

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. 10. No. 17. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 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)

An Open Letter to Australian Democrats

Urgent Warning on Post-War Peril

Dear Fellow Australians, —I am a Sergeant in the A.I.F. The purpose of this letter—and two that will follow it—is to examine closely the post-war powers being sought by the Federal Government. (You may soon have to vote "Yes" or "No" at a referendum.) Dr. Evatt, the prime mover in the campaign for increased powers for the centralised Government at Canberra, has specifically addressed many of his arguments to soldiers, and he tries to convince us that we will come back to chaos after the war unless these powers are granted.

I am sorry to say that the Forces have had very little opportunity of impartially considering the real issues at stake. I am one of those who have taken the trouble to look closely at what is proposed.

First and foremost, it is necessary to remember that the arguments being put forward by Dr. Evatt and Co. are not new. Every Federal Government that has sought to obtain increased powers for Canberra has said that there would be great chaos unless the people gave the powers sought. Mr. W. M. Hughes told Australians that there would be chaos after the last war unless the people surrendered great powers to Canberra. The people declined to give the powers—but there was no chaos.

If the people submit to the proposition that their problems can only be solved by a centralised Government seeking to legislate, in many cases, for areas more than a thousand miles away from the seat of Government, they will throw away their British heritage of local, decentralised Gov-

ernment. It is upon this heritage that the British Empire has been built.

It is an indisputable fact that the further the seat of Government is away from the people, the less control the electors have over the Government. It is only in local Government, close to the people, that the rights of the individual can be fully guarded. Nazi Germany is the extreme example of centralised Government; no local autonomy, but everything directed from the one central Government.

Centralised government means a flourishing bureaucracy. The individual has no chance with anonymous bureaucrats who are not responsible to the people. It is no use the advocates of centralised government in Australia saying that bureaucracy will not flourish if we hand over these enormous powers; BUREAUCRACY IS ALREADY HERE AS A RESULT OF CENTRALISATION INTRODUCED UNDER WAR CONDITIONS.

Bureaucracy attracts those types of persons who like power without responsibility. These people are those who make dic-

tatorships possible; it is the petty official who has the itch to mind other people's affairs, to tell them what they can do and what they cannot do. We have all seen these people obtaining more and more power over the ordinary citizen, and anyone who wants to see the perpetuation after the war of what has been happening over the past few years, has no idea of how close our fundamental liberties are to extinction.

I ask every thoughtful Australian to carefully read the following: —

"Totalitarian ideas are beginning to make headway in the Commonwealth Public Service. Ambitious men, engaged as war-time 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."

That statement, among others in similar strain, was made recently not by some irresponsible person with a grudge against authority, but by Mr. Colin Clarke, Deputy-Director of the Department of War Organisation of Industry in Queensland.

These members of the new bureaucracy, now thousands in number and receiving bigger salaries than most of the people, realise that they must continue their systems of CONTROL after the war if they are to retain their power and big salaries. These people are fighting tooth-and-nail for the greater-powers-for-Canberra campaign. And behind these people we see the evil forces seeking to enslave us, forces that are international. I will deal with them in another letter.

This letter is primarily concerned with establishing the fact that centralisation of Government kills democracy, because real democracy can only function when the individual has close control of his institutions. The lessons of history cannot be denied. Speaking in the New South Wales Parliament on the proposals to centralise Government in Australia, Mr. D. H. Drummond said: —

"Go back to the beginnings of our western civilisation, to the story of Greece. Gradually there was a concentration of power in Athens, which eventually destroyed Greece itself. It is on record by that great historian and British authority, Lionel Curtis, that in Rome the gradual

withdrawal of the powers of local government from the local governing communities which gave Rome its original strength, gradually destroyed the spirit of citizenship in Rome . . .

"From ancient Rome let me turn to the reply which President Calvin Coolidge of the United States of America made to a deputation which, in 1926, urged the granting of greater powers to the Federal Government of that country. He said: 'No method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced from self-government. No plan of centralisation has ever been adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, reaction and decline.'"

Can anyone point to one example of centralisation not having produced any of the results mentioned by President Coolidge? Let us forget Germany, France, Russia, Italy and Japan; let us try to realise what is happening right here in Australia. Professor F. A. Bland, Professor of Local Government Administration at the University of Sydney, recently offered the following comment: —

"There was a time when projected laws were subjected to three tests: The object sought, whether that object would be achieved, and the actual and potential cost. Measured by these tests, many of the bureaucratically-made laws that are being churned out under the National Security Act would find scant support. Has anyone calculated what they are costing in manpower, material resources and morale?"

"Let us grant, as axiomatic in any society, that laws must be obeyed. 'Let him that is without sin cast the first stone.' In a democratic society it is an essential that laws shall have a popular foundation, shall not offend the canons of equity and common sense, and are not over-costly to enforce.

"Has it entered into the consciousness of those who today are plastering our markets, shops, and business houses with edicts, prohibitions, commands and restrictions that they are not only disregarding the canons, but are poisoning our society?"

"Are they aware that by appeals to informers, spies, eavesdroppers, and snoopers, and by the employment of an army of special agents and even ardent agents—

(Continued on page 4.)

More Highlights From "Hansard"

Prepared by HILTON ROSS.

Speaking on the subject of post-war reconstruction, Mr. Breen, M.H.R., suggested "it would, be necessary for them (the people) to be inspired by a political philosophy so that they may accept the sacrifices incidental to the introduction of an ordered social and economic system after the war . . . The people, instead of being motivated by ideas of personal gain, must be inspired by the philosophy of labour. The country, must be controlled by a Government that accepts that philosophy."

What a philosophy! Would it be too much to suggest that the "Utopia" Mr. Breen envisages for us is one in which we can enjoy the blessings of work without pay, rather than the one we hope for—less work with more income. Furthermore, well-informed persons say that sacrifices by the people are NOT necessary for the post-war introduction of a "new order" satisfactory to the people. The opposite view seems to be self-contradictory.

tations with one party and another party behind closed doors."

It is precisely those negotiations, which are going on now behind closed doors that we are most anxious to expose. Past experience has shown that the results promise no good for the citizens of this and other countries.

* * *
Mr. Abbott: —"Has the Treasurer seen in the 'Sydney Daily Telegraph' this morning the following cablegram: —

"'Lend-Lease Blanket Trick.'"

"New York, Tuesday. —The United States charge £2/8/- for a 16/- Australian blanket, says the 'New York Times.' The paper uses this example as a warning that dollar figures give a false perspective of lend-lease aid. . . . The 1,000,000 blankets, which we are getting from Australia, are billed to us at 16/- a blanket. But if we were giving these blankets to Australia we would be charging £2/8/- a blanket. In other words, for exactly the same amount of lend-lease in actual commodities, Australia would be recorded as lending us only £825,000, but we should be Australia's benefactor to the extent of £2,470,000."

"Will the Treasurer consider charging reverse lend-lease aid to the United States at the dollar value of similar goods in America, as the present method of accounting on existing exchange rates is giving a very lop-sided view of the value and quantum of goods supplied, by Australia compared with those obtained by it from the United States."

Mr. Chifley: —"I have not seen the paragraph. I am fully aware that prices in the United States of America for some commodities are very high. As to whether the pound sign or dollar sign should be applied to lend-lease or reciprocal aid between the United Nations, it is generally understood that those signs are applied only in order to give some idea of the volume of goods supplied."

Mr. Abbott: —"They give a very distorted view."

Mr. Chifley: —"They do not give a completely correct view of the exchange value of articles, but I think it is understood that both the United States and Australia agree, subject to physical limitations, to assist each other as far as they possibly can. This country has tried to give, and has given, to the United States of America in goods and services all that it is physically capable of giving, having regard to demands from other quarters and the labour and materials available. I repeat that pound and dollar signs after all are only used within each country to give that country an indication of the volume of the goods supplied."

Evidence of political insincerity, and the folly of trusting ANY political Party with more power, is obvious as a result of the wrangle on censorship of the press. In the first place, the U.A.P.-C.P. drafted the regulations, which were abused by the Labor Party. Incidentally, these powers were also abused by Menzies and Co. in respect of other newspapers and radio stations. So it is obvious that none of the power-lusters should be trusted. So far as the monopoly press is concerned, yellow and dangerous as it may be, suppression of it—whether technically legal or not—is too dangerous to tolerate, because it establishes a principle which could then be applied to worth-while publications.

WATTS' WISDOM: At a public meeting in Perth, the State Opposition Leader (Mr. A. F. Watts) wisely stated that he "would rather have the worst possible State Government than any Federal Government under unification." The meeting formed a league pledged "to use every effort to ensure the rejection of the Referendum proposals by the electors of the State." In the past, W.A. was so dissatisfied with Federation that a movement for secession was instituted; so that State can be relied on to strongly resist the Referendum proposals. And so, another force joins in the fight against dictatorship.

NORMAN'S NEMESIS: Montagu Norman's exit from the financial dictatorship of England under the plea of ill-health, according to the Melbourne "Herald" of April 15, is accompanied "by criticisms of mistakes [plots] in the out-going Governor's international policies . . . including the return to the gold standard and the considerable assistance given to the rehabilitation [arming] of Germany . . . and the encouraging of one industry after another into a tight association [socialistic monopoly] to fix prices and protect its high-cost members." Well, Monty's nemesis has overtaken him, but he looks like escaping the penalty of his treachery—unless the people take a hand.

WILFUL WASTE: The Melbourne "Herald" of March 27 reports a Mr. Arrowsmith, secretary of the C.C.C. Workers' Committee, as describing criminal bungling by the A.W.C. He says that when Mr. Theodore was scheduled to visit Alice Springs "men were paid double time to pump water from tyres which had been left in the open, exposed to rain and sun . . . thousands of pounds involved"—yet Mr. Theodore bluntly refused to inspect them. Mr. Arrowsmith also said: "Thousands of building workers were overcrowding jobs

of an un-essential character," and yet we are told there is no labour to build houses for soldiers' wives and families living in sheds and stables. Fancy giving the bunglers more power!

MENZIES' MISSION: Mr. R. G. Menzies is reported as informing a loan rally in the Camberwell Town Hall, on April 18, that taxation was necessary to control spending, and that the people were being asked to lend money to themselves! So, even Mr. Menzies now corroborates the belief that extra taxation is used to "relieve" the people of their independence and their economic votes. Mr. Menzies is supporting the Labor Party in raising Government loans, on which our soldiers will have to pay their share of the interest, via taxation. Mr. Menzies is at the same time carrying out the bankers' policy.

TREASURY TROUBLES: The "Age" of April 19 claims that the Treasury is very

(Continued on page 2.)

Anti - Conscriptionists Oppose Fed. Powers

The Editor has received the following letter, dated April 20, from the No Conscription Campaign, Temperance Hall, Russell St., Melbourne:

Dear Sir, —At the general meeting of this organisation, held on 18th inst, it was decided to oppose the Federal Referendum proposals, on the grounds that they mean the continuance into the post-war period, and probably the permanent establishment, of the present system of industrial conscription backed by military conscription. A vigorous campaign against the proposals will be conducted by this organisation, and a regular series of meetings will be held at the Temperance Hall. —Yours truly, K. J. Kenafick, Hon. Secretary.

Quick Action Wanted

An indication that the bankers have nearly achieved one of THEIR war aims is seen in the statement of the U.S. Treasury to the effect that 34 united and associated nations have agreed on the restoration of the gold standard. Both "Unita" and "Bancor" plans are reported to have been abandoned in favour of an outright gold basis.

The Parliaments of the countries concerned have yet to ratify the proposals—which at least leaves an opportunity to rescue Australia from this bankers' plot. With this in mind, it is imperative that YOU write immediately to your Federal Member instructing him to refuse to ratify this proposal. Act Now—tomorrow may be too late!

The following extracts from Mr. Fadden's speech on primary production, made in Parliament on February 10, are sound comment on Government policy. Unfortunately, Mr. Fadden neglected to mention the fact that low financial returns are also having a serious effect on production. We fail to see how there is going to be a rush of farm labourers, outside farmers' sons, when farmers are unable to pay anywhere near the wages being paid in factories. We hope Mr. Fadden's electors will take up this point with him:

In May, 1924, my colleague, the honorable member for Richmond (Mr. Anthony), moved the adjournment of the House in order to focus attention on the inevitable and serious decline of food production consequent upon the depletion of labour in rural areas and elsewhere, and other members of the opposition parties supported him on that occasion. As emphatically as the forms of the House would permit, we brought to the attention of honorable members the decline of the food position and we stressed that, in our opinion, the Government was taking a too confident view of Australia's food stocks.

I shall enumerate some of the things, which the Government has done in an endeavour to deal with the situation. It appointed Mr. F. W. Bulcock as Commonwealth Director-General of Agriculture; it fixed production targets for all principal food-stuffs; it appointed Mr. J. F. Murphy, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Agriculture, as Controller-General of Food; it established a food executive of four Ministers; it launched a "grow-more-vegetables" campaign; it appealed to dairy farmers to increase production.

It has not only failed to provide for the welfare of Australia in wartime, but it has also failed to establish a foundation for post-war trade in primary products. It has created a foodstuffs bureaucracy and has provided a glaring example of wartime control run mad. I pause here to instance what I have in mind:

The Minister for Commerce and Agriculture (Mr. Scully), who is chairman of the Food Executive, has with him as colleagues the Treasurer (Mr. Chifley) and the Minister for War Organisation of Industry (Mr. Dedman). They are at the top of the food ladder. In addition to them are, according to page 184 of the "Federal Guide," a Controller-General of Food, an Administrative Assistant to the Controller-General, a Deputy Controller-General of Food, an Assistant Controller-General of Food, a Director-General of Agriculture, and a Chief Executive Officer of the Directorate of Agriculture. There are also a Director of Service Foodstuffs, a Director of Finance, a Director of Civil Supplies, and a Director of Public Relations. Added to those there are a Deputy Director, a Legal Adviser, a Chief Technologist, and an Economic Adviser. There are also the Commonwealth Food Purchasing Board and the Commonwealth Food Specifications Committee. After all these come the various Controllers—Controllers of meat supplies, dairy products, egg supplies, vegetable supplies, and potatoes and onions. Then there are Deputy-Directors of Service Foodstuffs associated with the Department of Commerce and Agriculture in the six States, an egg control organisation with a Controller, an Assistant Controller, and six State Deputy Controllers.

It will be seen that there is no shortage of manpower to give effect to the bureaucratic control of primary industries! Such a state of affairs cannot be allowed to go on unnoticed and unchallenged. I repeat that there is clear evidence that bureaucratic control has run mad during a time of war when, of all times, a commonsense policy, agreed upon in collaboration with the real producers of foodstuffs, should be followed.

The organisation to which I have referred includes, in addition to senior officials, a host of other officers, both male and female. I emphasise that what the primary producer needs is not a multiplicity of authorities and costly departments such as I have outlined, but the application of a little commonsense to the solution of the problems that confront him.

Declining production tells its own sorry story of the failure of the steps taken by the Government to remedy matters, despite the unconvincing assurance by the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture in this week's press that all is well. The Minister is reported in the Sydney "Morning Herald" of February 7, 1943, as having stated that the improved position of primary industries had resulted from the active planning of primary production, which war powers had made possible; it was a foretaste of what could be expected after the war! If this policy of bureaucratic muddling by the food control as it exists today is to be continued after the war it will produce a sorry state of affairs for Australia.

The back page of the Toowoomba "Chronicle" of January 29, 1943, consists almost wholly of advertisements of clearing sales of dairy herds, by farmers seeking to dispose of their properties. . . . We have the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture telling the people that all is well and that primary production generally is increasing. If the Minister's statements are correct, why are these established dairy-farmers being forced off their properties? And why has production so seriously declined?

The answer lies in the Government's bungling of rural problems including manpower. The Government has not carried out its own policy regarding the use of men, as I shall prove.

Going back to October 1 last, we have the decision of War Cabinet that, up to June, 1944, 20,000 men were to be released from the Army in addition to routine releases and 20000 men diverted from munitions and aircraft production. War Cabinet also reaffirmed its earlier decision regarding the release of 15,000 men from the services for rural work, to which I have just referred.

This, in the words of the Prime Minister in this House of October 7, was "an urgent priority." Notwithstanding these decisions, particularly the latter one to which I have referred, Members representing rural constituencies continue to receive complaints and farmers continue to be forced to give up their properties because of manpower shortages.

On October 13 last the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture stated specifically in this House, when referring to rural manpower, "a large body of nominated labour would be returned for permanent work on farms." On December 14, there

TOWN HALL DEBATE ON FED. POWERS

(Continued from last issue.)

Mr. Norman O'Brien, the second speaker in opposition to the proposed transfer and extension of powers, said that, while the Federal Constitution is not sacrosanct, alterations thereto should not be effected by means of measures bludgeoned through Parliament by the Party machine in times of emergency.

"If we are to alter the Federal Constitution every time an emergency arises, then the one thing permanently stable will become permanently unstable."

The proposals, if carried, would involve permanent regulations and restrictions, and a condition of affairs wherein "pink" economists would have power to mould individuals to fit a Government pigeonhole.

The soldier question is being used as icing to cover the real cake. If the Federal Government has its way, the men away fighting for freedom will come back to be bossed by bureaucratic "brass-hats."

Instead of the State existing to serve the people, the very reverse would be the position if the referendum proposals are carried.

Government spokesmen, in emphasising the alleged necessity of these additional powers being granted to enable them to do the things they profess to be anxious to accomplish, ignored the powers, which already reside in Section 51 of the Constitution.

If the powers are transferred supposedly for the limited period of five years, it will be found that in those five years we shall have the shackles of bureaucracy tightly clamped upon us.

COMMENT:—We are in agreement with the foregoing opinions expressed by Mr. O'Brien. His speech in the debate shows him to be realistically aware of the threat to our freedom involved in the powers plot. It is not known whether Mr. O'Brien, assuming the failure of the plot, visualises simply a return to pre-1939 conditions. In case he does not fully realise the extent to which existing conditions, including the war, can be attributed to the operation of the prevailing financial system; should he be unaware of the fact that members of the Curtin "Labor" Government, whose Federal Powers proposals he so rightly is opposing, are but tools of the bankers of Wall St.—we commend to Mr. O'Brien's earnest consideration Mr. Bruce Brown's remarkably revealing series of letters in this journal under the title, "Australia's Great Post-War Peril." Also, in view of the advertisements of the Town Hall debate having described Mr. O'Brien as a member of the Young Nationalists, we hope, if he has not already done so, that he will read the Open Letter addressed by the Association to Defend British Culture to

MARTIAL MUSINGS

It should be remembered that Russia is fighting Germany because Germany attacked her. That was very lucky for us. The United States is at war with Germany and Japan because Japan attacked her, and Germany declared war on her. That was probably lucky for us, too.

We are fighting Germany because Germany attacked Poland, and everybody said "Stop Hitler." Just how lucky that was, time will show. We are fighting Japan because we hadn't enough to do.

We mention these trifles because the prevailing idea seems to be that we declared war on Germany in order to bring in a brand-new economic and social system by fighting Germany, Japan, and Italy single-handed. Since, much against their will, others are in it too, we are fighting—oh, give over, Clarence, can't you!

And when Germany is beaten, Russia will be out of the war, but we shan't. So what? —"The Social Creditor," Jan 8.

appeared in several country newspapers a three-column advertisement, headed in bold black type:—

"MANPOWER FOR DAIRY FARMS"

"Immediate release of persons from the Army or elsewhere to help you to increase production can now be arranged...."

The advertisement then went on— "Dairy-men may obtain manpower they need either by (1) nominating persons previously employed by them and now in the Army or elsewhere for immediate return to their employment, or (2) indicating their willingness to employ any experienced person to help them to increase milk production"

Mr. Forde: From what paper is the honorable gentleman reading?

Mr. Fadden: The "Northern Star" of December 14 last. Then in the country press of February 3—I cite the Queensland "Times"—there appeared another three-column advertisement headed:—"WHAT DO YOU NEED TO INCREASE YOUR MILK PRODUCTION?"

Underneath there appears the query—

"IS IT MORE MEN?"

The advertisement goes on to say in reply— "You can nominate persons previously employed by you and now in the Army or elsewhere for return to your employment. Or you can simply say that you are willing to employ any experienced person. If you can increase production, or need manpower to maintain production, apply immediately...."

There is no ambiguity about either of those advertisements, which were issued by Commonwealth Food Control, or about the statement of the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture.

(To be continued.)

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

concerned because impecunious smokers and non-teetotallers are unable to purchase supplies. Well, the cause of the trouble is that 67% of the price of cigarettes goes to the Treasury, along with 62% from all tobacco sales. Then there is 50% of beer sales, and 54% from all matches sales, also 55% of retail spirits sales—not to mention the 12½% on materials used in housing, or 12½% on clothing, or the thousands of other living needs on which sales tax is levied to lower our purchasing power by inflating prices. Fancy Government spokesmen wailing against inflation when by their actions they deliberately cause the situation! And just fancy the Labor Party mulcting the workers in this manner!

POST-WAR PLAN: London reports state "about 30 business concerns in U.S.A. have arranged commercial loans totalling £625 millions for the post-war period." This, it is explained, is for the purpose of setting American citizens to work to provide machinery, chemicals and consumer goods for the Russians. The arrangement is said to have caused considerable satisfaction in Russia—no comment is made about what the U.S. citizens will receive in return. Since Russia has no goods wanted by U.S., presumably liens will be given on Russia's future production" and capital goods. And so the old game goes on!

FEDERAL FORCE: Following the ugly situation arising from suppression of Sydney newspapers, in which revolvers were drawn by Federal Police, the N.S.W. Commissioner of Police has made it clear that the State Police were not connected with the matter. This matter of Federal Police going over the head of State authority in civil matters is just another illustration of the attempt to force Federalism on the people and is part of the plot for centralisation. Another essential part of the plot is the Federal Courts, which are also operating. The sooner this Federal Police idea (which is said to have arisen out of "election eggs" being thrown at W. M. Hughes) is ended, the better. Maybe this press incident will bring the issue to a head.

WHITE AUSTRALIA: One of the few questions free from political bias presented to the people via the "Gallup Poll," namely, the "White Australia" Policy, disclosed that opposition to the Planners' plot to undermine our economic and cultural standards is growing. The question put was: "After the war, should Australia admit a limited number of coloured people, such as Chinese and Indians." The answer was "No" by 53% of those who voted, which represented an increase of 18% in the "No" vote in a period of 12 months. From, this it will be clear that Press and the Planners whom they boost are quite out of touch with public opinion—as usual.

SOLDIERS' SUITS: Discharged soldiers, after having given some of the best of their life to the country, are handed 50/- with which to purchase a civilian suit. Thus a grateful Government rewards those who answer the call. Frequently these heroes,

The Book you have been waiting for . . .

"STOP THAT THIEF!"
—FINANCE, THE GREAT DICTATOR."

AN EXPOSURE OF A GREAT SWINDLE
And A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY OUT from Economic Chaos and Insecurity via a middle road.

You Are Asking:
"CAN IT HAPPEN AGAIN?" That is, Another Depression or Another War?

Yes — and — No
For the answer: Read this forceful book, written for our times by STANLEY F. ALLEN, F.C.A. (Aust.), of 88 Pitt Street, Sydney.

Order now from the author. (The book will be ready in about three weeks.)

Price 1/6 per copy, or 12/- per dozen, plus postage. —Advt.

owing to the Army-pay pittance, are unable to make up the difference required for even a Dedman suit costing about £5/15/-. The Government responsible for this state of affairs has the audacity to seek more power via the referendum. Well, the soldiers and their dependents should know the answer to that one.

QUEER QUESTIONS: The "Age" of April 19 reports several sharp U.S. Congress questions, many of which were anti-British, during the Lease-Lend extension debate. One asked whether it was true that Russia was turning over U.S. lease goods to Japan, and whether lease-lend had been mishandled to benefit Britain. It seems that in America public men can be anti-Russian, anti-British, or anti anything—except anti-Jewish.

— OBH

An Open Letter to Australian Democrats

(Continued from page 1.)

provocateur, they are effectively introducing the Gestapo and O.G.P.U. to Australia?"

There is little doubt that the people mentioned ARE aware. They have told us we must be prepared to submit to "controls" after the war, otherwise we will have another depression. I presume that we are to take this talk about depression as a threat!

It is asserted that the last depression was the result of the Federal Government having insufficient power and control. This is dishonest argument, particularly from Labor members, many of whom, when in Opposition, truthfully said that the cause of the depression was FINANCIAL. The depression was worldwide, and wasn't only peculiar to Australia. It was the result of the bringing about of a sudden shortage of MONEY in every country. There was no shortage of goods, foodstuffs, manpower, or desire to produce. Mr. L. H. Hollins, Victorian M.L.A., had the following to say on this particular point: —

"The problem that concerns me, as well as hundreds and thousands of people throughout Australia, is that the power which controls everything—money—has not been mentioned. There is not one suggestion throughout the whole of the Constitutional proposals that has any reference to money . . . Part V. of the original Constitution Act relates to the powers of the Federal Parliament. Section 51 sets out that the Parliament shall have power to make laws in respect of various subjects, among which is paragraph XIII: 'Banking, other than State banking, also State banking extending beyond the limits of the State concerned, the incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money', . . . If the Federal authorities, and particularly the Federal Ministers, would show the same degree of zeal for taking control of money power as they have shown towards bringing about a change in the Constitution we would be proud of them."

Dr. Evatt and his friends have been attempting to discredit the State Parliaments. They say that the States were unable to prevent the last depression. But they don't say a word about the fact that the State Governments could not carry out their public works programmes and other schemes because the Federal Government, dominated by the Money Power, would not allot sufficient money to the States. They don't mention that, as a result of the Federal Government's Uniform Tax Plan, the State Governments lost their last semblance of financial independence. What hypocrisy, then, to blame THEM for all our troubles.

When Niemeyer and Guggenheim came to this country and, with the assistance of men such as Professors Copland and Giblin, forced the infamous Premiers' Plan upon us, it wasn't lack of authority which prevented the Federal Parliament from resisting the international bankers. It was sheer ignorance—or worse. But Copland and Giblin, who led us from one disaster to another, are still with us. Professor Copland is one of the big forces behind the campaign for greater powers for Canberra. He wants more and more control over the lives of the people. And Professor Giblin has recently said: —

"The power of taxation was being used more and more as a weapon of economic control. Taxation was not to pay for the war, but to reduce the great gap between income and consumable goods."

I hope Australians take heed of the above. If we don't want to be "pushed around," after the war, by the vast Government bureaucracies now being used by such men as Copland, Giblin and others, who failed to help us when the representatives of the Money Power visited this country, we must oppose any further centralisation of Government. WE must seek to obtain greater control OVER our institutions by bringing them CLOSER to the people. On this one point alone, admittedly the most important, democratic Australians must vote "No" when asked to give greater powers to Canberra.

Dr. Evatt tries to make out that the State Governments are incapable of handling post-war reconstruction. In other words, Dr. Evatt expects Australians to believe, for example, that Victorians, living in a State, which provides sufficient of everything to feed, clothe and house every individual decently, cannot do so unless they submit to the alleged genius of the Canberra bureaucrats!

It should be pointed out that New Zealand is much closer to Canberra than many parts of Australia. Why don't we have a campaign to run New Zealand from Canberra also? The idea is, of course, too silly for words. And we don't hear even the bureaucrats suggesting that then will be chaos in New Zealand unless New Zealanders submit to being planned from Canberra. (Of course, there's no saying that there won't be a move along those lines if the Australian electors grant the powers demanded for Canberra.)

It has been suggested by some people that the Federal Government, if successful at the referendum, might delegate some "powers" to the States, etc. But under such arrangements the State "Governments," etc., would be merely administrative agencies, forced to implement a policy, concocted in far away Canberra. This would wipe out real Local Government, which is for the purpose of carrying out the will of the local people, NOT for imposing outside policies on them.

One of the most powerfully propagated arguments of the power-lusters is that which would have us believe that nothing else matters so long as we have security. Well, there are already places in Australia where people have more security. The inhabitants of these places are given free food, clothing and shelter, they pay no taxes, they have free entertainment, free medical services and free libraries. The places I refer to are the prisons. Do you desire that type of economic security, fellow Australians? Surely you agree with me that if our Government authorities pretend that they cannot devise ways and means for allowing Australians to produce, distribute and consume, without first introducing the Slave State, they should be dismissed immediately. We CAN have security AND liberty. Don't be tricked on this point.

The most alarming fact about those seeking the proposed powers is the small importance they attach to the rights of the individual. Speaking at Canberra on February 11, Dr. Evatt said: "I want the House to consider these powers irrespective of the possible abuses of them . . ." What sort of talk is this? Already we have seen numerous examples of abuses of the

INDEPENDENCE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND?

(Continued from last week.)

In the House of Commons debate, Petty Officer A. P. Herbert commented as follows:

We should announce, I suggested, that, say, two or three years after the war, or from now if you like, that we intended to restore full self-government to Newfoundland unless by a plebiscite one year before that they had chosen some other form of government. But that interim period should not be regarded as another period of autocratic alien rule but should be used by Newfoundland, with such assistance as we can give them (a) to find out what they want, and (b) to prepare the people for a renewal of political activity, to help the emergence of leaders and the formation of parties and stimulate interest and the like. For that purpose I suggested the formation of a Council of Citizens, appointed by the Governor, from every class and body. There are a great many bodies in Newfoundland—the West Newfoundland Association, the Board of Trade, co-operative societies, and so on, who are already studying the problems of the future. I suggested that they should frame the questions, which should be put to the people at the plebiscite and that when they had finished that part of their task they should get on with the business of political education. The wireless, for example, has not been sufficiently used. In scattered communities in wintertime the only method by which the Government can reach the people is by wireless, which should be used for political, and, for that matter, for school education. We should send out lecturers to teach people how to take the chair at meetings, to make speeches, to teach the history of their country, the value of local government, and so on, and actively assist a resurgence of political interest and act.

If I may, I should like to go back to the question, what sort of alternatives are there to the original form of government, which might be worth discussing? My hon. Friend the Member for North Camberwell (Mr. Ammon) mentioned the possibility that Newfoundland should elect their free Commissioners. That might do as a stopgap for a short time, but it would not do for long, because the same troubles as there are now would exist. The people do not know what is going on. They cannot go into a Chamber like this and shake their fists at Ministers and ask them what they are doing—for ex-

amples already held by the Federal Government. But Dr. Evatt dismisses all this as of no importance. The fact that bureaucrats may, under Clause 2 of the Powers Bill, introduce industrial conscription and force a man to take a job in any other part of Australia, is glossed over.

The argument is being put forward that most of the opposition to the Powers Bill is coming from "vested interests." Let me conclude this letter by pointing out that Mr. W. S. Robinson, representative of B.H.P. and international financier, has been Dr. Evatt's advisor on both that gentleman's visits overseas, and has recently moved into palatial quarters at Canberra! The big monopolies have never been treated better than by the present Government. Don't think that you will be striking a blow against monopoly by voting "yes." You will be voting to strengthen monopoly in all its worst forms.

We will continue our investigation in my next open letter.

—Sincerely yours, ERIC D. BUTLER.

(Note:—Typed copies of this Open Letter may be obtained from the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, or the Association to Defend British Culture, 71 Jordan Street, Malvern, Victoria. Price: 1/6 per dozen, plus 3d postage. Send some to friends and relations in the Forces.)

ample, about Goose Bay. Whatever we do about electing Commissioners, that difficulty would still remain. In our last debate on this topic I was attracted by a suggestion by my hon. Friend, the Member for Altrincham (Sir E. Grigg), who, I am sorry to say, is ill. It was that it may be possible to consider the inclusion of Newfoundland in the United Kingdom on lines roughly, but not exactly, similar to Northern Ireland. That again, I believe, has been rather turned aside in high quarters, but I hope that high quarters will consider it because it meets the dilemma, as some call it, of my two main propositions that (1) Newfoundland must govern herself and (2) we must help her financially . . .

. . . That would be one of the things to be discussed by the Council, which should be presided over or assisted, I suggest, by a big constitutional expert from this country and attended by representatives of the Dominions Office able at any moment to say what was in the minds of the Department. [An Hon. Member: "Nominated or elected?"] The Council of Citizens would have to be nominated, because there is no machinery for electing anyone. But that is a detail. Then it is possible that they might say: "We want Dominion status, with two Houses of Parliament and the rest of it," but although they want to have a say in their own affairs, they do not put on Dominion airs. You do not hear the words "Dominion status" at all. So they might think it better to have a single Chamber, as in Ceylon or Jamaica, with elected and appointed Members face to face instead of having a bogus House of Lords, which no one ever sees, and no one respects. That is another alternative. There are two or three ideas thrown out. When the Council or Convention has discussed all these things and found out the kind of strength that there is in this, that or the other, they can decide what question shall be put to the people at the plebiscite. The question of how soon is one of detail. I suggested, I think, two years after the war.

But all this will be of very small consequence to the Newfoundlanders unless they have some confidence about their economic freedom . . .

[The Under-Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs (Mr. Emrys Evans) made a non-committal reply to the debate.]

JEWISH AIMS AND BRITISH INTERESTS

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

What ARE the Jews, and their ambitions? The Jews of the world are divided into three main groups: (1) more-or-less assimilated Jews (British Jews, and their like elsewhere); (2) "Zionist" Jews (with a foreign policy and territorial ambitions); (3) International Jews, with boundless aims.

The first are the Jews who, in spite of their faith of tribal antagonism, find, through long sojourn and adaptability, the way to live on good terms with, and to promote the national welfare, of those national communities, which have received them. These Jews claim only equal rights with their fellow-citizens, on the whole, and regard themselves as members of a RELIGION, not a RACE. This is the smallest group; and (as the example of Poland shows) it tends to become smaller, while present British policy, by supporting wider aims, threatens to exterminate it altogether. Anything, which promotes the belief that great Powers, like this Empire or the United States, are promoting the ambitions of the second or third group, immediately diminishes the population of the first group.

The second group contains those Jews, to whom the Jews of the first group in quiet times are often violently opposed, who pursue the aim called Zionism. These are organised, wealthy and powerful. They regard themselves as members of a RACE and claim a home for it, in the place when this home was two thousand years ago Palestine. It is now inhabited by others whose immemorial home it also is. They can only rule in Palestine by dispossessing the present occupants, on the strength of title deeds lost in antiquity.

The claims of this group, then, go far beyond "equal rights with other citizens." Indeed, history cannot supply a precedent for this ambition. It is a political claim,

involving territory, which DENIES the "rights of citizens" already established there. WE have grounds, not less substantial and more recent, to claim Saxony. This ambition is indistinguishable from that pursued by Mussolini in Africa, Hitler in Eastern Europe, or (I must add) by this country in Africa or India. Such ambitions, however, were realised, or attempted, by dint of Italian, German or British arms. The Palestinian ambition has been pursued through the use of OUR arms.

The third group of Jews are those who, as the events of twenty-five years ago showed, remain invisible until the moment of chaos, and pursue a greater ambition: exclusively Jewish rule in white countries, on the basis of laws outlawing "Anti-Semitism," and the weapons of terror. Unlike the Zionists, who openly pursue their aims, this group is secret and unseen; but its existence was proved in Russia, Hungary and Bavaria in 1918-19.

(None need waste stamps on telling me "Lenin was not a Jew"; I know that one!) Trotsky, Bela Kun and Levine were unknown to mankind, before they uncovered, and yet, when chaos arrived, they were suddenly there! The men they chose to work with them, the orders they set up, the laws they made and the things they did, cannot be gainsaid.

In quiet times, these three groups remain distinct. When wars come, populations shift, governments fall, and frontiers change, unrest and excitement spread through them

all. Many members of the first group become uneasy, dreading change. Others, as ambitions become more hopeful, which seemed hopeless, move from the first group to the second, the second to the third (witness the baptized Peter Agoston of Hungary, who in peace wrote of the menace of Jewry to the Gentile world, and in chaos became Bela Kun's henchman).

We need DISLIKE none of these groups. We need only KNOW them, what they want, and how this affects us. Precisely, this indispensable KNOWLEDGE is withheld from us by a thousand stealthy devices. This is the danger of the attempt which is made to prevent all open discussion of these matters.

A Socialist Leader (who is Leader of the Opposition [in Great Britain], and thus seldom says anything, in the House) was reported by the "News-Chronicle" on November 2nd, 1942, to have told a Jewish audience in London that the next 25 years would see "the fulfilment of their hopes!" (I doubt whether he told his electors that, in 1935. The current talk, then, was about Abyssinia.)

What are these "hopes" which are to be fulfilled, and how do they impinge on OUR interests? Mr. Greenwood is an important man, and supposedly commits our second greatest Party. What does he promise in our name?

Are they the "hopes" of those Jews who only wish "equality of rights with their fellow-citizens"? Of those who want Palestine AND "equality of rights" everywhere else? Or of those who want untrammelled power, based on terror and anti-Gentile legislation (for that is what the early Bolsheviks obtained, through their weapon, the Communist Party, in three countries)?

We are not told. So let us examine, severally, the three groups of Jews, and see what their "hopes" are.

The first is that of the Jews long-established by residence in all white countries, who were freed from discrimination during last century, when they came in most lands to enjoy that "equality of rights" which was THEN depicted as their utmost desire. The highest places in State service, professions and callings, were opened to them, and many climbed to these pinnacles. This bred the first group, of absorbed, if not assimilated, Jews: those who felt their interests to be vested in the country which received them, and worked for no exclusively Jewish aims contrary to those of the land which became their home.

(The great bulk of European Jews, the 3,000,000 Jews in the East, as I have shown from the testimony of one, never felt like this. From it came the Bolshevik Jews of 1918-20, and the immigrants who bred such discord in Germany after the last war. It includes those whom we are now asked to receive, in the name of "extermination.")

The first group of Jews was well defined, in the House of Commons on August 6th, 1942, by Mr. Lipson, the Member for Cheltenham. He opposed the proposal for a Jewish Army, which several rabid Gentiles advocated, and said he owned the advantage, over them, of being a Jew. (He pointed out that one of them supported the proposal in the belief that it would relieve Jews in his constituency from serving in the British Forces! You perceive, gentle reader, the need to watch your Member.)

Mr. Lipson, who often defends alone the best British and Jewish interests against non-Jewish Members of astounding ignorance, prejudice or dependence, and is in imminent danger of being pogromed as an anti-Semite, said the previous speakers "expressed a view which to my mind is harmful in its conception." This was, the repeated references to "the Jewish people." He submitted, with emphasis, that the Jews were a religious community. The anti-Semites, he said, argued that the Jews were a separate people, and thus justified discrimination against the Jews in various parts of the world. But ———

"this argument is also supported by the views put forward by the Jewish Nationalists, who also talk about a Jewish people. You cannot have the best of both worlds. You cannot at the same time say, There is a Jewish people, and therefore I am a member of the Jewish people, and I want to get all the advantages and privileges that that carries with it," and also say, 'I am a British subject, or a Frenchman or an American, with equal rights with other citizens.' Therefore, I feel that the Nationalists in their arguments are playing with fire, because they are proving the anti-Semitic case that the Jew is an alien in every country where he is. It is not true. In this country, thank God, we Jews enjoy the privilege of citizenship, the responsibilities of citizenship."

Mr. Lipson's speech contains the truth. Here is the "British Jew." He asks to receive no more, or perform less than we. No problem exists, with HIM. If this were all the Jews demand, all that our Governments intend to claim for them, all would be well. These, then, were NOT "the hopes" which Mr. Greenwood promised to fulfill; the Jews already have so much.

So we come to the second group of Jews. Mr. Greenwood spoke to Zionists. He, leader of a great Party, promised, not what the Jewish religious community wants (in which Mr. Lipson included himself), but what the Jewish people want (who, as Mr. Lipson said, justify those self-defensive measures against the Jews in various parts of the world).

That is grave. What DO they want, those Zionist Jews who count themselves "a nation," and pursue territorial ambitions, which can only be reached through British arms? If Mr. Greenwood was empowered to make this promise, we are committed to something gravely injurious to British and Jewish interests. This affects every British mother and mother's son. (To be continued.)