

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. 18. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1944

Canberra Power - Lusters Versus The People

Which Side Are YOU On?

By ERIC D BUTLER

Do the power-lusters underestimate the intelligence and initiative of the Australian people? I ask this question because hardly a day passes now but some bureaucrat or Member of Parliament blatantly informs us that we must submit to regimentation after the war. Dr. Coombs made such a candid pronouncement at the Constitutional Club in Sydney on March 28, where he made it perfectly clear that he believes we are fighting tyranny in Germany and Japan in order to establish it here.

If Australians are prepared to submit meekly to well-paid Government employees telling them that they must get used to the idea of a loss of personal liberties, then the position is indeed serious. This power-lusting virus is a deadly disease, a growing disease in our community. Its victims desire to order people to do this or do that. Great numbers of people are trying to mind other people's business instead of minding their own. This, of course, suits the policy of the people rapidly destroying the British way of life on this continent.

Now that the Socialists appear to be taking over "Christianity" and Bishop Blunt in England says that all opponents of Socialism must be liquidated, I presume that the statement concerning doing unto others as you would have them do to you, is considered old-fashioned! Christianity, like Democracy, a la Russia, is being brought up to date!

Anyone who cares to look back through previous copies of this journal will see that I have never at any time been an admirer of Mr. Menzies or the political party he leads. But I have never at any time believed that Mr. Curtin or the Labor Party would improve our position. I detest party politics in any shape or form, and if I thought that the present Members of all parties at Canberra were the best types of citizens we have, I would hold out very little hope for Australia's future.

The great tragedy is that many people regard politics in terms, which I can hardly mention in print. But it is no use people

saying that politics are too dirty for them, and that they have no desire to soil their hands; they must understand that if they won't come forward and help to cleanse democracy, then democracy is dying. In fact, it is, to put it crudely, being kicked to death at Canberra.

At present, Labor Members are doing most of the kicking. Many people have told me from time to time that Labor would do this and Labor would do that. Labor's betrayal on financial policy alone should convince any reasonable person that the Socialists everywhere are the perfect tools of the controllers of the banking system. One or two optimists have recently told me that Labor will "show us" when they have a majority in the Senate in a few weeks' time. Anyone who believes that would believe anything. The men controlling the Labor Party are working night and day to obtain, principally by trickery, powers, which no real democratic Government would even consider. Anyone who still doubts my statements about trickery would do well to read carefully Mr. Curtin's second reading speech on the Constitution Alteration Bill, on March 7. After dealing with his Government's desire for greater powers, Mr. Curtin said:

"It considers that the history of this matter is one of opposition, of a disposition to say 'No,' of a refusal to give to this Parliament the powers which successive Governments have regarded as necessary. It therefore considered that the practical ap-

proach to the question was to invite the representatives of the State Parliaments to assemble at Canberra."

Just what does this statement mean? It means this: Mr. Curtin tells us that the people, whenever they have been given an opportunity of a referendum, have rejected attempts by all political parties to obtain greater centralisation of politico-economic power in Australia. In effect, he then says: "As we couldn't expect the people to give us the powers in a democratic manner, we tried a 'practical approach' and endeavoured to get the States to give us the powers without consulting the people." This is the man who talks about democracy, the man who, in the speech mentioned above, goes on to make the following outrageous and insulting remark:

"I submit that the totalitarian powers in the Commonwealth are the State Parliaments. They have sovereign authority."

I hope all State Members note the above. Mr. Curtin trifles with the truth (I find words almost inadequate to deal with this matter) when he says that the States have sovereign power. Mr. Curtin knows that FINANCE governs everything; he told us so before he became Prime Minister. Even

the little financial sovereignty the States possessed was taken away by Mr. Curtin through the Uniform Tax Plan. The States can do nothing without MONEY, but it is Mr. Curtin's Government alone, which has to ensure that adequate money is forthcoming in order that all State and local bodies can carry out their projects. Mr. Curtin will find the power of the Federal Government concerning finance in the EXISTING CONSTITUTION.

Mr. Curtin talks about the "totalitarian powers" of the States. Well, well, well! Was it the States who had twenty Australian citizens thrown into prison and kept there without a trial?

The most shocking charges were made against these people, and given tremendous publicity in the daily press. Nothing was ever proved against these citizens—with whose political views I strongly disagree—but the daily press, which is always talking about freedom when its own interests are endangered, neither fought to have these unfortunate victims of gangsterism released nor made any apologies for the defamatory publicity they gave them. They tacitly supported one of the greatest outrages (Continued on page 4.)

The present Federal Government's proposals for post-war reconstruction, as indicated in the Powers Bill, are proposals for regimenting the people and ignoring the vital question of finance. Contrast them with the following statement, broadcast in December, by the Hon. E. C. Manning, Premier of Alberta, Canada: —

I have been requested to deal tonight with some proposals for post-war reconstruction that seem to have aroused a great deal of public interest. You are all aware that a Committee of Members of the House of Commons, under the Chairmanship of J. G. Turgeon, Member of Parliament for Cariboo, B.C., has been making an exhaustive enquiry into the important questions of post-war reconstruction and rehabilitation.

The Provincial Governments were invited by this Committee to make submissions outlining the various reconstruction projects, which they considered practicable and expedient for their Provinces. Recently it was my privilege on behalf of the Alberta Government, to submit a Brief, setting out certain of our recommendations in this regard.

I do not propose to deal tonight with that part of our submission, which dealt in a comprehensive manner with the scope and nature of necessary post-war reconstruction work within Alberta. While this may possibly be of interest to persons outside our Province, it does not directly concern them.

However, the second part of our Brief dealt with a matter which certainly does concern the people all across Canada, and for this reason I have been asked to deal with it on this broadcast.

It should be clear to all that there is no great problem involved in specifying what physical projects should be undertaken in the post-war reconstruction of our national economy. In this respect, the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the Canadian people can be stated in terms of agricultural and industrial development, of rural electrification and irrigation, of housing and transportation, of conservation, reforestation and recreation projects, of social security and of just wage conditions. Furthermore, we all know the abundant resources we possess and the adequate human and mechanical means available for developing those resources to an extent that would provide sufficient goods to guarantee every Canadian family absolute and complete economic and social security.

The problem, which confronts every industrialist, every farmer, every municipality, every Provincial Government and every department of the Federal Government is: "How can these post-war development projects be financed?" This is the all-important question, which we dealt with in the second part of Alberta's submission to the Turgeon Committee—and, as far as I know, it is the only definite, practical proposal for the financing of Canada's post-war reconstruction programme that thus far has been made . . .

Some persons are inclined to argue—"Well we don't have to worry about that: if unlimited funds can be provided to finance war-time destruction, they can be provided to finance peace-time reconstruction." This is only partly true—the funds can be provided, but not by a continuation of the methods being employed to finance the war. Since the beginning of the war, Canada's national debt has more than doubled. It is now over eight billion dollars. That means that every family in Canada already

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).

NOTES on the NEWS

To date, no instructions have been received by electoral authorities to "take the Referendum." In addition to this suspicious fact, in commenting on it the Melbourne "Herald" of April 29 used the phrase, "IF the Referendum is held Please note that word 'IF'." According to the requirements of the Commonwealth Constitution, the Referendum MUST be held some time between May 23 and September 23—and note the word "must." Can it be that even, if the State politicians betray the people by surrendering the "powers," that electors can over-ride them and insist that the Referendum be held? Will YOU "call the bluff" and ask your Federal and State Members —now?

BEVERIDGE BREW: A "White Paper" covering Britain's post-war plans is expected soon—based largely on the Beveridge Plan of complete regimentation under the guise of security. Commenting on this, the Melbourne "Sun" of April 22 says that, "despite strong opposition to regimentation, the Government seems determined to implement these or similar proposals." In the same issue, reporting the Australian proposals to be submitted to the International Labour Organisation Conference, the "Sun" says: "The Australian delegates will press strongly for full employment." It should be quite clear from this that this international demand for "work," not leisure, does not originate from those already doomed to toil.

PLANNERS' PLOTS: In the midst of the struggle for freedom from the tyranny of totalitarian centralised control, the bankers are forging their chain for post-war world domination. Unless strong resistance develops from Australia and other Dominions, the financiers will certainly win their first war aim—the restoration of the "gold standard." In addition we are now told that Mr. Stettinius of U.S. and Mr. Eden are agreed on certain principles of "Anglo-U.S. understanding." These agreements cover trade, air and military bases and military alliances. There is also the suggestion that Britain may be willing to risk the disinte-

gration of the Empire by surrendering imperial preferences—if the Dominions do not object. The idea behind all this is that because you have an accidental ally against an immediate and temporary enemy you must live forever and ever with your temporary ally. Well, Japan was our ally in the 1914-1918 brawl!!!

UNION UNREST: Mr. James Crawford, in his presidential address to the Scottish Trade Union Congress, uttered a grave warning to Unionists taking part in what is described as unofficial strikes, and "complained that sections of Trade Unions were repudiating machinery for collective bargaining." This term, "unofficial strikes" can only mean strikes which the workers desire, and which the paid Union executives do NOT want; and, vice versa, an "official strike" is one which the Union executives desire and which the workers do NOT want. If such a situation did arise it would be clear that the executives were NOT the servants they are supposed to be. Further, it would be beyond doubt that the executives were copying the Fascist dictators against whom they rail. It's a queer business, and one, which the rank-and-file Unionists will have to clarify.

LEASE-LEND: An interesting angle on Lease-Lend arrangements comes from the Canadian Press Association, via the Melbourne "Sun" of March 18, viz.: "Canadian 'Mutual Aid' differs from U.S. 'Lease-Lend' inasmuch as it does not require post-war settlement or payment, whereas the Lease-Lend agreement provides for settlement 'on such terms as the President may deem satisfactory.'" These terms have never been defined, and could lead to a very unsatisfactory situation. In this matter Canada has demonstrated in a manner beyond confusion or distrust her sincerity in assisting her allies; her "Mutual Aid" has no strings to it whatever.

MANPOWER MUDDLE: Press reports of April 3 state that "war workers at a Brisbane idle war plant come on early to clock on, then leave the building to work at other (Continued on page 2)

Beasley's "Blunder"

The following proposal is reported in the "Age" of April 26, as emanating from Mr. Beasley at the I.L.O. Conference: "An international labour committee containing representatives of the United Nations, to which the I.L.O. would make recommendations, instead of to Governments—and decisions made by the committee would be binding on the Governments."

What a nice way of short-circuiting elected national Parliaments! And to think that the proposal came from a supposedly democratic Labor delegate!

(To be concluded.)

Federal Powers Debate

A public debate is to take place in the Coburg Town Hall on, Friday, May 12, at 8 p.m. The case in favour of the transfer of powers will be in the hands of Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick. The negative argument will be put forward by Mr. E. J. Grogan. A "full house" is expected. Don't miss this.

(Concluded from last issue.)

Although Mr. Fadden neglected to mention the fact that low financial returns are also having a serious effect on production, the following extracts from his speech on primary production, made in Federal Parliament on February 10, are sound comment on Government bungling: —

Is it any wonder that Members who represent rural constituencies are snowed under with requests and complaints as to the use of manpower. There is no co-ordination, between the Services and the people charged with the administration of manpower, as to the use and balance of the manpower requirements of this nation. We have the muddle of Commonwealth Food Control inviting people to nominate men for discharge from the forces for service on farms, and the Services resisting applications. Is anyone surprised that we are in our present position, and that our food production is declining to a dangerous degree? Only last evening the Prime Minister, referring to conditions of rural employment, especially in the dairying industry said: —

"Apart from the general shortage of experienced labour, it has been found that many farmers are unwilling to accept other than nominated personnel which comprise predominantly sons and relatives previously employed on the farms."

The Prime Minister condemns producers for applying for the release of nominated personnel whilst, at the same time, the Commonwealth Food Control authorities actually invite producers by public advertisement in the country press to apply for the release of nominated personnel. In view of such confusion and contradiction, is it any wonder that the foundations of not only wartime but also peacetime life in Australia are rapidly deteriorating?

What a black outlook confronts us for 1944! However, it is not surprising that this problem has been bungled in so alarming a manner when we consider some of the utterances of the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture (Mr. Scully) who is in charge of food production. On June 1, 1943, the Minister said: —

"Australia's food position was the best of any country and would show an improvement soon. Man-power and transport difficulties which had handicapped production and delivery of primary products were being overcome so far as was possible."

On June 22, 1943, the Minister said: —
"The food position in Australia is essentially good. . . . No country in the world is in a better position than Australia in regard to food and I doubt whether any other country is in such a sound position. . . . The production of wheat is adequate for all purposes."

Mr. Fuller: Is that not a fact?
Mr. Fadden: If those statements by the Minister are correct, utterances made by the Prime Minister on this subject must be incorrect. The Minister continued: —

"The dairy farmers have maintained the volume of production at a much higher level than is generally understood. . . . Egg production has increased greatly in Australia. . . . These figures show an over-all rise in the production of meat in Australia. . . ."

Further statements made by the Minister were as follows: On August 31, 1943, he said: —

"There is plenty of meat for all. No one need go short."

On October 8, 1943: —
"The nation has more meat than it knows what to do with."

On October 13, 1943: —
"Nothing has occurred to suggest a serious decline of production since this Government took office."

On November 19, 1943: —
"Because of the huge carry-over of wheat, there is no possibility of a shortage in Australia for several years. . . . There is more wheat in Australia today than ever before in its history."

Honorable members opposite ask: Are not these statements correct? If they are,

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 two weeks.)

Price 1/6 per copy, or 12/- per dozen, plus postage. —Adv't.

the Prime Minister has made statements on the same subject which must be incorrect. On December 22 last the Prime Minister said that the estimated production of meat in 1944 would be about 25 per cent, below essential needs, that the leeway in egg production in 1943-44 would be 2,000,000 dozen, that the prospective deficiency in milk would be 153,300,000 gallons for 1943-44, and that the enormous demands for the Forces for fresh and processed vegetables would be met in 1943-44. Contrast what the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture has said with the following statement which was made recently by the Commonwealth Statistician: —
"Butter production for the last season was 170,000 tons, or 4800 tons below the record output in the first war year. The production goal for this season is 175,000 tons. If this goal is to be reached, pro-

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir, —On Monday, April 24, I attended a meeting in the Assembly Hall ostensibly held "to commemorate the First Anniversary of the Battle of Warsaw Ghetto" The meeting was arranged by the Victorian Jewish Advisory Board, and the Lord Mayor, Councillor T. S. Nettlefold, was in the chair. Mr. Arthur Calwell, Minister for Information, was advertised to speak, but sent an apology. Those who spoke were Mr. Alec Masel, Chairman of the Jewish Advisory Board; Wing-Commander T. W. White, M.H.R.; Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick, of the Council for Civil Liberties; and Rabbi Dr. Saenger, in that order. There was a great cluster of flags at the back of the platform, and the audience consisted almost entirely of Jews.

Mr. Masel read his address, and described the sufferings of the Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto and elsewhere. He painted a graphic picture and claimed that the resistance put up by the 25,000 Jews in Warsaw entitled the Jews in general, not only to possession of Palestine, but also, to have the door of every "free" country in the world thrown open to them. No attempt was made to explain why the Jews had been subjected to such treatment, why there is so much antagonism against them in every country, or why this gives them a greater claim to consideration than can be put forward for the suffering people of all the countries which have been overrun by the German armies. This audacious demand was not unexpected, but I thought Mr. Masel was straining credulity rather much when he quoted with approval the statement of Dorothy Thompson that "the Jewish Problem was created by Hitler." To my surprise this untruthful statement was greeted with applause.

Was there no "Jewish Problem" during the last war when the Armenian Massacres took place, and Hitler was only a corporal? Is it not a fact that the "Jewish Problem" played an important part in the Japanese war against Russia in 1905, when Jacob Schiff arranged finance for the Japanese? And was it really Hitler who created the "Jewish Problem" when the Jews, on more than one occasion, hundreds of years ago, were expelled from England?

Mr. Masel knows very well that this "Problem" is no recent development, and it will not help the Jewish fraternity to make out that it is. This "Problem" has been in evidence for a long while, and if we are to solve it we must have straight-forward discussion about the CAUSE of it. This, I am afraid, is NOT what Mr. Masel is advocating.

At the conclusion of the reading of the paper, the Lord Mayor told Mr. Masel that it was the finest address he (the Lord Mayor) had heard for many years. I thought it a pity that Cr. Nettlefold had heard so few, and my companion, also a Tasmanian expressed the opinion that the Lord Mayor would get on.

Little comment need be offered regarding the addresses given by Wing-Commander White and Mr. Fitzpatrick, both of which may be described as nice, but innocuous. Mr. White did take credit to himself, however, for having facilitated the entry of Jews into Australia, while Mr. Fitzpatrick laboured strenuously to get the audience to visualise what it would really mean if nine out of ten of the audience were blown away. Only one in ten would remain!

Dr. Saenger's address was easily the best of the evening, and except when he allowed himself to get emotional about "anti-Semitism," he was eloquent and impressive. All of us could have agreed with most of his remarks, but for a man of his experience and attainments to vehemently denounce "anti-Semitism" without explaining what he meant by the term was unpardonable.

While due praise was given to those who died in the Warsaw Ghetto, he made it clear that the important purpose of the meeting was to demand Palestine for the Jews and freedom of entry into all other "free" countries.

It is rather remarkable that during the past week our newspapers have reported two significant overseas items on this self-same subject. And strangely enough, although they occurred in places as far apart as Washington and London, they were both reported on the same day. The headings, taken from the Melbourne "Herald" of 27/4/44, were: "Sedition Trial Link Arouses Henry Ford's Ire," and "Angry Scenes at Jewish Meeting." The Washington report refers to action which is proceeding against thirty men who have apparently been charged with sedition, and

duction between October and June must be 14,009 tons greater than in the corresponding months of last season."

I also invite the House to compare the Minister's earlier statements with that which he made on December 2 last, when he said:—

"More milk, more eggs and more pigs are urgently needed. At all cost, production must be increased. The greatest agricultural planning effort in Australia's history is now being made in an effort to meet the demands on us for food for the British people, Australian and Allied forces in the Pacific and for the home front"

As recently as January 18 last, the Director-General of Agriculture, Mr. Bulcock predicted that some places would have shortage in some foods this year and that the outlook appeared to be that 1944 would be a difficult food year if Australia discharged its obligations to its Allies and Great Britain. Despite all that the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture has said, Australia has experienced butter and meat rationing; and I venture to predict that the Government's bungling may lead to still further rationing of essential food-stuffs. The responsibility for that development will rest entirely on the shoulders of the Government.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

private jobs; they then return at night in time to clock off. At the Brisbane Commonwealth Aircraft factory, girls, because there is no work to do, bring knitting and sewing to work and take orders for dresses." In reply to these charges, Manpower officials said: "This department is seeking more workers." Quite clearly the workers are not to blame for this situation, as they are compelled by regulations to remain at the idle plants. The only way to eliminate this form of sabotage is to direct the manpower bunglers to useful war occupations.

STRIKE SEQUEL: Following the move to make "unofficial" strikes illegal in England. Mr. Anuerin Bevan has launched a motion in the Commons to abolish the regulation. He charges the Government with "having launched a carefully prepared campaign of calumny against the miners, who struck because of the Government's incompetence." Further he submitted that the regulation was "a Slander on the people of Britain, and a stab in the back for the Forces." Mr. Bevan seems to have seen through the plot to discredit the workers in order to deprive them of their right to choose or refuse, which, after all, is what they are fighting for. The strike may be a poor weapon, but under present circumstances it is the only weapon the workers have. Their political party has failed them completely.

FARMER'S FUNERAL: The last remains of farmer Sam Brunt have been laid to rest and freed from the tyranny of Government regulations and "forms." Sam Brunt was 60-years-old farmer who tilled a 500 acre farm at Cheshire (England), and it was recognised as the best-run farm in the country, on which Sam worked from dawn to dusk with his 18 assistants, and delighted in his work and production. Then the plague of regulations, forms, statistics and arithmetic beleaguered him. Then came "pay-as-you-earn" taxation forms for himself and his assistants—so farmer Brunt, in desperation, drowned himself. The coroner said: "It is a pathetic case of an overworked farmer who could not keep pace with Government returns." Alas, there will be more and more victims unless this blight of bureaucracy is itself buried.

SNOWBALL SALES: Under this innocent heading the press informed readers that a confectioner was fined £100 for a breach of the Sales Tax Act. The point of interest behind the statement is that taxation officers calculated the alleged sales-tax deficiency on the basis of the confectioner's purchases—not his sales. Actually, the tax agents were bound to show sales actually, made, and not recorded or improperly calculated for sales-tax payment; instead of which they ascertained purchases, on which they presumed certain sales ensued. Many factors—such as theft, bad stock, bargain clearances, etc., etc., could have occurred to upset this arbitrary calculation. This is a violation of justice, which should be contested strongly by pressure on the Tax Department through Federal Members.

CANADIAN CONSCRIPTION: The Quebec Legislative Assembly by 55 votes to 4 expressed unyielding disapproval of any move to send conscripted men overseas. (The mover of the resolution pointed out that Ottawa had passed a conscription law because of the supposed danger of invasion, and argued that now that the danger had passed it should be abolished.) That's the most important step yet taken by any Parliament towards the restoration of democracy, and it is a step, which Australia should take without delay as a tangible indication of a worthwhile "new order."

DOCTOR'S DECISIONS: At a crowded meeting of the B.M.A. in Melbourne a few days ago, members pledged themselves not to co-operate with the Federal Government in the operation of the "Free Medicine" Act in its present form. Dr. John Dale, who presided, pointed out that they were not attempting to withhold free medicine from the needy, but that "the Association had a far better scheme for assisting the sick poor." Well, it should not be difficult to devise a better scheme than the Government's, which is not free at all—it is only robbery through taxation in advance: robbing Peter and Paul to pay Paul and Peter, with the Government pretending to be the great benefactor. It could be more accurately described as a confidence trick.

—O.B.H.

REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

(Report from the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.) There is room for a much better response to our financial appeal for £1 from every supporter for the big fight against the "powers plot." Maybe YOU have left your contribution until "later on." If so, we urge YOU not to delay any longer. Will YOU attend to it NOW? Thank YOU! 20,000 "Inside Information" anti-powers leaflets have already been sent out as our first attack. This has been made possible by the donations previously acknowledged, which totalled £41/5/-. The following amounts have since been received: Mrs. Abbott, £1; J. Astill, £1; J. Cleaver, 10/-; C. Dodd, £1; Mr. Grout, £1; W. H. Heseldene, £1; Miss Oughton, 10/-; D. S. McFarlane, 10/-; "Montagu," £2; J. Retallick, 10/-; (Grand Total, £50/5/-) These supporters have demonstrated their willingness to back the attack—will YOU? Donations and orders for literature should be forwarded to the above address.

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

SUNDRY HIGHLIGHTS FROM "HANSARD"

Prepared by ERIC D. BUTLER.

Mr. Breen, Labor Member for Galore, N.S.W., made an interesting admission on February 17, when, speaking about Mr. Curtin's trip abroad, he alluded to the fate of other Labor Prime Ministers who went abroad:—

"The Prime Minister is about to go abroad. I am grateful for the personal effort, which he has devoted to the task of organising and directing this country in its hour of crisis. I know his ability. He will not be easily swayed by some of the things that led to the downfall, from the Australian point of view, of former Labor Prime Ministers who went abroad. I am confident that that will not be the fate of the present Prime Minister."
Well, we shall see!

One of the many anomalies of meat rationing was given a mention on February 18 by Mr. Anthony (Richmond, N.S.W.):—

"When meat rationing was introduced we expected that all would be required to make an equal sacrifice. A man doing heavy work and a man working in an office have both been placed on the same ration, namely, 2¼ lb. of meat a week. The exceptions are cases in which a dispensation is granted, but here is some information which is worthy of note: Members of the Australian Women's Army Service, who cannot be described as doing heavy physical work, are given 4½ lb. of meat a week. The authority for that is a letter from the Minister for Trade and Customs (Senator Keane), in which he says:

"I am informed by the Minister for the Army, that the allowance of meat for ser-vice-women is not 7 lb a week but 4½ lb., carcass weight, which is equivalent to 3½ lb. butcher's weight."

"Even allowing for 3½ lb. a week, which is the minimum weight given to members of the Australian Women's Army Service, we find that a girl, merely because she is in uniform, is receiving nearly 4 lb. a week, whereas, men who do heavy work like mining and road construction, receive only 2¼ lb. If we want to organise a minimum consumption of meat, we must take into account the requirements of those members of the armed forces who are not in forward areas, and ration them in the same way as members of the civil population are rationed. Unless we do so, or, unless the Army itself takes a different attitude, it will continue the practice of withdrawing from the civil community everything it wants in the way of food and labour—and everything else that the civil

population requires. An army which can give to the members of its women's auxiliary more meat than is given to the men who do heavy work is not taking into account its responsibilities to the civil community in the way it expects the civil community to take into account its responsibility to the army."

Even under existing Constitutional powers, Canberra has power to impose its will upon the States. Mr. Menzies made this clear on February 23:

"The point I am making is this, in respect of the group of powers which I have been discussing: the Commonwealth has complete financial authority, and there is ample machinery to enable the Commonwealth to impose its will upon the States." (My emphasis.)

The job of democrats is to ensure that electors, with the assistance of their State Governments, impose their will on the Commonwealth.

An interesting little point raised during Mr. Menzies' speech on the Constitution issue, on February 23:

Dr. Evatt: "The Government led by the right honorable member appointed most of the officials."

Mr. Menzies: "I am glad of that admission. I have not noticed that many of the officials we appointed have been dismissed by this Government."

Dr. Evatt: "No, very few."

In commenting on the censorship of letters in Australia, Mr. Abbott (New England, N.S.W.), on February 25, gave the following interesting information about the internment of members of the "Australia First" Movement:

"Two kinds of censorship are now operating in Australia. The first is the actual opening and reading of letters. The second is the censorship to which the honorable member for Barker drew attention, namely, the censorship of delay. Letters to members of Parliament are held, up by this means, thus preventing them in many cases from taking action or from being able to raise the matters in the House. Last year, certain members of the 'Australia First

Movement' were interned, and the Attorney General tried to defend the act. Honorable members, representing all shades of political opinion in this chamber, made representations on behalf of some of the internees. One of the interned persons wrote to me. He was able to prove conclusively that he was innocent. He should never have been interned, and this was admitted by the right honorable the Attorney General. The letter that the internee addressed to me was held up for many days through the censorship or by some other authority. When I ultimately received it, I was able to use in this House the information contained in it, and I have no doubt that it had some effect in ensuring that justice was done to the

—pounds, shillings, pence, marks, pennings, dollars, cents, yen, etc. These coins and notes, the official money or legal tender of a country, are coined or printed by or on behalf of the government, which generally speaking has the sole right of issue.

Money also takes the very important form of bank-credit recorded as figures in the ledgers of banks and operated by cheques.

Everyone is familiar with the reasonable statement that money is a means of exchange. A man exchanges his labour or some possession for money, and exchanges this in turn for what he needs or desires.

A useful definition of money is "a valid demand for goods and services." It does not matter what form money takes, provided it is convenient and valid—that is, acceptable—and related to this definition is the statement that money is a ticket system, which is useful, since it is now literally true and serves to "debunk" the sacrosanctity and mystery of the nature and origin of money.

We are familiar with railway tickets and theatre tickets. Money is a ticket with a wider range of validity, but there need be nothing mysterious about it. Somebody writes up the tickets and somebody cancels them.

In modern industrial society, with its almost complete specialisation of production, the individual citizen as a rule plays some small and specialised part in producing the necessary wealth—which is the goods and services—which we need. Money is the means by which he can dip into the common pool, so to speak, and satisfy his needs. Money is, therefore, the means of distribution—the link between production and consumption—often a missing link! Generally speaking, the individual must have money to live, so that money is for the individual an indispensable license to live, and sometimes a reprieve from death as dramatic occasionally as the arrival in the nick of time of the galloping King's messenger! How often a reprieve from misery and famine! "When the factory gates are closed the workers...and the nameless multitude behind them must shake hands with Famine and lie down with Misery."

Proceeding from this, we can agree that money is a means of power. Those who possess it can direct the activities of those who do not, as a condition of giving them money; whilst those who control the general supplies of money can also direct the general activities—money for this, but not for that.

THE EVOLUTION OF MONEY

In very early days exchange of goods look place no doubt on a basis of barter, and it is obvious that as soon as activities began to be specialised and trade to develop, there would emerge the need for a convenient means of exchange. Corn, oil, cattle, sheep, skins, women, etc., were awkward things to equate and exchange. In early Greece—as may be read in Homer—a woman who was skilled in several useful arts was worth four oxen! The need for some measure of exchange value or universal equivalent was met by the use of precious metals, gold and silver, and a unit of weight of gold, for example, was equal to so much corn, oil, so many cattle or so many sheep. It became the measure of exchange value. The gold standard was born.

The history of gold is as old as that of civilisation. It was probably the first metal to be used by craftsmen. In his "History of Civilisation," Perry emphasises the extent to which it was used in the earliest days of Egypt, and propounds the theory that the civilisation which began in the delta of the Nile spread from there over the greater part of the world. Adventurers or expeditions from Egypt, according to this theory, travelled, largely in search of gold, to remote parts of Europe and Asia and even across the Pacific to the Americas taking with them their knowledge of cereal culture and irrigation; and in most places where today gold is mined there are to be found remnants of early Egyptian culture.

Elliot Smith has described the vast religious significance and mystical reverence, which attached to gold in ancient Egypt. Small wonder, then, that throughout ancient history gold figures largely as the symbol of wealth and as an important means of exchange.

The standard of exchange value was a weight of the precious metal. In early times it was made up into rings or loops, some of which could be linked together into chains, and these rings served as a means of exchange—the ancient ring money; this was used over the ancient world, having been found, for example, in Ireland, where, as presumably elsewhere, it apparently preceded coinage by many centuries. This ring money passed by weight not by tale or number, as the later coinage did. According to the textbooks on numis-

writer. In that instance the censorship was used by the Attorney-General and by other Ministers to shield a weak and incompetent Minister who was afraid to disclose that he had made a political blunder and a wicked error in internment men who should never have been deprived of their freedom. Because of departmental blundering, this man was slanderously charged with being a traitor to our country, and with wishing to sell our country to Japan. The charges were afterwards proved to be completely without foundation. Yet the whole galaxy of talent on the treasury bench was assisting to protect the Minister for the Army (Mr. Forde)."

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From The UNITED DEMOCRATS' headquarters, 17 Weymouth Street, Adelaide.)

QUARTERLY RALLY: Members are advised that our next Quarterly Rally will be held in our rooms on Saturday, May 13, and will commence at 8 p.m. Please keep this date before you and come along and make the meeting a success.

BOOKS TO READ: "THE TRAGEDY OF HUMAN EFFORT," by C. H. Douglas. (An outline of the principles of association, which, according to Douglas, are as capable of exact statement as the principles of bridge building). Price 6d "THE BIG IDEA," by C. H. Douglas. Price 2/6. "DOUGLAS CREDIT" ("Tell Me the Story Simply"), by Will T. Duggan. Price 6d. (All plus lid. postage.)

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

atics—on coins, those 'fossils of history'—the first money which passed by tale appeared in Greece about 300 B.C., and was not of gold, but of iron and of silver. Then was a quite large spike or "obelus" of iron, of such size that six of these were a handful or "drachma," and these are still the names of coins in Greece.

The earliest gold coins are said to be those of Alexander the Great, which were coined in large numbers and were later called Philipps. Such money was of course, intrinsically valuable as opposed to token money. It carried confidence in its very composition. It was itself real wealth and exchangeable as such even beyond the domain of the issuing emperor or authority.

The first gold coins of Rome appeared in 217 B.C.; but the Romans had at a much earlier date used money of copper or bronze in rectangular slabs of from one to ten pounds weight, impressed on one side with the image of cattle or sheep, which explains the derivation of the word pecuniary from "pecus," meaning cattle. The pound was the Roman "libra," parent of our pound troy, and divisible into twelve "uncia" (ounces). After that the Romans had a silver coin, equal to ten copper "aeses" and called "denarius"—a piece of ten "aeses." This coin became the parent of the penny of the Anglo-Saxon coinage. Finally, a homogeneous coinage in the modern sense, of gold, silver and copper, was widespread over the whole of the Roman Empire, including Britain, though Greek silver coinage had reached Britain at an earlier date and had been imitated there.

The metals were not, however, by any means the only form of early money. It is certain, for example, that the use of cowrie shells as a means of exchange goes back to very ancient times, and it has continued until recent times.

The skins of animals have also had exchange value from the earliest times; it is said that in trading a hide the owner would cut out a piece, which would represent the hide, and that whoever held the piece could claim the hide. Such pieces would be early examples of token money, representing value, though having no inherent value themselves. They could be used as a means of exchange, but their value would depend on credit—that is to say, on the belief that the hide was there and could be secured when the piece was produced.

Over the ages, many objects have been used as token money. The Chase Bank of New York has a collection of many thousands, including pieces of wood used in America itself during the recent depression when so many banks were closed.

We can well appreciate, however, how precious gold must have been, how eagerly it was sought, and how desperate must often have been the need of kings and princes for stores of gold or supplies of money in the form of gold, and how money-lending, usury and money changing developed. So also, as we come towards modern history and the developing commerce and industry of the last few centuries, we can realise, on the one hand, how supplies of gold affected the development of that commerce, and on the other, how money-lending gave rise to banking and eventually to modern banking.

(To be continued.)

RAFFLE RESULT.

A lady's tailor-made costume, the gift of F. Devlin, tailor, 340 Lit. Collins St., Melb., and raffled for the Malvern Red Cross, was won by Mrs. Sheppard, of Hawthorn (winning number, 219). The raffle realised £45.

HEALTH AND THE "GOLD STANDARD"

By DR. JOHN DALE.

[This article is taken from a paper read at a meeting of the Victorian branch of the British Medical Association, in November 1943, and published in the "Medical Journal of Australia" on March 18, 1944. Dr. Dale has the dual qualifications to speak on Health and the Gold Standard: he is, on the one hand, the City Medical Officer of Health, Melbourne, and Senior Vice-President of the Victorian branch of the B.M.A.; and, on the other hand, he has a long-established reputation as an exponent of the New Economics. Dr. Dale's ability to state his views on such subjects clearly and interestingly, "in plain English," makes this article particularly helpful to the general reader—especially as it gives much more than passing references to the evolution and nature of the prevailing money system.—Editor.]

The acceptance of a lecture on a subject such as this is evidence of the increasing interest of the medical profession generally in the nature of health, its preservation and improvement. We realise today that our profession cannot possibly accept the whole responsibility for the health or well-being of the community. What we can actually do is of great value; but it is of minor importance in comparison with activities in spheres such as those of economics and education. We must, nevertheless, interest ourselves in, and equip ourselves as far as possible to give advice upon, the whole scope of health.

The necessary limitation of our direct responsibilities in relation to health is such that I find myself objecting even to the title "health department." It would, perhaps be wiser to have, in the government, a department and a minister of medical services, rather than of health. So, also, we should object to the use of the word "health" in connection with the curriculum in schools, and to the idea of "doing health" on Tuesday afternoon from 3 to 3.30. When children study domestic science or physiology or do physical exercises, let those activities be called by their own names. All school activities should serve the health of the children.

A good definition of health is that it is "the quality of life"; and it is possible to classify the factors which affect that quality under such headings as diet, air, light, exercise and rest, social relationships, poisons and parasites. Consideration of these subject matters inevitably leads one on to economics, which in turn leads to money, which may be called the life-blood of the industrialised communities of today. Money, again, brings one to gold and the gold standard.

The study of health brings one to gold by another route—namely, the consideration

of poisons, so important among which in Australia is quartz dust that terrible hazard of gold mining which has been responsible for the untimely death and crippling of so many Australian men in the prime of life, more perhaps than has any other single cause. The death rate from tuberculosis in Bendigo is still almost double that in Melbourne (see Table I).

TABLE I.
Death Rates from Pulmonary Tuberculosis per 10,000 of Population.

Period.	Greater Melbourne.		Bendigo.
	Melbourne.	Bendigo.	
1891-1900	16.7	24.1	
1901-1905	13.9	22.7	
1906-1910	10.8	21.2	
1911-1915	9.1	16.5	
1916-1920	8.3	16.0	
1921-1925	6.9	11.9	
1926-1930	5.9	10.7	
1931-1935	4.8	10.5	
1936-1940	4.7	10.5	

Damage to health through gold mining is familiar ground to our profession and very properly within our sphere. The idea of damage to health by the use of gold as a standard of the value of money is not so familiar and may seem fantastic. The problems of control, standardisation and stabilisation of money, though seldom a matter of general discussion, and still largely veiled in secrecy by those who deal with these subjects, are, however, of urgent concern to all good citizens and particularly to members of our profession.

It is proposed in what follows to discuss briefly the nature and functions of money, the origin and evolution of money and of banking, the relation of gold to money throughout that evolution, the problem of value and of the need for a standard of value, the gold standard and its abandonment and the problem of power and its exercise through money; and finally, to indicate the danger of a return to the gold standard and the necessity that the money supplies of the community should be regulated on a realistic basis by a public authority in the public interest.

THE FORMS AND FUNCTIONS OF MONEY

Money has varied physical forms, the most familiar being notes and coins which carry numbers and denominations, the later varying according to the country concerned

"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.L.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.

JEWISH AIMS AND BRITISH INTERESTS

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

(Continued from last issue.)

Consider the birth of "Zionism." It was still a dream fifty years ago. Since then, one world war has brought it to fulfilment; a second now produces still greater ambitions. This opens sinister ways of thought, in the search for the origins of these two world wars, and I wish they were closed. It enshadows our future.

At the end of last century, the Jews were come to their heart's desire, if this was only the status, which Mr. Lipson defined. But, in 1895, Dr. Theodor Herzl, a Jew of Vienna, issued his pamphlet "The Jewish State," which called for the establishment of an independent Jewish State "in some suitable territory (not necessarily Palestine)" (yet in 1903 when the British Government OFFERED the Zionists UGANDA, it was refused, at the instance of the present Zionist leader, Dr. Chaim Weizmann!).

A wave of enthusiasm went through Jewry everywhere. A succession of Zionist Congresses was held in the next twenty years, and when the First World War began, Zionism was an organised power, supported by much wealth, and able to press political aims of the first magnitude through OUR Parliament [of Great Britain]. The Zionists at no time proposed, or admitted, that the Jews, if they obtained their own State, should yield any right of citizenship in other countries.

The grant of full equality to the Jews in Europe, therefore, led at one immense jump to the claim of those rights AND a Jewish State AS WELL.

Numerically strong nations have frequently conquered weaker ones. The idea of Zionism was that a numerically weak "nation" should conquer territory, through the political and armed strength of such great nations. At the same time, Jews should retain the right to become Prime Minister of Great Britain, Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Foreign Minister of Germany, Viceroy of India, Lord Mayor of London or New York, Prime Minister of France—anything and everything, everywhere.

The project is fascinating in its audacity. Most of our public leaders express sympathy for it, though none explain its full meaning thus.

Twenty-two years after the publication of Dr. Herzl's pamphlet, on November 2, 1917, Zionism gained its great victory. The British Government issued "The Balfour Declaration" addressed to a private citizen, Lord Rothschild. It said:—

"His Majesty's Government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate

the achievement of that object, it being understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in other countries."

Thus a British Government espoused the most audacious ambition in history: the conquest of Palestine and undiminished lights everywhere else! The Jews were to retain intact "rights and political status" enjoyed elsewhere; the "rights and political status" of the native inhabitants of Palestine, the Arabs, were not even mentioned. They were only to have their "civil and religious rights."

The pretext for this grave undertaking was, that it would win for our cause the Jews in Germany and Central Europe. It did not. They, like the established British and American Jews of THAT time, were happy in their countries, and were come to "full equality of rights," of which Disraeli and Lord Reading and many others were the proofs, living and dead. The Declaration was a surrender to the second group of Jews (behind whom lurked the third): those who sought to give the flesh-and-blood of territory to the doctrine of Jewish Nationalism. The Jews who were pleased, though not placated by it (for it only whetted their appetite), were the Jews of Poland and Russia and the more recent arrivals, from those parts, in America. If the Jews of Poland, between the wars, refused to feel themselves Poles, this was a main reason.

From that day anti-Semitism has grown apace—for the Palestinian Arabs are Semites, and the campaign waged against them by, the Zionists equals, in threats "tantamount to extermination," anything uttered by Hitler.

The memory of the Balfour Declaration, and its fruits, can only arouse deep misgiving about the results to which the Declaration of December 17, 1917, will lead. [The latter threatened the Germans with vengeance exclusively on behalf of the Jews; not a single word was said about reprisals for the greater crimes committed against Czechs, Poles, Serbs, Frenchmen, Hollanders, Norwegians, Greeks, Belgians and the rest.—Editor.]

(To be continued.)

TOWN HALL DEBATE ON FED. POWERS

(Concluded from last issue.)

Mr. K. J. Kenafick, secretary of the No Conscription Campaign, who was the third speaker in opposition to the transfer and EXTENSION of power proposals, said that he was expressing the viewpoint of Unionists. He considered the proposals of the Federal Government to be a fraud on the working class. Those proposals were being intentionally advanced to divert attention from the real problem, to keep the workers from moving to change the system of Capitalism, the aim of the Government being to place State Capitalism on a sure foundation.

The plan represented an attempt to impose industrial conscription, backed by military conscription.

The Curtin Government, he declared, is becoming increasingly anti-working class, as is evidenced by the conscription of coal miners and the taxation robbery.

Sir Keith Murdoch is a strong supporter of the proposal to centralise power in the Federal Government, and any differences of opinion between Mr. Menzies and Mr. Curtin concerning the proposal are merely a family quarrel.

We hear a great deal about the conflicting claims of Federal rights and State rights. "But," Mr. Kenafick asked, "what about peoples' rights?"

COMMENT: Whilst there is no doubt that Mr. Kenafick's statements are in accord with fact, and that his charges against this "workers' Government are fully justified, we regard it as unfortunate that he should have introduced the element of class-consciousness. The situation with which we are now confronted is one in which, if we face facts realistically, we must abandon as obsolete, the concept of "workers" and "capitalists." In any case, those terms require careful definition in order to guard against confusion of thought arising from their careless use.

The following words of that penetrating and clear thinker, C. H. Douglas, are commended to the consideration of those who still cherish the concept of class warfare:—

"Consider that 'class differences,' as distinct from cultural differences, are almost solely a question of money, yet official Socialism and Communism, which the international Press of every country advertise and favour in every way, never attack bankers or the money ring, or question the credit system" . . . "it is true to say that the cause of war is economic—that men do not fight because they want to fight, but they will fight if they believe that otherwise they will starve, just as it is indisputable that revolution always relies on a promise of economic betterment, although it rarely or never fulfils that promise. But exactly at this point we come

By "FOOTLE"

I perceive now, if I ever doubted it, that I shall never be certified as an economist. What I mean is, that having observed that our money system is not an ordinance of nature, that it is not altruistic in design and that bankers—the big five I mean—are not in business for their health—or ours, either—I have not in me that priceless humility which declares in hushed tones that while everything is obviously right with the system, no light is visible at the end of the tunnel. I can't do it. Montagu Norman can. And so can Mr. Geoffrey Crowther, editor of "The Economist."

The latter gentleman has written a book called "An Outline of Money," which is as frank about the unpleasant aspects of money creation as George Washington was about the cherry tree. It might be argued that the unpleasant aspects have become as difficult to dissemble as the ruined cherry tree.

Mr. Crowther does not dwell upon these aspects: he is really much more concerned to tell us what he knows about velocity of currency, the power of business to be financially self-liquidating and the thrilling but elusive theory of the ratio of savings to investment. Velocity of currency is a phenomenon, which ignores the cost of producing an article, and is concerned only with the speed with which a pound note can be induced to change hands.

This phenomenon, presented skilfully by any economist worth his salt, makes clear that no matter how much or how little money there is, there is always enough.

The power of business to liquidate itself means that all the money paid in costs by business is available to buy the product of said business—which makes it rather hard to see where the profit comes from unless someone puts that in too when no one is looking.

The ratio of savings to investment beloved of Prof. Keynes—oh, well, this is how I understand it: If you distribute a shilling in making toffee (and, like an economist, you aren't particularly fussy about making a profit) and the employee who receives your shilling buys back six pennyworth and pays away the other sixpence to a fellow to make brandy-balls, the chappie who has the brandy-ball sixpence can still buy your balance of toffee. What happens to the brandy-balls? Anyone can see you're not an economist. Economists are like sailors sometimes: they don't, care, even when at sea.

On the question of creation of credit, Mr. Crowther says this: "The bank does not create money out of thin air: it transmutes other forms of wealth into money." Or more precisely, "He takes the immobile wealth as his asset and gives his I.O.U. (which is money) in exchange." It is when I read this sort of thing that I realise my own crudity. I should never have attempted to convey the idea in that way. I should have said simply and tersely that the banker invents a title to someone else's property. Let us honour truth, however!

The writer is not downhearted about this: the arrangement has his entire approval. The only thing Mr. Crowther appears to regret is the difficulty of reviving the gold standard. The difficulty does not arise because the bankers cannot invent a title to that or anything else of a material nature, but because of the deplorable tendency of modern production to outstrip the store of gold.

I admire Mr. Crowther's patience in telling us what money is. He begins with the time when goats were currency: he deals with the disadvantages of goats as a medium of exchange; how they differ, how they are liable to fade away when the supply of old boots and tins runs low—or worse, in certain seasons how the community's currency might breed itself into serious inflation. But anyway, those were the days when it was dangerous to get a fellow's goat. Times have changed. No longer do we make goats our currency. Our currency makes goats of us.

Mr. Crowther does not dwell on the transition period when a goat became less of a goat and more of a symbol, when he became loved less for himself than what he could be exchanged for. The author is content to pass to the obvious advantages of precious metal over goats, as portable property. He is convinced that everyone wants gold because it is gold. He makes me quite ashamed of my own poor experience. I have known only a few people who wanted to own a gold coin because it was a gold coin, and even then it was only that the coin might be hung on a chain in defiance of the law.

Mr. Crowther is fair. He keeps on telling us so! He deals with "fallacies" as well as orthodox theories. A few lines are devoted in his book to Major C. H. Douglas who is particularly attacked over the savings and investment mess, which I represent to myself as the toffee v. brandy-ball scandal. Major Douglas, like you and me, is plainly no economist: he wants to know what happens to the brandy-balls!

The author plumbs the depths of my abysmal ignorance by mentioning three other originators of "fallacies." It is tantalising that the "fallacies" themselves are not mentioned, but anyhow, two gentlemen, Messrs. Foster and Catchings were joint inventors of one and a gentleman now deceased was the inventor of another. The last named, one J. A. Hobson, was as unknown to me as the first named. All I know of him is that he is not the originator of the famous choice, which bears the same name. According to Mr. Crowther, he presented a "somewhat different, and much more creditable, line of argument" (than Major Douglas's). Furthermore, he did that for many years with notable skill. Isn't it just like me to be ignorant of such a one and acquainted with

the foregoing recommendation, which, because of its transcendent importance, is again made in these columns in conclusion of our report and commentary on the Town Hall debate on the plot of politicians to impose the Slave State on their masters, the people. J. BRADSHAW.

the less "creditable" Douglas? Still, if he had a "fallacy" he'd probably got something.

When he wrote his painstaking book, Mr. Crowther was doubtless getting worried about the growing unpopularity of bankers and economists, and obviously aimed to place a reassuring finger on a tender place. But to my primitive imagining he looks less like a healer with a finger on a sore spot than like a diminutive hero with his thumb on the hole in a dam. He looks like being overwhelmed in the long run.

For his frankness in acknowledging the money trick I thank him. And even for his defence of the banker who invents money and issues same as debt (when the signs are propitious) I must also thank him. For he has provided me with something for which I have been searching for a long time—namely, a satisfactory short definition of an economist. Here it is:

An economist is a person who cannot tell the difference between owing money to yourself and owing it to the other fellow.

QUEENSLAND NOTES

The Bardon Progress Association has passed the following resolution:—

"That we renew our request for legislation providing for the basic wage for all service men and women on their discharge, and payment of same to be continued until suitable employment for them is obtained."

It was decided to send a copy of this resolution to our Federal Representatives, drawing attention to page 30 of the booklet, "Outline of Repatriation" (issued by the Repatriation Commission), under the heading, "Employment Allowance," which reads:

"While awaiting employment the applicant may be entitled to receive an allowance, etc."

You will note that the applicant MAY, not that the applicant SHALL, be entitled to receive an allowance. Thus provision is made to place our discharged service men and women at the tender mercy of some bureaucrat administering the Regulations to give them what HE considers fit, NOT WHAT THEY ARE JUSTLY ENTITLED TO.

On page 55 of this booklet it will be seen that the War Service Homes Scheme provides repayment of £1157/10/- over 50 years on a loan of £500: actually £657/10/- more than was borrowed. Glorious treatment, no doubt, for men and women who have offered their lives for their country!

It is to be hoped that all those interested in the welfare of our service men and women will apply to their Federal Representatives for a copy of this booklet, and see for themselves what really can happen to our service men and women on their discharge.

Wake up, Australians, and see that your returning service men and women are properly treated, and not left to starve in the gutter, as they were after the last war. Provision is being made, right now, for that to happen again, as you can see from the above, if you allow it.

—A. W. NOAKES.

Canberra Power-Lusters . . .

(Continued from page 1)

against the right of the individual yet seen in this country—an outrage condoned by Mr. Curtin's Government.

Was it the State Governments who established something very similar to the Gestapo and OGPU in this country? The rot started when Mr. Menzies introduced his National Security Regulations. (No wonder Mr. Menzies dared not allow a real public enquiry of all censorship, present AND PAST!) Curtin and Co. have made full use of them. Private letters have been opened; snoopers have endeavoured to provoke people into breaking regulations in order to prosecute. And many more unsavoury activities have been given some very necessary publicity in a few outspoken weeklies. While all this is going on Mr. Curtin's chief bureaucrats are conducting a campaign to condition us for the loss of more liberties and the continuance of more controls after the war. And yet this man has the hypocrisy to talk about the States having "totalitarian powers"! The same man said last year:

"If, in the years to come, the authority and responsibility of the Government for the ordering of the people's minds was not acknowledged, it would be easy for democracy to end in turmoil and disorder."

It is high time for the Australian people to throw off their party chains, face up to the public issues as free men and women, and tell Members of ALL parties at Canberra that there is a limit to the abuses they will stand. Only an overwhelming "NO" vote at the referendum will vindicate democracy in this country. Are YOU doing all in your power to help your fellow electors? Unless you are, you are tacitly agreeing that we should all submit to the new slavery—in which "the ordering of people's minds" will be used to convince them that they should expect no more than the "security" of a herd of cows.

In conclusion, I suggest that as many people as possible bring to the notice of their State Members Mr. Curtin's insulting remark concerning the State Governments. It should not be allowed to pass unchallenged.