

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)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No. 29. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY JULY 21, 1944.

"NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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

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.

The Dangers of "National Health Service"

A Warning to Doctors and Patients

The following Bulletin, the tenth issued by the Medical Policy Association (London), embodies an analysis of the White Paper published by authority of the British Minister of Health on February 17. We offer no comment upon the document beyond saying that, in our opinion, the picture presented of far-reaching, interlocked, cunning controls designed, and destined if the measures of totalitarian planning contemplated become law, to uproot and to destroy what we know as the English way of life, is not exaggerated in a single particular. We will give the text of the Bulletin in full, because of the urgency of this matter, to secure the maximum of publicity and effective resistance to similar plots in this country:

'A NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE'

AN ANALYSIS OF THE GOVERNMENT WHITE PAPER IN RELATION TO THE POLICY OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION AS REVEALED BY THE MEDICAL POLICY ASSOCIATION PLEBISCITE.

"There is no question of far-reaching changes of a controversial character being made by the present Government unless they are proved indispensable to the war. Another Government might take a different view, but not this Government. . . I certainly could not take the responsibility

for making far-reaching controversial changes which I am not convinced are directly needed for the war effort, without a Parliament refreshed by contact with the electors." —The Prime Minister, October 13, 1943.

In 1932 a mysterious document entitled "Freedom and Planning" was secretly circulated by the inner circles of Political and Economic Planning (according to A. N. Field in "All These Things"). Today, in the spate of totalitarian planning, which is being pressed on a muzzled public, we see the fruition contemplated by the author of that document. P.E.P. was also responsible for that now well-known statement "Only in war, or under the

threat of war, will any British Government embark on large-scale planning."

The White Paper, entitled, "A National Health Service," published on February 17 1944, embodies plans to bring about what "Freedom and Planning" advocated so many years ago. Here is the relevant extract: "It is high time that man should make effective use of biological knowledge to improve the human race and make himself more fit for his twentieth century responsibilities. In the health services and the province of medicine it is urgently necessary to shift the emphasis from cure to prevention, from negative to positive health, and this may well call for a big change in the organisation of the medical profession, which has at present too often a vested interest in disease. But there is no reason for supposing that in order to deal with these various questions any new invasions of freedom will be called for which in degree or kind go further than what has already been contemplated [by the author, whose plans for industry were far-reaching] in the industrial field."

P.E.P. inspired, if it did not infiltrate (many of its members are anonymous), the Medical Planning Commission; and P.E.P. is known to be active in most Government departments. It is not surprising, therefore, that the White Paper and the Interim Report of the Medical Planning Commission are identical in their essentials, or that they both outline the administrative machinery for implementing the policy outlined in "Freedom and Planning." The Report advocated, and the White Paper contemplates, the setting up of a Central Authority to organise and control the profession, with powers of making Regulations under the aegis of the Minister. We have explained in earlier Bulletins that centralisation of authority under one man or a small group of men is the very essence of totalitarianism and hence the very antithesis of democracy. Yet this is what the White Paper proposes. It proposes the creation of a Central Authority, which is directly to control doctors, and indirectly to control hospitals.

A very convenient summary of the plan is given in Section IX, pp. 47-52, of the White Paper.

CONTROL OF GENERAL PRACTITIONERS

On page 12 the White Paper states "the organisation of the services of general practitioners will call for a higher degree of central control than other parts of the services." This high degree of control has been very carefully devised:

(1) At the top of the pyramid of control is the Minister of Health, He, in theory, and "subject to Parliamentary control," is the supreme autocrat. But, as anyone who has studied Lord Hewart's "The New Despotism" knows, the real power is exercised by the bureaucrats, who draft the Regulations. Wherever the word "Minister" appears in the White Paper it is a euphemism for "Bureaucrats." Although a well-intentioned Minister could, in theory, mould in some detail the initiation of such a new service as is proposed, quite obviously his successors would be less and less able to master the accumulating mass of Regulations and administrative details. The more organisation is developed, and the more Regulations accumulate, the greater the inertia of the system. This process is quite automatic, and it really is important to grasp its nature, for it is the process by which power inevitably falls into the hands of the permanent officials. Only those who spend their lives in the organisation, who have grown old in it, really know what it is all about, and what can and what cannot be done. Whatever the position at the beginning, after a time the bureaucrats become all-powerful. Eventually the Minister becomes merely the mouthpiece in Parliament of his officials, and utterly dependent on them for the answer to any awkward questions.

(2) THE CENTRAL MEDICAL BOARD: This body is to be the "employer" of the doctors. It is to be to the general direction of the "Minister"—i.e., it is to be the instrument by which the bureaucrats (Continued on page 2.)

That "Inside Information" Leaflet

Although some of our readers are already familiar with that potent Referendum leaflet entitled "Inside Information," we quote the text of it hereunder so that others before it is too late, to what extent it would help them in campaigning for a "No" vote. (Supplies may be obtained, personally or through the post, at 1/6 per 100, from the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne.) The leaflet is worded as follows:—

INSIDE INFORMATION

My name is "Information." I come to warn YOU of the Referendum plot to rob YOU of your liberty.

Read me, heed me, pass me on; I have a thousand appointments waiting.

Beware of would-be "Hitlers" and bureaucratic officials seeking permanent power to boss YOU around after the war.

Hitler and Mussolini also told their foolish people sob stories about employment and security. The Gestapo and the concentration camp soon followed.

Manpower snoopers and the C.C.C. are already here. Neither YOU, your mother, sisters nor brothers are safe from these snoopers. The Referendum, if carried, would soon make them permanent.

The monopoly Press (along with Labour and other political parties!) is urging a "Yes" vote; that fact alone should cause YOU to record an emphatic "No" Vote against industrial conscription for you and your womenfolk.

Dr. Evatt has stated that freedom to choose his own job was only one of the liberties to be lost by the worker. Could Hitler speak more brutally?

Employment is much more important than employment. Liberty is more important than either of them; don't sell your liberty for employment.

It is a cruel and dangerous falsehood to say "more power" will prevent another depression or provide security — beware of such lies.

Britain, South Africa, New Zealand and other "One Parliament" countries armed with "total powers" permitted the bankers to impose the financial depression just as our political parties did.

State Governments can carry out their own reconstruction plans — if given sufficient finance. There's no need to centralise power in Canberra.

It is the duty of the Federal Government to provide State Governments with the

necessary finance—free of debt and interest charges, so as to prevent increased taxation.

Recently and in past centuries actual hard experience all over the world has PROVED that grave dangers and ever-increasing dissatisfaction are caused by handing over power to one "central" government.

In U.S.A., after many years of actual trial of centralised Federal control, which has resulted in general dissatisfaction, plus greatly increased taxation to maintain the centralised juggernaut, the various States are fed-up. Already 48 States have adopted resolutions calling for the necessary amendment of the Constitution to restore powers to the individual States.

Bitter experience has shown that political parties cannot be trusted; they already have sufficient power—don't give them any more vote "No."

Labor has imposed higher and more vicious taxation on lower income groups—and more regimentation than foreign dictators.

The cry for "more power" comes from political Party bosses—not from YOU, the people. Don't surrender your liberty.

Always remember that the other Party may soon be in office. Would YOU trust the other Party? Certainly not. Then play safe—don't trust any of them with more power.

You can get the "Four Freedoms," also food, clothing, shelter, medicine, and work—free—at Pentridge or any asylum, provided you surrender your liberty. Don't do it. Vote "No."

Your sons, brothers and fathers are fighting and dying for freedom; don't betray them—vote "No."

Politicians, bureaucratic officials and economists have bungled wartime production, employment and marketing. Why trust them with power over these matters in peacetime?

The secret powers of "High Finance" are also behind the referendum plot. Don't be fooled by these hidden dictators, or their political dupes.

In the past all political Parties have sought more power over their employers (electors), who wisely refused to permit their servants to become their masters. Be wise, do likewise—vote "No."

During the turmoil of war, when our soldiers are absent, is a most improper time to attempt to stampede the people into deciding such important issues; there is time enough for this when the war is over.

MORE POWER FOR POLITICIANS
MEANS LESS POWER FOR YOU
EVERY "NO" VOTE IS A BLOW AGAINST
FASCISM.
VOTE "NO."

NOTES on the NEWS

The mania for finding work for "the other fellow" has been manifested at the World Monetary Conference, as witness the following resolution proposed by the Australian delegates: "That all countries pledge themselves to maintain high levels of employment and to exchange information, on measures necessary to prevent the growth of unemployment and its spread to other countries." This can only mean opposition to any development likely to transfer more of the burden of labour on to the backs of machines. So, if any scientific development by way of a machine or a process is likely to be made available to eliminate more work, each country is to pledge itself to suppress it! Presumably all inventors and scientists are expected to immediately refrain from discovering or improving anything that is likely to eliminate work, and turn their attention to devising ways of making more work!

CURTIN'S CRUISE: It was stated recently in these columns that we would probably soon learn the real reason for Mr. Curtin's summons to "Wall St." The following from the Melbourne "Sun" of July 11 at least provides a lead: "Australian Ministers are known to favour placing Australian Forces at the disposal of an international authority." Now we begin to see the probability that the transfer and extension of Powers to the Federal Government is being sought so that the powers can in turn be surrendered to an "international authority." Labor leaders in the past have been associated with some treacherous acts, but they are insignificant by comparison with this threatened betrayal, which would mean, among other things, that Australians could be conscripted to wage war against Australia and their own flesh and blood. Get busy and rouse your fellow-citizens against this danger.

CONSCRIPTION: Mr. Curtin is reported, also in the Melbourne "Sun" of July 11, as saying: "I wanted conscription in 1941 and 1943, but as far as I am concerned there will be no post-war industrial conscription. I am not sure of the U.A.P.'s intention." Fancy that, now! First of all he violated Labor's anti-conscription policy; and after betraying that cardinal principle he expects to be trusted not to carry conscription into the post-war years, and whilst he questions the intentions of Menzies and Co., he seeks to place the industrial conscription power at their disposal later on, via the "Powers Bill." If he were sincere about this matter, he certainly would not be a party to placing the power at their disposal. His statement, along with those of many others, including those of U.A.P. leaders, reek with hypocrisy. Surely electors will not trust ANY Party with more power.

U.S. UNIONS: A Washington report predicts the overthrow of union gangster John L. Lewis as a result of rank-and-file re-

volt. The rebels in conference objected to the "provisional control" system under which Lewis appoints the bosses and officers of 21 of the 31 districts, thus ensuring his absolute authority. The conference demanded the right for local districts to appoint their own officers. Once again we witness the corruption and confusion of centralised control, and this should be a lesson to rank-and-file unionists here who are being bossed around by their executives. It should also illustrate the danger of giving more centralised power to political gangsters.

SKIMPED SESSIONS: Since the allegedly democratic Labor Party was returned to office on August 21, 1943, these paid servants of the people have sat for only 37 days; and if, as proposed, the House only sits for an additional 14 days, that will mean they have worked for only 51 days and drawn their pay (plus special taxation deductions) for 365 days. This undemocratic practice means that discussion is curbed and redress of grievances is denied to their employers (the people). Fancy giving more power to men who have flouted the prin-

(Continued on page 2.)

More Money for Zoo than Babies

ADELAIDE. —Maternity services in South Australia received a Government subsidy, that was actually £200 a year less than the subsidy given to the Zoo, the superintendent of Northfield Infectious Diseases Hospital (Dr. Alan Finger) said.

According to the Government Statistician's figures, he said, in 1941-1942, £3000 was paid for maternity services, and £3200 to the Zoo.

School medical services were so poor that one medical officer was responsible for the health of 7500 children, he said.

The Camp Follower

"The world is showing an unmistakable tendency to argue that if a thing is physically possible, whether it is fighting a war or removing unemployment, it must not be stopped by considerations of "sound finance" alone. In war, finance is manifestly a mere camp-follower, and the tendency is to reduce it to a dependent status in peace as well."

—From "The Economist" (London).

In Melbourne an independent Vote "No" Campaign, conducted by honorary organisers F. C. Paice and E. J. Grogan, is being financed by public subscription, and therefore has free leaflets available. "New Times" readers anywhere in Australia may obtain some of these leaflets by writing to Mr. Paice, c/o Box 1226L, G P.O., Melbourne. The text of each leaflet is reprinted hereunder:

LEAFLET NO. 1:

You are told that if YOU do not give more POWER to the Federal Government YOU will have another DEPRESSION and CHAOS. Did the ONE PARLIAMENT countries like Britain, South Africa, New Zealand and other TOTAL CENTRAL POWERS countries avoid the last financial depression? No. More POWER to Canberra means MORE CONTROL over YOU and LESS CONTROL over your MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT. A YES vote relies on a promise of SECURITY WITHOUT FREEDOM.

VOTE NO AND DEMAND SECURITY WITH FREEDOM.

LEAFLET NO. 2:

WORKERS!
Do YOU realize that Subject No. 2—CONTROL OF EMPLOYMENT and UNEMPLOYMENT—means that TRADES UNIONS COULD BE SMASHED as effectively as Hitler smashed them by some PUBLIC SERVANT wielding DELEGATED POWERS, DIRECTING (CONSCRIPTING) MILITANT Unionists to a MORE SUITABLE JOB?

YOU can get PEACE and SECURITY in PENTRIDGE (with music).

After the war there will be plenty of WORK FOR ALL (if the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT makes MONEY available under its EXISTING POWERS) without INDUSTRIAL CONSCRIPTION.

Do You Want to Retain Your Freedom? THEN VOTE NO and DEMAND SECURITY and FREEDOM.

REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

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

The referendum issue is becoming more hectic each day, and it looks like being the most lively campaign in Australian history—it is certainly the most vital. Many organisations, although usually divided, are solidly united to defeat this threat to our liberties. On the one hand, Lang Labor is fearlessly opposing the proposals, whilst the rank-and-file of what is commonly called "Business" are also staging a real fight, so it cannot be argued that only business interests are on the "No" side. Rather does it appear that these seeming opposites are realising that they have been led astray in the past and so we have strange bedfellows. The reasons for all this need not concern us; the important point is that these forces are assisting (or at least attempting to) our fight to retain our freedom of action. If it be that these sections realise they have previously been led astray, it augurs well for the future; after all, that is what we have been telling them for years. So, on with the fight—using everything and everybody willing to be useful—post-mortems can be held later.

We send our hearty congratulations to country supporters, who are putting up such a splendid fight, and in particular to those who are staging their own meetings and finding their own speakers.

Contributions to our financial appeal for £1 from every supporter are still coming in, and we urge YOU not to delay attending to this matter. Previously acknowledged amounts total £113/2/-. Subsequent donations are: H. Butt, 17/-; Mrs. Cummings, £2; W. Griffiths, £1; Sgt. Godden, 10/-; Miss Groves, 5/-; Miss Lane, £1; S. Murphy, £1; "Red Cliffs Friend" £1; "Shepparton Friends," £5; H. Waite, 15/-. Grand total: £126/19/-. There's still room for your donation, and an urgent need for it to keep the fight going until the gong goes; will YOU attend to the matter—NOW? Send your donation to the above address, and don't forget to let us know the quantity of "Inside Information" leaflets you are prepared to distribute.

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

FARMING IN CANADA

"Another thing that alarms me," said Mr. J. W. Burton, in the Canadian House of Commons recently, "is that the agricultural policies of this Government are forcing the family farm out of our national economy. More and more are we being forced on to a mass production basis. The only way the farm family can compete with modern mass production is by the use of the unpaid slave labour of the women and children on the farms. If it were only that the family farm was in danger I would not be so much concerned, but the very existence of the farm family is being severely threatened. Remember, the family unit is the very foundation of our nation . . ."

Later in the debate, which was on the Governor-General's Address, Mr. Hlynka (Vegreville) gave corroborative details. He said that the 1941 census showed that there were then 732,715 farms operated in Canada. Of this number 549,972 were operated by owners, and others either in part by owners and part by tenants or simply by tenants. "In the Province of Quebec tenants occupy one farm out of every thirty; in Ontario, one out of every nine; in Manitoba, one out of every five; in Saskatche-

LEAFLET NO. 3:

Would a YES vote mean the continuance of INDUSTRIAL CONSCRIPTION for a period of at least 5 years after the war?

The FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, through Acting Prime Minister Mr. Forde, has given a specific agreement that it will NOT.

("Argus," 17/5/44.)
How can the Government honour this agreement when it has ALREADY passed the UNEMPLOYMENT and SICKNESS BENEFITS ACT (No. 10 of 1944), which contains the following provisions:—That any WORKER who is unemployed shall NOT receive benefits unless he—

PART III. DIV. I. PAGE 5—(c) "SATISFIES THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL that he (1) is unemployed and that his unemployment is NOT DUE to his being a DIRECT PARTICIPANT IN A STRIKE." (II.) "is capable of undertaking and is willing to undertake WORK which in the OPINION OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL IS SUITABLE to be undertaken by that person" (our emphasis).

NOTE.—The DIRECTOR-GENERAL can DELEGATE his POWERS to ANY OTHER PERSON (Page 10, Clause 8).

VOTE NO. And Demand Security with Freedom.

LEAFLET NO. 4:

OPEN LETTER TO ELECTORS OF AUSTRALIA.

The organisers of the "VOTE NO CAMPAIGN" invite ALL Electors OPPOSED to the TRANSFER OF POWERS to exercise their PERSONAL INITIATIVE and DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS by becoming ACTIVE in their opposition to the continuance into the POST-WAR PERIOD of:—

- (1) INDUSTRIAL CONSCRIPTION, with its MANPOWER CONTROL, depriving you of the right to CHOOSE YOUR OWN JOB.
- (2) IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT TRIAL OR CHARGE.
- (3) CLOTHES AND FOOD RATIONING.
- (4) DESTRUCTION AND RESTRICTION OF PRODUCTION.
- (5) CENSORSHIP OF PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE, etc.
- (6) ZONED DELIVERIES, WHICH RESTRICT THE HOUSEWIFE'S CHOICE.

LEAFLET NO. 5:

WHERE DOES MENZIES STAND? 1938: He Strongly Urged Greater Powers for Canberra. ("Hansard," Vol. 158; pages 1815 to 1821.)

1942: He is quoted at length (4 pages) in Dr. Evatt's Book, "Post-War Reconstruction," in support of Greater Powers.

1944: Menzies now says VOTE NO. This may cause Workers to go into reverse and Vote Yes. If "Yes" wins, will Mr. Menzies be like prosperity, JUST ROUND THE CORNER? GOVERNMENTS CHANGE—POWERS REMAINS.

VOTE NO.

LEAFLET NO. 6:

OPEN LETTER TO VICTORIAN ELECTORS:

Perhaps YOU Do Not Like Mr. DUNSTAN. Maybe YOU Regard Him as A DICTATOR. Wielding STATE Wide Power. Would You Prefer a Similar Character Wielding INCREASED COMMONWEALTH POWERS

AT CANBERRA? IF NOT—WHY TAKE THE RISK? VOTE NO.

LEAFLET NO. 7:

UNIONISTS! UNION EXECUTIVES, acting as your MASTERS, have pledged YOU to a "YES" vote.

MAKE YOUR OWN choice and show that YOU are the MASTERS and they are your SERVANTS.

VOTE: NO [1]

wan, one out of every four; in Alberta, one out of every six. The census shows further that from 1931 to 1941 the ownership of farms dropped by 5.8 per cent, and there was an increase of 25.3 per cent, in rented farms during the ten-year period." The average size of farms in Canada increased from 198 acres in 1921 to 238 acres in 1941. In 1941 Canadian farmers owed 629,000,000 dollars, which amounts to an average of 2372 dollars per farm, and that does not include debt written off, or smaller private debts. Forty-eight per cent of all owned farms in Canada are mortgaged. The following are the percentages of farms operated by owners and carrying mortgage indebtedness in 1941:—Nova Scotia, 13.1 per cent; New Brunswick, 19.0 per cent; British Columbia, 31.5 per cent; Quebec, 39.9 per cent; Prince Edward Island, 46.4 per cent; Ontario, 50.7 per cent; Manitoba, 53.3 per cent; Alberta, 61.0 per cent; Saskatchewan, 77.6 per cent.

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.

THE DANGERS OF "NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE"

(Continued from Page 1.)

rule doctors. It is to have no voice in policy, but is to have important executive functions (including disciplinary powers). Payment of doctors will depend on their entering into a contract with the Board, and it will then be the duty of the Board to ensure that the doctors carry out the terms of their contract. The White Paper gives only an indication of what the contracts would cover, but it is not difficult to read between the lines. Obviously, quite apart from mere medical care (which would become by degrees the least of their functions, as hospital organisation got under way) doctors would have certificates and forms of all kinds to fill in, records and returns to make, inspections, annual medical examinations, special examinations for fitness for this and that kind of work, compulsory inoculations and the other paraphernalia of "positive" health.

The Board is required to assess the "proper competence" of its employees: this clearly implies a system of "confidential reports" on individuals, either from seniors in the service, or from special inspectors. This system is utterly vicious, and rapidly leads to destruction of individuality. Whatever you do, you wonder what your next senior thinks of it. The system also means that every doctor will be card-indexed and dossiered; at Headquarters he will be represented on an individual file, where every letter he writes officially is kept, where records of his doings and misdeeds (according to the informer) are noted. As we have pointed out many times, the doctor becomes responsible not to his patient (though he is at his patient's mercy), but to the central authority. The opportunities for intrigue are fantastic, and in fact intrigue becomes a main preoccupation of many officials. Human nature is—human nature: "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

The creation of a central authority with power to enforce Regulations framed by bureaucrats is the fundamental criterion of totalitarianism, and the absolute antithesis of democracy. Doctors have not yet been able to control their own Executive in the B.M.A. What hope would they have of controlling the Central Medical Board?—And "the public" owns the B.B.C., and never has, and never will, control it, and no more would it ever control the C.M.B. or "the Minister," both of whom would impose on patients what they considered "good" for them—i.e., "in the public interest." Bureaucracy is never concerned with individuals, only with mass effects and statistics.

The Board will also watch over the distribution of public medical practice generally. That is, they will acquire just those powers of "Posting" medical officers hither and thither (movements within the service, the White Paper calls it) which are exercised in the Armed Forces. This power is very useful for disciplinary purposes.

The Board will have the power of "directing" new graduates into "apprenticeship." This is simply a provision to eliminate private practice gradually instead of all at once. The idea is that those who have never known private practice will never miss it (that is why the bureaucrats are so anxious to have their scheme in operation when the young doctors come out of the Forces)—once in the State Medical Service (sorry—National Health Service) the new recruits would lose all their initiative and so never leave it. It should be specially noted that every new graduate automatically comes under the authority of the Board. Release from its clutches would not be automatic, and would be abolished as soon as everything was working smoothly.

(3) HEALTH CENTRES: In Bulletin 8 we explained at length that the effect of Health Centres would be to take away from doctors their property rights in and control over the instruments of their profession and place of practice. In socialist terminology, they would thus be reduced to the ranks of the proletariat. Once sufficient Health Centres were established, the logical next step would be to make it illegal to practice anywhere but in the centres, and to own medical instruments. Doctors would then be completely dispossessed and at the mercy of the bureaucrats. Ownership nominally would be vested in "the public." We invite the public to go along and exercise its ownership of the Post Office. It is effective control, and not nominal ownership, which is vital. Control of Health Centres is to be vested in the rehabilitated Local Authorities, so that to the extent that doctors are compelled to work in the centres, they come under the control of the Local Authorities in addition to the central control of the Board. It is an obvious device to induce Local Authorities to increase their power and prestige, by undertaking the construction of Health Centres at their own expense, thus speeding up their construction, and hastening the end of private practice.

Such is the very simple plan to reduce the private, and hitherto independent, general practitioner to the status of serfdom.

(To be continued.)

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, July 27, at 8 p.m. After the general business is concluded, there will be a general discussion on the Referendum Bill, led by Mr. D. J. Amos. As he has recently examined the Australian Constitutional Law, both as at present and if the Referendum is carried, this meeting should be of particular interest, so all members are urged to come along and bring their friends.

—J. E. Burgess, Hon. Secretary.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

principles of representation in this Fascist manner!

HOUSING HORRORS: The following comment on the N.S.W. Housing Commission's £900 model home for two adults and four children comes from a Sydney builder and contractor, and was published in "Smith's Weekly" for July 1: "(A) this cost must include a lot of red-tape and overhead, because cottages better in design and comfort were built in 1939, at £600 for the finished job. (B) the 8ft. ceilings instead of the 10ft. height would not be passed by any council building committee. (C) There are no chimneys, and no separate dining-room, even in a £900 house." Sacking those responsible for such buildings is suggested as being vital in the public interest.

TAX GRAB: A Sydney doctor has been ordered by Justice Rich to pay to the Taxation Department £13,303 for alleged tax evaded, a penalty of £500, and an additional sum of £4000. Council for the victim said bankruptcy is thus made inevitable. That did not worry the "Bankers' Collection Agency," which also required sequestration and an undertaking that the assessment would not be disputed when issued. The Judge ordered that within 24 hours of receiving outstanding assessment the victim should file a petition in bankruptcy for the sequestration of his estate—no alternative of imprisonment was offered, so obviously bankruptcy was the objective. Irrespective of the legal correctness of the action, this should be a warning that this taxation monster must be subdued before it wrecks all of us.

TRACTOR TROUBLES: A practical dairy-farmer writing in the Melbourne "Sun" of July 13 objects to the action of impractical socialist Planners foisting on the dairying industry 10,000 tractors, together with a bill for £6,000,000, plus an annual operational charge of many more thousands. He says that few if any dairy farms would require more than a three-horse team (which would feed on the farm) to do all cultivating, harvesting or top-dressing work that is necessary or practicable. He also says that the communal plan for using the plant and the tractors is valueless—and that the irony of the situation is that 75% are to be rubber-tired, whilst dairymen cannot get a tyre for transport purposes! A lot more of these facts from practical men and pressure from electors (coupled, of course, with a "No" vote at the Referendum) will be required to stop the crazy Planners.

POWERS PLOT: Evidence is to hand that the "Powers Bill" being submitted to the people is not the same as that presented to the parliamentary convention; and, in the opinion of several eminent K.C.'s, subsection 4 would build into the Constitution the power to govern by regulation. This completely disposes of the false statements by "Yes" advocates that the convention agreed to all these Powers. The campaign is progressing very badly for the "Yes" side—because truth will out; but beware, unscrupulous stunts may be on the way as last-minute sensations.

HOLLOWAY'S HYPOCRISY: Labor stalwart E. J. Holloway is reported as saying that he and his colleagues hate industrial conscription. Here is an illustration of mere words, contrasted with actions. This so-called enemy of conscription, and his confederates who verbally hate conscription, not only refuse to abolish it when they have the power (now), but enforce it with greater venom than their so-called political rivals. In addition, this apologetic gang pegged wages to prevent workers from providing for a rainy day; then they imposed more vicious taxation than Menzies & Co. On top of this, they abolished the statutory tax exemption regarding workers' incomes. Surely workers will not trust such men with more power?

FEDERAL FOLLY: Posters issued by Commonwealth planning authorities throughout Tasmania, and costly appeals over the air exhorting people to save electricity, have aroused the ire of the Hydro-Electric Commission. Why? Because Tasmania's power is generated from water, not coal; besides, the Commission is trying to sell surplus power. This absurd and willful waste by Federal Bureaucrats is just another illustration of the dangers of giving these maniacal Planners more power to sabotage the peace—as they are sabotaging the war effort.

WELCOME TO ERIC BUTLER

Arrangements are being made for a gathering to welcome Eric Butler, who will soon be in Melbourne on leave from "up North." His wife is also expected to be present. The function, which will take the form of a social evening and supper, probably at "The Victoria," Little Collins St., has been fixed tentatively for August 22. Friends and supporters intending to be present are requested to advise Miss M. Fahey, c/o "The New Times," so that catering arrangements can be finalised. The charge per head will be 3/6. Please assist by notifying your intentions promptly. Watch these columns for further details.

Red Cliffs and Mildura

Readers of the "New Times" who reside in or near Red Cliffs and Mildura, and who are able in any way to help the Vote "No" Campaign in that district are invited to communicate with Mr. S. W. Butler, Box 423, Red Cliffs with a view to making a coordinated effort.

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

Sir, —Mr. J. V. Barry, K.C., has written a booklet entitled "Wider Powers for Greater Freedom," and it carries a "Foreword" by the Rt. Hon. Sir Isaac Isaacs. The booklet is described as "An Argument for Constitutional Reform," but with the exception of a brief reference on page 15 is wholly irrelevant to the issue. His whole argument is based on the erroneous assumption that the only power the Commonwealth Parliament has in regard to Finance is the power to join with the rest of us in a scramble to COLLECT some of it. He makes no reference whatever to the PRODUCTION of it! This is what he says:

"The contention that the Commonwealth can use the taxation power and the exclusive right to levy customs and excise duties, coupled with the power under Section 96 of the Constitution to grant financial assistance to the States, to force the States to carry out reconstruction measures, ignores the realities of practical politics, but in any event there is surely something repugnant about a suggestion that the Commonwealth should use its control of the purse-strings to coerce the States."

All his "argument" is based on the idea that the supposedly sovereign Parliament is limited in its finance to what it can get from taxation, revenue, and "borrowing"—i.e., to what it can COLLECT. The more important question of its PRODUCTION—especially the great bulk of it known as bank credit—does not even get a mention. How shrewd was Anselm Rothschild when he said: "Permit me to control the money supply and I care not who makes the laws!" And to think that a learned King's Counsel harbours the belief that the Commonwealth Parliament "controls the purse-strings"! It may well be argued that it SHOULD, but until it actually does so Mr. Barry's argument is worthless.

The only reference I wish to make to the "Foreword" by Sir Isaac Isaacs is that most of his compatriots see eye to eye with him on the question of the centralisation of POWER and the killing of initiative on the part of individuals.

Another booklet entitled "YOU and the Referendum" is being distributed "under the authority of the Commonwealth Government of Australia." It contains this important paragraph on the last page:—

"The Referendum is NOT a question of transferring powers. The States do not lose the 14 powers in question. The carrying of the Referendum merely means that the Commonwealth is given the same powers to legislate in these particular fields as the States will continue to exercise."

This new twist makes it appear that we are to go in for a further DIVISION of power. States cannot continue to legislate in fields covered by Federal legislation because the Federal legislation is supreme. This booklet also carries the emphasis throughout that the intention is to put everyone to WORK, even though our scientists and engineers are showing us how to be relieved from excessive toil. What we seek is more leisure, not more work.

The same basis has been used for a third booklet entitled, "What is the Referendum?", prepared by the Referendum Research Committee of the Melbourne University Labor Club, the "organisers" being S. B. Gurewicz (I do not know the proper pronunciation of that) and Betty Reilly. This, too, has a "foreword," and it was written by Brian Fitzpatrick.

Mr. Fitzpatrick hits the nail on the head when he says that if the people vote "Yes" national planning can proceed "with assurance on the part of the planners that their arrangements for full employment and social security can be put into effect when the war is over."

That's what it's all for! We must establish the PLANNERS! THEY will then proceed "with assurance" to fix things up and give us the sort of security that prisoners enjoy when they are in gaol: Everything but freedom to choose for ourselves! Like Mr. Barry, Brian Fitzpatrick never intrudes on the question of the PRODUCTION and ownership for the stuff every worker and every soldier is obliged to fight for—MONEY.

That these men have only hazy ideas on the subject is shown by the question and answer on page 10, as follows:

Question: "Why does the national income of Australia fluctuate?"

Answer: "Fluctuations arise mainly from two factors—(a) variations in the level of employment; (b) variations in the volume and value of primary production, and therefore of exports."

What do you think of that from a University body? Not one word to explain what CAUSES the level of employment to vary, or the "value" of our production to fall! Like all the other "authorities" advocating a "Yes" vote, these people say nothing about the production and control of the thing that controls all other things—MONEY.

Employment and "values" are both controlled by the policy of the bankers, and are influenced by interest rates, their sale or purchase of securities, and the granting or recalling of overdrafts (bank credit). This control will NOT be affected by the Referendum, and readers are requested to notice that all the "Yes" literature being circulated is of the same type, carefully keeping away from the vital matter of control of FINANCIAL POLICY. That is being fixed up behind closed doors in the United States.

Unfortunately it is not practicable to reply in detail to all the propaganda being issued, but it will be found helpful to give brief consideration to each of the "powers" included in the Referendum proposals, and to note the difference between what is being SAID and the position as it really IS. What we DO is much more important than what we SAY.

It is proposed to insert a new Section in the Constitution Act to be known as Section 60A, and sub-section (1) will give the Commonwealth Parliament "power to

make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to" the fourteen items enumerated therein. Sub-section (5) specifically provides, however, that Section 60A shall continue in force for only five years from the date on which hostilities cease in the present war, and that "no law made by the Parliament with respect to any of these fourteen items shall continue to have any force or effect after this Section has ceased to have effect."

Item (i) reads thus: "The reinstatement and advancement of those who have been members of the fighting services of the Commonwealth during any war, and the advancement of the dependents of those members who have died or been disabled as a consequence of any war."

There is already a Repatriation Commission and a War Service Homes Commission, which work under instructions from the Federal Parliament, and the High Court has ruled that the Commonwealth has full power to repatriate members of the armed forces. No soldier or the dependant of a soldier will be in difficulties after the war if assured of an adequate income, and income is a matter of MONEY. Finance is within the powers vested in the Commonwealth Parliament, vide Section 51 of the Constitution Act, and there is no State Power which can prevent the Federal Government from doing what ought to be done for members of the Fighting Services. Provided it can get the MONEY the Parliament can even give our returned men independence for life, but unless there is a change in FINANCIAL POLICY the returned man will borrow £750 for the purchase of a home and will have to repay a grateful Government £1500. Nothing is too good for these men, so we give them less than nothing. That would NOT be changed by the Referendum proposals.

Item (ii): "Employment and unemployment":

This, of course, could be made to cover everything, and indeed it would be the only power, which the Federal Government would really acquire. It is the power to make you go where you are sent, do what you are told, and starve if you object. Apart from this pleasing aspect, the question of employment and unemployment is nothing more than a question of income. The unemployed who receive dividends do not find unemployment undesirable or demoralising. The very reverse is the case. They regard it as very desirable and uplifting, and we call them "independent gentlemen." The unemployed only become a problem when they have no money. Income is a matter of finance, and finance is not controlled by any State Parliament. Unemployment could have been eliminated in 1931 had the Federal Labor Government been able to operate a fiduciary issue of only £18,000,000 (since then we have in-

creased the note issue by more than £150 millions!), but the Bank Board refused to co-operate, and the Senate, under the "leadership" of Sir George Pearce, rejected the Bill. In the face of these facts it is clear that the question of unemployment is being approached from the wrong angle altogether, and that this particular "power" is designed to control us, not to help us. In this regard it is important to remember the admission of Dr. Evatt that the freedom to choose his own job and his place of toil is only ONE of the liberties to be taken from the worker. It has been correctly stated on one of the "No" leaflets that "the only power of importance which the Government does not already possess is the power to tell you where to work and what work you shall do, whether you like it or not." To protect us from this very thing is one of the purposes for which we thought the war is being fought.

Item (iii): "Organised marketing of commodities":

There are two kinds of organised marketing—one is for the maintenance of a "price" and the other is to get the maximum quantity of goods to the people. All experience to date is of the former variety, under which the best apples are fed to pigs and the best potatoes left in the ground to rot, so as not to come on the market and spoil the "price." Organised marketing has never been designed to ensure the maximum supply of goods to hungry and needy people; it has always been designed to get a "price." "Price" is a matter of money, and if the people are supplied with money they automatically provide the market. Genuine public demand will of itself be a good regulator in the matter of orderly marketing, and if our financial policy is right our marketing will be right. Financial policy is not a State matter and is not affected by these powers. This particular power is wanted to maintain the scarcity, not to encourage plenty. Give the farmer a sure market for his goods, with reasonable transport facilities to get them there, and there will be no need for marketing boards. Marketing conditions are the product of financial policy, and all the "organising" in the world will be useless if the people are not supplied with sufficient money to purchase what they need.

Item (iv): "Companies, but so that any such law shall be uniform throughout the Commonwealth":

Much of the lack of uniformity in Company legislation arises from the competition between the States to secure the "attraction" of what is called "capital" for developmental purposes. States have granted special "concessions" and special "rights" to companies in order to beat other States for the business. The purpose behind this scramble is to provide work so as to attract workers, distribute money, and increase revenue. If finance were available for all legitimate developmental work each undertaking would be organised on its own actual merits and there would be no need whatever for concessions or special rights. Any desirable uniformity in company legislation would then be brought about by co-operative action. Even in this question finance is the controlling factor, but this is never mentioned by Government spokesmen or by politicians professing to oppose the powers transfer.

(Continued on page 4.)

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the UNITED DEMOCRATS' Headquarters, 17 Weymouth Street, Adelaide.)

ANNUAL MEETING: We wish to remind members that our annual meeting will be held on Saturday, July 29. Business will commence at 3 p.m. Tea will be served by the ladies and the evening will be of a social nature, and will include the screening of a colour film of Malaya with a commentary by Mrs. Bath. We are assured that this film will be well worth seeing. All members are urged to make a special effort to be present at this meeting.

VOTE "NO" CAMPAIGN: Suburban and country branches are still being formed. We appeal to social creditors to join their local branch. Full details may be obtained from the campaign headquarters, 85 Rundle-street, Adelaide. We understand that the Vote "No" League will soon be issuing a manifesto on post-war reconstruction. We have not yet received a copy of this, but as soon as we do, details will be published in these notes. We believe that something positive along these lines must be offered to the public to avoid the Referendum being carried.

FREEDOM FROM WANT" CAMPAIGN: We have just noticed in "Hansard" a speech by Senator McLeay on 30/3/44, in which, although he admits that 27/- per week is not a very substantial amount and will not buy what 20/- would buy before the war, he criticises the Government for altering the law by regulation under the National Security Act to avoid a reduction of 6d in the pension rate due to a cost of living adjustment. Whether or not the Government was right in altering the law by regulation, the fact remains that from the point of view of reality Australians can produce sufficient food and clothing adequately to provide for the needs of all citizens. From his remarks it is clear that Senator McLeay knows very little about finance, and therefore he exceeded his duty in prattling about the dangers of inflation. He stated that until all social services are provided on a contributory basis the people will not receive the protection in future years to which they are entitled. He believes that even invalid and old age pensioners appreciate this fact. No, Senator, pensioners cannot be expected to understand such a highly technical subject. What they can appreciate, however, is the fact that, after giving a lifetime of service to a country which is obviously enormously wealthy in a material sense, they are expected to exist on a mere pittance. Go to it, pensioners, demand your rights. If you have sent a request letter to your Federal Representative, send one to your Senators. Forms may be obtained from this office, or from Mr. J. Fitzgerald, President of the Prospect Branch of the Pensioners' Association, 3, Elizabeth-street, Prospect, South Australia.

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Sec.

machinery and better organisation in industry has resulted in an increasingly bigger proportion of industry's costs being devoted to previously produced capital goods, and relatively less and less costs being caused by paying current wages, etc., to individuals. Unemployment increased and orthodoxy could suggest nothing better than the employment of a great number of the people in building more and more capital goods in the form of factories, etc. War temporarily saved the situation; in fact, it arrived just in time to prevent another depression. What a boon Hitler was to the controllers of the international banking system, who are determined that any "ordinary" individuals not required in the production of consumable goods shall not obtain money unless they build more factories, etc.

It seems to have escaped the notice of people such as Mr. Menzies that in Australia at least fifteen years ago there were enough capital goods, if utilised fully by a comparatively few people really interested in production, to have produced enough consumable goods for every individual, irrespective of whether he was able to find a position in industry or not.

Furthermore, this war has been responsible for the creation of millions of pounds worth of new capital production, much of which could be easily switched to production of consumable goods.

The primary and major task of the Australian Government after the war is to take steps to ensure that Australians have sufficient economic "votes" in the shape of money, in order that they can "vote" for the things they require. Under such conditions, production units would automatically develop to the stage where they could give high quality with efficiency. I am confident that Mr. Menzies' mass production units would soon go out of business. When all Australian requirements were satisfied—and they never have been—any real surplus of, say wheat, could be exchanged for any goods offering from other countries.

Australians should unite in demanding that, immediately upon the conclusion of military hostilities, Australian primary producers and industrialists shall be allowed to serve Australian consumers, instead of wasting time and energy fighting for world markets. We have the best market right here in Australia. But it must have sufficient MONEY—which is a fact never mentioned by Mr. Menzies.

MR. R. G. MENZIES' WEIRD ECONOMICS

By ERIC D BUTLER

Time and time again it has been stressed in these columns that leaders of all parties at Canberra are agreed about the "full employment" policy, but merely disagree on methods as to how this policy is to be achieved. The sooner primary producers and men in what genuine private enterprise is now left in this country wake up to the fact that men such as Mr. Menzies and Mr. Fadden no more represent them than does Mr. Ward, the sooner they will start to find out why they are being "liquidated."

More and more primary producers and business men are, fortunately, beginning to realise that social credit proposals are the only ones which not only will preserve the sound and successful parts of our social and economic system, but will also permit the progressive elimination of those evils which have brought our civilisation to the very brink of disaster.

Mr. Menzies has some very weird views about the economic system and the purpose for which it exists—as will be seen by examining the following statement he made at Canberra on March 29, while speaking on the Wheat Subsidy Bill:

"I have never believed, and I have occasionally got into hot water about it, that the business of Government in relation to primary production was a mere business of pleasing a majority of voters. The real problem in dealing with primary production, secondary production, or any other production in Australia, is the business of producing the best economic result, so that this country may reduce its costs and begin to compete with the world."

Mr. Menzies went on to say that he was in favour of mass production.

The above views are worthy of close study by all of us, because they are an exact replica of the ideas being promulgated by theoretical planners everywhere, irrespective of what name they call their parties or groups.

Social Creditors have spent much energy, time and money to show the Australian people that they can never make democracy work unless electors associate on a non-party basis and make it clear to Members of Parliament that they are paid servants of the people. Real democracy is closely related to Christianity: both concern the individual; they spring from the individual; they stand for the supremacy of the individual over the institution; and they

postulate a growing belief by the individual in his own power in the scheme of things. But, Mr. Menzies, along with Socialists, financiers, and others, rejects the idea that he should seek to serve the electors. Christ said that those who would be the greatest must be the servants of others. Mr. Menzies says very definitely that he knows what is good for us, irrespective of what a majority of electors say. Let us further analyse Mr. Menzies' statement. He says that the real business of all production is the producing of "the best economic result" in order that Australia can "begin to compete with the world." I realise that many mesmerised students of the brand of economics taught at our universities—and others who have been working so hard all their lives that they have never had the opportunity of lifting up their eyes and looking at the facts of the world in which they live—believe that we must "compete with the world." What insanity this is! Production of any description should have one major aim: TO SERVE THE INDIVIDUAL.

A far greater man than Mr. Menzies put the matter clearly when he said that the sole purpose of industry is to provide goods when and where required, with the maximum of efficiency and the minimum of effort.

Industry doesn't exist to provide "full employment" to compete with the world, or to do anything but provide consumers with goods and services which they require. Now, in order that consumers can indicate the goods and services they require, they must possess purchasing power in the form of money "votes." Until comparatively recent times no one ever questioned the idea that the great majority of people could obtain money only by working in industry. However, it is now only too obvious that the introduction of

"To anyone who wishes to obtain an unbiased and objective view of Soviet Russia, I can recommend the Russian section of "Looking For Trouble," by the American journalist, Virginia Cowles, who took considerable risks to get away from the spoon-feeding which is the usual treatment of investigators."

—C. H. Douglas, in the "Big Idea."

The specified section of the above-mentioned book begins as follows:

The Russian frontier guards, with the snow clinging to their boots and the red stars gleaming from their peaked caps, had already boarded the train. We had left Stolpce, the last Polish frontier station, twenty minutes before, and in another few minutes would reach the Soviet Customs House at Negoreloye.

The train moved through the darkness slowly. The windows were covered with frost and it was impossible to see out. I left my compartment and went into the corridor. I was surprised to find how quiet it was. I walked through the carriage and discovered there were only three passengers besides myself: two couriers with the diplomatic mail—an Englishman and a Pole—and an English businessman. It reminded me of a ghost train; the stillness, the blank white windows, and the groaning of the wheels as they moved through the darkness.

The English courier (officially known as the King's messenger) and the English businessman sat in their compartments reading magazines and eating chocolates, obviously bored (in the best British manner) by their surroundings. But the Polish courier was nervous. He was a small dark man, who paced up and down, every now and then rubbing the windowpane and trying to see out. As I walked past him he spoke to me in French, his voice almost a whisper: "I don't like it. It's bad business."

"What is?" I asked in surprise.

"Going into this country. When you cross the frontier you never know if you will ever return to the world again."

His remark took me aback. For me, the trip to Russia was almost a holiday. On the continent hatreds were flaring up more brightly than ever; Hitler was denouncing Chamberlain as a hypocrite, and Mussolini was shouting, "Savoy, Corsica, Tunis." All over Europe governments were divided against each other and life had become even more restless than in the days before Munich.

When the "Sunday Times" suggested I make a six weeks' trip to Moscow to write a series of articles on current conditions, I welcomed the chance to escape from the gloom of London. Somehow Russia seemed another world. As a country, it had always fired my imagination, and as a political force, the subject of so much heated controversy, it aroused my curiosity. I had no bias either for or against the Soviets; I wanted to see for myself. In fact, I had wanted to see for myself for some time, but my application for a Russian visa two years before had been refused with no explanation. This time, Randolph Churchill had taken me to lunch with Mr. Maisky, the Soviet Ambassador in London, and Sir Robert Vansittart had unofficially recommended me to him. When I arrived in Warsaw the visa was waiting. I sent a wire to a friend in Moscow, Fitzroy Maclean, the Second Secretary of the British Embassy, and told him he could make good his promises of introducing me to Russian hospitality; I also hoped to see General Gal, the Russian soldier who had tried to convert me to Communism in Spain. Altogether, I was determined to enjoy myself.

My holiday spirit was a little dampened by the Polish courier's depressing comment, but a few minutes later we rolled into Neforeloye, and anything more of a contrast to the sinister atmosphere he had suggested would be difficult to imagine. The station was a large white concrete building blazing with lights. The walls were decorated with photographs of Stalin, Lenin, and Marx, and inscribed with huge letters: "Workers of the World, Unite." Unsmiling porters with burlap aprons boarded the train to take off our luggage, and we walked into a room swarming with husky-looking frontier guards.

I had been warned that the Soviet Customs inspection was laborious and had been careful to clear my bag of letters and documents. I had even selected my reading matter carefully: Shaw's "The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism," which I had bought in Warsaw expressly for the trip. I was pleased with my forethought, and when I saw the Customs inspector frowning upon the English businessman's Agatha Christie detective story, I was even more complacent. But, alas, Mr. Shaw's spirited plea for socialism also failed to impress him: one suspicious flip through the pages and he confiscated it. After a long examination my suitcases were returned to me intact, but the Polish courier did not fare so easily. He had a bag of lemons, which aroused deep distrust. Each lemon was taken out and inspected under a magnifying glass. But this was not enough: another official appeared with a knife, and one by one the lemons were cut open to make sure they contained no secret codes. The Polish courier watched the process unhappily, for, by the time the inspectors had completed the job, the lemons were of little use to anyone.

Once again the train crawled and creaked over the broad gauge rails. It was getting late and the porter lumbered down the corridor to tell us dinner was ready. I discovered that I was the only one who

hadn't brought food from Warsaw. The two couriers were not allowed to leave their diplomatic bags even to go into the dining-car (the Polish courier said he had instructions to stay awake all night), and the businessman was already munching sandwiches and drinking beer.

No one seemed to mind being deprived of the benefits of the dining-car, and I soon understood why. It was a small room with three or four tables, separated from the kitchen by a wall with an opening through which the dishes were passed. The window was open and I could see the cook, a woman with untidy hair streaming about her face and a pair of dirty hands with a bandage on one of her fingers. This was enough to put me off, but the prices settled the matter. The official exchange was twenty-five roubles to the pound; an omelet was twenty-three roubles. I finally had some tea and a caviar sandwich (the least expensive thing on the menu), which came to eighteen roubles. The sandwich was meagre, and I went back to my carriage almost as hungry as when I had left; the King's Messenger gave me a cookie and some cake and the Polish courier a glass of lemonade, which he had made himself, angrily determined that his mutilated lemons should not be wasted.

(To be continued.)

REASONS WHY WE SHOULD VOTE "NO"

(Continued from page 3.)

Item (v): "Trusts, combines and monopolies":

All trusts, combines, and monopolies are the product of financial manipulation, and the availability of finance. For example, the three monopolies, which virtually control Australia, are known as the Metal Monopoly, the Sugar, Gas and Tobacco Monopoly, and the Overseas Group. Each of these monopolies has behind it three of the private trading banks, as follows:

Metal Monopoly: National Bank of Australasia, Bank of Adelaide, and Commercial Bank of Australia.

Sugar, Gas and Tobacco Monopoly: Bank of New South Wales, Queensland National Bank, and Commercial Banking Co. of Sydney.

Overseas Group: Bank of Australasia, the Union Bank, and the E. S. & A. Bank.

Each of these monopolies also has a representative on the Commonwealth Bank Board, and the Overseas Monopoly is directly represented on the Bank of England. Trusts, combines and monopolies are unavoidable under the present financial organisation, and it is a question of credit control and financial policy, not a matter of State power at all. Without exercising control over financial policy (which power it already possesses), the Federal Parliament will continue to be impotent regarding trusts, combines and monopolies, and will continue to stand by and see the enterprising and worthy individual forced out of action.

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

Only two brief comments are called for on this. The first is that the words "profiteering and prices" refer to the MONEY aspect of the delivering end of our distribution system, and that while our first concern continues to be success in the struggle to get money, the businessman must be excused for seeking to fix his price on the basis of cost, plus profit, plus whatever else he can get. That helps him to be prepared for the so-called and ever-threatening "rainy day"! You know, of course, that the "rainy day" comes only when we allow the bankers to reduce the quantity of purchasing-power available to the great bulk of the people, "Rainy days," so-called, are not in evidence when money is plentiful. (The second comment is that the power relating to profiteering and prices is intended to be exercised only against SOME of the businesses. Note particularly that monopolies approved by the planners (e.g., those under so-called "public ownership") may charge what they please. And of all the things "publicly owned," how much, gentle reader, actually belongs to you, or can even be used by you without your being severely stung in the process?)

Item (vii): "The production and distribution of goods, but so that—(a) no law made under this paragraph with respect to primary production shall have effect in a State until approved by the Governor in Council of that State; and (b) no law made under this paragraph shall discriminate between States or parts of States":

Apart altogether from the important provisions of Section 92 of the Constitution Act which makes trade within the Commonwealth "absolutely free," the intention behind this idea of extending Government control over production was set out as far back as 1931 in "a document first circulated to a few members who were asked to use its contents but not reveal its source." It was issued by the organisation in England known as "P.E.P." (Meaning Political and Economic Planning). This was the organisation, which said "only in war or under threat of war would a Brit-

THE ORIGINS OF HITLER AND NAZISM

A certain amount of mystery still surrounds the parentage and earlier years of that prophet of National Socialism who is commonly called Adolf Hitler, and there is much confusion regarding the origins and fundamental characteristics of National Socialism. In these columns some light has been cast on both subjects from time to time, because their elucidation is of great importance to the future, if any, of western civilisation in general, and to the welfare of the British peoples in particular.

A few more facts, clues and hints, and some confirmation of others already cited in this journal are to be found in an article entitled "Man of Coincidence," specially written by Alec Dyer for the June 1940, issue of "Parade" (a London "digest") and described by the editor of that publication as "an exclusive and remarkable account of the early life of Adolf Hitler." Hereunder we reprint passages extracted and condensed from that source, but the words in brackets are our interpolations:—

Never in his life has Adolf Hitler pushed himself upwards; he has been pushed, driven by strange, almost incredible, coincidences.

It almost seems that Fate [alias "The Hidden Hand"?] did not want peace.

Incidentally, the name "Hitler," so spelt, has always been regarded in Austria and Poland as a common one with Jewish families.

Thus Fate secured for the future dictator a suitable surname.

The story of his "Christian" name presents still stranger aspects, and was not without influence on Adolf Hitler's career.

[About 15 years before Adolf was born] Alois Hitler [Adolf's nominal father], then still called Schicklgruber, took into his house a distant niece, Clara Poelzl, as foster daughter cum servant girl. She was a strange and silent creature, over twenty years younger than her master. A few years later Alois separated from his wealthy wife Anna, and Clara suddenly disappeared; she went to Vienna. This alone was an unusual thing with the Waldviertel people,

to whom Vienna was the capital of sin. Still stranger, in old Austria, where every subject was carefully filed and registered with the police, what secret made Clara avoid registering her address with the authorities?

Anna died, and immediately Alois married his cook, by whom he already had a child. After a year this second wife, too, was buried—and as suddenly as she had departed, Clara turned up. A few months later she became Alois Hitler's third wife.

In Catholic Austria, and especially among the country folk, it is usual to choose a name for a child after some Catholic saint. So it happened with all of Alois's children except Adolf. And young Adolf was always the pet of his mother, Clara.

Has the choice of this strange and unusual name any explanation in some memory of those ten years Clara spent in Vienna?

We know that with this name, and the rather tattered family tree to which it belonged, it became rather difficult for the young man to remain and settle down in his own district.

Adolf is a good old German name. But after, being admitted to civic rights the Austrian and German Jews were too anxious to demonstrate their true German hearts and preferred very German names for their children—Herrmann and Adolf being the most popular among them. Thus corrupted, these names acquired a rather Semitic significance, and combined with the likewise suspicious surname Hitler, must have made many people assume that the tall and dark young man was a Jew.

Lack of money and the forced descent from the lower middle class to the proletariat, and still lower, accumulated in him bitterness and hatred against anything that looked prosperous—even the skilled and organised workmen.

It was Jewish charity that kept Adolf Hitler afloat in those years. Thanks to his conspicuous name and rather Semitic exterior, he gained admission into Jewish-endowed night shelters. "They won't let me starve," he then complained, "but they don't let me have the chance to live either."

His sister, Paula, found a job as a cook in the Vienna Jewish hospital.

One more thing young Adolf perfected in these years—the art of copying. In these days he made his living by making watercolours using other pictures or picture-post-cards as models. This copying has gone on through all his career. There is really not one thing in the whole Nazi system that hasn't been taken over from somebody else [Obvious example: the "Herrenvolk" adaptation of the Chosen Race Theory].

Even the idea of compulsory labour service, generally credited to the Nazis as their genuine creation, was picked up from the Vienna Jewish author, Popper-Lynkeus, who advocated this scheme in his books. [And now it bobs up in Australia, very thinly veiled, as No. 2 of the Referendum proposals: control of "employment and unemployment" by the central Government! Perhaps Bernard Baruch, Samuel Rosenman and Felix Frankfurter told Dr. Evatt to try to "put it over."!]

The first criminal offence soon came—perjury in court, in a case in which his friend, Hanisch, was involved. The documents traced in Vienna speak a plain language. Now it became necessary to say farewell to Austria, and as soon as possible. He went to Munich, slipping more and more downhill.

ent to the thinking members of our community that the idea behind this particular proposal is that the market shall continue to be controlled by finance—i.e., the people's limited ability to buy—and production will then be conditioned to suit this financially-limited market.

In this matter of production and consumption is bound up, of course, all industrial disputes and dislocations. An unbiased examination of these will show that they are invariably concerned with the "money" aspect. It is either a question of higher wages, excessive taxes, shorter hours or safer working conditions. Wages are paid in money; taxes are theft of the money, which should come as wages; shorter hours are resisted because of the financial effect on industry; and proper working conditions are denied because of the "cost." Every disability is the product of financial considerations, but this fact is carefully excluded from mention and is not touched by the Referendum.—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2. 16th July 1944.

(To be continued)

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