

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

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 10 No. 25 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY JUNE 23 1944 Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

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).

Evatt's "Three Safeguards" Are Worthless

Nominal "Freedoms" Promised, but Real Freedom Undermined

ERIC D. BUTLER

Closely connected with the campaign for the centralisation of all political and economic control at Canberra, has been the talk about freedom by Dr. Evatt and his henchmen. Ever since "education" was made "Popular" and "compulsory," the idea that TALKING about freedom is the same thing as actually HAVING freedom, has been constantly propagated.

A little thought will reveal the complete falsity of this idea. In his booklet, "The Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket," C. H. Douglas makes the following observation—

... it has to be realised that not for thousands of years have the people of these (British) islands been so completely enslaved as they are at present and the primary characteristic of the slave is not bad treatment, IT IS THAT HE IS WITHOUT ANY SAY IN HIS OWN POLICY." (My emphasis.)

And that is the position of an increasing number of people to-day. What is the use of people talking about a free press and political votes for adults when they have little control over their own actions. Compare the position of the working man to-day with the position of his English forbears, even down until the latter end of the eighteenth century. The small English farmers, before enclosure and rising debt and taxation eliminated many of them, were far more independent than the working man of to-day. They could and did live off their own properties and they were free to govern their own actions. Any man to-day living on a fertile piece of ground, free from debt, possesses more real freedom than a man who is obliged to work to the growing industrial monopolies. That is why independent

farmers must be first crushed everywhere before complete tyranny can be imposed on everyone. No truer words have been written than the following by that great Englishman, William Cobbett, early last century:—

"Freedom is not an empty sound; it is not an abstract idea: it is not a thing that nobody can feel. It means . . . the full and quiet enjoyment of your own property. If you have not this, if this be not well secured to you, you may call yourself what you will, but you are a slave."

But, do Dr. Evatt and his backers propose to try and remove the causes, principally financial, which prevent more and more people from owning and enjoying their own property? They most certainly do not. They propose to take existing monopolies and make them into State monopolies under the magic name of "public ownership."

Freedom, to Dr. Evatt, is just an abstract idea. And like most intellectuals, he is contemptuous of those who refuse to be tricked by his honeyed words. Speaking on March 15 at Canberra, he was expressing the opinion that servicemen "will vote in overwhelming strength in favour of the (Powers) Bill," to which Mr. Menzies replied: "Because they will not hear the case against it." And then comes the following gem:

More Highlights from "Hansard"

On March 16, Mr. Mulcahy (Lang, N.S.W.), directed attention to a matter which has caused much criticism among soldiers attempting to buy homes:—

Many servicemen and their wives have been saving their money with the object of purchasing homes after the war. The wife of a soldier who is serving in New Guinea entered into a contract to buy a home, subject to the approval of the Sub-Treasury in Sydney. The departmental reply was that, unless she could get vacant possession and contribute £100 or £200 to the war loan, the sale would not be permitted. These restrictions should not be placed upon purchases of this kind. They are not investments. I urge the Treasury to give sympathetic consideration to these genuine applications. The persons concerned have no money to invest in the war loans after they have paid a deposit upon the purchase of a house. Usually they have to borrow, to finance the transaction. The particular application to which I referred has gone to the Treasurer for review, and, I hope he will give it favourable consideration.

The idea of the Federal Treasury being sympathetic towards any project that would direct money away from its clutches, can only be regarded as a forlorn hope!

It is sometimes forgotten by many Australians that the socialisation of a number of industries was once tried by a Queensland Labor Government. The results were disastrous. In the Senate on March 21, Senator James McLachlan gave some very telling figures:—

It will be recalled that certain sections of the meat industry were antagonistic to the meat rationing scheme, and that the Minister told them that if they would not accept the plan the Government would take the matter in its own hands. Some years ago, Queensland adopted or

Gen. Smuts to Replace Mr. Churchill?

"The 'Wall Street Journal' a month or so ago printed a 'rumour' that Mr. Churchill would shortly be superseded by General Smuts.

Well, Clarence, it's kind of them to let us know, anyway."

The Social Crier, April 22, 1944

Dr. Evatt: "That is to say that they will not hear what does not exist." ("Hansard," p. 1348)

Just like that! Dr. Evatt will be well advised not to think that he can brush vital principles aside with an impatient statement such as the above. "Salt" and other journals for the Forces, all of which are paid for by the Australian taxpayers, have been pro-greater Powers for Canberra ever since Dr. Evatt brought up the issue. A prominent N.S.W. State Labor M.P., Captain Martins, has been in New Guinea urging troops to vote "Yes." Still, this lust for power inevitably brings its own destruction and the ACTIONS of some of our local Gestapo-minded power-lusters have had far more effect on the thoughts of Service personnel than Dr. Evatt's abstract WORDS about "freedom."

I have recently gone to some trouble to ascertain how members of two branches of the service in my area are going to vote at the Referendum. Dr. Evatt may be interested to know that at present he wouldn't get more than thirty votes in every hundred—and that is a liberal estimate.

But I urge every real democrat to leave nothing to chance; send literature and accurate information concerning the Referendum to all those you know in the Forces. Don't let Dr. Evatt brush you

aside by saying that the troops "will not hear what does not exist." It is time this high-handed gentleman was given a salutary lesson in democratic action.

I have already mentioned in these columns the fact that Dr. Evatt's belated inclusion of clauses relating to religious freedom and freedom of speech was merely a clever sop. These clauses reveal Dr. Evatt as an arch-hypocrite. Should anyone regard my charge of hypocrisy as too strong, I ask him to read closely the following statement by Dr. Evatt:—

"Section 116 of the Constitution already contains a guarantee of the freedom of religion. . . . This is a safeguard against Commonwealth action only, which is anomalous, especially since, by their very nature, the legislative powers of the State rather than those of the Commonwealth are more likely to involve the risk of interference with religious freedom." ("Hansard," p. 1154)

Dr. Evatt knows as well as I do; that it is in the big centralised countries such as Germany and Russia that the liberties of the individual have been respected least. His statement above is a gratuitous insult to the State Governments, and I hope State Members are well acquainted with the statement and make use of it. I challenge Dr. Evatt or anyone else to tell

(Continued on page 4.)

NOTES on the NEWS

The latest development in the fight against centralised Federalised Governments, according to a New York report of June 5, is that "forty-eight American States, through unanimous resolutions at the Governors' Conference just concluded, stand committed to decentralisation of federal control, and re-assertion of State rights in the post-war era." This revolt, after bitter actual experience of centralised government, is a telling argument against the Referendum proposals.

COMMUNICATIONS CENSORSHIP.

Evidence given at the committee on censorship, according to the Melbourne "Sun" of June 9 discloses that Mr. Fadden, who has registered strong objections to the recent actions of the censors, was himself responsible for conveying certain suggestions to the censor to the effect that "it would be helpful to the taxation authorities if the censors would show them information about practices which reduce taxes." So this artful Arty Fadden played his part in setting the Gestapo in motion! And, of course, the "democratic" Labor stalwarts have kept the ball rolling with a vengeance. This is a typical example of the political hypocrisy engaged in by all Party stooges. Incidentally, it would not be surprising if bank managers were part of this system of espionage.

LOUATS LOGIC: Dr. F. Louat, President of the Constitutional Association, commenting on the action of taxation officers seizing citizens' money deposited in banks, suggests that "this practice of seizing money without a court order is contrary to British principles." There can be no doubt by this time that the banks, the so-called custodians of the people's money, have collaborated with the taxation gestapo in this Hitler-like practice, and now that a show-down is approaching they seek to evade the responsibility; but it was their duty to contest the issue before a court before they handed over the money. In any case, the victim should take action against the bank, and let the bank take action against the taxation department. The banks would have to satisfy the claim and produce the deposits.

BARUCH'S BLAH Bernard Baruch, ace financier and member of that "Unofficial Super Cabinet" in U.S.A., is reported in the daily press as saying a typical mouthful, viz.: "We are the most powerful nation in the world, we feed the hungry, clothe the naked, build roads, airports and harbours and supply the world with machines of death and supports of life." A recent report pointed out that "in the city of New York one in every six people are at one time or another confined to a mental home. No wonder, if they listen to Baruch's blah.

MISSING MONEY: Despite the fact that £150 millions was supposed to have been received by the Treasury from the recent loan, legal tender (notes and coins) held by the public still remained at about £185 millions, which was the same as the amount held by them when the loan opened. The question is, whence came the money which filled the loan? Better ask your M.P. that one! This missing money is causing Treasury officials much concern, because they believe it is being hoarded to evade taxation. Taxation officers are also hot on the trail of this missing money, and every

now and again they throw out suggestions "that they have secret methods of tracing these hoarders." Perhaps bank managers are part of this secret technique, in so far as they may act as informers as to bank balances and cash withdrawals—more of this anon.

WIVES' WAGES: Rev. Dr. C. B. Crockett caused a slight stir when, as reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of May 26, he urged that "wives should receive wages of about 30/- per week for their very own." As usual with daily press reports, it was not made clear whether or not the said wages should be docked from hubby's pay, or be paid out of taxation direct from the Treasury. As both these methods are identical from a result viewpoint, it is unlikely that any reasonably intelligent person could consider them desirable. So perhaps the Rev. Crockett suggested that the wives' incomes should come from a special issue of new money for the purpose, and perhaps the reporter forgot this part of the address. Perhaps!

BEER BREWING: Delegates to the N.S.W. Trades and Labour Council have requested the Federal Government to make home brewing legal on the grounds that beer is a food and a necessity which workers find it almost impossible, to get. As the Government encourages the brewery monopoly because of the big rake-off through excise duty, it will be interesting to note the reaction to the request. Most likely it will take the form of professing concern for the morals of the public—which would be lowered if the Government did not get its

(Continued on page 3.)

Planners Ask for Power

They say their plans will set you free,
Do you think chains bring liberty?

Let them deny with careful words the lust that drives them on!
But each day sees their kingdom grow,
finds other freedoms gone.
The greed for place, the itch for power,
ambition's cold desire,
These underlie their pompous plans, their promises inspire.
Yet who shall blame if easy power makes their demands more vast?
Not you, who held the gates of Power, but blithely let them past?
Not you? Although it may be you, who yet will wake aghast
Too late to save your liberties, when on a day at last
Their work is done;
Their Kampf is won;
Their shackles hold you fast.

—W.P.I.

AUSTRALI'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir,—Great publicity is being given to the programme of the visiting Empire Parliamentary Delegation, and to those who read this paper three of its members give significant emphasis to the peril which faces us in the post-war period. I refer to the Earl of Listowel, Dr. Edith Summerskill, and Mr. Angus MacInnes. The Earl of Listowel is a "Labor" representative in the House of Lords; Dr. Edith Summerskill (wife of Dr. Jeffrey Samuel) is a "Labor" member, of the House of Commons, representing one of the most bombed areas of the poorest quarter of London; and Mr. Angus MacInnes is a "Labor" member (called Commonwealth Co-operative Federation) in the Canadian Parliament. These three exemplify the effectiveness of the technique of the authors of the "Protocols."

In the Earl of Listowel we see the strange phenomenon of an aristocrat who approves of and works for the destruction of the aristocracy. According to the Melbourne "Argus" of 15th June, the Earl made a "notable" speech at the State luncheon, in which he said that in Britain there has been a levelling down as well as a levelling up; that the higher income groups have already been wiped out; and that, "at the other end, the majority of the wage-earners are earning more and making more than they have done before." He went on to say, "The net result of this process is that we have achieved in Britain at the present time a more substantial measure of social and economic equality than any that has ever been recorded hitherto."

He did not explain that the levelling DOWN has been greater than the levelling UP; that the "equality" is on a lower average basis; that although the worker is EARNING more, he is actually GETTING less; that workers make wealth but cannot "make" money; and that before they can share the wealth they have to fight their fellow-workers in a desperate struggle to "collect" a little of the stuff they are not allowed to MAKE.

This particular speech was described by the "Argus" as "outstanding," and the newspaper commentary included the following:—

Lord Listowel, the fifth Earl of his line, is a convinced Socialist. Aesthetic, unemotional, erudite, artistic, and bespectacled, there is something about his outlook and appearance suggestive of the influence of Sir Stafford Cripps."

It is interesting to know that he is unemotional and bespectacled. It may be that that helps to increase his effective assistance to what is called "the working class." But apart from this, the extract from the "Argus" explains a lot, and prompts me to call attention to a further quotation from "Protocol" No. 3, as follows:—

"The people under our guidance have annihilated the aristocracy, who were their one and only defence and foster-mother for the sake of their own advantage, which is inseparably bound up with the well-being of the people. Nowadays, with the destruction of the aristocracy, the people have fallen into the grips of merciless, money-grinding scoundrels, who have laid a pitiless and cruel yoke upon the necks of the workers."

The noble Earl does not speak against the financial oppression which has brought the workers to such a condition, and, so far as I have been able to find out, never

DOES anything against the interests or to check the power of the international financiers responsible for it. He does not seem to know that he is being used against his own kinsmen, for another part of "Protocol" No. 3 reads as follows:

"We appear on the scene as alleged saviours of the worker from this oppression when we propose to him to enter the ranks of our fighting forces—Socialists, Anarchists, Communists—to whom we always give support in accordance with an alleged brotherly rule. . . . Our power is in the chronic shortness of food and physical weakness of the worker, because by all that this implies he is made the slave of our will, and he will not find in his own authorities either strength or energy to set against our will. Hunger creates the right of capital to rule the worker more surely than it was given to the aristocracy by the legal authority of kings. By want, and the envy and hatred which it engenders, we shall move the mobs, and with their hands we shall wipe out all those who hinder us on our way. The goyim have lost the habit of thinking unless prompted by the suggestions of our specialists."

Again we should ask, is that a correct description of the position or is it not?

Dr. Edith Summerskill is invariably given the most prominent place in the publicity set-up, and is featured as being terribly concerned about the "welfare" of mothers and children. A strong point in her addresses is a plea for equality of competitive opportunity for women after the war. She is greatly concerned about WORK and payment for WORK, but shows no interest in the question of providing women with incomes apart from the question of work, or in the vital question of the production of the money which is to be used for the proper payment of women. For example, in the House of Commons on 20/3/41 she called attention to the fact that the basic rate of pay for women in 1941 was £1 per week—the same as in 1914! She said nothing at all about the conditions which caused such a scandalous state of affairs, i.e., the financial policy IMPOSED upon Great Britain by loyal agents of disloyal "money-grinding scoundrels." These conditions force business men to look for cheap labour and to conduct their businesses on a basis which makes the practice of Christian principles a physical impossibility.

In a letter which appeared in the London "Times" of 4/4/44, Dr. Summerskill wrote as follows:—

I welcome every suggestion which focusses

WARNING AGAINST FORMING A PARTY

Under the headings, "Party Political Action" and "A Warning To Australia," the March 18 issue of "The Social Creditor," which is the official journal of the Social Credit Secretariat (chairman: Major C. H. Douglas), gives prominence to the following letter, already published in Australia by Mr. Barclay Smith, and written to him by Mr. L. D. Byrne, Technical Adviser to the Social Credit Government of Alberta:—

Legislative Building, Edmonton, Alberta,
October 13 1943

Dear Mr. Barclay-Smith,
Dr. Streeter's letter in the "New Era" of August 20 raises an issue which is fundamental to the future of the Social Credit Movement at this critical stage in the Battle for Freedom.

Dr. Streeter argues that "if we could convince the majority that a Social Credit Party could deliver plenty to all instead of scarcity to the many, the Party would win; and then success would depend upon the wisdom of the leader and the loyalty, honesty, and industry of the elected S.C. representatives."

This plea for party political action is based on a series of hypotheses for which there are absolutely no valid grounds:

"If we could convince a majority. . . ."
IF the leader (i.e., Der Fuehrer or II Duce) had wisdom.

IF the elected representatives were "loyal" (to whom?).

IF the elected representatives were honest.

IF the elected representatives were industrious.

It is suggested that the process of "convincing the majority" must start by creating a further political division, and automatically mobilising all the resources of the other "parties," plus those of the financial powers, against Social Credit. Such a proposition is so obviously absurd it does not require any detailed examination.

However, conceding that by some miracle a majority of "Social Credit" party members were elected, and all the other improbable qualifications mentioned by Dr. Streeter were met, what hope would the Government have of bringing about the necessary changes in face of the organised opposition, sabotage, misrepresentation and actual violence which would be invoked by the money powers?

Moreover, the electorate would be little better than a disorganised mob, which could be easily stampeded, and would constitute fertile ground for disruptive tactics of "the enemy."

Dr. Streeter states, with a refreshing touch of realism: "The money monopoly is not going down without fighting to the last ditch. . . . It is perfectly controlled and disciplined; it can mould public opinion; and it is therefore ALMOST unbeatable."

That being the case, why set about defeating it by methods which are doomed to failure from the outset? Apart from any other consideration, it is not reasonable to expect to establish a genuine democracy by means which violate its basic principles.

Dr. Streeter quotes Alberta in support of his contentions. He is overlooking the fact that Social Credit emerged as a political action AFTER the electorate had been organised for pressure politics. It was only "when the Government and opposition parties had flouted the demands of the highly organised non-partisan movement, that the groups formed themselves in an organisation to run their own candidates."

Moreover, it was because there was a strong organisation of electors in the hundreds of groups scattered all over the Province that the early storms were weathered.

In short, it was a unique combination of circumstances peculiar to the Alberta situation which resulted in the breakthrough here—and it would be foolish to imagine that the money-monopoly has not learnt its lesson.

As a matter of fact, the "party" taint which the Social Credit movement has got as a result of being forced into partisan political action in Alberta constitutes its greatest handicap in the rest of Canada.

We have to recognise that no course of action designed to defeat the money monopoly and to provide a basis for establishing

attention on the serf-like status of the working housewife, but I cannot accept the view that £1 per week paid by the State will remove the injustice suffered by a woman who works hard seven days a week and is ignorant of the amount of her husband's wage. . . . A State grant, without legislation designed to compel a husband to reveal his wage, would improve the economic position of the mean and greedy man, who would simply reduce the housekeeping allowance by £1.

What a lovely opinion she has of the greedy husbands, who give their physical lives away for the basic wage. Perhaps some of them would behave as she says, but surely not in any appreciable number. Anyhow, what do women think of the great idea? I quote Mrs. B. M. Palmer ("Social Creditor" of 5/2/44), as follows:—
"I suppose it takes a woman to insult a woman; every member of our sex who troubles to notice her must feel outraged by her egregious remarks. After all, most housewives feel in their bones that, though far from free in the true sense of the word, their status approaches nearer to freedom than that of any wage-earners; and the rest of the insult, i.e., that they are so unbeloved of their spouses as to be considered as unpaid drudges—they can afford to laugh at."

Then, after quoting the words given above from the London "Times," Mrs. Palmer went on thus:—

"And of course, nothing else matters! If you get your wage every week, does it matter whom you sleep with? Dr. Summerskill seems too emotionally undeveloped to grasp that a compulsory wage to the wife does not make a marriage; and that a marriage no longer exists when the parties to the contract begin to quarrel over money matters. There is another name for it. . . . Of course it may possibly be that Dr. Summerskill is denying her own experience. In either case she deserves pity"

Like the noble Earl, Dr. Summerskill says nothing against the FINANCIAL POLICY which has been IMPOSED upon the people of the Empire or against the men responsible for it. She professes to be appalled by effects but is stonily silent about causes. The effect of her agitation will be to serve the purposes of our enemies by promoting an industrial struggle between the womenfolk and the men folk instead of doing justice to women irrespective of the work complex. The wife of Dr. Samuel is clearly concerned not with the emancipation of wives but with the disciplining of husbands.

As to Mr. MacInnes, the comments must wait until next week.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C2
18th June, 1944 (To be continued)

PURPOSE OF VOTERS' POLICY ASSNS.

(To the Editor.)

If we don't know our objective we are likely to go astray. There are likely to be some who will go astray, therefore it becomes essential that all concerned—and especially those whose counsel or example is likely to carry any weight—should know precisely what it is they are attempting.

To sort the matter out:—

Voters are those who, in whatever field, possess and exercise the power of expressing preference; or, to carry it a bit further, of expressing approval or disapproval, or (less often) accepting or rejecting. Readers of these pages are well acquainted with the idea that a parliamentary vote does not expire on election day. Representation being a continuous function, voting (expressing one's preference) becomes a continuous responsibility to one's self.

Policy is related to one's own self-chosen course or line of action or behaviour; to one's desires or wishes; to one's preference for or against. It is seldom possible to express one's policy on election day; only too frequently we have to accept the enemy's policy, or choose the lesser of evils instead, but that does not prevent one from adhering to the practice of expressing his policy from time to time to the appropriate representative.

Associations are people combined, under whatever form of functional discipline they choose to adopt, for a common purpose. Wherever a Voters' Policy Association is formed, it is desirable that the purpose of the association be clearly understood and agreed upon before any action is taken. The Bristol Voters' Policy Association's objective is:—

"By means of advice and information to assist those who may be interested to obtain by study and practice an understanding of the nature of Democracy (Government which delivers the results wanted by the governed) with a view to ensuring that the VOTERS' policy—rather than that of any party, or independent representative or anonymous controller of policy—shall prevail increasingly in the affairs of the country."

It will be noticed that the first part of the objective (teaching democracy) applies to interested persons only. It is definitely not necessary, nor for that matter desirable, from the point of view of effectiveness, to attempt to arouse the interest of the general public with a view to teaching them all about democracy. Nowadays we need spend but little time educating or attempting to convert opinion; the less time the better in fact.

Regarding the second part: if we are honest about it we must acknowledge that Voters' Policy Associations do not exist to influence the public's choice, but rather do they exist to assist the Voters to implement their policy. And it must be understood that the public are entitled to enjoy (or suffer) the results of their choice, whether in our opinion the choice is sound or not. It is not our function to advocate the election or the dismissal of certain candidates. The Voters are entitled to get POISON if they want it; and it is their representative's duty to see that they get it. Of course, if he sees that it is poison they ask for he should RESIGN rather than be a party to their demise; but he cannot consistently hold

a Social Credit economy has the slightest hope of success unless it:

(1) Cuts across all political parties and UNITES the people in organised action to assert their indisputable sovereignty.

(2) Establishes an effective and continuous control of representatives by their electors.

(3) Mobilises sanctions of overwhelming strength on the side of the electorate.

Such a course of non-partisan action is outlined in the accompanying draft leaflet designed for action in Canada. Subject to minor modifications, it would be equally applicable to Australia.

—Yours, etc., L. D. BYRNE.

office as a representative and refuse to implement their desires on the grounds that he knows best what is good for them. Voters' Policy Associations are in a somewhat similar position, though not in the representative sense. Should the Voters evince a desire for something which is likely to be detrimental to them, all that can be done in the matter, after seeing that they are in possession of all the relevant facts, is to let them choose. We must not stand in their way.

It is our function to offer advice to Voters on how to implement their changing policy. It is our function to make certain issues clear and to supply information. It should be our aim to establish a prestige and a reputation as people bent on assisting the public to rehabilitate themselves; not as party hacks. To present an argument in support of a candidate for election, or against, is to lower ourselves to that level and erase any confidence the public may have had in us.

Rules: The fewer the better. Some form of local functional discipline is indispensable, but it should be kept in mind that you cannot defeat centralisation by centralising; nor can you encourage individual initiative by prescribing bounds. The greater the scope for individuality the better, because only individuals can win this battle. It should be kept in mind, though, in the absence of general rules from a central source, that Voters' Policy Associations are not Institutes of Public Opinion—indeed they are very different, and we should be well advised to work it out in our own minds exactly what the difference is—nor are they Representatives, nor should they attempt to educate (except in the narrow limits of the objective stated above) nor should they bear the brunt of an action or a campaign, nor be "heroes" or "saviours."

I do not suppose that everything I have attempted to present will be made clear without further explanation. Perhaps I may have a further opportunity, but in conclusion would say that the task we should set ourselves is not so much to attempt to show that the Voters' Policy is so-and-so in connection with certain specific issues (though that has its importance) but to put the onus on the particular administrators and on Representatives to PROVE that what they are imposing (specific issues again) is really wanted by those on whom it is imposed. AND KEEP ON PUTTING THE ONUS ON THEM.

—Yours, etc., W. PRESCOTT, Associate of the Social Credit Secretariat.

The Boulevard, Sutherland, N.S.W.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The next meeting of the S.C.M. of S.A. will be held in the United Democrats rooms, 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide, on Thursday, June 29, at 8 p.m. Following the usual business, a general discussion on "Topics of the Day." Members are urged to come along and be prepared to share in the discussion.

—J. E. BURGESS, Hon. Sec.

"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.

FRANTIC FOLLY OF "FOOD CONTROL"

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

Those of us who saw the large crop of apples rotting in Tasmanian orchards last year, or apples being fed to the pigs, hoped that criticism of this wilful waste would stir the Commissars in charge of food to do something to prevent a similar occurrence this year.

Apparently all that has happened is that the Government has made a statement that the apples will be shipped to the mainland this season. The statement however, has been challenged by Ellis Dean in a letter to the Hobart "Mercury." I shall quote his letter:

"Sir—A statement appeared in the Press recently that there was considerably less waste fruit in Tasmania this year than has been the case in previous seasons, and that the bulk of this year's crop would be shipped to interstate markets. This is erroneous and misleading. The facts are that to date there has been a bigger waste of fruit in Tasmania this season than ever before.

"Throughout Southern Tasmania there are hundreds of thousands of bushels of Jonathans, Cleos, Delicious, Geeveston, Grannies and other mid-season varieties lying thickly under trees or tipped into heaps. As to the pear crop, it has barely been touched. Taking it all round, orchardists are experiencing a trying time. Abnormal seasonal conditions alone have been upsetting and costly, and the sizes demanded in most varieties have put the picking costs up 25 per cent.

"Now we are asked to send nothing but show fruit to the cool stores, and this has put the handling costs up another 25 per cent. Consignments are being condemned in all directions from reputable growers.

"On top of all this, growers will be thousands of pounds short at the end of this harvest by the loss of 6d. per case on non-delivered fruit; in other words, fruit that has not been called up.—(Signed) Ellis Dean."

I have been down in the Huon district and have seen this waste for myself. One orchardist I visited had large quantities of Cleos lying waste. I asked him if I could take some away with me, but he told me that he was not permitted to give them to human beings, although he could give them to his pigs.

The "Government contends that since the orchardist has been paid for his crop, the crop no longer belongs to the orchardist but to the Government. This is what is called "public ownership"—whatever that means—if it means anything.

THUS THE GOVERNMENT PAYS THE TAXPAYERS MONEY TO THE ORCHARDIST ON CONDITION THAT HE ALLOWS NO TAXPAYER TO EAT THE APPLES! AS PIGS DON'T PAY TAXES THEY DON'T COME UNDER THE LAW.

Here I want to draw your attention to some important statements in Mr. Dean's letter. The Government Marketing Boards when they offer to buy the crop from an orchardist may insert innocent-sounding conditions which, although they mean very little to an outsider, mean ruin to an orchardist.

For example, if the order is for apples of a definite size the orchardist may be left with more than half his crop on his hands; seasons vary, and so do the size of the apples, but the bureaucrats at Canberra don't vary—they remain just as stupid as ever.

Why should apples be left lying just because they won't go through a certain size of ring? Are we to assume that the people of Australia will refuse to eat them unless they happen to be a particular size?

Many of us are very strongly opposed to Marketing Boards for very good reasons. For over 20 years we have seen the production of the world systematically held up or destroyed in the most outrageous manner. This has been done by manipulation of the international clearing houses and of foreign loans, etc.

In the past, the control over the world's production has been mostly financial. This now is no longer considered strict enough; various countries show a tendency to kick away from this stranglehold. But whatever happens, it appears certain, if the Planners get their way, that the increased powers of production witnessed all over the world are going to be hedged in, if not strangled—the official word is "controlled"—and that means that "control" is going to be used to keep the people of this world separated from the bounty of God and the ingenuity of man by means of Marketing Boards.

The Marketing Board can use all sorts of little innocent tricks to keep you from getting what you want, and when these Marketing Boards come under the control of the international food-controlling body set up in America you will see all sorts of strange things happen, and you won't be able to do a darn thing about it—unless you wake up now to what is happening.

It is not sufficient for the Government to pay for the entire crop of the growers; after all, apples and cabbages are grown as human food to be eaten by human beings—that is the only justification for growing food.

It is no justification to say that if the food is released in large quantities the price will drop. Why shouldn't the price drop low enough so that all can have their fill? There is no financial obstacle in the way of the Government to prevent it compensating (subsidising) the price of apples so that the entire crop reaches the homes of the people, while the growers still get a fair payment

After all, if the Government's financial system cannot permit the people to buy the goods produced in Australia how in the name of all that is reasonable are we going to sell to other people?

The financial system as at present manipulated is used for one purpose—that is, to create debts. As a debt-creating machine it is the most scientific instrument ever invented. No wonder those who manipulate it and who receive its manifold blessings are so proud of it!

But, as a mechanism to distribute the world's wealth to the people the financial system is a disaster of the greatest magnitude. The fact that people are permitted to buy anything at all is merely an accident, and is looked upon by some as an unfortunate accident requiring very severe correction by the overworked tax-collector.

If we are going to look forward to an era of peace wherein intelligent people will desire to live and to rear families, then we shall have to very severely alter our ideas on money and production.

If all the inventions of the last 100 years has any meaning it should automatically and progressively reduce the price of goods to the people, and so reduce the sordid struggle to maintain a household at a reasonable level.

Just imagine what is going to happen after this war: You are going to see a prodigious output of houses, furniture, motor-cars, and all the thousand-and-one products of the factory and the farm. How are the people going to pay for these things? They haven't got the remotest possibility of paying, and there isn't a man who has studied this aspect who can prove otherwise. The great idea, of course, is that we shall go further into debt and become debt slaves.

The tragedy of our Governments before this war, and during the war, has been that they did not and could not satisfy the people because they were merely debt-collectors for the most powerful industry in the world—the Debt-creating Industry.

Over a quarter of a century ago Major Douglas gave the world a mechanism whereby the full output of modern scientific production could be made available to the people; he said that industry did not pay out sufficient in wages, salaries and dividends to enable the people to buy the goods they produced; that there was always a deficiency in purchasing-power which forced people into debt and bankruptcy.

If one industry paid its way it did so at the expense of other industries. Douglas also stated that the chronic shortage of

purchasing-power forced every country to export goods in increasing quantities in order to collect some of this most strictly rationed commodity—Money. He further stated that this hectic and unhealthy fight for markets would make another war inevitable.

A series of nation-wide broadcasts was given in England some years ago, under the title of the "Causes of War," by five different men. They all differed in their analysis, but all agreed on one point—the Socialist, the Economist, and the Financier agreed heartily that Douglas was wrong and they have agreed heartily ever since.

In fact, the close and brotherly harmony between the international Financier and the international Socialist is most touching; it is so very consistent that in Socialist and Communist literature there is almost a complete ban on any criticism of the financial system as run by the wealthy and most powerful men in the world.

The budding young Professors of Economics, with an eye to publicity and a fat Government salary, vied with each other in ridiculing Major Douglas. But as soon as war was declared the compensated price suggested a quarter of a century ago by Major Douglas was introduced immediately into England, then to Canada, Australia and America.

The use of the compensated price prevented a large increase in food prices in England; it enabled the Government to control the cost of living and to prevent a frantic race between prices and wages. The Government was able to bring the price of essential commodities down to any level it desired. In Australia a subsidy is given to the growers to keep down the prices of milk, butter, potatoes—all of which would otherwise have risen greatly.

Professor Copland was one of the first to openly attack the compensated price of Douglas: I have his book in which he made the attack. Professor Copland however was forced to introduce that which he went to great lengths to prove false!

It is a great pity that Professor Copland is in charge of price control to-day, because his handling of prices has been so ridiculous and so childish that one can't help feeling that he still disbelieves in it and is trying to show that it is unworkable.

Price-fixing is quite a different method to price compensation. When Professor Copland fixed the prices for milk he very nearly smashed the industry; but he did it to prevent a rise in the basic wage. He sacrificed the farmers to keep the industrial workers in Sydney quiet.

To take money from the people in taxes so as to reduce or limit prices by subsidies is not what Douglas suggested—that's merely a sleight-of-hand trick. Douglas suggested a scientific basis for issuing fresh money, free of debt and free of interest, put into circulation to reduce prices of commodities; and the subsidy was to be paid when the prices were reduced.

This new money was to be used to enable the people to buy the entire production of the nation without going into debt to the financial monopoly.

It is strange why such a scheme should be ridiculed by so many for so long! Or is it?

WHO SAID IT CAN'T HAPPEN HERE

(To the Editor.)

Sir—I have just finished reading that well-written novel by Sinclair Lewis entitled "It Can't Happen Here." The radio oratory of a Church Bishop, the democratic platitudes of a candidate for Presidency, and the subtle cunning hypocrisy of his secretary caused one Buzz Windrip to become President of the U.S.A. Buzz immediately, with the assistance of "minute men" or private troops, liquidated the Bishop, some hundred Senators, and the law courts of America, and established a Fascist dictatorship.

The plot of the novel centres round one Doremus Jessup, editor and proprietor of the "Daily Informer," a provincial journal, who for the temerity of publishing an editorial adversely criticising the actions of officials appointed by the Dictator, and later otherwise opposing, rather than cooperate, experienced being bashed, flogged and thrown into an internment camp, while his son-in-law was shot. Such fate befell many thousands of others.

You may say, "Well, what of it? It can't happen here."

Recently over the radio we had it reported that one Harry Barnes, a master butcher of Surry Hills, a suburb of Sydney, was fined £20 for opposing the Government's policy of meat rationing.

Harry Barnes had observed how that iniquitous National Insurance Act was scrapped, and the Act to sell our Commonwealth Bank to the financiers, through the sale of debentures and inscribed stock, was dropped because the electors in all parts of Australia sent letters to their elected Parliamentary Members, demanding that the N.I.P. Act be repealed and the mortgage of the Commonwealth Bank be frustrated. Here the will of the people—real Democracy—made itself felt.

Harry Barnes evidently considered that because Australia had 13½ million more sheep, one million more cattle, and 500,000 more pigs than in 1939 when the war started, it was not in the best interest of Australia, the pastoral industry, the retail butchers and the consuming public, that rationing should be enforced. That fat lambs unmarketed would become sheep, further overstocking small holdings, the purchasing of ageing sheep on the uplands stations for the fattening pastures of the plains would not be profitable, and millions of sheep would die in the drought. Thus the sacrifice would be in vain, with no benefit to Great Britain and the war. Rather the under-

mining of the physical constitution of the whole of the civil community by lack of substantial food on which to work must restrict production, weaken morale and jeopardise the war effort.

Also, believing in the integrity of Dr. Evatt, when he valiantly upholds the freedom of the press and speech, and the true democratic principle that the constituents of an electorate are masters of their parliamentary representatives whom they elect, and through him they Re-present their will in the Nation's Parliament—as the story goes—Harry Barnes had some 50,000 demand letters printed to be made available to the customers of retail butchers to give citizens the opportunity of expressing their will to Parliament through the local Member. This, in a free Country, free from Fascist tendencies or the Gestapo, is a perfectly natural and legitimate ambition.

Harry Barnes was subjected to a visit of the Federal Secret Police acting under "Security" Regulations, and later hauled to court for obstructing Government policy.

By hook or by crook the people are to be obstructed from expressing their will. Really and truly, Democracy is in peril.

A fine for exercising a democratic privilege is the first stage of Dictatorship. The internment camp is the second stage, and the firing squad the third. It can't happen here? Under the threat of Bureaucratic Socialism and war security regulations, a Referendum, designed to give Bureaucrats and Professors increased powers to push you and me and all the rest of us about, is imposed upon the people of Australia. We have already experienced that the acquisition of power corrupts, and we will find out that absolute power corrupts absolutely.

All who vote "Yes" to carry the Referendum deserve all that will come to them. —Yours faithfully, WILLIAM AGER, Yamba, Clarence River, N.S.W.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

rake-off! Whether or not one partakes of liquor, the beer could not be worse than the brewery product, and if beer be classified as a food, and comes under the Pure Foods Act, all should be well. (P.S. — Since the above was written Senator Keane has received his instructions, and says "no brew.")

CLOTH CURRENCY: More evidence of criminal bungling on the part of our socialistic officialdom is seen in the press report of June 9 that "most of a shipment of 3,000,000 yards of women's and children's cotton dress materials imported from U.S. under Lease-Lend was too inferior to be released to the public, and was diverted to the British Solomons to be traded with the natives, as currency." Another report says that even the natives refused to have anything to do with it. Quantities were also released for calico bag making. In addition to this 1,500,000 yards of cotton sheeting and 500,000 yards of shirting was also withheld from the public because of poor quality. Just imagine giving more power to incompetent Government officials responsible for this form of sabotage!

ROSEBY'S REALISM: In the course of his criticism of the butter bunglers, Dr. Roseby made the following comment: "The public should demand the names of the people advising the Government on health matters." All practical people will endorse this idea. There is far too much shielding going on—first Governments hide behind advisers, then advisers hide behind Governments. Meanwhile, our war effort is being sabotaged by unknown persons who so far have escaped the penalty.

CAPITALISTS CHALLENGED: John Storey, in his presidential address to the Institute of Industrial Management, declared that capitalism (private enterprise) was challenged, and asked, "can we not declare our confidence in the future under a policy of 'freedom of enterprise,' instead of allowing the public to accept the beliefs of theorists, would-be bureaucrats and ideological wreckers?" That sounds as though he has been reading the "New Times," but he should remember that, if free enterprise is to survive, he and other industrialists will have to play their part in correcting the existing crazy money system, which, by denying the people sufficient purchasing power to purchase full production, has at the same time discredited private enterprise. This is the challenge that these industrial dreamers must accept, or sink.

MONOPOLY MOVES: The Australian delegates to the I.L.O. Conference have now circulated the following proposal: "Steps should be taken to establish an international agreement to guard against identical goods, which might pile up into surpluses." Again we see this bunch, who denounce monopolies, seeking to build a super monopoly to prevent abundant production for the workers. It is extremely difficult to see how the proposed restrictive monopoly can be squared with the professed aim of these so-called "representatives" of the workers—unless, of course, they regard Menzies and Co. as the workers!

BIG BUSINESS: Suburban butchers are reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of May 22 as saying that coupons and killing quotas were introduced through the action of big meat firms for the purpose of forcing small wholesale buyers out of business. Whether or not this is correct, our abundant livestock was sufficient for the armed services and civilians, plus much more than available shipping could carry to Britain. The only people who claim the need for rationing of meat are Government officials and theoretical economists.

—O.B.H.

NO CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN

Temperance Hall, Russell St., Melbourne, Sunday, June 25 at 7.45 p.m.

Mr. J. McKellar will speak on—
THE FEDERAL POWERS REFERENDUM.
Learn the motives behind these proposals!

CLUB OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

Next Thursday, June 29, at the Assembly Hall, 156 Collins St. Melbourne, the Club of Political Thought will hold their first annual meeting, when plans will be discussed for the ensuing period, and arrangements made for extending the services and activities of the club. An invitation is extended to readers to be present and take part in the discussions. Several talkie films will be screened, and should prove of great interest. The meeting starts at 7.50 p.m. (—Adv't.)

SYDNEY MEETING

If we would end wars we must abolish causes.

Stanley F. Allen, F.C.A. (Aust.), of 88 Pitt St., Sydney, well-known writer and lecturer, will lift the lid off the Bankers' box of tricks.

At the Savoy Theatre, Bligh St., Sydney, on Sunday, June 25, at 7 p.m.

The subject will be:
"The Dictatorship of Finance—How It Works."

It's a free lecture on a most important question of the times.

Mr. Allen's explosive new booklet, "Stop That Thief! Finance the Great Dictator" (1/6 per copy), will be on sale at the meeting. (—Adv't.)

"FEDERAL BLIGHT" HIT PEANUT CROP!

In Federal Parliament, on March 7, Mr. Adermann (Maranoa, Queensland), dealt with the plight of the peanut industry. All those who advocate greater power for Canberra should read this Member's speech and ask themselves how much confusion we would have with Federal Government Departments running everything Mr. Adermann said:—

"I desire to bring to the notice of the Government the present situation of the peanut industry. It is a tragedy that a commodity so valuable should be in danger of being lost, and the fact that this danger exists is not the fault of the board or of the growers. The board consulted with the authorities to find out what quantity of peanuts the growers were expected to produce and the quota was fixed at 13,000 tons. We advised the growers to this effect, but they were reluctant to plant the crop without receiving an assurance that labour would be available. On the 29th November last the Director of Service Foodstuffs told us that we could depend upon obtaining labour even if it was necessary to make soldiers available. We were content with that assurance, because last year we had obtained the services of 200 servicemen of eighteen and nineteen years of age, as well as of a number of aborigines. We consulted regularly with the chairman of the District War Agriculture Committee, who regularly advised the manpower authority in Brisbane regarding the requirements of the industry. The crop is a good one, and harvesting operations must commence at once. The growers have done their part, but so little co-operation has there been between the department in Melbourne, which gave us the assurance with regard to labour, and its office in Brisbane, that the Brisbane office was not even advised of what our requirements were. No action was taken by the head office or by the State office, and the only help we received was from the State department in control of aborigines. Some months ago the appropriate authorities were advised of the approximate date when the labour would be required. A minimum of 600 men is required, but, so far, only 80 aborigines and nineteen soldiers, aged eighteen or nineteen years, have been supplied, despite the assurance given, on which basis plantings were made. The crop is worth about £500,000. Already the September planting has been lost, and the October planting is in process of being lost. It is probable that five-sixths of the crop will be lost to the country. Three departments, namely, Manpower, Commerce and Agriculture and the Army are involved. On four successive days last week I sent telegrams from Kingaroy to the Minister for the Army (Mr. Forde). After the receipt of two of them, the Minister replied that the matter was being investigated, and he would let me know with what result. It took him to the end of the week to say that his department was not responsible, and that I should consult the Director of Manpower. Surely, he could have told me that in the first instance. I had also sent telegrams to the manpower Director in Brisbane but they were not even acknowledged, notwithstanding that I am the Member for the district and Chairman of the Peanut Board, and also that labour for the work was definitely promised.

Dr. Evatt: "Who gave the assurance?"
Mr. Adermann: "The Director of Service Foodstuffs in Melbourne on the 29th November last."

Dr. Evatt: "Who was the manpower officer who did not answer the honourable Member's telegram?"

Mr. Adermann: "I sent the telegram to the Manpower Department in Brisbane. The only way in which I could get any notice taken was by giving publicity to

the facts in Brisbane newspapers last week."

Dr. Evatt: "Did that have any result?"

Mr. Adermann: "This morning nineteen young soldiers landed in Kingaroy and 28 more have been promised."

Dr. Evatt: "Will that be enough?"

Mr. Adermann: "Six hundred men are required to harvest the crop. Peanuts will not keep on the bushes for more than a week. I did not wish to bring this matter forward in the Parliament, but the peanuts have been grown at the request of the Department of Commerce and Agriculture, and growers have cooperated with the Department to the full. They have informed the Department of the action they proposed to take, and yet they are in danger of losing five-sixths of the crop."

THE REFERENDUM PROPOSALS

At the Referendum to be held on August 19 the Federal Government will ask electors to give it power over the following:—

(1) "The reinstatement and advancement of those who have been members of the fighting services of the Commonwealth during the war, and the advancement of the dependants of those members who have died or been disabled as a consequence of the war."

(2) "Employment and unemployment."

(3) "Organised marketing of commodities."

(4) "Uniform company legislation."

(5) "Trusts, combines and monopolies."

(6) "Profiteering and prices (but not including prices or rates charged by State or semi-governmental or local governing bodies for goods or services)."

(7) "The production" (other than primary production) and distribution of goods, and, with the consent of the Governor-in-Council, primary production, but so that no law made under this paragraph shall discriminate between States or parts of States."

(8) "The control of overseas exchange and overseas investment; and the regulation of the raising of money in accordance with such plans as are approved by a majority of members of the Australian Loan Council."

(9) "Air transport."

(10) "Uniformity of railway gauges."

(11) "National works, but so that the consent of the Governor-in-Council shall be obtained in each case before the work is undertaken, and that the work shall be carried out in co-operation with the State."

(12) "National health in co-operation with the State."

(13) "Family allowances."

(14) "The people of the aboriginal race."

DON'T MISS THIS!

A limited quantity of back-numbers of the "New Times" is available to our supporters. If you write to us at Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne, and simply ask for a parcel of back-numbers, we will forward same free of charge. If you are in Melbourne, you may pick up a parcel at our office (5th floor, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins St.).

Many of these copies contain articles on the Federal Powers question, so they are not only helpful for introducing the paper to prospective new readers, but also for spreading the truth about the Referendum proposals, and that is very urgent.

PARTY TYRANNY IN FEDERAL PARLT.

On March 15 the vital question of allowing private Members more opportunities, especially for bringing forward the grievances of their constituents, was brought up in Federal Parliament:—

Mr. Harrison (Wentworth, N.S.W.): "I am giving reasons why honourable Members on this side should resist the attempt to deny to private Members the right to air their views and to criticise Government activities, and am instancing matters that are of great public moment, concerning which I have heard rumours and about which I shall perhaps have something to say later."

Mr. Speaker: "The honourable Member will be quite in order so long as he does not discuss the matter in detail."

Mr. Harrison: "For two or three weeks, I have endeavoured to persuade the Attorney-General (Dr. Evatt) to take action in regard to a matter which vitally affects the freedom of certain individuals in the metropolitan area of Sydney. Honourable Members on this side of the House have a multiplicity of matters which need to be debated. We do not mind subordinating these to Government business, if the Government is prepared to go ahead with its business at regular, stated intervals throughout the year, thus giving to us a fair opportunity to take advantage of the forms of the House; but we are not prepared to give the Government the right to shelve private Members' business and to rush into recess in order to prevent the exposure of matters which we consider are of vital importance to

this country. If the Government wishes to rush into recess in order to stifle criticism, honourable Members of the Opposition must take every advantage of the forms of the House with a view to full publicity being given to the opinions which they hold."

Mr. Holt (Fawkner, Vic.): "This House is peculiar among the Houses of Parliament in Australia, in that very little provision is made for the transaction in it of private Members' business. The introduction of Bills by private Members is a frequent occurrence in most of our STATES' legislatures. In THIS House, however, the practice has been for private Members to have certain privileges at question time, and occasionally during the course of a sessional period, to have a general debate on a Supply Bill or a discussion of grievances on certain Thursdays. The interest of private Members must definitely be protected, particularly at a time when the Government has not only an overwhelming majority in this House, but also a majority that is so dumb, and so docile to the crack of the Caucus whip, that the electors are unable to have their views properly represented. It would be a tragic day for Democracy in this country if private members were not prepared, irrespective of the side of the gangway on which they sat, frankly and fearlessly to voice the grievances which their constituents brought before them. Therefore, we require an assurance that this opportunity will be available to us."

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

From the UNITED DEMOCRATS' headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

REFERENDUM: We wish to advise members and friends that a meeting will be held in the Adelaide Town Hall on Tuesday, June 27, to discuss the question of the Referendum—mainly why it is desirable that there should be a majority of voters who will vote "NO"—and to discuss ways and means of bringing about this result. We urge you to come along to this meeting and also to encourage as many other citizens as you can to be present.

We have a supply of dodgers on hand advocating a "NO" vote. Secure a supply from us as soon as possible, and distribute them far and wide—enclose one in all your correspondence—get your local storekeepers to exhibit them in their windows—and so on.

TAX CAMPAIGN: We also wish to advise members and friends that there will be a meeting in the Adelaide Town Hall on Tuesday, July 11, to protest against the imposition of the 25% extra tax to meet the "alleged Tax Lag." Here again we urge you to popularise this meeting as much as you can.

Have you obtained your supply of request letter forms yet? If not, send for a bundle to-day. Many thousands of signed forms have been sent in to Members of Parliament. Do your share towards making this campaign a success.

HOUSING CAMPAIGN: It will probably be of interest to members to know that Mr. Sheehy, Federal Member for the Division of Boothby, in reply to a signed request-letter-form from one of our members, has stated that housing has always been, and will be, of special interest to him. He enclosed a copy of a speech he made in September of last year, in which he urged that a comprehensive housing campaign should be inaugurated.

This does not mean that electors of Boothby should sit back and await results. If a representative knows that there are thousands of electors requiring the same thing he is much more likely to take active steps to effect the desired result than if he has been requested by only a few of his electors for that result. So, irrespective of what electorate you are in, if you have not had a supply of Housing Campaign leaflets, send us for a supply.

BOOKS TO READ: "The New Despotism" (How Courts Are Used to Defeat the Course of Justice). Price 6d each, 3s doz. "Why Big Finance Backs Socialism" by James Guthrie, B.Sc. Price 6d. "The Enemy Within the Empire" (A Short History of the Bank of England), by Eric D. Butler. Price 9d.

A CARD EVENING will be held at our rooms on Saturday, July 1, at 8 p.m. Basket supper—cosy fire—pleasant people. Come along and make it a success.

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Sec.

PLAN FOR A WORLD GESTAPO

From the "Social Creditor," April 22 1944—

Yet another plan for the world-wide centralisation of power seems to have been foreshadowed, under official auspices, by Mr. Breckinridge Long, United States Assistant Secretary of State, when he addressed the American Federation of Labour Forum on "Labour and the Post-War World" in New York last week, and outlined some of the results of the State Department's studies in the field of problems after the war.

"A thorough analysis of the mistakes of the unhappy past, a study of current developments, and an examination of future possibilities have led us," Mr. Long declared (according to "The Times"), to the following conclusions with regard to the prevention of aggression and war:—

1 The major nations, together with the other law-abiding States, should create an international organisation for the maintenance of peace and security.

2 The major nations, and in due course all nations, should pledge themselves not to use force against each other or against any other nation, except on the basis of arrangements made in connection with such an international organisation.

3 Each of the major nations, and any other nations to be agreed on, should accept special responsibility for maintaining adequate forces, and for using such forces on the basis of arrangements made in connection with the international organisation to prevent or suppress all disturbances of the peace.

"It is clear," Mr. Long said, "that there must be some general body, on which all member States will be equally represented, to serve as a world assembly of nations. There must be a court of international justice, and a small council, representative of the large and small nations, endowed with adequate powers and means for maintaining the peace."

THE NOBLEST CAUSE

Slaves fight for what were better cast away, The chain that binds them, and a tyrant's sway,

But they that fight for freedom undertake The noblest cause mankind can have at stake,

Religion, virtue, truth, whate'er we call A blessing, freedom is the pledge of all.

—William Cowper, 1782.

REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

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

Public interest is quickening on the Federal Powers question, and there is every indication of lively campaigning ahead. In addition to numerous public meetings on this issue, at which our ideas are well presented, circulation of the leaflet, "Inside Information," is progressing nicely—one journalistic opponent complains bitterly that "up North at No. 2 camp every one of the 280 men at the camp received one." We hope everyone in every camp is fortunate enough to receive one. This is a powerful propaganda leaflet, with a punch in every line, which every supporter should carry and distribute. Supplies are available at 1/6 per 100 from the above address.

Our "financial appeal for £1 from every supporter is still open for your contribution—may we expect it soon? Previously acknowledged amounts total £75/15/-. Amounts since received are: C. M. Burney, 10/-; S. W. Butler, £1; C. H. Butler, £2; M. S. Cawthorn, £1/1/-; W. A. Coughlan, 10/-; W. J. Dyer, £1; B. George, £1; R. C. Hancock, 10/-; Miss A. Hooper, £1/1/-; A. Ingham, £1; J. Jilbert, £1; A. M. Moyle, 15/-; Miss Oughton, 10/-; Mr. Pulpe, 10/-; M. J. Rose, 10/-; "Mrs. S.," £2; L. H. Strain, 10/-; Miss E. L. Molkenkin, 10/-; Grand Total: £91/12/-. That should inspire YOU to play your part in keeping the fight going. We know YOU won't fail us, but we do hope you will attend to the matter—NOW.

EVATT'S THREE SAFEGUARDS

(Continued from page 1)

me just why the powers of a State Government are likely to be used against freedom of religion. As far as I am aware there is not one example of a State Government attempting such a thing. What hypocrisy for Dr. Evatt to make such baseless attacks on the States when he is a member of a Government which had people thrown into prison and kept there without a trial! These people still possessed all the freedoms mentioned by Dr. Evatt: they could talk as much as they liked, they were given food, clothing and shelter, and they could worship as they pleased. BUT DR. EVATT'S GOVERNMENT TOOK AWAY THEIR GREATEST FREEDOM—FREEDOM OF ACTION. Perhaps this outrageous action was symbolical of the proposed "new order"; all the freedoms except the one that matters! I sincerely hope that Christians don't fall for this freedom of religion sop.

If it weren't so tragic, one could afford to laugh. Just think of it; for over a century we have had religions freedom and now along comes Dr. Evatt, who proposes to ask people to guarantee themselves freedom of worship! Will historians of the future say: "These Australians must have been backward? They had no religious freedom or freedom of speech until Dr. Evatt came along in 1944!"

Written constitutions have never made a people free in any sense of the word. That is why the British, who have known more about real freedom than most peoples, the freedom, Cobbett spoke about, have never gone in much for writing great constitutions. The French, after succumbing to the abstractions of the French revolutionary leaders, went to much trouble writing constitutions concerning "The Rights of Man." Consider the state of France before the war! The German constitution, rather an elaborate document, didn't save the Germans from Hitler. People can only save themselves from tyranny, not by writing nice-sounding phrases about freedom but by effectively resisting the conditions which allow tyranny to flourish, by being in the position and frame of mind to resist tyranny. The Powers being sought by Dr. Evatt, rather crudely camouflaged with freedoms we already have, can be used to crush the liberty of the people to oppose despotism. Anyone who takes the "trouble to study the Sickness and Unemployment Bill passed during the last Parliamentary session at Canberra will be astounded to learn that the miserly benefits are to be allowed only in cases where the applicant has not refused work. In other words, if you are ordered to the North-West coast of Australia on a Government project, but object—well, you will have the freedom to starve!

Can it be that the great apostle of freedom, Dr. Evatt, had anything to do with this Bill? Yes, Australian democrats, there in "Hansard" is recorded the fact that Dr. Evatt vigorously supported this attack on the greatest of all freedoms—freedom of action.

This is the great freedom we fight for to-day, most strongly against the Germans and Japanese at present, while behind our backs Dr. Evatt and Co. support a campaign to remove that very freedom from us. No words of mine can express the contempt I feel towards men who talk about freedom while removing the very things which can alone make us free. Australians who still possess the spirit of liberty with which we and our British forefathers have always been associated, will if they have not already done so, take up the great battle for freedom on the home-front, in order that men who are dying on the battle fronts shall not have died in vain. That battle on the home-front must be won if we are to live as a really free people—free to ACT as WE like, as long as we interfere with no one else.

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