ASIATIC AUSTRALIA? At the recent "Summer School" Planners' Picnic certain individuals with foreign accents questioned the wisdom of the "White Australia Policy." Granny "Argus" quickly followed the lead and suggested that perhaps this cherished tradition of racial selectivity may cause offence—not to Japan this time, but to the Chinese and Indians. Then Messiah Murdoch tuned-in on the same key. Evidently emboldened by this advance propaganda barrage, the Methodist Conference, as reported in the Murdoch Press of March 1, openly and brazenly urged "a review of all clauses relating to the White Australia policy." No reasonable person would regard that sequence of events as accidental, and it is obvious that the plot to break

down Australia's economic standards to the coolie level is well under way; so, let the tocsins loudly ring—ask your MP where he stands.

FACT FINDERS: The following frank and truthful statement appeared in the Melbourne "Sun" of March 1: "Financial figures sometimes speak more eloquently than the most elaborate official statement on the progress of the war." The article then quotes the price movements of shares of (Continued on page 2)

British Share in War

"The British Empire looks very big on the map, but the part of its population which can be used in the war is far smaller than is often appreciated. The actual British population, that is, the white population, numbers only about 65,000,000. Of these, 20,000,000 are scattered over the vast sparsely inhabited areas of the Dominions. That means that they have just about half the available manpower the U.S.A. has. And in the British Isles themselves they only have 45,000,000, or about a third of the American population.

"With that smaller population Britain has carried from the beginning, and still is carrying, more than half the burden of the air attack on Germany, although the American Air Forces are taking over an increasing share. Also, with that smaller population Britain has consistently carried and still is carrying the larger part of the burden of war in the Mediterranean. And America's share on that front is decreasing, not increasing.

"Thus the implication that fewer British troops in the actual Channel invasion will mean any shirking of British responsibility is entirely unfair and overlooks, among other things, the fact that at no time through the Tunisian, Sicilian, and Italian campaigns have American forces equalled the numbers of British committed to battle."

—Joseph C. Harsch, in the "Christian Science Monitor," December 30, 1943.

That Missing Freedom

"Freedom of Speech"; well, even slaves may chatter,
So long as they're unarmed it doesn't matter.

"Religious Freedom"; well, what are the odds?
So long as Mammon heads the list of Gods?

"Freedom from Want"; no breeder would deprive
Good cattle of the means to keep alive.

"Freedom from Fear"; a counsel of perfection?

Not if there's always ample police protection.

Freedom to act, to choose or to refuse?

Ah, that's a very "different pair of shoes!"

—"Excalibur" ("Social Crediter," England).

Political thought, at present, is divided into two main groups, consisting on the one hand, of those who consider man to be a gregarious creature destined to subordinate his individuality to herd (or newspaper) opinion, and on the other hand of a group who believe that man can only reach his full stature—mentally, morally and physically—in an environment which permits of the maximum degree of freedom of choice and action.

The former group believe that although the individual should be free to worship his Maker as he thinks fit, and should have a limited measure of free speech, his actions and general living conditions should be rigorously circumscribed by the dictates of his leaders, so that he shall enjoy a measure of security and peace, such as has only been enjoyed in the past, by those who have been privileged to spend their days in the workhouse.

It may not be inappropriate at this point to consider the affinity between our vaunted democratic freedom and that enjoyed by our woolly friends, the sheep. They, like us, are free to bleat to their heart's content, provided they do not attempt to stray from the flock. They also enjoy security and freedom from want, and freedom to move within the confines of the pasture. Like us, also, they are shorn when the wool grows far enough over their eyes. But although such a life might be tolerable from the viewpoint of the sheep, whether quadruped or biped, it is certainly not the life for human beings raised in the British tradition.

The latter, of the above groups of thinkers, which consists mainly of Social Crediters, considers that conditions the reverse of those desired by the former group should prevail. They believe that the people themselves should have the power of deciding policy and that the function of Parliament should be to remove all impediments to free association and to economic plenty. Parliamentary representatives should so represent the wishes of the people to the civil service that they shall be capable of serving the people civilly to the limits of their ability.

The Social Credit school is of the opinion that association should yield material dividends to the individual, rather than that it should be a mere ethical exercise, and that given adequate inducement, free from uncertainty or deception, the individual will feel impelled, by virtue of being a social creature, to give of his best to the common pool, which to him is the

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

PENSIONERS' CAMPAIGN: One Sunday afternoon recently at the invitation of Mr. Johnson, manufacturing chemist, our president and vice-president, Messrs. C. H. Allen and M. E. Dodd, spoke from "the stump" in the political ring down at the Botanic Gardens, to give the pensioners' campaign a boost. They answered numerous questions, distributed leaflets and obtained many signatures.

Whilst this campaign to secure a better deal for pensioners (an unconditional £3 per week) is still receiving steady support we urge those of you who have already been active to keep up your efforts, and those of you who have not yet done anything, to bestir yourselves.

BOOKS: Have you read the following? "THE VICTORY ROAD," by C. Barclay Smith; price, 3d. "FEDERAL UNION EXPOSED," by C. Barclay Smith; price, 1/-."THE NEW DESPOTISM" (The amazing case of a man who tried to obtain a hearing in court!); price, 6d each, or 3/-doz. (All plus lid. postage.)

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

QUEENSLAND E.G. NOTES

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

As a result of suggestions made by our Mulgeldie Branch the following resolution was recently passed by the Bardon Progress Association:—

"That a letter be sent to our Federal Representatives requesting that they take immediate action to have provision made for the payment of the basic wage to every serviceman and woman on their discharge from the service, and that such payment be continued until such servicemen and women rehabilitate themselves. Further, that should any serviceman or woman, on their discharge from the service, require any financial assistance to re-establish themselves in their former business or to enter any profession or industry of any nature whatsoever, such finance shall be provided by the Commonwealth Government free of any interest."

The letter to the Federal Representatives covering that resolution requested them to have legislation passed to give effect to that resolution so that our service men and women will be properly provided for on their discharge and not left to shift for themselves as they were after the last war. Legislation now, not political pie-crust promises, is what we want.

—A. W. NOAKES, Hon. Secretary.

Page 2 ----- "New Times," March 10, 1944

reservoir from which flows the material necessities and comforts of his existence.

Now, the word "association" implies that individuals shall come together voluntarily for the purpose of agreement upon objectives and upon the means of achieving them. A director controlling a chainstore, displaying goods bought in mainly because they are cheap and offering them at marked prices upon counters patrolled by automatons who are wrappers rather than salesmen, cannot be said to be associating with his customers in anything approaching the fullest sense of the word.

Without direct contact between the person administering the policy of the trading unit, with the customer endeavouring to control the policy or pattern of his own life, the needs of the latter cannot be met satisfactorily. Such service can only be provided where the association between the customer and the vendor is entirely voluntary (i.e., free from financial necessity), and where the proprietor of the trading unit is free from any influences, which hamper his ready access to the commodities and services desired by the customer.

Those undesirable influences are of two kinds; they arise either from interference with administration by outside parties or from lack of finance. Interference can be expected wherever any form of bureaucratic control, with its contempt for individual tastes, is permitted. Inadequate finance is inevitable wherever orthodox financial policy operates.

Under conditions of financial scarcity the small trader can only hope to compete

with the chain-store to limited extent. Against the personal contact and quality to be obtained at the small store, the chain-store man can offer a bait which is always effective where financial ends must be made to meet—cheapness. He is able to do this through his ability to buy large quantities of any particular article and thus obtain discounts not available to the small man, unless, of course, the small man surrenders his individuality to a co-operative buying group.

The object of the chain-store is to obtain the maximum turnover on a given floor space, therefore the sales normally spread over a larger number of smaller shops must be concentrated into one. The small stores, on the other hand, offer a greater number of centres from which the consumer can purchase his needs much nearer to his home. They also offer a measure of competition which will be lacking should the chain-store oust the small store and the proprietors of the rival chain-stores reach agreement that competition between themselves is wasteful of their finances. It is conceivable that the policy of High Finance during the next depression (if another is permitted) will be directed towards the centralisation of distribution, as well as the rationalisation of the means of production, unless, in the meantime, the job is completed for them by other hands.

If we are to preserve the small, independent store and thus revive the social value of shopping, instead of allowing our shopping excursions to become a struggle to make a little money go a long way, we must increase our purchasing power. The obvious course to follow in this regard is to increase incomes by raising wages and salaries; but what alteration can we hope for from this source when every additional penny obtained in this way must be costed into prices? If we must avoid an increase in costs, the only alternative is to increase incomes from a source outside the wage-and-salary structure, which means National Dividends.

—H. ROBERTS, in a recent address to the Melbourne Economic Research Council.

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir,—My son, who is with the Forces in the North, has called my attention to an item of news in the Brisbane "Telegraph" of 15/2/44, dealing with the possibility of a new political set-up after the war within the British Empire. The "news" emanated from some American source, and included the following:

"British leaders are also reported to be considering the elevation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir John Anderson) to the Prime Ministership, with Field Marshal Smuts as Foreign Secretary."

It is, of course, quite in keeping with what we have been trying to point out that British intentions should be given publicity from American sources, and also that British "leaders" should impose their ideas upon an uninformed and unconsulted community. It is also quite the usual thing for these so-called "leaders" to remain anonymous. Note the familiar routine—"leaders" are "reported" to be "considering"! We should be asking, which leaders? Who reported it? And at whose instigation is the idea being considered?

General Smuts, as we have seen, has been described as an Empire "elder statesman, with unique prestige and power." It has also been stated that "at 73, Smuts's behaviour suggests that he may not only have a role in winning the war, but a far bigger one in making the peace than he had the last time" (American magazine, "Life," of 8/11/43.)

This latest news item makes it necessary for us to know something about Sir John Anderson, and his record, I suggest, is not the kind to inspire confidence and trust on the part of those who desire to see genuine Democracy in operation. He was Governor of Bengal from 1932-37, and became conservative M.P. for the Scottish University upon his return to England. He joined the Board of Imperial Chemical Industries (I.C.I.), in 1938, and was a Director of that International organisation until he joined the Cabinet. Prior to his appointment as Lord Privy Seal he was a Director of the Midland Bank (one of the Big Five). Another significant sphere of interest was in Vickers, of which he was also a Director until his "promotion" to Cabinet. It should be borne in mind in this regard that the late Sir Ernest Cassel, International Financier and financial sponsor of the London School of Economics, was also a Director of Vickers, and that his granddaughter is the Wife of Lord Louis Mountbatten, now in charge of our operations in Burma. Sir Ernest was born in Cologne of Jewish descent, and became a naturalised British subject in 1878. His daughter married Lord Mount Temple, who resigned as chairman of the Anglo-German Fellowship in 1938 "as a protest against the treatment of the Jews by the German Government."

The most important of the armament firms is Vickers. Sir John Anderson was on the board of directors until his elevation to the Cabinet. Sir John Anderson, it is interesting to note, was first elected for the Scottish Universities at a by-election on the 21st February, 1938. At the seventy-first Annual General Meeting of Vickers, on April 1, 1938, it was announced that he had been "elected during the year," and his directorship was confirmed for the first time by the shareholders. . . . The armaments work of Vickers is done in the main by its subsidiary, Vickers-Armstrong, which was described by the chairman of Vickers at the Annual General Meeting in 1931 as "the largest armaments firm in the world." (Quoted from "Tory M.P.," page 63.) Our good friend, Sir Otto Niemeyer, was,

of course, connected with the main subsidiary of Vickers-Armstrong, and so we see that Sir John Anderson is just the sort of man with the right sort of connections to serve the interests of the International Financiers. This, of course, qualifies him for the Prime Ministership,

The book, "Tory M.P.," page 233, has this to say: "The Government has appointed Sir John Anderson, MP, to take charge of our National Service. Sir John Anderson's main claim to distinction is founded on his long experience of police administration, in Ireland at the time of the Black and Tans, as head of the Home Office, and as Governor of Bengal. Such wide experience of police work is hardly the best qualification for leading a democratic movement. One of Sir John Anderson's first moves has been to place a large part of the National Service, including part of the organisation of Air-raid Wardens, under the Police instead of the democratically elected local authorities." So you see, Mr. Editor, there is still little difficulty in finding the suitably conditioned men to impose the appropriate policy.

Mr. Louis T. McFadden, whose speech to Congress on 8/6/34 was quoted last week, was already well aware of the power of the Warburgs, the Strakoschs, the Baruchs and their confederates, and of the manner in which they made use of "public men" suitably "built up" by a servile press, for as Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, he had warned Congress in 1932 as follows:—

"We have in this country one of the most corrupt institutions the world has ever known. I refer to the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve Banks. This

(Continued on page 4.)

"WHY BIG FINANCE BACKS SOCIALISM"

By JAS GUTHRIE, B.Sc

This new booklet contains five broadcast talks, and it is hoped that all readers of the "New Times" will help to give it wide publicity

7d per copy or 4/6 per dozen, posted

Obtainable from

**THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN
101 Collins Street, Hobart, Tasmania**

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

investments in the Pacific zones, in Germany, Argentine and Brazil, etc., and finishes on this note: "These figures are the more significant because they are backed by information and hard cash." From this it seems that it should be more informative to follow the war via the financial columns.

POLICING PARLIAMENT: Arising from the publicity given to censorship interference with letters to Members of Parliament, the "Age" of March 1 reveals that the Victorian Parliament's sergeant-at-arms took it upon himself to peruse letters to Members delivered by hand, and to decide whether such letters were circulated or not. From this it is quite clear that the sergeant-at-arms is of the opinion that the Members to whom the letters are sent are not fit and proper persons to decide such matters for themselves. It would seem that the disease of "Hitlerism" is widespread.

RUSSIAN RESOURCES: Russian domestic wool production in 1928 was 300,000,000 lbs., equal in weight to 1,000,000 Australian bales; much of it, however, was of very poor style and quality. Russian imports for that year equalled 80,000,000 lbs., which amounted to only 2 lbs per head of population. In view of the rigorous Russian climate, these quantities are extremely low, being no more than 20% of the volume per head normally required in Britain and Australia. These figures were used by the Melbourne "Heralds" wool expert as an argument for increased wool sales to Russia after the war, but no information was forthcoming as to what surplus goods' Russia has available for exchange purposes. Russia does not seem to have any surplus wanted goods available for exchange.

GIPSIES' GUILT: The police recently issued a warning against Gipsies' "money blessing confidence tricks." It appears that a Kew man handed, over a roll of £20 to a gipsy woman to breathe on it and bless it for him. It also seems that she charged him £10 for the service, which he did not discover until later, whereupon he called in the police. Quite a lot of publicity was given to this age-old trick, which is thought to be copyrighted by the gipsies. Strangely enough, no mention was made of the other money trick of operating a private money system involving thousands of millions represented by circulating cheques without legal tender backing.

PALESTINE PROBLEMS: An indication of unrest is seen in the report that "a second series of explosions have occurred in Jerusalem, Tel Aviv and Haifa taxation offices." The extent of the damage is not stated, but it will be readily seen that such a development would cause serious concern to financial interests in Jerusalem, because it would threaten the machinery for collecting bankers' usury. It will be remembered that it was in this historic and onetime hallowed land that Jesus denounced the moneychangers and their methods of usury. Can it be that the bankers have turned the screws once too often?

RATIONING REMOVAL: The Canadian Government has announced the suspension of meat rationing throughout Canada because, owing to the accumulation of large surpluses of meat, shipping cannot be found for British export. Now, Canada is much nearer to England than Australia, and yet we have meat rationing here! If meat cannot be sent to Britain from Canada, how can it be sent from Australia? It would appear that there is no justification for this control here, unless it be for the purpose of disciplining and regimenting the people; and no Britisher will accept that as a reason.

ANNOYING ADVERTISEMENTS: The nauseating radio-advertising tie-up with soaps, pills and "make-up" dopes, has stirred the American Federation of Women's Clubs to strong resentment; they say that "so-called soap operas and radio serials concentrated within certain hours, during which 50% of listeners are virtually denied use of their radios, have created an intolerable situation in America." The position is somewhat similar here, and even if one can "switch off" it is difficult to avoid the blast and blare of advertising. If one tunes to the "A"-class stations one is met with advertising propaganda for Government policy, to the exclusion of all criticism— which is equally poisonous. It's about time this matter received some attention.

BEVERIDGE BREW: A "White Paper" Issued by the British Health Ministry envisages putting into operation part of the Beveridge scheme for medical services. It is stated that the cost will be met partly from taxes and partly from contributions from the public—as though there is any difference between taxes and contributions if both are compulsory. However, it is stated there is no compulsion to use or not to use the health facilities. If this is the case, likewise there should be no compulsion in the matter of the taxes or the contributions. In any case, what's wrong with the Government providing the people with the required money direct from the Treasury, and letting them help themselves to health services?

—O.B.H.

"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.

AN OPEN LETTER TO AUSTRALIAN FARMERS

This is the second of a series of Open Letters brought out by the Association to Defend British Culture. The first of the series was published in the "New Times" Nov. 12, 1943. After some delay in publication, the second is now available. Subsequent letters of the series will be issued every month. These letters come from the pen of that well-known patriot, Eric D. Butler:—

Dear Fellow-Australians,—In my first Open Letter I briefly dealt with the general dangers threatening those people who usually vote, under the Party system of government, for either U.A.P.—Now L.D.P.—or the Country Party. This letter is directed especially to the farmers of this nation.

Now, it is recognised by certain people about whom we will be dealing later in these letters, that a man who lives on a fertile piece of land, free of debt, is reasonably independent. He isn't a man who has to consider whether his ideas and actions will offend anyone. HE AND HIS KIND ARE A MENACE TO ALL POWER-LUSTERS.

But there are very few independent farmers left now. I state an incontrovertible fact when I say that there are very few Australian farmers who aren't hopelessly in debt to the banks and their allied financial monopolies. The weapon used to destroy the independence of farmers and landowners generally was taxation and interest payments on debt. Every farmer knows that, even under war conditions, his main problem is a financial one. Tens of thousands of Australian farmers have already walked off their farms over the past few years, and many more are going to follow unless: (a) farmers receive adequate financial returns for their production, and (b), the dead hand of bureaucratic Government muddling of the man-power position is removed. Thousands of examples of food that was actually produced not being sent to the markets, because of shortage of man-power, could be quoted. Shortages have meant rationing, AND RATIONING HAS STRENGTHENED MONOPOLY. I suppose most farmers realise that the big meat monopolies are going to benefit as a result of meat rationing. But have they ever stopped to realise that, while they are hampered by a shortage of manpower and lack of a decent price for their production, there is no shortage of man-power to police the ever-increasing schemes of control! And the Government bureaucracies are prepared to waste millions of pounds of taxpayers' money to ruin practical producers. The Apple and Pear Board was a forerunner of things to come. Primary producers are being ruthlessly beaten into submission. Propaganda is being issued daily to try to persuade us that private ownership and control of land has failed and that farmers must submit more and more to Government interference. Collective farming, a la Russia, has been publicised by practically every big newspaper in Australia. All in the name of "efficiency." And yet, what irony! It is beyond dispute that, in spite of crippling restrictions, private small-scale farming in Australia or in other British countries far surpasses collectivised farming in Russia.

Now, I know that many farmers think that all this growing bureaucracy has just come about haphazardly; they don't realise that there is a PURPOSE behind it. That purpose is to smash the independence of the farmers and bring them under CONTROL.

We haven't far to look for those who desire to control. Remember what I said in my first Open Letter concerning P.E.P. in England, the London School of Economics and men in this country who are products of that socialist institution. Never forget that "our" Director of Post-War Reconstruction, Dr. Coombs, was trained at the London School of Economics. He demands more control of everyone. Let us look at the evidence concerning the purpose of those working for control of all human activities. The following statement appeared in the P.E.P.'s Journal of October 4, 1938. Consider it closely:

"We have started from the position that only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark upon large-scale 'Planning'."

The men behind P.E.P. and other Planning groups openly admit that only under war conditions can the British people be persuaded to give up their liberties. Now you know why schemes of control are being forced upon you, which have little or nothing whatever to do with the successful prosecution of the war. Further, you have no doubt noticed how we are being told that present control must continue after the war. This policy is being advocated in every British country; also in America. Let us examine further evidence of what the Planners have in mind for primary producers. In "Freedom and Planning," issued by Mr. Israel Moses Sieff's P.E.P. organisation in England, the following illuminating passages appear:

The Farmer: "The development of an organised system will lead to a profound modification of the traditional individualism of the dairy farmer."

"Whether we like it or not, the individual farmer will be forced by events to submit to far-reaching changes of outlook and methods."

The Landowner: "Planned economy . . . must clearly involve drastic inroads upon the rights of individual ownership of the land."

Primary producers have only to think of what has happened over the past few years, and what is still happening, to realise that there IS a policy to bring them under control and keep them under control. The so-called representatives of the farmers have failed miserably, not because some of them are not sincere men, but because they have to do as told by their Party heads and the men behind their Party. In England, where a so-called "Conservative" Government has been in office for about eighteen out of the past twenty-one years, special taxation on land has crippled the "landed class." Surely you can see that there must be some greater power than Party when the "Conservative" Party has crushed the very people it is alleged to represent. The truth of the matter is; of course, that the members of all Parties, in all countries, have little or no say in governing. I will give you direct evidence of this in another letter.

It is an indisputable fact that a farmer's sole concern should be production. No

one can truthfully deny that, in spite of all restrictions imposed upon you, you farmers have done a splendid job in your own sphere. Is it not a fact that you were alleged to have produced "too much" before the war? How, then, can the Planners say that you are inefficient and incompetent?

I believe, fellow-Australians that the power-lusters who desire to control you have deliberately imposed artificial restrictions on you for the purpose of discrediting you. The restrictions have been placed on all forms of real private enterprise. The Planners then say: "Look, private enterprise has failed us in our hour of need. The Government will have to assume control! Does anyone with a knowledge of farming believe that it can be conducted by a Government department? Of course not!"

The time has come when the farmers of Australia have to look at facts. Prior to the war their main worry was how to sell their produce at a reasonable price. Why was this so? BECAUSE THE AUSTRALIAN PEOPLE DIDN'T HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO BUY YOUR PRODUCTION. Tens of thousands of good Australian citizens desired to eat your apples, your meat, your butter and drink your milk. Have you ever asked yourself who MANUFACTURES the money used in this

country? And can you explain how we now have plenty of it for fighting a war? Will there be any PHYSICAL reason why the people cannot have the same flow of money after the war? Can you, as experts in your sphere, produce all the consumable goods we require after this war? You will answer: "If we are allowed, we can produce whatever the people as a whole can buy." People with sufficient "money-votes" can vote for what they desire, and you can undoubtedly produce what they desire.

But the men who seek control are openly telling us that the people are to have no freedom of choice as to what they desire to buy. Government departments are going to "plan" production. You are to do as you are told. Heavy taxation is to be maintained as one of the principal methods of controlling the supply of money in the hands of the people.—Yours sincerely, ERIC D. BUTLER. [Copies of this Open Letter can be obtained from the U.E.A. Office, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, or from the Secretary, Association to Defend British Culture, 71 Jordan-street, Malvern, Victoria, at 1/6 per dozen, plus 3d. postage. Copies of the first letter of this series are still available at the above addresses. Keep the Flag of Freedom flying! Buy and distribute your copies NOW!]

THE GREAT BATTLE FOR FREEDOM THE WAR BEHIND THE WAR: THE TREND OF EVENTS

By L. D. BYRNE, Technical Adviser to the Alberta Government.

(An Address to the Rocky Mountain House Board of Trade, on Monday, May 10, 1943.)

(Continued from last issue.)

Let us now consider the situation, which we face at the present time. Since the outbreak of war, and under the stress of the demands of war-time conditions, in Canada, Britain and every democratic country a uniform policy has been pursued to centralise the planning and control of production and distribution. Parliamentary government has taken second place to rule by departmental regulations, authorised by Orders in Council. Taxation has been stepped up to maximum limits. A vast State machine, involving a growing bureaucracy, with wide powers over the life of the individual citizen, is becoming strongly entrenched. Perhaps much of this is absolutely essential—and, for the sake of the war-effort, the people are willing to put up with it

However, there are grounds for more than mere anxiety. This trend towards State-ism is being carried out, in the main, by men who are avowed Socialists, and it is being accompanied by a steady pressure of propaganda to the effect that the State controls and crushing taxation being imposed under war conditions must be carried into the after-war period. IN SHORT, THE CONDITIONS CREATED BY THE WAR ARE BEING USED TO PREPARE PEOPLE FOR A STATE-DOMINATED AND ESSENTIALLY TOTALITARIAN SYSTEM AFTER THE WAR.

SOME SINISTER FACTS

It is significant that in Great Britain, where the roots of our democratic ideals are most deeply entrenched, an organisation called Political and Economic Planning (PEP) was established before the war to prepare large-scale plans for the centralisation of industry and commerce in accordance with principles common to both Socialism and Big Business. Under the chairmanship and guiding inspiration of Israel Moses Sieff, this group has had a powerful influence in public affairs in Great Britain, and somehow its members seem to have been pushed into controlling positions. This organisation stated quite frankly in one of its publications that the people of Great Britain would not put up with the regimentations involved in any large-scale planning of their lives, except under the stress of war!

Shortly after the outbreak of war a flood of propaganda was unleashed to persuade us that the peace aims of the democracies should be to set up an International Federation of Nations under a central authority, having control over finance, the armed forces, international trade and citizenship rights.

There were two well-publicised textbooks on this scheme, one by a man called C. Kirschman Streit and the other by J. P. Warburg, son of Paul Warburg, who did so much to consolidate the power of International Finance on this continent.

It shows to what depths we have sunk in the appreciation of our democratic ideals when we failed to recognise in this scheme the blueprint of a world tyranny worse than the evil thing we were fighting in Nazi-ism.

It would be bad enough to concentrate power to control our lives in a Supreme State authority, but this scheme for an International Federation goes much further. It seeks to set up a World Power having supreme control over every aspect of the economic life of all the nations in the

Capitals have stagnated, withdrawing money from States-----"

The Chairman: Order! I do not see how we can properly discuss the monetary system or money problems on this item. Again I repeat that although it is very wide in its scope—there is no doubt about that—if we want to make any headway at all, I think we should keep as closely as possible within the limits of the item.

Mr. Jaques: I sympathise with your remarks, Mr. Chairman. May I say that to the uninitiated it does seem strange; but we are now discussing, I believe, world, affairs and the future policies of world government, and to leave out of that discussion the question of financial control is surely to rob it of all reality.

[At six o'clock the committee took recess.]

federation by its control of their financial systems and trade relations with each other, control over the rights of every citizen, and control over armed forces of overwhelming strength to impose its dictates on disarmed and helpless people.

The Nazi tyranny pales into insignificance beside this hideous plan for a World Slave State. Yet many deluded and well-meaning people have been tricked, by clever propaganda, into giving their support to this scheme.

TWO-FOLD NATURE OF THE WAR

The Evidence Overwhelming

Have you still any doubts that there is a deliberate conspiracy by an international group of dominantly Germanic power maniacs to destroy democracy and set up a totalitarian tyranny in its place?

Do you consider it an accident that on the question of post-war social security, a Conservative Government in England and a Liberal Government in Canada should have both approached avowed Socialist economists for advice, and that, working independently, Sir William Beveridge and Mr. Leonard Marsh should have produced fundamentally similar plans which would involve a vast State bureaucracy with mass regimentation for the purpose of maintaining a minimum subsistence standard of living? Do you consider it an accident that within a few days a similar scheme was put forward in the United States? Or that on the same day both the British and United States Governments put forward proposals, which were basically the same, for the establishment of an international monetary system? Is it just co-incidence, too, that, since then, the propaganda campaign for an international police force—i.e., control of the armed forces by an international authority—has been intensified?

To anyone who examines the facts dispassionately—and I assure you that I have barely touched upon some of the highlights—it should be evident beyond any possibility of doubt that we are confronted with a desperately critical situation. While the focus of the world conflict is the clash between democracy and totalitarianism, that battle has to be fought on two fronts—the military front and on the home front of every democratic country.

THE GREATER PERIL

Of the two the more deadly peril is from the enemy operating on the home front, because as yet there is no general realisation of the extent of the menace from that quarter. On the military front we have the measure of the forces ranged against us and the necessary action is being taken to deal with them.

Yet, of what use will all the sacrifice and super-human effort have been if the result of victory for the forces of democracy in the military field is to be crushing defeat on the home front, and the establishment of a totalitarian post-war order which violates every ideal of democracy and Christianity?

That is the challenge that faces us and in the inevitable conflict centred in this struggle between the forces of these two philosophies of democracy and totalitarianism nobody can be neutral. Every one of us has to meet that challenge and take sides. The man or woman who attempts to escape responsibility because he is fearful—(Continued on page 4.)

CANADIAN M.P. ON THE "PROTOCOLS"

(From a Speech by NORMAN JAQUES, Canadian House of Commons, July 12, 1943.)

(Continued from last issue.)

To prove that I am not afraid of the "Protocols," I have made a few quotations from them and intend to put them on "Hansard," and I challenge any hon. member to rise and say that they are false.

I have never said that I guarantee or that I endorse the authenticity of them. I have never said that So-and-so and So-and-so were the authors of the "Protocols of Zion." Those who feel libeled by the "Protocols" have the most obvious remedy in the world; all they have to do is to rise and denounce the POLICY of them, instead of merely denying the AUTHORITY. Here and now I say on behalf of Social Crediters the world over that we utterly repudiate and denounce the policies contained in the "Protocols of Zion."

But when you come to read them, how can any reasonable man deny the truth of what is contained in them? Let me read this one:—

"Gold always has been and always will be the irresistible power. Handled by expert hands it will always be the most useful lever for those who possess it, and the object of envy for those who do not. With gold we can buy the most rebellious consciences, can fix the rate of all values, can subsidise all State loans, and therefore hold the States at our mercy."

We shall have occasion at a later date to refer to that. Does anyone care to deny that? Then here is another one:—

Mr. Coldwell: Just a minute; "Does anyone care to deny that?" I do not suppose anyone cares to deny that gold can be used for that purpose, but the point is that the "Protocols of Zion" state that a certain group of people are using it for that purpose and that they are a particular nation. That is the danger of the thing.

The Chairman: Order! We have been discussing this department for quite a while, and I hope that in future speakers will keep within the orbit, which is a very wide one, of external affairs. I do not think the statement of the hon. member for Wetaskiwin can be said to be included in it.

Mr. Jaques: Mr. Chairman, we were assured by the Prime Minister that we

would have the utmost latitude. I maintain that the matter under discussion is perfectly germane to this debate; more than that, that my honour and reputation have been impugned, and I wish to make my answer to these charges publicly in this House. I can assure the Chairman that I shall say nothing to shock anybody's sensibilities.

Here is another one:

"In our day the power which has replaced that of the rulers who were liberal is the power of gold."

"Thanks to the press we have got the gold in our hands, notwithstanding that we have had to gather it out of oceans of blood and tears."

And listen to this one:

"We shall create by all the secret methods open to us and with the aid of gold, which is all in our hands, a universal economic crisis whereby we shall throw upon the streets whole mobs of workers in all the countries."

Here is another:

"We shall surround our government with a whole world of economists."

Mr. Blackmore: We have them now!

Mr. Jaques: "Around us there will be a whole constellation of bankers, and millionaires, because in substance everything will be settled by the question of figures."

And here is another one:

"Economic crises have been produced by us by no other means than the withdrawal of money from circulation."

|| (An extract from DOUGLAS REED'S latest book, "Lest We Regret.")

(Continued from last issue)

We were told, then, that the Jews were being "exterminated," and we must therefore receive them. We are entitled to examine the truth of this, since it is the basis of the claim made on us, mainly on behalf of those Jews in Poland who most tenaciously hold to the teaching (expressed by the Chief Rabbi in London) that "the mission of the Jew is first of all to be a Jew." (Hitler has used those very words about Germans.)

The claim was, that something different was being done to the Jews, something more than the non-Jews suffered:—

"Nothing else in Hitler's record is comparable to his treatment of the Jews"—(The "News-Chronicle.") "For Hitler the Jews were and are the first and principal victims of a frenzied malice manifest in his earlier outpourings as an irresponsible political agitator."—(The London "Times.") "Upon this people, the Jews, the fury of the Nazi evil has concentrated its destructive energy."—(The Archbishop of Canterbury.) "The worst cruelties are reserved for the Jews."—(The Bishop of Chelmsford.) "The persecution of the Jews is, however, unique in its horror; it is deliberate extermination directed against, not a nation, but a whole race; this is a horror unprecedented in the history of the world."—(The Archbishop of York.)

These statements are untrue. I saw Hitler's work with my own eyes, from the day he came to power until the eve of this war. [The author was the London "Times" correspondent on the spot. He resigned because his urgent warnings of the rising Nazi menace were suppressed by the "Times," and because of the "appeasement" policy of that paper. —Ed., "N.T."] Nineteen-twentieths of the inmates of his concentration camps were non-Jewish Germans; nineteen-twentieths of his victims outside the German frontiers are non-Jewish non-Germans. This distortion of the picture has gone on since 1933. I felt misgivings about it then, when his first cruelties were practised, and I noticed that the Jewish share of the whole was being put out of all proportion in the foreign press.

But now the suggestion has been crystallised into a definite statement which I would not dare challenge if it could be upheld: the Jews in Europe are being "exterminated." You must not use this big word unless you mean physical extinction. What was the evidence, first that "extermination" was ordered, and second, that it was carried out?

(1) The "Times" of December 4, 1942, spoke of "a memorandum compiled by underground labour groups in Poland" which stated, "one of the war aims of Hitler's regime, and one which has been publicly proclaimed by its highest authorities, is a complete extermination of the Jews." The Archbishop of York said on December 9: "The extermination of all the Jews in Poland has been decided on and will be carried out." The "Manchester Guardian," on December 11 spoke of some "evidence available in London" that "a plan was proposed to Hitler last June that the Jews (in Poland) should be exterminated by Christmas. . . . He hesitated for a time, but soon relapsed and decided to gratify his lust for cruelty by adopting the original proposal. . . . One need not suppose that Hitler has signed an actual order for the destruction of the Jews, which is strongly reported but at present unconfirmed." The London "Times," on December 12, said, "Hitler has boasted of his intention to eliminate every Jew in Germany under his yoke." Mr. Eden, on December 17, spoke of "Hitler's oft-repeated intention of exterminating the Jewish people in Europe." The London "Times," on December 21, quoting a statement issued by the Allied Information Committee, said, "Himmler, after a stay in Warsaw, issued an order that half the Polish Jews were to be killed in the course of a year." The Archbishops of Canterbury, York and Wales, in the name of all the British Bishops, in January, 1943, stated, "The extermination already carried out is part of the carrying into effect of Hitler's oft-repeated intention to exterminate the Jewish people in Europe, which means, in effect, the extermination of some 6,000,000 people." The Roman Catholic Cardinal of Westminster and the head of the Salvation Army associated themselves with such statements, which were repeated innumerable times in the radio and press. On January 9, the "New Statesman" said, "In July of 1942 Himmler gave the necessary orders for extermination on a continental scale."

(2) On December 4, Mr. Vernon Bartlett wrote, "According to cables from Dr. Stephen Wise, President of the World Jewish Congress, and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Organisation, confirmation has now been received of an order issued by Hitler for the extermination of all Jews in Nazi-occupied countries before the end of the present month" (then, how could they be rescued?). "The number of Jews who have already died cannot, of course, be estimated with great accuracy. In the opinion of the World Jewish Congress roughly two million out of the three-and-a-half million Jews in Poland have been murdered by the Nazis since the outbreak of the war." Almost on the same day, the World Congress, according to the "Times," issued a statement on Nazi massacres of Jews in Europe showing that of the 7,000,000 Jews who normally live in the territories now under Nazi occupation, 1,000,000 have been cruelly done to death." Mr. Harold Nicolson wrote in the "Spectator" of December 25, "In order to assuage his insane hatred of the Jewish people, Hitler, with Himmler as his main agent, has carried out the murder of some 250,000 men, women and children in cold blood." Mr.

Harold Nicolson wrote in the "Spectator" on December 25, "In October, 1940, the Germans interned 433,000 Warsaw Jews in a special area or ghetto which they surrounded with a high wall. . . . For the month of October, 1942, only 40,000 ration cards were printed." (His clear inference, and he says "there can be no doubt whatever of the fact," was that the number of Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto was reduced from 433,000 to 40,000 by "extermination.") The Jewish Labour representative on the Polish National Council in London reported in March, 1943, that "only 200,000 Jews remain in the Warsaw Ghetto." Readers may compare these quotations for themselves. "Extermination" was ordered; it was not ordered, but strongly suspected; it was ordered for half the Jews in Poland; for all the Jews in Poland; for all the Jews in Europe, by the end of 1942. Two out of three-and-a-half million were already dead on December 4; one million out of seven

THE "PAY-AS-YOU-EARN" TAX TRICK EXPOSED!

(Continued from page 1.)

unconstitutional—a special law will be implemented dealing only with taxation on wages and salaries. . . . It may, of course, be that two separate periods of liability will be stated in the one Act. We can spend many hours trying to guess the form of the proposed law, but as it must—no matter what its form—be unconstitutional, it can take whatever form its sponsors decide, and as every known rule is just pushed aside, its ultimate form may take any conceivable or inconceivable shape.

One thing, which cannot be understood today, is the totally illogical attitude of the Government on the question of constitutional rights. As you know, there is a great deal of publicity given to the question of a Referendum to enlarge the powers of the Government because the Government, in effect, says that it has not the power to control the affairs of the nation once the war ceases. On the other hand, it states, and, in fact, acts as if it has the power to implement such an unjust law as this pay-as-you-earn taxation scheme.

Your newspapers have informed you that it is the intention under the proposed scheme to continue the weekly deduction from your pay envelope. The deductions so made for the period from the 1st April to the 30th June of this year will be treated as a payment of your tax allegedly applicable to this mysterious "lag" which has been created. The deduction from the 1st July of this year to the 30th June next year will be taken as payment of the tax due in respect of the wages or salary tamed in that period—that is, as you earn so will a tax payment be deducted.

Let us take the case of a wage earner who, for this year ended 30th June 1944, is due to pay tax under the existing law. The basis of his liability is fixed under that law and in the normal course of procedure his liability is assessed and notified to him. The weekly deductions made from his pay envelope up to the 31st March 1944, have been sufficient to pay the tax for which he has been assessed; therefore, for the year ended 30th June 1944, he has paid the total liability imposed upon him by the law.

Now for the next year, which is the year, which will begin on the 1st July 1944, and end on the 30th June 1945. That person will be liable for payment of tax in respect of that year, and the Government says, in effect, "we are going to make a change in the basis of calculating your liability." Let us presume that such proposed variation of the basis of liability is legally correct and constitutional. If that is so, then there can be no objection to the change, which is made. But on the new basis a liability is assessed and notified to the person concerned. If the weekly amount deducted from the pay envelope from the 1st July 1944, to the 30th June 1945, is sufficient to meet the liability assessed in respect of that year, the person so assessed has paid his liability, and nothing further is due by him. So we see, therefore, that for the year beginning 1st July, 1943, and ending 30th June, 1944, and also for the year beginning 1st July, 1944, and ending on 30th June, 1945, a person was liable for the payment of tax for each year, and satisfied his liability by the deductions made from his pay envelope for the period ended 31st March, 1944, and for the period from 1st July, 1944, to the 30th June, 1945.

You will have noticed, however, that there is the intervening period from the 1st April, 1944, to 30th June, 1944, during which certain amounts have been deducted from your weekly pay envelope, and that the Government has received those amounts and intends to retain them. The question that arises is, in respect of what liability are those amounts to be retained?

I have shown you that for the period ended on the 30th June 1944, the full liability has been met. For the period commencing on the 1st July, 1944, the full liability has also been met. There is no

millions were already dead on the same day; 250,000 were already dead three weeks later. Thus spake our leading public men.

This was the "factual" basis of the most stupendous political and press campaign in my experience. I suspect that I am better informed about German affairs than many of the people who spoke thus, and I know of no "oft-proclaimed intentions" or "orders" to exterminate the Jews. Hitler is noticeably, reticent on that theme. Any threats he has uttered cannot compare, in ferocity and iteration, with his threats to exterminate England, the British Empire, Bolshevism and other things.

The only threats I know, which promised "extermination," were clearly aimed, not at the Jews, but at the Czechs, Poles and Serbs, who are the foremost objects of German detestation. Such was Hitler's statement, on February 24, 1943, that he would "not spare alien lives," and its meaning was pointed two days later by Frank, the Czech "Protector," when he said, "Stalin could only enter Germany as a victor over the body of every single German and over the body of every single Czech." The only authentic instance that I know (the Germans themselves announced it) of local extermination in this war, was the extermination of every Czech man, woman and child in the village of Lidice, where I once received most friendly hospitality. Similar, though smaller, massacres have been committed on Frenchmen, Serbs, Norwegians and Greeks. The Germans published them.

(To be continued.)

AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL

(Continued from page 2.)

evil institution has plundered and ruined the people of the United States. . . . If the world is to escape enslavement by the 'golden calf,' sovereignty must be strengthened and Governments made responsible only, to the people, and not to national or international money lenders." ("New Times," 16/10/43.)

It has been shown, of course, that the plotters are anxious to weaken sovereignty and to ensure that Governments shall be responsible to the moneylenders.

Like so many other men who have sought to tell the truth on this all important subject, Mr. McFadden died suddenly. In many speeches in Congress between 1932 and 1934, he had accused certain Jewish International financiers of plundering and bankrupting the United States. The Chicago "American Gentile," of October, 1936, said "clogging of the blood" had been given as the cause of death, "a condition," it said, "usually a result of poisoning when occurring in persons in perfect health." Mr. McFadden was only 60 at the time, and seemingly in perfect health.

Attempts had previously been made on his life. According to "Pelley's Weekly" of 14/10/36 he had been shot at when alighting from a cab in Washington, the two bullets fired missing him and lodging in the structure of the cab. On another occasion, he became violently ill at a political banquet in Washington from what was diagnosed as poisoning. A physician who was present saved his life by at once procuring a stomach pump and giving him urgent treatment.

The Republican Party selected Mr. McFadden to open its election campaign in 1934, and the New York Jewish paper, "Der Tog," protested violently at the choice. On 2/8/34, it said: "Nobody in a responsible position has yet dared to talk about Jews in such vile language as he did. . . . Does the Republican Party really believe that in America such a provocation to Jewry could pass without punishment?" The "Sentinel," an American Jewish weekly of Chicago, on 8/10/36 reported Mr. McFadden's death under the heading, "Out of the Way."

Fortunately, the searchlight of Truth cannot be put "out of the way" as easily as the brave men who have been focusing it, particularly at times when understanding was far less extensive than is the case today. By the courage of these men, and their fidelity to truth, millions of eyes have been opened, and they are going to stay open.

After a lot of first-hand experience, President Woodrow Wilson, not long before he died, declared:—

"The great monopoly is the monopoly of bank credits. A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities, are in the hands of a few men who chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom. . . ."

"We have been dreading all along the time when the combined power of high finance would be greater than the power of the Government. . . ."

"Some of the biggest men in the United States in the field of commerce and manufacture are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know there is a power somewhere so organised, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so persuasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it."

This is the nature of the peril we are endeavouring to expose.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne. C.2.
March 5, 1944. (To be continued.)

POLITICAL CENSORSHIP

(To The Editor)

Sir,—There is no doubt that political censorship has gone past the nuisance stage and has become a menace to this country. In other words, the machinery of communications censorship is being used by the Labor Party officials to spy on their political opponents, and to use the information gathered in private letters for their own political ends.

It is obvious that information gathered for military purposes should be retained in the hands of specially selected and trusted officials. Non-military information of a private nature should not be handed round from one department to another or given out in public by irresponsible people.

I hope that the proposed inquiry into such censorship will help to "nip in the bud" a disgraceful abuse of wartime emergency powers.

—Yours, etc., P. PARTINGTON,
Glenorchy, Tas.

THE "NEW TIMES" IS OBTAINABLE

AT

ALL AUTHORISED NEWSAGENTS

Great Battle for Freedom

(Continued from page 3.)

ful of the consequences of his actions is actually taking sides. He is supporting the steady drift towards the totalitarian State into which we are being railroaded, just as effectively as if he went out and worked for it. Only deliberate and conscious action directed towards the establishment of a properly functioning democracy can save us from the overwhelming disaster towards which we are rushing.

(To be continued.)