

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

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).

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 10 No. 28 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JULY 14 1944

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

"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.

Danger of Granting More Federal Powers

An Open Letter to All Electors

Dear Fellow-Australians,—Dr. Evatt's fear campaign to try and persuade you to give the Federal Government powers very similar to those possessed by Hitler has now gained full momentum. However, unfortunately for those seeking greater powers for Canberra, Australian electors have been increasingly shocked by the actions of members of the vast new bureaucracy established under war conditions.

Courageous men and some newspapers have spoken out against what they term the "Australian Gestapo." Gestapo-like practices have only been made possible by the powers possessed by the Federal Government under war conditions. Dr. Evatt and the men behind him suggest that we allow a continuance of the present outrages by giving the Government the right to use similar powers after the war. Should Dr. Evatt protest against this statement that he supports a continuance of the present dangerous bureaucracy, with its Gestapo-like methods, ask him why the Government of which he is a member hasn't been able to control this bureaucracy.

Dr. Evatt pleads that he didn't know that certain violations of individual rights were taking place. What an admission, coming from the Attorney-General! This in itself is equivalent to saying that we no longer have responsible Government in this country.

The revelations concerning many infringements of individual liberties have caused the power-seeking forces to try and allay the fears of the electors. In the official organ of the Australian Labor Movement, "The Standard," there recently appeared a remarkable article in which it was admitted that the Government was losing ground with the public because of censorship and other revelations concerning the actions of the bureaucrats. Then the following remarkable and damning statement appeared: "THE LABOR MOVEMENT KNOWS THAT IT IS IN NO WAY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INFRINGEMENTS (OF LIBERTY) THAT ARE TAKING PLACE." ("Standard," June 22)

If given the necessary publicity throughout Australia, and one feels confident that all readers of this open letter will do their best, the above statement alone should mean the certain defeat of Dr. Evatt's proposals.

Fellow-Australians, just think of it! The Labor Movement, in its official organs, in-

forms us that the Government of the day is in no way responsible for what the bureaucrats have been doing! In other words, the bureaucracy is the "Government behind the Government" and Parliament has been reduced to a farce.

If the men controlling the Labor Movement believe in democracy (they are always assuring us that they do), they should, on the basis of their own journal's admission, immediately take action to ensure that the Government in office is also in power. They should advocate the decentralisation of Government to the stage where the electors can effectively control the Government and ensure that it is not made the tool of vested interests, whether those interests be financial, individual, bureaucratic or political.

But this is just what the Labor Movement is NOT doing. After telling us that the Government isn't responsible for the growing infringements, of individual liberties, its leaders tell us that, in the post-war period, the central Government must keep the dictatorial powers it now possesses.

All Labor advocates of more powers for Canberra should be asked the following question:

"If, as the 'Standard' admits, the Government cannot control the great bureaucracy now functioning, how can it expect people to believe that it will control this bureaucracy after the war?"

But it is obvious that Dr. Evatt thinks that Australians have turned into a race with no spirit or backbone whatever. Speaking at Canberra on February 11 of this year, he said that he wanted the Federal House to consider the question of greater powers for Canberra "IRRESPECTIVE OF THE POSSIBLE ABUSES OF THEM." In effect, fellow-Australians, this apostle of "liberty" says to you:

"Forget the fact that your private letters have been opened; that telephones have been tapped; that bureaucrats have persuaded people to break regulations in

order to convict; that people have been thrown into prison without a trial; and that a vicious system of industrial conscription has been introduced under war conditions."

Dr. Evatt insults our intelligence. His abuse of the State Governments which refused to betray the electors has been outrageous and has touched a new level in misrepresentation. It is no use Dr. Evatt denying that he and others have attempted to trick the electors. Mr. Curtin has admitted it. Speaking at Canberra on March 7, he said:

"It (the Government) considers that the history of this matter is one of opposition, of a disposition to say 'No,' of a refusal to give this Parliament the powers which successive Governments have regarded as necessary. It therefore considered that the practical approach to the question was to invite the representatives of the State Parliaments to assemble at Canberra."

Just what does this statement mean? It means this; Mr. Curtin tells us that the people, whenever they have been given the opportunity of voting at a Referendum, have rejected attempts by all parties to obtain greater centralisation of politico-economic power in Australia. In effect, he then says: "As we couldn't expect the people to give us the powers in a democratic manner, we tried a 'practical approach' and endeavoured to get the States

to give us, the powers without consulting the people."

The major issue before Australian electors is to devise ways and means of effectively controlling their Governments. This is a matter of life and death. We not only don't control the present Federal Government, we have no power of doing so while it possesses ITS PRESENT POWERS, still less if it got those it is seeking at the Referendum.

Any person who votes "Yes" at the Referendum without being able to show how we can control the Government NOW, when it actually has many of those proposed post-war powers, is either, ignorant of the realities of the present situation in Australia or is a hopeless party "yes-man."

Don't forget that the official Labor paper says quite definitely that the Government cannot govern what is done with its present "powers"; that it cannot protect the individual from the bludgeoning of the power-crazed bureaucrats.

This admission touches the crux of the matter. It alone should be sufficient to induce every believer in Australian democracy to do all in his or her power to ensure an overwhelming "NO" vote at the Referendum. We must have Government in which Members are responsible to their electors and are not pushed around by a "Government behind the Government."

—Yours sincerely, ERIC. D. BUTLER.

NOTES on the NEWS

Many unscrupulous advocates of a "Yes" vote at the Referendum are attempting to make it appear that the powers sought are necessary to give effect to the "Atlantic Charter." In commenting on this, Mr. Ian Macfarlan, M.L.A., K.C., is reported in the "Age" of July 3 as saying that "the clause 'employment and unemployment' was absolutely CONTRARY to the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, which was to the effect that every man in every country should have the liberty to CHOOSE HIS OWN path of life, religion and otherwise." Whether the Charter means just that, or whether it means anything or nothing, the fact remains that our soldiers are fighting for the continuance of the right to be free from domination by Governments or Bureaucrats, be they external or internal. Only a solid "No" vote will make that possible.

WATER WORRIES: Our socialised "State Rivers and Water Supply Commission" recently sued an individual part owner of that same institution for excess water rates, and got a verdict for £112/11. The defendant pointed out that the water supplied was polluted and discoloured with either vegetable or animal matter and on occasions was red, white or green. That would be sufficient grounds against a private firm. But, a State department? Oh, dear, no! The judge regretted that he was compelled to enter judgment for the Commission, but under the Act the Commission had no power to grant any remission of charges for water that was unfit for domestic purposes. Good old socialism!

FOOD FRONT: At the instigation of the Food Planners, Lindenow vegetable growers incurred heavy expenditure on machinery, until they were the most highly mechanised in the Commonwealth—and then the Planners reduced their acreage permits, in some cases up to 60%. In addition, one grower at the protest meeting held in June stated that they "have not yet been paid for cabbages delivered last January." This helps to explain the food shortage. Of course, in accordance with bureaucratic ethics, each bureau passes the responsibility for the bungle on to another bureau, and thus these theoretical socialist Planners escape the penalty for sabotage.

CANBERRA CATEGORY: Canberra citizens have started a campaign to make the Federal Capital an electoral area, so that the residents will have a vote. The chairman of the movement, Dr. L. W. Nott, pointed out that at present "we are in the same category as lunatics and criminals. The Crown Law Department, the Health Department, the Department of the Interior, and the Income Tax Department all have a say in governing our lives, whilst we have no say in electing the heads of these departments." Well, that's all to the good, but citizens will need to have more than a "say" in electing their political servants—they will need to determine the results required from them, not take what the servants give them.

PRODUCERS' PROBLEMS: Following the formation of the "Australian Primary Producers' Union" objections have been made by several other producers organisations to the "one big Union" idea on the grounds that it would lessen the faith of the farmers in organisations—which assumes, of course, that the producers have faith in them, a doubtful assumption indeed. The stated immediate objectives of this new body are very slightly more

realistic than those of other such organisations, but there is no indication of any attempt to attack the debt structure arising from our outmoded money system which makes it quite impossible for farmers to establish or maintain a reasonable equity in their holdings after years of toil in clearing and developing. And there is no indication of putting their political servants on the spot to get results.

ARGENTINE ANTICS: Further to the recent report that "Argentina was likely to become a dangerous rival to U.S.," the Melbourne "Sun" of July 4 (Independence Day) reports the Argentine War Minister (Mr. Peron) as "urging the country to prepare for inevitable war." Although not stated, the declaration is understood to be directed at "the United Nations in Latin America, and eventually the United States." Meanwhile, as in Germany and elsewhere, the preliminaries—military dictatorship, ruthless suppression of civil liberties, alliances and rearmament—have

(Continued on page 2)

Prof. Fitzherbert on Fed. Powers

Professor J. A. Fitzherbert, of the Adelaide University, gave a welcome contribution to the discussion on the Referendum issues at a public meeting in the Adelaide Town Hall on Tuesday, June 27, for the reason that philosophic considerations were prominent in his suggestions in support of the "Vote No" campaign.

In his opening remarks Professor Fitzherbert reminded his audience of the enormous suffering and loss resulting from the attempt of the National Socialist State of Germany to take away the freedom of the People of Europe, etc. He then expanded the idea that while in Australia we have temporarily submitted to war-time restrictions, we should be most persistent in our determination to see that as complete freedom as possible is ensured, not only for ourselves, but for "all small nations and groups of people."

Freedom, it was suggested, was something of a personal spiritual achievement but was unattainable unless each was able to "control the means necessary to reach the goal that one has set before himself." Therefore we must be wary of surrendering our personality and free-will, and accepting instead the guidance of a Government office.

Taking the family as the essential unit the Professor argued for a greater measure of decentralisation in all but the few enterprises (like war) where unified strategy under one command are

required. In regard to agriculture, for instance, it could be seen how much more satisfactory are the results (materially and psychologically) when men owned and managed their own farms.

Again, the ideal was put forward of each man's work being a way of life rather than a way of making a living; but the opposite would obtain if a system of centralised Government organisation were to be adopted.

Warnings from such men as Gladstone and Belloc against "planning as a disease" have been given us, and recently in a book called "The Road to Serfdom," by F. A. Hayek, a warning has been sounded that economists in London are to-day expressing opinions and advocating measures in favour of more State planning along lines in vogue in Germany 20 or 25 years ago.

Professor Fitzherbert doubted whether the clauses about religious freedom were of a nature to promote a more complete realisation of religious equality; and if they were, then why limit them to five years?

In conclusion, the audience was warned against being led away by sentimental hopes, and all were asked to think how unsatisfactory it was to have so many referendum proposals lumped together, instead of having each item submitted separately; and to note that little was to be gained by putting more burdens of administration on a central Government already overburdened in its work.

—C. H. ALLEN, Ashleigh Grove, Millswood, S.A.

Topical Tit-bit

On June 20 the Melbourne "Sun" published the following lines:—

"Electors, as the referendum booklet shows,

Are not intended to be led by the 'noes.'"

Whereupon our office boy got busy; —
"The carrot held in hands of dangling messers

Is meant for asinines to join the yesers."

REASONS WHY WE SHOULD VOTE "NO"

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

Sir,—If you desire further proof that the possession of "Power" by Parliament is not much good to the PEOPLE when some greater power outside Parliament can dictate the POLICY to be followed inside Parliament, you may find it in the case of New Zealand. That country was not "handicapped" by the divisions of "power" amongst several Parliaments. There was only one Parliament, and theoretically it possessed all power.

But did the New Zealand soldiers get adequate repatriation benefits or the New Zealand people escape the torture of depression? Were they saved from the effects of the deflation imposed by direction of a conference of International Bankers held in Brussels following the "Peace" Conference of 1919, or from the effects of the deflation imposed by the Wall Street bankers in 1929?

They were not. They suffered from depressed conditions just as acutely as the people of England and Australia suffered.

And they suffered because the "Central Banks" of the world were used to implement the financial POLICY dictated in Wall Street. That is how it was that despite our unprecedented productive ability the people were deprived of the MONEY with which to buy. That is also how the "depression" so quickly became world-wide! As intended by the originator of the system of "Central" banks, the international bankers had thus secured world hegemony in finance, and a re-distribution of governmental powers will make no difference whatever to THAT situation. The possession of "power" which Parliament did not, or could not, exercise was useless when it came to the simple matter of protecting the people of New Zealand.

But strange as it may seem, the people of AUSTRALIA did NOT suffer from conditions of depression in the year 1920 even though "power" (so-called) was divided between seven Parliaments.

What was the explanation of the strange phenomenon that Parliaments with full "power" could not protect their people, whereas the people of a country whose national Parliament did not have full power WERE protected? The explanation is simple. At that time the Commonwealth Bank was controlled by a great Australian patriot (Sir Denison Miller) for the primary benefit of the Australian people, and he did not PERMIT conditions of depression to develop. Unfortunately, since 1924, the Commonwealth Bank has NOT been controlled by great Australians for the benefit of the Australian people. It has been controlled by unworthy Australians for the benefit of International Finance.

There was no need to alter the Constitution before Sir Denison Miller could challenge the International Bankers.

After having done that with great success, he told the Australian people that he could provide them with whatever financial credit was necessary for the full development of the resources of the country. By that action, however, he pronounced his own death sentence, for a press campaign was immediately launched to undermine the people's confidence in him and to foster the idea that it was dangerous for so much power to be vested in one man. This is neither the time nor the place to detail the history of those days, but every earnest and responsible Australian is urged to get and read "The Story of the Commonwealth Bank," by Mr. D. J. Amos, F.A.I.S., of Adelaide. If it is not procurable locally, write to Mr. Amos at 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide.

Since the untimely death of Sir Denison Miller in 1923, the Commonwealth Bank has been used to keep the Commonwealth Government in financial subjection, and it is the present Board's intention to keep the Federal Government in subjection after the war.

Unless the Federal Parliament exercises the power it ALREADY possesses, the Referendum will make no difference whatever to the Government's ability to get things done. Not one of the fourteen "powers" will prevent the Board from dictating to the Government, but an amendment of the Bank Act could convert the Bank from an instrument of dictation to an instrument of service. This simple and proper course is apparently NOT contemplated, and up to now there is no proposal to provide financial sovereignty for the National Parliament. Without financial sovereignty it can have no other sovereignty.

We therefore come to this simple position: Just as an alteration of the Constitution was not necessary for the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank to save us from depression, in 1920, an alteration of the Constitution is not necessary to save us from depression in 1945 or at any other time.

An alteration of the Constitution was not necessary in 1931 to enable the Commonwealth Parliament to LOWER the standard of living, and it therefore stands to reason that an alteration of the Constitution is not necessary to enable the Commonwealth Parliament to RAISE the standard of living.

If the Australian Parliaments could cooperate so readily in 1931 to carry out the orders of Sir Otto Niemeyer and Professor Guggenheim (the names should be carefully noted), representing the INTERNATIONAL FINANCIERS, they can cooperate just as readily after the war to carry out the orders of the AUSTRALIAN PEOPLE.

The pressing need will then be for purchasing-power equal to the prices of the goods and services for sale, but the whole of the fourteen "powers" have apparently

been designed to keep clear of this important issue.

In considering the question of depression, it is essential to bear in mind that they are always the product of FINANCIAL action. They never result from failure of productive processes, from lack of industrial ability on the part of the people, from a drying-up of our natural resources, from a falling-off in the need for food, clothes, and shelter, or from the fact that the means of production are under private control. They are brought about by deliberate reduction, of the volume of purchasing-power in the hands of the people, and this is effected by the trading banks through the imposition of a policy of deflation. You doubt this too? Then read what the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. J. H. Scullin) said in the House of Representatives in 1931, as follows:—

"Recently there came A VERY SUDDEN DROP in the price of exportable commodities, together with a complete cessation of borrowing overseas, and these two factors have greatly aggravated the financial and economic depression. The Government has endeavoured, during the last year or two, to arrest the deflation which has been going on. WE HAVE ENDEAVOURED TO PREVAIL UPON THE BANKS to extend credit in order that unemployment might be arrested. Failing to obtain bank credit, part of the plan was to pass a fiduciary notes bill to assist the wheat farmers and the unemployed, but that measure was rejected in another place."

Paragraph 93 of the Report of the Monetary and Banking Commission explains how the "very sudden drop in prices"

BRITAIN'S VITAL HELPTO RED ARMY

We are far from endorsing all the OPINIONS of the radio commentator who calls himself "The Watchman," but in a recent broadcast from 3UZ he gave a good summary of some FACTS which indicate that a socialistic "planned economy" has seriously hampered the home-front war effort of the gallant Russians; making them partly dependent, to a vital extent, on supplies from abroad—despite their enormous population and territory, their vast and varied resources, and their exceptionally long preparation for war.

[This information has a very special significance for Australians at the present time, because, on August 19, a Referendum will be held to decide whether THIS country is to have a socialistic "planned economy" after the war is over—which would cripple Australia's peace-time production even more than Russia's war-time production, because the partly compensating factors of war-time incentive, urgency and unity-of-purpose will be lacking. Of course, such a disaster—and the loss of hard-won British liberties which so many Australians are fighting and dying to preserve—can be avoided by a majority of electors in each of any three States, if they vote "NO" at the Referendum.]

The following extracts from the broadcast mentioned above are taken from the "Listener In," Melbourne, June 24-30.

Any pause in the general Russian offensive may have been due to an easily-explained cause. With our own great adventure demanding every form of reinforcement that can be made available, it may be that the Western Allies have had temporarily to suspend the supplies they have been pouring into Russia and that the latter has therefore been driven back more upon her own resources for that replenishment of strength necessary before she could again get on the move, which it is hoped will be the final one to eliminate the Nazi power this year.

It is not generally recognised how much the Russian campaigns have owed their

REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

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

Every day finds more and more supporters actively taking up the fight against the "Powers Plot." Even those who in the past have merely cheered us on, recognise this issue as an immediate threat to our liberties and freedom of action.

In accordance with our philosophy of individual decentralised action, campaigners are arranging local meetings and distributing literature, thus bringing the real facts before the electors. Thousands of people are on the "doubt" line on this issue, and it is quite easy to win them to record a "NO" vote. There's no need to waste time on those who have quite made up their mind without knowing the "No" side—it is better to leave them to their fate.

Each individual campaigner, armed with literature, can influence at least a few to vote "No." In this way many thousands of "No" votes will be won; and remember, every vote counts. Will YOU play your part? Nobody else can play it for you. YOU can start in right now by obtaining a supply of "Inside Information" leaflets and distributing them, especially to soldiers and in industrial centres. This is an excellent leaflet for general distribution and is available from the above address at 1/6 per 100 posted. Many thousands of these have already been distributed, but there is room for YOU to introduce them to your district. Don't delay, send NOW.

Our financial appeal for £1 from every supporter is still open, and we will be happy to receive your donation for this fight of fights—the fight for freedom.

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

was brought about by action on the part of the Bank of England, and, believe it or not, the Chairman of the Commonwealth Bank Board has already informed the present Prime Minister that there will be a drastic reduction in the quantity of funds that will be made available after the war. This reasonable intention has been confirmed in the annual report of the Bank Board. The "transfer" of powers will have no effect whatever on this important matter, and if the Bank Board is permitted to carry out its deflationary threat, then the Federal Parliament will be able to do only what the Bank Board permits it to do, as was the case in 1931.

Power to legislate on matters of finance is vested in the Commonwealth Parliament under Section 51 of the Constitution Act, and no power at present vested in the States has anything whatever to do with it.

So you see, that unless the Federal Parliament exercises its sovereignty over finance, the only effect of the transfer of the powers will be to enable the Government to impose industrial conscription, and no genuine Australian would favour that.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2 July 9, 1944. (To be continued.)

[Editor's Note: Mr. Brown intends to conclude this series with two more letters. As soon as they are published we intend to reprint the whole series, of four letters, in the form of a pamphlet. The price will be approximately one shilling per dozen copies, including postage. The urgency of securing the widest possible distribution is obvious; but there will not be time to publish a second edition, and we do not want to print too many, so we appeal to EVERY reader to write to us at once and say how many dozens of copies of the pamphlet he or she will require, so that we can have sufficient copies printed and despatched before it is too late to use them effectively. We must ask for payment with orders, so as to avoid invoicing and bookkeeping at our under-staffed office. If the price is slightly more or less than anticipated, we will adjust orders accordingly. In the unexpected event of not being able to get the printing done promptly when the time comes, payments would be refunded immediately.]

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

all been largely accomplished. And so the game goes on.

RUSSIA AND RUBBER: Further evidence of the willingness of the Allied nations to help Russia to overcome the disadvantages of socialism, which has hampered her industrial development over the past 25 years, is seen in the fact that at the request of the American Government, the Dupont Co. has made available to the Soviet full technical details and plant specifications for the manufacture of neoprene synthetic rubber." According to the Melbourne "Sun" of July 4 this is the first time an American corporation manufacturing strategic materials has made available a highly valuable trade secret to a foreign power. Incidentally, this particular secret, so far as is known, has not yet been made available to Britain or Australia.

"TRUTH'S" TRAILERS: A recent issue of "Truth" uses O.S. print to tell the world that it has trailed down a big gambling racket—to wit, "baccarat." It features a well-known gangster as raking off thousands of pounds from those who choose to follow the sport. "Truth" has a trained staff of sleuths with an immense amount of racket-locating experience behind them, but up to date they have carefully refrained from stalking the really big racketeers—the big bankers—who have got away with, not thousands, but millions, by circulating in the community a staggering total of hundreds of millions of pounds over and above the legal currency issued by the Government. It should be a comparatively simple job for these sleuths to unravel this counterfeit cheque-system plot, and they would earn the lifelong gratitude of the people if they brought the counterfeiters to trial.

RAINY-DAY REASONING: In the midst of an appeal for the proverbial "rainy day" that is always just around the corner, the following appeared in the Melbourne "Herald" of May 1: "Essential purpose of the First Victory Loan is not to finance the war effort. If that were all that mattered the Government could expand credit sufficiently to meet its obligations through the Commonwealth Bank. It is because this has been done that it is imperative to withdraw money from circulation." If you, dear reader, said that, you would be accused of retarding the war effort, and you would be called a crank; but the above is a statement from the "Sound Finance League," so it must be correct! And so it is, excepting for that word "imperative."

SOLDIERS' SUCCOUR: The annual Lord Mayor's Appeal for £25,000 (as set out in a widely distributed circular) tells us that "in Victoria to-day there are more than 1000 men who have lost an arm or a leg, some of them two arms or two legs, as a result of service in the last war or this," and then goes on to appeal for money to assist these heroes. All the finance necessary for this purpose could be provided by the Federal Government through the Commonwealth Bank, free of debt and interest charges, and it is to the Federal Government that the Lord Mayor should direct his appeal for funds.

POLITICIANS' PAY: Pursuing the ethics of Bureaucracy, a recent income tax order, which applies to the year ended June 30, reduces taxation on Federal Members of Parliament by amounts up to £200 a year. Thus we see those who might reasonably be expected to set an example excluding themselves from their own vicious tax laws. Could Hitler do worse?

BUTTER BUNGLE: Some explanation of the alleged shortage of butter is found in a report in "Smith's Weekly" of July 1, concerning £50,000 worth of butter, or about 600,000 lbs. "Smith's" was unable to discover whether the Red Cross, the Army, the Department of Commerce or any of the thousands of bureaucratic bodies owned or controlled the butter, since they all passed the buck. However, the important fact is that it had deteriorated in storage from prime to second grade butter, and it is still in storage on the way to third and, perhaps, last grade butter! Up to date, storage has cost nearly £4000. Incidentally, Italian prisoners of war are still receiving their butter ration of 8ozs! Would YOU give those bungling bureaucrats more power? No? Then vote NO on August 19.

ever used against Russia.

Let these two impressive facts sink into your mind, and you will begin to ask how far the great Russian victories were won by Britain.

M. Litvinov, in January, 1943, declared:

"There is no manner of doubt that the contribution of both war and food supplies played no small part in making possible the Soviet troops' mighty blows against the Fascist invader, and both the Red Army and the people of the Soviet deeply appreciate the help they have received from Britain."

That appreciation was officially endorsed, from Moscow a week ago. If time permitted, I could tell you other striking facts in this connection, but I have told you enough to confound those ignorant and misguided people who all through the war have thought they were clever in asking, "What has Britain done," and who have been unable to see any nation except Russia as playing a decisive part in winning victory.

WHY GIVE CANBERRA MORE POWER?

In discussing the various powers demanded by Canberra "for post-war reconstruction" it is important to know what power already exists to do any particular job.

A State Parliament has powers to pass practically any law it likes, and is only limited in its scope by the powers already given to the Federal Parliament to legislate on Defence, Banking, the Post Office, Foreign Affairs, etc. The State Parliaments can build schools, roads, hospitals, and start up new industries, make wages awards, etc. In the past State Governments paid unemployment benefit. It was a State Government—that of New South Wales—which first paid child endowment.

Under the present Commonwealth Constitution the Federal Government already has powers to pay invalid and old-age pensions; also soldiers' pensions; it already has powers over trade and commerce with other countries and among the States [Sec. 7, 51 (17)]; it already has powers over foreign corporations and trading and financial corporations formed within the limits of the Commonwealth [Section 51, xx]; it can acquire, with the consent of a State, any railways of the State on terms arranged between the Commonwealth and the State [Sect. 51, xxxiii]; also matters referred to the Parliament of the Commonwealth by the parliament of any State [Sect 51 xxxvii].

And over-riding all these, the Federal Parliament already has powers to raise money, tax the people, and to use the facilities of the Commonwealth Bank for creating credit.

Advocates of increased power for Canberra never tire of referring to the years of the depression, and the years after the "last war as examples of drift through lack of adequate powers. Here is what Mr. D. H. Drummond, M.L.A., states in his recent book, "Australia's Changing Constitution" (Angus & Robertson, Sydney; 3/6):—

"It is sometimes stated that lack of constitutional power prevented the Commonwealth from effectively handling problems arising from the depression. Such an assumption can arise only from ignorance of the facts. The spending power and taxing power of the Commonwealth is unlimited. Actually, what prevented the Commonwealth from doing other than make

doles to the State was not lack of power, but failure to perceive the real nature of the depression until it was too late.

"It was not entirely singular in this. There was a time lag in the States also. But fortunately not to the same extent. The Commonwealth could have made money available for power development, unification of railway gauges, schools, technical institutions and housing, on terms and conditions laid down by the Federal Government. It could have instituted long-range schemes. However, it did not, and so missed a great opportunity for leadership and sound policy.

"Yet a reasonable deduction from this experience is that there can be no successful post-war reconstruction unless the financial power of the Commonwealth is harnessed to the States. Had the necessity for such Federal co-operation and leadership been fully recognised at the beginning of the 1930-36 depression, much misery and waste could have been avoided. Moreover, it is certain this war would have found Australia better equipped materially and spiritually.

"That the Commonwealth failed fully to use its powers in the economic crisis "is a reason of doubtful value for scrapping the Constitution and granting further powers." — (Pages 42-43)

This book from which I have quoted is, I think, one of the greatest contributions any Australian has made to political thought, and should be in the hands of every person who is willing to give an hour's serious thought to this important problem.

The fact is that the financial supremacy of the Commonwealth Government dominates the entire political scene, and the work of the States and Municipal Councils has suffered by the concentrating of financial powers at Canberra.

Those who framed the Australian Constitution were no fools; they did their work exceedingly well, and if subsequent generations were not pleased with their work they had full powers to alter the Constitution by referendum.

The Federal system of Government was designed so that States like Tasmania, West Australia and Queensland could be governed by their own people in their own States, with a Federal Parliament at Canberra to look after those things like the Army and the Post Office, which rightly belong to the central Government.

The Leader of the Opposition in the West Australian Parliament has posed the following question:

"Can a Government and Parliament situated at Canberra, 2500 miles from Perth, govern West Australia as wisely in the ordinary concerns of life as similar bodies in Perth itself?"

The fact is that the central Government at Canberra, like other over-centralised Governments, has become a gigantic bottleneck, holding up the life of the community. The immensity and the diversity of the work that Canberra has taken upon itself cannot be adequately dealt with by one Parliament, if for no other reason than that there are only 24 hours in each day. But there are many other reasons.

—James Guthrie, B.Sc.

REFERENDUM DEBATE

The Christian Social Order Study Group has arranged a public debate on the Referendum proposals at the Presbyterian Hall, Trentham Street, Sandringham, on Friday, July 21, at 8 p.m. Mr. G. L. Dethridge, a member of the legal profession, will put the case for a "Yes" vote. He will be opposed by Mr. F. A. Parker, B.A., Dip.Ed.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT (Lectures and Studies Section)

An examination for the Diploma of Associate will be held in Australia in March, 1945

Entry Forms will be sent to candidates during February, and these should be returned within ten days, accompanied by the Entry Fee of 10/6

Names and addresses of intending candidates can be forwarded at any time now to Miss G. A. Marsden (Supervisor), 6 Harden Road, Artamon, N.S.W.

MR. MENZIES AND THE REFERENDUM

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

The greatest factor likely to prejudice the "No" vote at the Referendum is the widely accepted belief that Mr. Menzies and Mr. Fadden are the representatives of all those people opposing greater powers for Canberra.

As pointed out time and time again in these columns, Mr. Menzies and his colleagues are NOT opponents of greater powers for Canberra. They merely quarrel with Dr. Evatt about what powers should be sought. I even doubt whether there is much sincerity in Mr. Menzies' arguments against Dr. Evatt's proposed powers, because he has sought similar powers himself in the past.

But Mr. Menzies is a very shrewd politician, and knows that there is a rising tide of public opinion against the heavy-handed actions of our swollen war-time bureaucracy. If he can create the impression that he is leading the "No" vote, and a "No" vote is successful, he no doubt hopes that he will thereby restore his own political prestige. This is an important point which we would all do well to bear in mind.

The various political leaders are, I believe, going to play a less vital part in this referendum than any ever held in the past. The daily press, which so far has not finally committed itself, is, of course, only publishing the party leaders' views. Many electors will no doubt follow the "party line" BUT A BIG NUMBER IS GOING TO DECIDE HOW TO VOTE BY EXAMINING THE ISSUES INVOLVED.

Social crediters have played a vital part in making these fundamental issues clear to the people. Without going into details here, it can be said that our material on the Referendum issue is regarded so highly by people who are usually opposed to the social credit viewpoint, that they are making liberal use of it in the referendum fight. Although Dr. Evatt and Mr. Curtin make no reference to the matter, it is well known that a considerable section of the official Labor Movement itself is opposed to Dr. Evatt's proposals.

I recently had the pleasure of a discussion with an official Labor Councillor in Sydney, and he told me how much he appreciated the material on the Referendum which this journal has been publishing. He is openly coming out and advocating a "No" vote.

A "No" victory at the Referendum will, I suggest, increase immeasurably the prestige of social crediters in the community. More and more we are being accepted as people who can show people the correct way to do things. I have previously stressed in these columns the fact that our job is to find people with problems and show them how to solve them. I have long since given over the idea that it is worthwhile putting our ideas before people who have no problems, who already have a "solution" to all our problems. Such people are the socialists, irrespective of what label they wear. But there are many people in the community, particularly those who have up until the present time unquestioningly placed their faith in the "Conservative parties, who see the whole fabric of our social structure being undermined without any effective fight being made by their alleged representatives. These people are concerned, and it is not surprising that an increasing number of them are starting to realise that

social crediters have a solution to offer them, a solution which will purify and preserve all those parts of our social structure which most Anglo-Saxons cherish, while eliminating those evils which have proved such a fertile breeding ground for agents of "the enemy."

When one looks back over the past, it is really encouraging to note what such a comparatively small number of ACTIONISTS have done in Australia.

It is so easy merely to read, to know; but it is not so easy to ACT! And action alone will make us an increasingly effective force in the community. Now, although I know that many readers of this journal are already doing all in their power in this Referendum fight, I feel that there are many who could do a little more. The immediate danger confronting us is so vital to our future as a democratic people that no effort can be considered too much in order to defeat it.

Not only am I certain that we can defeat the danger if we all play our part; I also feel that we are presented with a splendid opportunity, one which we may not obtain again for some time, of establishing non-party political groups in all electorates for the purpose of fighting against the "transfer" of powers, groups which I am sure could be easily kept in existence AFTER the Referendum in order to give direction to public opinion. Let us seize this opportunity of bringing many people of different political views together and show them just what they can do if they will work in a non-party association.

Time is now short, but I would like to make a special appeal to all readers of this journal to make it as widely known as possible that Mr. Menzies and his colleagues are NOT the spearhead of the "No" campaign; that the campaign is primarily coming from the electors themselves.

Here is a wonderful opportunity for social crediters everywhere to establish themselves further as people who have something vital to offer in the fight to preserve our way of life.

Some readers have no doubt felt a little diffident about taking action of any kind in the past because they have doubted their own ability. I understand this lack of confidence. But here is a great chance for all these people to obtain experience and confidence on an issue which is comparatively easy. So what about contacting one or two people who are opposed to Dr. Evatt's proposals and forming a group to work for a "No" vote? You should have no difficulty in doing this. Then obtain the literature which is available and ensure that it is used to the best advantage. Help

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

VOTE "NO" LEAGUE: At a committee meeting immediately following the Adelaide Town Hall meeting, at which the League was formed, it was decided to form branches in all suburbs and country towns. The initial work is just beginning to bear fruit; a number of branches have already been formed and many others have been convened.

A central depot has been opened at 85 Rundle Street (Adelaide's important shopping area) where persons interested in the "No" aspect of the campaign are invited to make donations to the campaign funds, and perhaps, what is more important, to find out where they may offer their assistance so that it will be most effective. Full information as to why it is desirable that there should be a majority of citizens who will vote "No" can also be obtained from this address.

We cannot over-stress the vital necessity for all persons who wish to retain their freedom to choose and to act (as opposed to the doubtful freedom of the Atlantic Charter) to get into this fight to defeat the threat of dictatorship in Australia.

ANNUAL MEETING: In last week's notes, owing to an oversight, this meeting was advertised to be held on Tuesday, July 29. This should have read SATURDAY, July 29. Members are requested to notify our office as soon as possible whether or not they intend to be present at this meeting. Business will commence at 3 p.m. Tea will be served by the ladies, and the evening will be of a social nature. As only financial members are entitled to vote, we shall be glad to receive subscriptions before this date. Membership fee is one guinea.

BOOKS TO READ: "STOP THAT THIEF! Finance, the Great Dictator," by Stanley F. Allen, price 1/6. "THE ANSWER TO SOCIALISM," by C. Barclay-Smith, price 2/6. (Both plus 1/4d. postage.)

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

ALICE AND THE RED QUEEN

"The great thing," said the Red Queen affably, "is control."

"What sort of control?" inquired Alice patiently. "Would self-control be any use to you?"

"Not a bit of use!" declared the Red Queen emphatically. "That's a positively dangerous form of control—it leaves no sort of room at all for Ministries and lots and lots of nosey little men running round with notebooks, taking people's numbers and fingerprints."

"Well, what do you want to control?" asked Alice.

"Everything," explained the Red Queen genially. "Morals, social welfare, applied economics, medicine, the fine arts, planning for future betterment, industry and commerce, dog-racing, ballroom dancing, religious beliefs and convictions, small talk and table manners, the size of men's hats and the differential calculus. Control the lot—get graphs drawn about 'em and fine everybody who can't understand them when they're drawn!"

"It sounds a bit fussy to me," remarked Alice.

"Fussy? Of course it's fussy—that's the whole idea of control, child! The more we fuss together the better we shall be."

"I see," said Alice thoughtfully. "Government by the fusspots, for the fusspots, of the fusspots."

"Exactly!" agreed the Red Queen admiringly. "For once in a way, child, you've got the thing in a nutshell."

"Yes," said Alice. "But the English aren't fusspots and don't like fusspots, so it just won't work at all."

—"Manchester Guardian."

IS HEAVY TAXATION REALLY NECESSARY?

Under the auspices of the Brighton (North Ward) Progress Association, Mr. Bruce H. Brown, will give an address on the above question at the Murphy Street Hall, Gardenvale, on Thursday, July 20, at 8 p.m. All welcome.

IT'S OUT

The book you have been waiting for: "STOP THAT THIEF!—FINANCE, THE GREAT DICTATOR."

By Stanley F. Allen, F.C.A. (Aust). It is right up to date—packed with knowledge on conditions gained in pursuance of public duties—and backed with statements from English, Canadian, American and Australian authorities.

Price 1/6 per copy or 12/- dozen (plus postage).

Order direct from S. F. Allen, 88 Pitt Street, Sydney.

—Adv.

DOCTORS CONSULT THEIR PATIENTS

(From a recent issue of a Scottish newspaper.)

It sounds queer. But it happened in Scotland last week.

Dr. Ruth Munro, Invergowrie, and Dr. Hay, Liff, had a joint meeting with their patients in Invergowrie, to explain and discuss the proposed National Health Service plan.

Patients of both, doctors were invited to vote on the plan. They were given papers with these questions:—

(1) Do you wish to employ your doctor as at present?

(2) Do you favour the proposed State Medical Service?

The doctors have now got back 600 voting papers, marked and signed. Every one is against the State plan.

In his address, Dr. Hay said:—

The proposed National Health Service is a political scheme.

Family doctors to-day are employed directly by you. If you don't like us you are free to change to someone else. The so-called "free" medical service is part of the Beveridge plan. Sir William is not so much concerned with your health, but is decidedly concerned that you be fit for work.

Doctors are to become medical policemen to see you don't draw benefit too long or to prevent you from drawing benefit at all. The most successful doctor under the scheme will be the man to whom regulations mean more than his patient. Do you realise medical records cannot possibly be kept secret between you and me, because State officials must be satisfied you have taken the necessary steps to restore your capacity for work in the shortest possible time?

Doctors all over the country should follow the lead of Dr. Munro and Dr. Hay.

They should tell their patients exactly what the proposed plan means. It means more State control. More bossing from the high-ups. Less freedom for you. The disappearance of your family doctor.

The people will not stand for that—if they are warned in time.

And the decision must be made by the people. It is their affair—and theirs only.

AMERICA "HAD TO"!

In a newspaper article dealing with the preparation of the special currency used by Allied forces in invaded territory, Alexander Dilke says—

"It is an interesting comment on the world situation that America [the United States of America], with the greater part of the world's bullion, had to go to Canada for gold coins, since a special Act would have been necessary to enable any of her old reserve to be minted."

"The Social Crediter," March 18.

All matter in this issue dealing with the forthcoming Referendum, and not bearing the name and address of the writer, is written to express the editorial view of the "New Times," and legal responsibility for its publication is accepted by H. F. Allsop, McEwan House, Melbourne.

VOTER'S POLICY GROUPS NECESSARY

If electors showed more signs of wanting to be realistic in their political behaviour there would be little difficulty in showing them the tragic futility of "Party" politics. But some inertia of tradition seems to keep the "Party" system of Parliamentary management in vogue, and the incursion of a few "independents" has not made much difference, partly because, it should be admitted, a Parliamentarian who is free to treat issues according to his own whims may be as dangerous as one who is subservient to caucus rule.

Even a well-intentioned and reliable democrat who tries to oust a Party man at the polls may have about as good a chance as a man would who attempted to "beat the books" on a race day by using a "superior" technique and system of betting.

It may be theoretically possible for a man with the right knowledge and mathematical acumen to succeed in beating the books; but if the test is to be made under existing circumstances the bookmaker has established advantages which work strongly in his favour.

Many people are realising that we are not getting a satisfactory deal from the functioning of Parliaments; but, as yet, few of them will think and act along sound democratic lines, and the outlook often seems a little "black." The following notes are penned in the hope that they will tend to popularise the idea that the position need not be so difficult.

(1) Let us define democracy as a set of conditions under which each person in the community is as free as possible; and actually gets what he or she wants up to the limit of resources available.

(2) Let us understand clearly that a citizen is not fulfilling his political obligations unless he acts so as to make known to his civic and parliamentary representatives what it is he wants done, and what he wants let alone by civic or State executives.

(3) Let us determine to force representatives to fulfil their duties as representatives, and to drop for ever any idea that elected persons shall concoct programmes, or assume any power to decide policies.

(4) Let us realise that money could, and should, be so managed that consumers would wield a "franchise" over producers, parallel to the franchise which we are supposed to have over parliamentary representatives.

If these four "points" are to be used as

WHAT PEOPLE ARE SAYING ?

A citizen of Tasmania writes to a friend in Melbourne:—

I don't know what you think of the present Government, but I think in some respects they are making a mess of things—especially in the food line. You know, Arthur, we have here in Tasmania thousands of bushels of apples rotting on the ground. I've seen them myself, so I can vouch for my statement. We are not allowed to go to the growers and buy them, and the growers are not allowed to sell them to us. The Government is in control of practically everything. It is the same with eggs. Only a few weeks ago they dumped hundreds or thousands of dozens of eggs from the cold stores—they went bad, and the grocers were selling eggs they could not guarantee. Moreover, we are taxed to the eyes to pay parasites who are supposed to see that things run smoothly. They are making a hell of a mess of things to my way of thinking. I don't know what your opinion is with regard to the Commonwealth Powers Bill, but I think they have too much power as it is, and if the Bill is carried, we'll have the "Gestapo" with a vengeance. Curtin and his gang are heading for trouble. Well, I think I had better conclude now, before I say too much, because you never know, they might bring in a Bill before I post this—making it compulsory to have our letters censored; some other parasite might want a job. With best respects to all.

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

The co-operation of readers is sought in securing the widest possible distribution of this work, which appeared serially in the "New Times" and has now been published in Australia in one cover; price 2/- plus postage. Readers of the "New Times" are aware of the exceptional difficulties placed in the way of the dissemination of ideas which are not shared by those upon whom responsibility for the present and past phases of the World War rests. They are to a lesser degree alive to the awakening will to effect a just relationship between power and policy. The forces working in antagonism to peace in freedom are well informed concerning this resuscitation, and are doubtless confident that the immense resources of power at their exclusive disposal will suffice to defeat it.

THIS GREAT ISSUE WILL BE DECIDED BY THE SUFFICIENCY OR OTHERWISE OF THE OPPOSING WILL OF INDIVIDUALS ACTING AS SUCH. FORTIFY IT! EQUIP IT!

A limited number of copies of this booklet is available, so early application is invited. A further edition will be printed if the demand warrants.

Also available—Major Douglas's two other important recent publications: "THE BIG IDEA" (2/6) and "THE LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN) PEOPLE" RACKET" (2/-) Postage extra on both booklets.

The above publications are obtainable from The Electoral Campaign, N.S.W. Division, 296 Pitt Street, Sydney, or from any of the State Electoral Campaign organisations.

strict watch and a directive influence over their representatives as regards policy alone. That is, we citizens, having specified what we want, must never be put off until the results which we want have been arranged and delivered.

The question as to how such public services as Health Department, Railways, Finance, Waterworks and Postal deliveries are to be managed must be left strictly to chosen and able technicians.

If the above ideas are to be used and made effective there is one new piece of "organisation" now lacking. We as citizens must learn the art of getting together as neighbours in groups so as to find out what are the desires of the people in any locality, and pass on this information to our representatives.

This sounds so simple that few will at once be impressed; but the more one thinks of the problem, the more one can be satisfied that this idea of having local groups for no other purpose than that of conveying the wishes of the electors on to the parliamentarians is fundamentally essential.

—C. H. Allen.

ATTACK ON PSEUDO-INTELLECTUALS

"The Edge of the Abyss," a small book of 92 pages, by Alfred Noyes, is packed so full of quotable paragraphs that one is at a loss to know which to leave out of a brief review.

Noyes, whose poetic contributions to English literature are already well known, writes as one of the vanguard of an army which has been on the defensive for years; an army which has heard everything they have held sacred ridiculed, abused, slandered and "debunked."

The virulence and power of the offensive so astonished and stunned them that they were left almost paralysed. But now the tide of battle has turned, the "debunkers" are now about to be "debunked" and many are looking forward to the long-overdue public thrashing.

Noyes sees in the ruthless contempt of life and the degraded subservience of the individual in the modern all-powerful State, and in the open and cynical disregard for the pledged word in politics—he sees in these things the inevitable result of the contempt of the pseudo-intellectuals for all tradition, convention and established principles. He states:

"There had been a world-wide pseudo-intellectual attack, he (John Buchan) observed, in every department of art and letters, on the fundamental principles of ethics and religion, as well as on the most elementary codes of good faith and decency in ordinary human life; and this attack had preceded and prepared the way for the new savagery in the political world. There is a real and vital connection between these phenomena.

"The European tradition (he, Buchan, wrote) has been confronted with an Asiatic revolt, with its historic accompaniment of janissaries and assassins. There is in it all, too, an ugly pathological savour, as if a mature society were being assailed by diseased and vicious children." — (Pages 45-46)

And speaking of conventions, Noyes says: "It may be a convention not to spit in the soup at a dinner party, but . . ."

Speaking of H. G. Wells, one of the "modern" prophets, he quotes Wells as writing that the British Empire has "outlived its usefulness" at the very moment when the salvation of human freedom depends upon it. He said no more, but he had said enough.

Noyes sees in the present chaos of values something sinister and deliberate; he sees something more than a struggle for markets and territory, and he calls it "a battle for the possession of the human soul." He further adds:

"And this is not a sudden eruption. The forces of destruction have been at work within our borders over a long period. For more than half a century, in the literature of the pseudo-intellectuals and neo-pagans all over the world, the sapping and mining has been carried on, with a curiously malicious ardour of concentration, confusing all the lines of right and wrong, and all the loyalties of mankind." — (Pages 5-6)

The book contains quite a few pungent remarks about the evil of the great State bureaucracies. The author says:

"In almost everything that concerns human beings most—their thoughts, their affections, and the lives of those dear to them—the individual human being of average intelligence and character is necessarily far ahead of any man-made organisation, no matter how large or mechanically powerful. Mentally and morally, the individual human being is bound to be in advance of those larger but far more crudely organised bodies—or abstractions—which we loosely personify as nations, States, bureaucracies, or even political parties. It is exactly true that committees have no common conscience—as it is impossible for them to have a child in common, and to feel towards that child exactly as the individual mother feels."

The foregoing quotations should be sufficient to indicate the calibre of the book. That it will arouse a great deal of criticism goes without saying, but those who object to Noyes' attack will have to look to their defences, for Noyes represents only the forward scouts of a great army, which has suffered every kind of ridicule and abuse for many years, but is now on the march and "means business."

The world has many problems ahead of it, and not the least is the problem of bringing back the power of discrimination to a bewildered world. Discrimination is impossible without some minimum standards of behaviour and some knowledge of that great body of experience which has come to us from the past. For this Noyes makes his plea.

—James Guthrie, B.Sc.

PRESERVE FEDERATION

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—The Australian people, after striving for many years for the right to be free and self-governing, that they might establish their own institutions, make their own laws, fashion their own way of life, and guide the destiny of their own community, succeeded in forming five Crown colonies on the mainland and one in Tasmania. Democracy in Australia grew in strength.

Towards the end of last century those Crown colonies had bred some of the greatest statesmen Australia has yet known. Those faithful sons of Australia grappled with the problems of Federation and compiled the Federal Constitution.

With an "Elective Convention," sitting in the calm of peace, wide debate on the platform and discussions in the press, the people were given the opportunity to become thoroughly conversant with Federation and the meaning of the many clauses of the Constitution by which Federation is safeguarded. Thus the Commonwealth of Australia had its birth.

With the birth of the Federal system the crown colonies Federated as States for the common good of each Sovereign State and for the collective security and evolution of all. This Federated Australia that the most intellectual and loyal statesmen of the age created, dupes of overseas influences and false new orders now attempt to destroy.

It is clear you cannot have the Federal system without States, or a more applicable term, "Federal Units." Destroy the Unit and you destroy Federation. Without the Unit the Constitution is no longer a Federal Constitution.

Our Federal Constitution is the bulwark of our freedom, our Parliamentary institutions, and our democratic way of life. It is as sacred to the people of Australia as "Magna Charta" is to the people of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

We Australians should not allow knaves, fools or dupes, under the emergency of war, or threat of isolation or depression, to stampede us into destroying our birth-right of freedom in security, for conscripted slavery.

The democratic freedom, talked about so much, and of which we are told our boys are fighting so valiantly to preserve, will be all hokey if powers are given Curtin, Evatt and Co., of Canberra, to enlarge the Professor-controlled Socialistic Bureaucratic Dictatorship set up under war emergency regulations with which we are now afflicted. The Federal Parliament has full powers already over finance—the powers it neglected to use in 1930-33. It has the power, if it has the will, to work in co-ordination with and through the States and Local Governing bodies. It has the power to release credit, without debt or interest, through the Commonwealth Bank, to stimulate development, both communal and private, in all spheres, in all parts of the continent, building assets, thus further increasing the Nation's credit.

If the Commonwealth Government works in true accord with the will of the people, the 7,000,000 Australians will not only sustain themselves in a high standard of living and advanced civilisation, but also absorb desirable immigrants as fast as they arrive to help develop our nation and make it safe, secure and free.

We can expand Federation, but let us await the calm of peace in which mature, sound judgment can be given the problem of the wise demarcation of powers as between the National Government and the many Federal Units.

The boys will fight and die in the field of battle in vain if we on the home front surrender our "Freedom to be Free" by Referendum on August 19.

—Yours faithfully, WILLIAM AGER
Yamba, Clarence River, N.S.W.

KOSHER

From the "Social Creditor" (England)
May 13.

A correspondent tells us that all margarine made from nuts is considered better than the other kind, and that it is all kosher and marked with the Beth Din stamp. After commenting further on the impact of other such Jewish religious practices on the rest of society, he writes:—

"As a British subject who saw the beginning of the minor Russian Revolution of 1905, I am greatly perturbed at the way people here have put the Jews in a special caste who can do no wrong.

"Two things have remained in my memory: the astonishment expressed at the way the Jews had thrown off the restraints of their Jewish faith and had adopted revolution—the more red the better; and secondly, a German saying, 'Give us Russian soldiers commanded by German officers we shall conquer the world.'

"In 1944 the question may be, what if Germany goes Communist and sides with Russia?

"It has been said that Internationalism is the handmaid of Revolution. Have we started a glissade into Revolution plus Communism?"

BEVERIDGE THE UNREAD

A Social Security League (Northern Ireland) has been formed "to promote the Principles of Social Security as envisaged in the Beveridge Report." The advertisement for a public meeting in Belfast stated "no one can afford to miss this meeting."

Four speakers and the chairman were members of the Action Committee. The chairman said frankly that he had not read the Beveridge Report, but was supporting it because of the claims made for it. The speakers all made the usual claims that the Plan would give the people "real social and economic freedom," etc.

Two Social Crediters were present, and at question time No. 1 asked a question regarding financial control, and was immediately identified by the chairman as a Douglas Social Creditor. The chairman then gave a short address in favour of Social Credit, but said that Douglas had been so misrepresented and boycotted that there is little hope that anything would come of his "schemes," although in the opinion of the chairman Douglas was "absolutely sound." Another member of the League said that Social Crediters were years ahead of the Social Security League.

Social Creditor No. 2 then asked how many members of the Committee had read the full Report, as distinct from the 3d. edition and any popular versions.

There was some "stalling" by the League chairman (one of the speakers), but on being pressed it was admitted that none of them had read the Report. When asked by what right they had called a public meeting for the furtherance of a plan which they had not read, there was no reply.

Discussion followed, and Social Creditor No. 2 could not catch the chairman's eye until an hour when most Belfast meetings close. He quoted paragraphs from the Report pertaining to the conditions for receiving benefit and to various disqualifications from benefit (from page 2 of "The Beveridge Plot") explaining their exact meaning and the power they placed in the hands of the officials. For over twenty minutes the audience stayed while he showed by reference to the report and to the statements of the speakers, how the claims which had been made were contradicted by the Report itself, and went on to censure the League for their temerity in calling the meeting for such a purpose. None of the audience left during this address, which was longer than that of any of the main speakers.

None of the speakers ventured to reply, but the chairman of the meeting reminded the audience that he had admitted that he had not read the Report, and said that the last speaker had now confirmed his fears that the Plan was not all that it had claimed to be.

He had noted that none of the conditions or disqualifications appeared in the 3d. official edition. He was very suspicious of the whole thing. He said that he had been unable to "place" the last speaker as he had the previous one (Social Creditor No. 1), but his suggestion was that both these gentlemen (Social Crediters 1 and 2) should be asked to meet the committee of the Social Security League and discuss the whole question. No attempt was made to pass a resolution. When the audience dispersed, which was immediately after these remarks by the chairman, both Social Crediters waited and met the platform party for a short time. Some of their friends were heard telling them that they would have to be careful before they called any more meetings. One candid person said that they deserved the "telling off" that they had got. A short informal discussion took place between the platform party and their critics in a very friendly atmosphere. No arrangement to meet the committee was made.

—J.A.C. in the "Social Creditor," May 13

THE "NEW TIMES" IS OBTAINABLE AT ALL AUTHORISED NEWSAGENTS

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