

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.

EVERY FRIDAY THE NEW TIMES PRICE—FOURPENCE

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.)

Vol. 10 No. 23 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JUNE 9 1944 Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

# Industrial Conscription After This War?

## Open Letter to Every Australian Democrat

Dear Fellow-Australians,—in this open letter we shall examine Clause 2 of the Powers being sought by the Federal Government—the clause relating to "employment and unemployment." Although there are other clauses which are dangerous, Clause 2 contains the principal weapon which all the power-lusting bureaucrats and others are seeking. All Australians must face the fact that the granting of the power sought in Clause 2 would mean industrial conscription.

Dr. Evatt revealed quite clearly that this is the main power he is seeking, when, during the debate on the issue in the Federal Parliament, he refused to consider the amendments made to Clause 2 by the South Australian and West Australian State Governments because, he said, "without the power over employment and over industrial matters associated with employment, in that period which will follow the cessation of hostilities, the Commonwealth Parliament will be helpless." ("Hansard," March 15, 1944.) On the same day Dr. Evatt also said: "Power over employment and unemployment... is crucial. If this power be not referred to the Commonwealth... all the rest of the powers of the Commonwealth will be inadequate."

On March 23 Senator Foll asked Senator Ashley the following question: "Will the Government have power to introduce industrial conscription under these powers?" To which Senator Ashley replied: "Yes, but this Government has stated that it will not introduce industrial conscription."

Senator Ashley must rate the intelligence of the Australian people very low "if he expects them to believe that the Government is specially asking for such a tremendous post-war power—but doesn't propose to use it! Every student of history knows that all dictators have risen to power on promises which they invariably denied by their actions. What is the use of Federal Ministers such as Senator Ashley telling us

that we have nothing to fear, when their own Reconstruction "experts" are going around telling us openly that we must give up fundamental liberties after the war? Has any Federal Minister rebuked either Dr. Coombs or Dr. Lloyd Ross? No.

In fact, Mr. Curtin himself asserted in Adelaide last year: "It will be impossible to deal with the legacy of war unless machinery similar to that set up for war is maintained." In other words, it is intended that industrial conscription, etc., shall be continued! Dr. Lloyd Ross, one of the power-lusters who propose to run this country after the war, speaking out at the Summer School of Political Science at Canberra early this year, threatened that those who desired assurance of employment and security would have to endure a state of affairs, under which they might be sent anywhere.

Now, it is an interesting fact that all monopolists, whether they be industrial financial or political, are keen advocates of domination of the individual by a strong central Government. Thinking Australians will therefore be extremely interested to know that, during the last session of Parliament, although Dr. Evatt's socialist associates didn't mention International-financier Robinson's close affiliations with the Attorney-General, they quoted with strong approval an article in "The Australian Industrial and Mining Standard."

Let us look at Mr. Calwell's speech at Canberra on March 10. (Mr. Calwell is the gentleman who hates Menzies and the Communists and who supported the freedom-of-speech "guarantee" in the Powers Bill. He is also the same gentleman who upheld the use of censorship powers created by Menzies, to show the newspapers just what "freedom" they have; which action was vigorously supported by the Communists!)

"I refer to the 'Australian Industrial and Mining Standard,' which honorable members opposite will recognise is a journal published by a section of people who support their interests at election time. . . . In a leading article entitled, 'Powers Transfer Necessary,' in the issue of the 1st March, the following appeared: . . .

The transfer of the powers to the Commonwealth will not create any new despotic authority, but will merely pass them to one government which can exercise them uniformly and with an Australia-wide scope. . . ."

Well, it is so nice to see all the monopolists agreeing that the transfer of powers wouldn't "create any new despotic authority"! But, fellow-Australians, surely those of you who have closely observed the methods of the despotic authorities we have NOW, are not so simple as to believe that these authorities, already corrupted by too much power, are all going to become kindly, considerate souls always worried about your individual problems? That is the issue you must face, and face realistically.

Here is a further statement by Dr. Evatt which reveals all too clearly the type of post-war "new order" he has in mind:

"Security cannot be provided for unless there are efficient and comprehensive placement services, as under the Man-Power Regulations, to match men with jobs, and unless there is some restriction of the right of arbitrary dismissal which has hitherto characterised private industry." ("Hansard," March 15.)

That is a clear enough indication that there will be Manpower dictators bossing us about after the war—IF we are such fools as to vote "Yes" at the Referendum! (The present Manpower Authorities are already preparing to continue their jobs in the post-war era!) Well, that is certainly one way of solving the so-called unemployment problem—it is the way of Hitler, who was so successful that he abolished all unemployment in Germany in a very short time. Are you, fellow-Australians, who have always prided yourselves on your freedom of choice, going to allow yourselves to be trapped as the German people were trapped? Are you going to surrender your freedom of action, on the false assumption that that is the only way in which you can obtain food, clothing, shelter, and the amenities of civilisation? If we can only obtain security by becoming slaves, then let us cut out all this talk about "liberty," "democracy" and "the individual" immediately. Let us openly proclaim that this war is being fought to establish gangsterism everywhere. But you don't believe that, do you? You don't believe that your sons, your brothers, your husbands, your sweethearts, are going through hell, and many of them dying, in

(Continued on page 3.)

## NOTES on the NEWS

The Federal Council of the British Medical Association has issued a statement expressing alarm "at the continued drift in nutritional requirements," and pointing out that the latest reduction in the butter ration was made despite their opposition. They also expressed alarm at the plight of children and expectant mothers being unable to obtain their minimum food requirements. How do you like the results of theoretical planners meddling with practical producers—and opposing medical opinion?

## PARTIAL PECULATION OF PUBLIC PROVENDER?

"SYDNEY.—The Commonwealth has no intention of interfering with the weekly quota of two dozen eggs received by employes of the Egg Marketing Board. This was made clear to-day by officials of Food Control, who said the ration, which totalled about 6000 eggs a week, was no more than 'a drop in the ocean.' They pointed out that this week it was expected releases on the civilian market would be about 120,000 dozen—1,440,000 eggs. The Egg Controller (Mr. H. Souter) refused to comment. It was purely a matter for the Egg Board itself, he said."

This report (and its casual acceptance by the public), raises some odd possibilities for the future. It could affect such an apparently unrelated field as light fiction for instance.

How? Well, any planner knows that criticism, even implied criticism, of his actions, is anti-social. Hence, in the planned State of to-morrow, unsympathetic references, however oblique, to the foibles of the planning classes could invite official displeasure, and the writer anxious to "get on" may have to condition his literary outlook to modern social trends.

Thus, the embezzler, the guardian speculating with his ward's finances, the trusted friend who runs off with the absent one's wife, and other such stock villains of fiction, may be seen in a new and more favourable light.

No more will we be asked to despise the shrewd gentleman, who, entrusted with the dwindling water supply of his shipwrecked mates, drinks his fill on the sly. His obvious planning abilities will be recognised in the right quarters, and we shall find

him at the end of the book living happily ever afterwards, directing his less capable fellows.

Indeed, crawling being an accepted mode of progression in the well-run bureaucracy, we may well find the exploits of such new social heroes sung in admiring verse.

Like this:

### EGG-BOUND, Or, It Ain't No Sin.

"A drop in the ocean!" (the bank teller whined

To the constable holding his arm).  
"I took a few quid, but left millions behind:

I'll explain if you'll only keep calm.

"It's not really stealing—there's such a lot left.

And it's nobody's business but mine. You just ask the Egg Board, THEY know it's not theft

To swipe what one's paid for supplyin'.

"Now there's a fine crowd; for a fellow like me

They serve as a great inspiration. Their method of sharing out eggs, you'll agree.

Is one that commands admiration.

"They take all they want, then if any remain

The great unwashed herd gets a go. And if any go eggless, they shouldn't complain—  
It's their own fault for being so slow.

"If they really want eggs, they had better keep fowls,

Or else—and this course I applaud—  
They should cease from emitting their egg-hungry howls

And apply for a job on the Board.

—W.P.I.

## Butter for Ducks

At a meeting of farmers in Southern Rhodesia:

"After referring to the 'very high-handed action' taken in a recent case, when a farmer's wife was prosecuted for sending 5 lb. of butter as a present to a town friend, the producer in the accepted sense, but as it seemed he could not even give butter away, he was feeding his ducks on it. He was giving it away to the lower creation, as he understood the restrictions only applied to human beings.

"A discussion on the malnutrition of children as a result of better rationing followed . . ."

—"The Rhodesian Herald."

**AFFECTION APPEAL:** Professor E. J. Curran, of Kansas State University, has made a strong appeal to Australian girls to retain their affections for Australian boys, and not to be misled by the financial flushness of American servicemen, which is mostly temporary and due to war conditions. He said that when many American boys get back "their pay will not be sufficient to buy a good steak now and again." He then illustrated how high costs in U.S.A. offset the bigger money available. (Everywhere the banker controls the money supply, and most of the people are only permitted to receive sufficient to keep them alive just above the revolt level. When the people's incomes come to them through industry as costs in the prices of goods, purchasing power is not increased by bigger incomes. The remedy is supplementary incomes coming direct from the money factory without being added into the prices of goods.)

**STEINBERG'S STRATEGY:** A New York report, which naturally found space in the daily press, tells us that Mr. P. J. Clarey, one of Australia's delegates to the I.L.O. conference, was entertained by Dr. Steinberg, President of the Free-Land League for Jewish colonisation, which is anxious to settle Jewish refugees in the Kimberleys. It was, of course, most appropriate that immigration should be the subject of discussion on such an occasion and in such company. It was certainly an astute move to further Jewish objectives through innocent Mr. Clarey and an ever-obliging Press.

**PAINTING PRIORITIES:** A Ministry of Munitions decree, P.C.9, covering release of paint materials, lists priorities in the following order: Vehicles used by the Governor-General, State Governors, Ministers of the Crown, High Commissioner, Trade Commissioners, Consuls-General and Consuls—followed by public utility organisations, fire brigades and ambulance organisations. No priorities are specified for primary producers, transport vehicles or general utility purposes, and yet the above-mentioned functionaries are privileged in this matter. It is a strange situation when functionaries are rated above the people who sustain them.

**GOLD GOSSIP:** The Melbourne "Sun" of May 30 says "it is believed that U.S., Britain, Russia and China have already reached agreement on returning to the gold standard." Yet this matter has not been considered by the Parliaments of the first two countries. Therefore, if the report is true, it is clearly not intended that Parliaments,

or for that matter the coming conference, shall determine the issue. The question is: "Who does fix these things?" Even some American bankers appear to oppose the scheme on the ground that it is too grandiose—but they are merely managers and directors. The real currency riggers who determine policy are further back in the ambush. Such managers and directors only service the system.

**COMMUNIST CAPERS:** The disbanded U.S. Communists, in accordance with their usual cunning strategy, have formed a new Communist Political Association for "protecting American democracy" among other things! This followed the Federal Courts' finding "that the Communist Party advocated the forcible overthrow of the Government." Is it any wonder they had to develop a new guise? However, it is safe to say that the new name will make no difference to their tactics of stirring up strife. The Australian Communist Party has not decided to disband; apparently they think they can fool plenty of workers for some time yet under the present title. Well, it shouldn't be long.

**CURTIN'S CRUISE:** Some idea of the purpose of Mr. Curtin's trip to the Empire Conference is seen in the Press report of May 19 to the effect that Washington approves the decision favouring "plans for world organisation" (Federal Union), which is said to be in full agreement with U.S. endeavours. However, it should be remembered that neither Mr. Churchill, Mr. Curtin nor any other delegate has any right to commit their electors to any such proposal. Just the same, your parliamentary

(Continued on page 2.)

## Alberta Leads Again!

The Government of Alberta has accepted the following recommendations in regard to Land Tenure, made to them by the Alberta Farmers' Union. The Government has been asked, and has agreed to change the Provincial Constitution so as to provide for:—

(1) Security of tenure to all owners and tenants of land.

(2) Control of land titles to prevent gambling in land values.

(3) Protect debtor tenants from dispossession as a result of circumstances beyond their control.

(4) Ensure that owners will receive the benefit of all improvements that they make, and discourage the abuse of land or property by allowing it to deteriorate.



## AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

**A gentleman who writes to me rather frequently is wondering whether the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" and all the talk about them is not merely another red herring to divert attention from more important things, as, he says, some of the ideas included in the Protocols are so cold-blooded that they would have been kept secret had they been genuine.**

He also thinks I might get nearer to the mark if I give more attention to community morality. Apparently it was the intention of the Learned Elders that their plans SHOULD be kept secret, and the fact that they were obtained and published is a circumstance of great importance to the welfare of the people of the world. As to community morality, I find no fault with it, but I do find fault with the basic conditions which prevent so many individuals from reaching a higher personal standard. It is towards these fraudulent basic conditions that we are endeavouring to focus attention, and as such fraudulent conditions are the result of a POLICY, it is important that we get an understanding of that policy and identify the persons behind it. That is where the contents of the "Protocols" become so important because they specify very clearly what was planned to take place, and enable us to see that that is exactly what IS taking place.

Perhaps it would be as well to state again that I agree with Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc., of Hobart, that the plan which it is intended to impose upon us is one of centralised world control, and that one of the main essentials in bringing about the destruction of the scheme is to expose the real enemy (vide his broadcast address on 7/11/43). As I see it, this means that immediate attention should be given to the task of informing the community of the nature of the subversive POLICY referred to, and the identity of those responsible for it. This necessitates further reference to the "Protocols," and it is my intention to give as much information on the subject as is available to me.

Most countries have had plenty of good word-spinners, and the British Empire has always been second to none in this respect. Even Australia has had "a silver-tongued orator." Mr. Churchill is an outstanding example. Frequently his choice of words has been inspiring, and he has been a great force in helping to maintain the morale of the British people at such a high level during the period of their greatest strain. But eloquence is not sufficient. The test is what practical good is coming from it for the PEOPLE? The RESULTS have not been too good to date, and here again the authors of the "Protocols" have apparently left their mark. They regard our orators as "babblers," and they may be right. Read this interesting part of "Protocol" No. 3—

"Babblers inexhaustible have turned into oratorical contests the sittings of Parliament and Administrative Boards. Bold journalists and unscrupulous pamphleteers daily fall upon executive officials. Abuses of power will put the final touch in preparing all institutions for their overthrow, and everything will fly skyward under the blows of the maddened mob."

Who would now say that the abuses of power against which the PEOPLE are becoming restive are accidental? And who would say that certain people are not consciously working for the overthrow of our institutions?

There is another choice part of the same "Protocol" which should be read in conjunction with the extract just given. It is this:—

"In order to incite seekers after power to a mis-use of power, we have set all forces in opposition to one another, breaking up their liberal tendencies towards independence. To this end we have stirred up every form of enterprise, we have armed all parties, we have set up authority as a target for every ambition. Of States we have made gladiatorial arenas where a host of confused issues contend. . . . A little more, and disorders and bankruptcy will be universal."

Again we should ask, Is the confusion of ideas which surrounds us the result of accident?

In view of the conditions which preceded certain "revolutions," and of the "warnings" being issued that conditions after the war will be hard, it is interesting to refer again to Dr. R. McNair Wilson's book, "The Mind of Napoleon," in which, at page 217, he wrote: "Kings, in the strong grip of usury, poured out the blood of their subjects to make the world safe for a bastard and merciless finance. What that Finance had in store for the common people is known to the world." Napoleon's plan in its essence was "man against money, because it was

### "New Times" Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home or elsewhere every week are as follows:

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. HALF rates for members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F.

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

not directed against English sea power or against the English people, with whom Napoleon had no quarrel, but solely against the Masters of Money, not in England alone, but in Amsterdam and Hamburg and Geneva, and even in Paris itself, Money," he said, "has no motherland." Dr. McNair Wilson went on to say this:—

"Napoleon was still alive at St. Helena when Robert Owen and his son visited some of the new factories in victorious England which Lombard Street was conducting for England's greater glory. This is what they saw:

"Not in exceptional cases, but as a rule, we found children of ten years old worked regularly fourteen hours a day with but half an hour's interval for the midday meal, which was eaten in the factory. In some cases we found that greed of gain had impelled the mill-owners to still greater extremes of inhumanity utterly disgraceful indeed to a civilised nation. Their mills were run fifteen, and in exceptional cases sixteen, hours a day with a single set of hands, and they did not scruple to employ children of both sexes from the age of eight. We actually found a considerable number under that age. It need not be said that such a system could not be maintained without corporal punishment. Most of the overseers openly carried stout leather thongs, and we frequently saw even the youngest children severely beaten. We sought out the surgeons who were in the habit of attending these children, noting their names and the facts of which they testified. Their stories haunted my dreams. In some large fac-

ories, from one-fourth to one-fifth of the children were either cripples or otherwise deformed or permanently injured through excessive toil, sometimes by brutal abuse. The younger children seldom held out more than three or four years without serious illness, often ending in death. When we expressed surprise that parents should voluntarily condemn their sons and daughters to slavery so intolerable, the explanation seemed to be that many of the fathers were out of work themselves and so were, in a measure, driven to the sacrifice for want of bread."

Please note the phrase, "for want of bread." It will be mentioned again at a later stage. How like the period of the recent so-called "depression"! In the days referred to by Robert Owen, the youngsters had to be enslaved for the purposes of the EXPORT MARKET, just as it is being contemplated that the whole population will be enslaved after the present war for the very same thing. Dr. McNair Wilson explains that he quoted the experience of Robert Owen from G. D. H. Cole's "Life of Robert Owen." In the face of this, it is inexplicable to me that Mr. Cole has hitherto acted so favourably towards the system which produces such results. Twenty-five years ago, it was discovered that industry generates costs faster than it distributes money, and that so long as this continues to be the case, so long will the worker continue to be exploited and his wife face a never-ending struggle to make ends meet. Mr. G. D. H. Cole refused to acknowledge this fact, and attempted to ridicule those who sought to obtain an acceleration in the distribution of money. In this ill-advised course, he has played into the hands of our enemies. Unfortunately, men similarly blind to the FACT mentioned have been "selected" to plan our future living conditions, and they seem so anxious to save us from the "employer" that they have quite overlooked the greater need to save us from the counterfeiting money-lender.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2, 4th June, 1944. (To be continued.)

## WHEAT GROWERS NEED A FAIL DEAL

**The present Federal Government's policy toward the wheat-growing industry appears to be twofold: (1) Thoroughly hamper and discourage the growers by means of gross underpayment, the Mortgage Bank mockery, excessive man-power restrictions, and bureaucratic interference. (2) When THIS has sufficiently sabotaged the industry, insist that "private enterprise has failed" and that the only remedy is nationalisation of land, collective farming and MORE bureaucratic control!**

Further evidence of this twofold policy was given in the House of Representatives on February 25 by Mr. Adermann (Maranoa, Queensland), when he followed up Mr. Alex Wilson's speech, which we quoted last week, and said:—

"To assist the wheat-growing industry, the Commonwealth Government should bear the total cost of and responsibility for all surplus wheat. By 'surplus wheat,' I mean that portion of the harvest in excess of Australia's own requirements. The adoption of my suggestion would assist to bring about a speedier payment. It is a national obligation that should be borne by the Commonwealth Government. If Australia consumes 70,000,000 bushels, leaving a surplus of 40,000,000 bushels, why should growers wait until the whole of the crop is realised before they receive their final payment? That wheat will be required by other countries, and the Commonwealth Government should accept it and pay for it.

"At present, the Government is receiving up to 5/7½ a bushel for wheat, but payments of only 4/1 1-3 and 3/- are being made.

"Although I do not wish to appear parochial, I point out that wheat-growers in Queensland are worse off under the present [Federal] scheme than they were before it operated. Under the Queensland Wheat Board, the first advance payments were in excess of 3/- a bushel. Prior to the war, farmers netted about 4/- a bushel. That price is not equalled by the average price for Australian wheat at the present time. On the basis that I have described, farmers could grow unlimited quantities of wheat.

"When the Minister visited Queensland recently, he threatened wheat-growers that if they failed to produce more wheat, he would acquire their land and provide labour to work it.

"I refer the Minister to the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Curtin) on the coal-mining industry, and suggest to him that wheat-growers will no more be driven than will coal-miners. Apart from that, I challenge him to carry out his threat. It is not practicable. The wheat-growers of Queensland or of any other State cannot and will not grow wheat for a price less than the cost of production. They have yet to be convinced that the average payments for the Australian wheat harvest exceed the cost of production.

"The Commonwealth Government is offering about 4/- a bushel for the first 3000 bushels and 2/- a bushel for the balance of the crop. If the quantity of surplus be considerable, the average price will not equal the cost of production.

"The sale of 3000 bushels at 4/1 1-3 will yield £618/15/-, and no one with any knowledge of primary production will be prepared to attempt to grow wheat on land compulsorily acquired by the Minister while such a low return is offering. How could they obtain machinery—tractors are unprocurable now—and pay for fuel and

seed wheat, and planting and harvesting charges? On a gross income of £618/15/-, a wheat-grower would starve before the end of the financial year. The farmer also runs the risk of having his crop ruined by adverse weather. Obviously no one would take the Minister's threat seriously.

"I urge him to allow Queensland farmers, with the present labour and machinery, to produce more wheat, and so obviate the necessity for transporting 400 tons of wheat daily from the southern States. The increased production can be achieved without additional manpower; the machinery is available and is now lying idle.

"Strangely, Queensland has been affected conversely to the southern States. This year, the wheat-grower has had a good crop, but lost heavily through floods. One year he loses because of drought and the next year because of floods. It is not right that he should be called upon to bear all the interest charges other than those mentioned by the Minister."

### GERMAN REARMAMENT BETWEEN THE WARS

"Then certain incidents which had occurred abroad became known. There was the submarine incident involving Captain Canaris, who was to become chief of German military espionage under Hitler. He founded a secret submarine shipyard in Vigo, Spain, the Versailles Treaty having forbidden submarine construction in Germany. The Spanish shipyard was too small for quantity production, but afforded an opportunity to keep abreast of technical developments. Secret German aeroplane factories in Russia served a similar purpose. The Soviet Government had granted permission to its Rapallo partner to construct these factories, which were supervised by a builder of genius, who was certainly far from completely occupied by his world-renowned stove factory in Germany. In the Reichswehr factories in Russia, Professor Junkers prepared to gain even greater renown by building aeroplanes, their construction within Germany having been forbidden by the peace treaty. In Russia he and his staff of engineers could follow the rapid technical developments in the aircraft industry. Unfortunately, he was entirely lacking in self-control. He had several disputes with the Reichswehr Ministry as a result of the costs of his enterprise, and at one point went so far as to file a formal legal complaint against it. Under Hitler, he would have paid for so much temerity with his life. Under Weimar, he only caused embarrassment to the authorities."

—Leopold Schwarzschild, in "World in Trance" (Hamish Hamilton).

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1)

representative should be reminded of this fact. It's up to YOU to keep this point before your Federal Member. NOW is the best time to do it.

**COMPULSION CAMPAIGN:** Figures released by Mr. Wurth (Director General of Manpower), published in the Melbourne "Sun" of May 16, disclose that for the 15 months' period ending on March 31 this year, 5412 persons were conscripted into occupations against their will. In other words, they had imposed on them the very thing we are supposed to be fighting against in this war. The report glossed over this ugly fact by pointing out that large numbers were transferred voluntarily—which in no way lessens the victimisation of 5412 people who previously laboured under the delusion that they were living under a democratic government.

**MALIGNED MINERS:** Working in relays, 20 miners shovelled for six hours before they located the body of one of their mates who was killed when more than 200 tons of coal fell on him in the Pacific Colliery (N.S.W.). Doubtless every able bodied miner available would have done likewise if required, yet these are the men maligned by the daily press from time to time when they endeavour to obtain safer conditions to prevent such tragedies, or to obtain a more reasonable financial reward for their unhealthy and dangerous work. These men, and others like them, are also insulted from time to time by those "change of heart" advocates who, because of a complex peculiar to themselves, can see nothing but evil in others.

**PATON'S PATTERN:** Another planner, in the person of Professor Paton, has been ushered into the public arena to tell us that Australians are not bad chaps really—but—just a little bit raw! He tells us that we are too fond of improvising (initiative), and then in a subtle way gives himself and other Planners a boost by saying that in the past we have been too suspicious of the trained attack on any problem. Then came the blast for maintaining the bureaucracy (trainers): "It should be recognised that the war-time departments were not mushroom growths, and that it could not be expected that they would be whittled to the bone at the end of the war." This word-spinner may go a long way unless the revealing spotlight is kept on him.

**POST-WAR POINTERS:** A Press report on Trades Hall discussion of post-war employment indicates that a few rays of light may be entering the cranium of one or two of the speakers. Mr. D. Thompson (Painters Union) is reported as questioning whether the building trades will absorb the numbers suggested, having regard to pre-fabrication and other modern methods; but he said all other avenues will need to be surveyed. Another speaker, Mr. Maxwell (Tramways Union), said: "There was a lot of wishful thinking regarding employment schemes—there must be monetary reform." This chap also objected to the building of 80,000 houses with "eight-foot ceilings," under which a disgusted six-foot man would only need to raise his arms to displace the tiles. Well, maybe these unionists will knock some sense into the executive—some day. —OBH

### RIGHT OR WRONG?

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—At the Summer School of Political Science, held in Canberra recently, Dr. Evatt was reported to have given his opinion, "that the individual no longer had a right to choose his own vocation."

As an opinion it is characteristic of the policy favoured by Dr. Evatt, but coming from a man of his parts it would be more acceptable if supported by answers to some pertinent questions, such as:—

(1) If I, Individual No. 1, no longer have the right to choose my own vocation, what other individual (No. 2) has the right to choose it for me?

(2) If Individual No. 2 now has my former right, who (Individual No. 3) authorised the transfer of that right?

(3) Who gave Individual No. 3 the "right" to transfer anybody else's right? And so on, ad lib.

I suggest that neither Dr. Evatt, Dr. Coombs, nor Dr. Lloyd Ross can give satisfactory answers to these questions, and I have a strong suspicion that when Dr. Evatt used the words "no longer had a right" he really meant "no longer should be allowed." In that case was the opinion begotten by his own intention?

It seems to me that an individual's rights can be transferred only by consent of the individual himself—or taken from him by superior force or trickery, which, in plain English, means robbery.

—Yours, etc., F. H. AULT, 69 Strathalbyn-street, East Kew, E.5.

### BIG BUSINESS AND SOCIALISM

The close connection between Big Business and revolutionary socialism is strikingly indicated by Trotsky in his "History of the Russian Revolution," page 29:—

"The giant enterprises, above 1000 workers each, employed in the U.S.A. 17.8 per cent. of the workers, and in (pre-revolution) Russia, 41.4 per cent. . . . In Moscow the percentage is even higher, 57.3 per cent."

It is notorious that the large factories of the modern British industrial combines are the primary breeding grounds of Communism, and, that revolutionary Socialism favours their establishment, as distinct from the compact, efficient, individually-owned business.



## GOVT. ROBS SMALL LAND-BUYERS!

Those who believe in socialism-i.e., control by Government Departments—would be well advised to read the following extracts from "Hansard" concerning small land-buyers' dealings with the Commonwealth Department of the Interior. They bear out the oft-repeated statement that Government Departments have neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be damned:

Speaking on March 2, Mr. T. White (Balaclava, Vic.) said: I ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Curtin) to investigate complaints regarding the acquisition by the Department of the Interior of land adjacent to aerodromes . . . the owners may have been induced to pay more than a fair price for the land, but the offers of the Department are so contemptuous that the owners have been compelled to form an association for the protection of their interests. They have showered members of Parliament with letters, but when we show them to the Minister for the Interior (Mr. Collings), he sometimes raises the price of a block by a pound or two, and at other times refuses to do anything. Recently, a deputation of honourable members endeavoured to wait upon him to discuss the subject, but he declined to see anyone but the Minister for Labour and National Service (Mr. Holloway). In January last the department paid £75 for blocks for which it is now offering £37. The owners of blocks acquired by the department have, over the years, paid rates and charges for street construction. Some of the prices paid by the Government for the land acquired are so low that they are by a long way insufficient to discharge the remainder of the money still owed on the land, and these debts remain to be paid. It is useless for the Government to say that the district has not improved. Reference to the reports of the Railways Commissioners proves that the district is developing. Passenger journeys from the North Essendon station have increased each year since the land was subdivided in 1924 . . .

Mr. Pollard: The owners have the right to arbitration.

Mr. Holt: No person would spend a couple of hundred pounds on a law suit in connexion with a £100 block.

Mr. White: How could such persons go to law against the Government? They have formed an association in defence of their interests. I could cite dozens of instances of unreasonable offers made to block-holders, but I shall content myself with citing only two. The first instance is that of a widow whose husband won the Distinguished Conduct Medal in the last war and subsequently died from war injuries, leaving her with five young children. He paid £115 for his block. His widow states that he mortgaged the block with the Bank of Australasia for £50, but the best the Department of the Interior will do is to offer £25 for the unencumbered estate in fee simple, free from all mortgages, charges, liens and interests over or upon the land in full satisfaction of her claim. . . . The second instance is that of a man who has paid £156 for his block, plus £34 for road-making and £30 for rates and taxes, and was offered only £52. The land was taken. The Department did not offer to rent it. It was acquired without any cognisance being taken of the rise of prices. Wages and the cost of goods have risen, and why is it that land values must not rise?

Mr. Curtin: The honorable member says that the owners of the blocks have formed an association and that no individual has sufficient interest which would justify him in incurring legal costs?

Mr. White: They have offered to the Department independent valuations, but the Minister for the Interior has refused to entertain the idea. In order to show the attitude of that Minister, I shall read an extract from one letter I have received:

"The Minister devoted the first half-hour of the meeting to a lecture delivered of course, by himself mainly on himself. At the end of this time I drew his attention to the fact that we were there to talk to him. . . ."

I have numerous instances of the Department offering only £15 compensation for the acquisition of a block which cost £100. The unsympathetic attitude of the Commonwealth towards these people is not right. A great many of them do not want to sell their land. Some of them have been paying for it for twenty years at the rate of a few shillings a week in order that one day they may be able to build a home on it. . . ."

Mr. Bowden (Gippsland, Vic.) followed Mr. White: I assure the Prime Minister that the low values that the Department of the Interior is placing on land acquired for the purposes of the Services is a serious matter to those from whom the land is acquired. Not all those affected live in Melbourne. They live all over Victoria.

Mr. Pollard: All over Australia!

Mr. Bowden: In my electorate there are many of them. I have dozens of letters protesting bitterly against what the writers term a gross injustice. Although I know that land can be acquired "at a reasonable valuation," it is an injustice that people, who have paid £100 for a block of land and still owe £70 on it, should be given only £40 in full payment. That leaves them still £30 in debt and they do not even have the land. The circumstances require the most searching inquiry, because what they have paid in rates and taxes often amounts to more than the Government is prepared to pay for the land. If this were done by private enterprise, we should call it "robbery"!

Mr. Menzies: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowden: There is no other word for it. The Government is using its powers to the disadvantage of the people, many of them poor. The Minister himself knows that many poor people buy a block of land on the time-payment plan and regard it as something in the nature of a savings bank account. They hope eventually to have a "nest egg" for their old age. . . . I protest most strongly against the attitude taken up by the Minister for the Interior (Senator Collings) who refused to admit to his . . . honorable members, some of whom had travelled hundreds of miles to see him about this matter.

Mr. Holt: He would not allow us in, but he allowed a few of his colleagues in.

Mr. Bowden: We have a duty to the people as well as to the Government, and owners who have been offered on the take-it-or-leave-it basis about 2/- in the £1 for their land demand that that duty be done. The Government should err on the side of generosity to these people rather than deprive them of their rest egg by paying preposterously low prices for land it needs.

Mr. Holt (Fawkner, Vic.) also mentioned the above matter: The honorable member for Balaclava and I know of instances where the valuation offered by the Government department was less than one-half of the valuation imposed on that land for the purpose of municipal rating and land tax.

Mr. Curtin: For municipal rating? Is the honorable member sure of that?

Mr. Holt: Yes, I shall cite a specific instance. The wife of a member of the Australian Imperial Force wrote to me:

"Some time ago I purchased land at North Essendon, adjacent to the Essendon aerodrome. Recently I received a letter of notification from the Minister for the Interior intimating that the Commonwealth Government had decided to acquire this land, and requesting me to submit a claim for compensation in respect of my block. In response to my claim for £60 I received an offer for £27 from the Department of the Interior. I need scarcely say that this offer is inadequate; in fact is scandalous. In order to emphasise how unfair is the offer made, I would point out that the Commissioner of Taxes assessed land tax on the purchase price and the municipal authorities rated the property on an almost similar valuation. I am reliably informed that land in the vicinity has been sold recently at prices considerably higher than that offered by the Government."

I do not wish to indulge in "tear-jerking" tactics, but I assure honorable members that some of these instances are genuine cases of hardship.

Two weeks later, on March 16 Mr. White complained that, although Mr. Curtin had said on March 2 that he would have an investigation on land valuations, he had later written him a letter defending the Department of the Interior's valuation methods.

Mr. White continued: Let us see how the system works in practice. Various offers are made for a block, sometimes as many as four, and a sort of bargaining goes on between the Department and the owner. In some instances, the amount offered was not sufficient to meet the unpaid instalments on the land. In one instance, a woman received from the Department an offer of £55 for her two blocks, on which she still owes £80. In another case the purchase price of the block was £100, and the owner was offered £45/15/-, although he still owes £45 so that he may receive 15/-, while the amount of £55 already paid will be a complete loss. A later case, since the matter was first discussed, was that of a Miss Malone, who paid £150 for her block, plus £30 for road-making, plus rates and taxes since 1928, and she was offered £68. She was originally offered £54, but when she declined to accept that amount the offer was raised to £68. This is the sort of unfair letter that is sent to owners in such circumstances by the Department.

"In an endeavour to arrive at an amicable settlement in this matter, however, I am prepared to recommend to the Minister provided that you will intimate your acceptance thereof, an increase in the offer already made to £68 for an unencumbered estate in fee simple free from all mortgage charges liens and interest over or upon the land in full satisfaction of your claim.

The method followed by the Department is incomprehensible. In fact, there appears to be no method at all. It makes an offer to some person who, it is thought, will not make a fuss. If the person complains, the Department raises the offer by a few pounds. It may even raise the offer two or three times. The Act requires the Government to take cognisance of the prices at which land in the vicinity has recently been sold. The records show that this district is developing rapidly. . . . The Minister's attitude seems to be that the land holders should take action against the Government if they are not satisfied with the compensation offered, but I ask them to remember that most of these people are in poor circumstances, and cannot afford to institute legal proceedings against the Government. . . . The Prime Minister should reconsider his attitude towards them and not go back upon his original promises.

## Centralisation of Power in India

On the second reading of the India (Attachment of States) Bill in the House of Commons, Mr. Godfrey-Nicholson (Famham), who spoke late in the debate, pointed out that the assumption in every single speech had been that the Bill was one to attach smaller States to larger States in Kathiawar and Gujarat for purposes of better administration. "That is not correct in the slightest degree. Neither Kathiawar nor Gujarat is mentioned in the Bill, although it may well be that the present intention of the present Government of India is to apply this Bill in that direction, if the Bill is passed. But I would direct the attention of hon. Members to the Bill itself. It says that any Indian States not mentioned in Divisions I. to XVI. of the Table of States in Part II. of the First Schedule to the Act of 1935 may be attached—in other words, may be extinguished, for that is what it may amount to . . . it appears to me that the States not mentioned in Divisions I. to XVI. in Part II. of the First Schedule of the Government of India Act, 1935 far from having a population of only 800,000 . . . (have a population of) over 3,000,000 . . . I do not know where many of these States are outside Gujarat and Kathiawar. I myself only know one at first-hand—which is in Orissa. It is a small State excellently administered. . . ."

The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Butler, who replied to the Debate in the absence of the Secretary of State for India, replied to this point: ". . . The provision of this particular Schedule of the Government of India Act, which I remember something about, was drafted for convenience. In the language used in the Bill itself, it covers almost exactly the area which the House has before it, and that is the area of Kathiawar and Gujarat. But there are some other States, really very few, which would be affected. They are small States of exactly the same character of those which we are dealing. . . ."

Mr. Godfrey-Nicholson: "Could my right hon. Friend tell me how the difference between 800,000 and over 3,000,000 is got over?"

Mr. Butler: ". . . I accept the significance of my right hon. Friend's figure, but I would like to investigate further, before the Committee stage, the number of extra States likely to be affected."

## FEDERAL POWERS REFERENDUM

(Report from the No Conscription Campaign, Temperance Hall, Russell-street, Melbourne.)

Several meetings have already been devoted this year to this subject, so vitally important for the liberties of the Australian people. One of the speakers was our president the late Mr. Maurice Blackburn, this address being the last he ever gave. "Mr. Blackburn was no supporter of these proposals and stated quite definitely that he did not at all relish seeing such power put into the hands of men like Mr. Curtin and Dr. Evatt, whom he did not trust to use it in the interests of the Australian people. These proposals would not improve the position of Australians, and would probably make things worse.

Despite the lamented loss of Mr. Blackburn, the organisation is pushing ahead with its campaign against the Powers Bill. Speakers and debating teams are being arranged, and a pamphlet is being prepared. The first blow in this more intensive campaign will be struck when, on Sunday, June 11, at the above hall, Mr. E. J. Grogan will attack the Powers Bill with his customary vigour and eloquence.

Our campaign for liberty and democracy and against regimentation and totalitarianism can be made much more effective by increased financial support, which would enable us to have bigger advertisements, more pamphlets, and larger halls. Active workers in the cause would also be welcome.

So, if you really believe in liberty and democracy, and want to see them preserved, help us to help you by sending a donation to the secretary at the above address. All donations will be acknowledged, and any offers of help greatly appreciated.

The fight against military and industrial conscription is not being relaxed, and we want you to help us in it.

—K. J. KENAFICK, Hon. Secretary.

## PUBLIC DEBATE

A debate between Mr. C. S. Cavanagh (New Economic Order) and Mr. C. W. Sandford (Socialism) will take place at the Assembly Hall, 156 Collins-street, Melbourne, on Thursday next, June 15, at 8 p.m. Subject: "Inflation." This debate was arranged by the Club of Political Thought.

## RINGWOOD MEETING

A meeting will be held at the Ringwood Town Hall (small hall) on Monday next, June 12, for the purpose of discussing the dangers of the Powers Bill. The meeting has been arranged by the citizens of Ringwood, and it is to be hoped that the public will avail themselves of this opportunity to hear this vital question fully discussed.

## HOUSING PROBLEM

In the Melbourne Town Hall (lower hall), on Tuesday, June 13, at 8 p.m., an address on housing in Czechoslovakia, illustrated by moving pictures, will be given, and followed by an address on the Equitable Co-operative Society's building scheme, which is of special interest to those wanting a home. Admission free. Further information from the Equitable Co-operative Society, Bradshaw Building, Prince's Bridge, Melbourne, S.C.4. —Adv.

## Industrial Conscription After This War

(Continued from page 1.)

order that Dr. Evatt's "placement services" can turn them into industrial conscripts after the war. A "yes" vote at the Referendum would be a vote for slavery, a vote to allow men like Dr. Lloyd Ross to decide the details of your future for you.

On March 15, Dr. Evatt also said that the National Parliament must have "full powers to deal with the terms and conditions of employment." How do you like that? It seems that YOU would have no say in the terms or conditions; there would be no question of you saying that you would not work or go where you were ordered, because the authorities would have the power either to deny you the right to work elsewhere or to send you to prison.

What a price to pay for politicians' promises of "security"!

In order to try and justify his arguments in favour of post-war Manpower Authorities, Dr. Evatt attacked private enterprise. Several times at Canberra during the debates on the Powers Bill he quoted from a speech of Mr. Herbert Morrison, the British Socialist, who has openly proclaimed his faith in Government-by-regulation: "The right of private enterprise to inflict the penalties of unemployment and want in its own interests has been seriously and, I believe, decisively challenged. . . . The whole of the emphasis we are increasingly placing on full employment means the denial of this right to throw men on the scrap-heap." What ridiculous nonsense is this? Does Dr. Evatt really believe that during the depression tens of thousands of Australian business men deliberately went bankrupt and put their employees out of work, so that in some mysterious way they might "benefit" themselves? This sort of talk is an insult to our intelligence, and the sooner Dr. Evatt is told so the better for all of us. Dr. Evatt says there must be "some restriction of the right of arbitrary dismissal which has hitherto characterised private industry." This is more nonsense—it can only mean that, irrespective of whether his firm was paying or going bankrupt, an employer would not have the right to dispense with the services of any of his employees (and they might have to go on working without any wages!). During the parliamentary debates no Government spokesman was able to say just what the position would be then—the obvious reason being, of course, that the rank-and-file Members just simply did as they were told and have little idea of what can be done if the Federal Government obtains the Powers sought.

If a Government authority can force a firm to employ people irrespective of whether the firm needs and desires them or not, it is obvious that if the firm refuses to "co-operate" the authority can close it down by denying it any manpower or materials. A newspaper or wireless station critical of the authorities could be closed in the same way.

What hypocrisy it is to blame private enterprise for the fact that we had unemployment before the war! Private enterprise is dominated by those who control the banking system. You business men and primary producers know that. The supply of money can either be increased or decreased by those who control the banking system. During the depression years, the financial-controllers seriously reduced the money-supply at a time when private enterprise was able and willing to supply sufficient goods and services to provide every family in Australia with a much higher standard of living than they had. Is the Federal Government asking for more power to deal with those money-controllers—the big bankers? No, it is not. And I am not aware that the controllers of the banking system are opposing more control (over the people) for Canberra. They are prepared to work in with any Government that will crush private enterprise, build monopoly, and regiment the people.

Needless to say, there will be clashes between the various power-lusting groups to see who is eventually going to do all the proposed controlling (of the people) after the war; but for you, fellow-Australians, industrial conscription would be just as much slavery no matter by whom you were controlled.

There is undoubtedly a big job ahead in ensuring that we obtain security AND freedom after the war, in ensuring that private enterprise is allowed to work as it should and could work, and in ensuring that individuals have freedom to accept or reject jobs. Surely we Australians have enough confidence in ourselves to believe that we can build a society in which there will be freedom of association between employers and employees? If we have—and I believe we have—we will overwhelmingly reject post-war industrial conscription by voting "No" at the Referendum and working for a "No" vote.

Sincerely yours, ERIC D. BUTLER.

[Note: This is the fourth of a series of Open Letters issued by the Association to Defend British Culture. Further copies can be obtained from the United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, or from the secretary of the above Association, 71 Jordan-street, Malvern. The price is 1/- per dozen, plus postage. Help the fight to preserve our British liberties by distributing copies of this Open Letter.]



# "DOING BUSINESS WITH THE DEVIL"

By HENRY TAYLOR. (Condensed from the "Strand Magazine.")

**America delivering petrol to Franco. The Japs selling rubber to Russia. British tungsten going to the Germans. The Turks buying anti-tank guns from the Nazis. The list of what appear to be the bewildering contradictions of the war is long. The reasons are many.**

Possibly I can tell you why, based on my own observations and judging from discussion I have had lately with government leaders abroad.

Spain has 40 per cent, less acreage under cultivation than before the civil war. Spain lost her farm animals, her railways. Spain's first problem is food distribution. She can distribute what food she has only by lorry, and she can grow more only by working tractors. Yet Spain has no petrol.

Hitler's ambassador, Dr. Eberhard von Stohrer, offered Spain petrol, provided Spain would permit the Germans to refuel Nazi and Italian submarines in obscure Spanish ports. Spain rejected the offer.

While benefiting from this rebuff to the Germans, could we have refused to send the petrol ourselves? Apparently not. The United Nations agreed that Spain should be allowed to import petrol. But we do not make a gift of petrol to Spain. It is exchanged for Spanish products needed badly in the United Nations' economy of necessity; chiefly cork, olive oil, mercury, and iron ore. It was, and continues to be, a two-way scheme.

Also on the Iberian Peninsula, the wolf-ram situation arose in Portugal. Wolfram is the chief ore of the metal tungsten. Germany lacks tungsten and must have it. Portugal has tungsten, ranks high in the world in wolfram production, and business is booming in Northern Portugal, where it is mined.

At this point, trade with the devil enters the picture. The chief wolfram mines in Portugal are British-owned. Good, you say; that means Great Britain controls this strategic material; the enemy must be writhing.

You forget the enemy is as ruthless towards neutral countries' economies as towards belligerent countries' armies. Hitler threatened to occupy Northern Portugal if the Portuguese Government attempted to protect the full rights of the British mine-owners in Portugal, to the degree that the British could take for themselves all their own wolfram output and allow none to be sold to German agencies. The German ambassador in Lisbon pointed out that German occupation would mean that the British would get none of their own wolfram and the Germans would get all of it.

Salazar, Prime Minister of Portugal, accepted this challenge as far as his own nation's integrity was involved. "Wolfram or no wolfram," he told the Germans, "Portugal will not be blackmailed into putting pressure on the British or anyone else."

"Portugal is Britain's ally," Dr. Salazar reminded me in Lisbon; "Portugal is also Britain's oldest ally. It is the oldest alliance in existence, and it will not be turned into a club to bludgeon our friends."

But the British authorities knew that neither Portugal nor they themselves could prevent German occupation of Northern Portugal, so they decided to take only a percentage of their own wolfram. The balance went into a pool and was offered in the open market.

As for the rubber Russia gets from the Japs, the machinery of international law transports this trade with the devil in American ships under the Russian flag. Aid to Russia required ships. Vessels owned by American companies were taken over by the United States Maritime Commission. A number of these cargo ships were then given to Russia under Lend-Lease. The ships were loaded with American war materials for Russia and have been sailing back and forth across the Pacific ever since.

The route to Vladivostok, Nikolaevsk, and other Siberian ports means passing through Japanese coastal waters. But Russia and Japan are not at war. If Japan stopped one of these ships from America, it would be a belligerent act against Russia, and apparently Japan does not wish to risk that.

The Japs have a trade agreement with Russia, and Russia demands all the rubber it can.

In Northern Europe—Scandinavia—the barter centres in Sweden. "The problem of trading with the belligerents begins with the map," Per Albin Hansson, Prime Minister of Sweden, told me in Stockholm. "Sweden lives on coal," he said, "one piece at a time."

In World War 1, Sweden's coal came from Wales, for the ports of Norway were open

and shipments across the North Sea could reach Sweden through those ports. Denmark was neutral and free. Sweden had access to the world.

In World War 2, Sweden is entirely surrounded by belligerents and occupied areas—Germany, Russia, Finland, Norway and Denmark. Sweden's coal must come from the Ruhr and Poland. The Germans license each shipment, a separate permit for every cargo, so that Sweden's supply may be shut off at any time and her industrial life crippled. Sweden is "fed through a cage" by German coal.

For vital imports which Germany cannot or will not supply, and which we are willing to supply in order to assist Sweden's rearmament and to fortify our goodwill, Sweden must obtain Germany's permission to let our deliveries through.

Such shipments are sent to the Swedish port of Goteborg. The Germans blockade Goteborg. Therefore, Sweden must first obtain the co-operation of the British Ministry of Economic Warfare in London and the American Board of Economic Warfare in Washington to obtain what she must have, and then negotiate with the Germans in Berlin to let the delivery pass the German patrol boats. It is difficult to work that out, even a few times a year. And whenever the United Nations require that the Swedes ship back in exchange the Swedish products which they need, the Germans have a habit of saying no.

Switzerland, too, is "fed through a cage" by German coal. In exchange, Hitler demands Switzerland's milk, butter and cheese, and with these dairy products he insists on certain machine tools, precision instruments, and several valuable armaments which Switzerland originally designed for Russia.

Germany negotiated a grandiose commercial treaty with Turkey in 1941 through Karl Clodius, and Hitler's ambassador to Turkey, the wily Franz von Papan. His Excellency Sukru Saracoglu, the Prime Minister of Turkey, described this pact to me in Ankara. "Over many years," Mr. Saracoglu explained, "we have been buying German machinery. As this equipment began to wear, spare parts from Germany became the most pressing need in the entire Turkish economy. Of course, spare parts for these replacements were obtainable nowhere but from German factories in which the equipment was originally made."

The Clodius Pact, providing for the exchange of goods valued at 45,000,000 Turkish pounds, centred in this matter of replacement parts. The Germans agreed to deliver the replacement parts and to send Turkey certain new war materials, including anti-aircraft guns and anti-tank guns. In exchange, the Germans agreed to buy Turkey's tobacco, grain, tanning materials, and other products, but German's real interest was in a provision to obtain Turkey's priceless chrome, vital in alloy steels.

Switzerland, Russia, and Germany together figured in the largest single delivery of machinery that has taken place in the war.

Citroen, the Ford of France, had an immense plant, converted to aeroplane manufacture, at Strasbourg, France. It was a stone's throw from the Rhine, within hailing distance of the German border to the east and within seventy miles of the Swiss border to the south.

Shortly before the fall of France, the Citroen management loaded every tool, all the dies, and every item of machinery on 800 lorries and sent them west across France to Bordeaux. When the lorries reached Bordeaux, the German blitz was ravaging Northern France. As the Germans stormed south and entered Paris, it looked as though the machinery would soon be captured. The company directors decided to send the cavalcade back across France into neutral Switzerland. By the time arrangements had been completed with the Swiss Government and the winding line had left Bordeaux for Geneva, it was too late. As the lorries and their cargo approached the Swiss border the entire cavalcade was captured by the Germans. That night German soldiers drove the unpacked lorries back to Strasbourg, completing a round trip of 1000 miles. From Strasbourg they crossed the Rhine into Germany.

The Germans, however, did not know what to do with this vast prize. It takes time to assemble an immense plant, knocked down and crated. They decided not to unpack the lorries until they could make up their minds how to handle the cargo.

The German-Russian non-aggression pact was still in force, and also the German-Russian trade treaty. The Russians were protesting that the Germans were drawing out Russia's wheat, oil, and other things, but had fallen behind in their deliveries of machinery to Russia. The Germans answered the protest by giving the Russians the French Citroen plant—on wheels. The lorries were finally unpacked in the foothills of the Ural Mountains.

By the time the plant was re-assembled, Germany had attacked Russia. One of the best planes that the Russians fly against the Nazis is made in that plant to-day.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

Meeting with Mr. Sheehy: Several of our members, together with a number of their friends resident in the Boothby electorate, recently had a meeting with their Federal representative at Parliament House. The purpose of the meeting was to ascertain from Mr. Sheehy what in his opinion was his relationship with his constituents, and to obtain from him an account of his stewardship since his election.

Mr. Sheehy definitely stated that his job was to represent all of the people of Boothby, and provided his electors let him know what they wanted he was endeavouring to have their requests met, so it is up to us to see that people do tell him what they want. Mr. Sheehy is to be congratulated upon his present outlook, as in previous correspondence he stated that he represented "a majority" of the electors, and that he would do what "he" thought would be best for all concerned.

On the question of finance, Mr. Sheehy expressed the opinion that after Labor had a majority in the Senate we can expect big things. It will be interesting to see what happens in July, or soon after.

"Freedom From Want" Campaign: Mr. M. E. Dodd, honorary organiser of this campaign, reports as follows:—

Included in the request for £3 per week is the proviso that it shall be paid without reference to a Means Test. It will therefore be welcome news to actionists in this campaign to learn of the delegation to the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Chifley) on April 20. This delegation represented 8000 employees, ranging from daily paid labourers to high salaried officers who are employed by Governments throughout Australia, and contribute to superannuation funds. Upon reaching retiring age they will all be entitled to a pension for which they are now paying contributions. The delegates were unanimous in requesting the abolition of the Means Test, which, they said, was undemocratic. They contended that every taxpayer contributed towards the cost of pensions, and should therefore be entitled to a pension irrespective of his or her income. Mr. Chifley said he entirely agreed with the abolition of the Means Test, but it would involve a very heavy expenditure, and Cabinet could not see its way clear at present to do this. He also hoped the term "Old Age Pension" would be superseded by "Retiring Allowance," and that this would be available to every person who reached the retiring age, irrespective of any other income. The estimated additional expenditure to abolish the Means Test would be £14 million a year, but "that which is physically possible can be made financially possible." In our request letter we have a safeguard against increased taxation in the clause, "Furthermore, the cost of living must not be increased."

Are YOU helping in this great crusade to get freedom in security?

Congratulations are extended to Mr. C. A. Clarke, hon. secretary of Merewether United Old Age and Invalid Pensioners' Association, who has done yeoman work, upon being the latest to have "Freedom From Want" forms printed.

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

## REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

(Report from United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.)

Following the successful meeting at Seville, other meetings have been arranged by a few enterprising local shopkeepers who realise the need to get the facts on the dangerous aspects of the Powers Bill before the people. Campaigners acting on their own initiative put the idea to the shopkeepers as a business proposition (not as a reform idea). In this way those who have something to lose are inspired to help themselves; YOU, wherever you are, could get the tradespeople in your town or suburb to do likewise—what about it? Billheads to advertise the meeting can be printed locally and distributed with customers' orders or from shop counters—and the job is done. In most cases arrangements can also be made for suitable literature to be sold at the meetings. Here's an opportunity for YOU to act; don't fail to grasp it. And, by the way, have YOU played your part in our financial appeal for £1 from each supporter? If not, would you kindly send your donation to the United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

## PLANNERS' CANNON-FODDER

It is becoming increasingly clear that all political parties have lost touch with reality. Without exception, the fundamental idea in all current legislation seems to be to make it almost impossible for the ordinary individual to take any vital part in life. He is to be a mere passenger. To exist, he is to be made to carry out certain duties which it is not necessary for him to understand in any other than a mechanical sense. The inspiration of this kind of thing is identical with that of the National Socialism we are supposed to be fighting. The common man is regarded as "cannon fodder" to be used in the schemes of Planners.

## 25 PER CENT. TAX IMPOST

A leaflet worded as follows has been issued by the United Democrats of Adelaide:—

Our Government has passed the "Pay-as-you-go" Taxation Bill, including the clause which imposes on taxpayers the payment of an additional 25 per cent, to meet an alleged "Tax Lag." But consider the following facts:

1 Your Income Tax receipt shows clearly that there is no Tax Lag. The S.A. Crown Solicitor, Mr. A. J. Hannan, K.C., as well as other undisputed authorities, definitely say there is no Tax Lag.

2 Income Tax in Australia is higher than in the United Kingdom.

3 "High Taxation is an important factor in avoidable absenteeism," said a spokesman of the Sydney Metropolitan Meat Commission.—(See "News," 22/3/44) Thus high taxation hampers our war effort.

4 The Prime Minister, Hon. J. Curtin wrote in the "Locomotive Journal" of December 14, 1939: "Everything in War must be paid for, not by reducing wage standards, but by the use of the National Credit." But this 25 per cent, taxation impost does reduce wage standards.

5 "The Banker," one of the highest financial authorities in England, stated in September, 1940: "It is not in the least true that the production of arms could not take place, or would take place on a smaller scale, if the public were not providing the money in the forms of gifts or loans or taxes. If the money were not forthcoming in one of these ways it would have to be created. And this the State, as the monetary authority, can do perfectly well, at negligible cost, and practically without limit."

Bearing these facts in mind, why not ACT by telling your Representative in Parliament to repeal the 25 per cent, alleged Tax Lag clause? The pressure of public opinion has been successful many times before. You could make it successful again by signing and sending the letter below.

More forms can be obtained from the United Democrats, 17 Waymouth Street Adelaide, Phone, C 1967. Price, 1/6 a hundred (postage 3d.).

To Mr....., MHR.

CANBERRA, A.C.T.

Dear Sir,

I object to the impost of the 25 per cent alleged Tax Lag.

Please note that I want you, my Representative in Parliament, to demand the repeal of this imposition. Any deductions already made from my wages to be credited to my taxation account or refunded to me.

Yours faithfully, .....

## MICA AND INDIA

The snow-white purity of motive behind the raging propaganda in the United States to "free India from the British" is well illustrated by an article syndicated from coast to coast by the columnist, Drew Pearson. Mica is an important war material, as well as a peace-time necessity for insulating purposes, and mica comes from both India and the U.S.A. The wicked, British, however, "have built up the myth that their mica (obtained from India) is the world's best, just as the British formerly sold the idea that Sheffield was the world's best quality of cutlery steel." Notwithstanding that "the Bureau of Standards has failed to find any difference between foreign and domestic mica . . . the product from India has so completely dominated world markets that the United States only supplies 20 per cent of its own requirements."

Obviously the cure for this is to push the British out of India, take the mica, and go on saying it is the world's best.

Big Business is becoming preponderating concerned with injecting grievances into suitable groups of people, and then manipulating them to produce the results required by Big Business. There is probably a big majority amongst the people of the Middle West and Pacific States who talk glibly about the wrongs of India, who believe that Indians dress in feathers and utter war-whoops. During the past few years there have been more dangerous racial riots in the United States than anything in India during the past fifty years. But there's no money in them. The Negroes haven't any mica.

In case anyone should be under the delusion that this technique is confined to America, we admit at once that this country is strangled with it. There is not a single individual right, of the many filched from us, the theft of which has not been preceded by a deluge of bilge directed to people who would pine away if they were not allowed to meddle with other people's business. The whisky business is a stinging scandal, which would not be tolerated if numbers of people of the type of Pussyfoot Johnson had not discovered that fortunes are made by making things scarce, not by making them plentiful and good.

—"The Social Creditor," March 25.

## FEDERAL POWERS MEETING

A public meeting will be held in the Rechabite Hall, Canterbury-road (near Union-road), Surrey Hills, Melbourne, on June 16, at 8 p.m. Subject: "The Powers Bill and Your Freedom." Speaker: Mr. E. J. Grogan, Councillor F. Le Leu will preside, and other local Councillors will be present. Convener: A. McPherson.

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

## NO CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN

Temperance Hall, Russell St., Melbourne.

SUNDAY, JUNE 11, AT 8 P.M.

Mr. E. J. Grogan will speak on

THE FEDERAL POWERS BILL.

Hear the truth on this important measure!