

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. 12. No. 7. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1946

## "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.

## Will The British Empire Decline to Fall? Paradox and Danger in Post-War Situation

It is clear that the Great War Against The British Empire still goes on—as it continued after 1918. Not, of course, in the military form, which was the one most easily seen in the 1914-18 and 1939-45 phases; but in forms that are not less dangerous because they are less obvious.

An outstanding article, on some vital aspects of this current situation and its background, appears in the "Social Crediter," England, of January 5, 1946, under the title, "Contemporary Gibbonish." We reprint the article hereunder. The writer is Major C. H. Douglas:

It is part of the charlatany with which "scientific" thinking is now infected, to suggest that history automatically repeats itself. As a consequence of this, the fact that the Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Byzantine and other great civilisations all had their rise and fall (or, at any rate, are presented to us in that aspect) is supposed to be evidence that—e.g., the British Empire must inevitably go the same way.

The implication is, of course, Masonic; Nations and Empires are supposed to be merely repetitions, macrocosms, of the individual man, the microcosm, and to have their infancy, manhood and decline in the same manner, but over a greater duration, as that exhibited by the human being.

If there were no other grounds for objection to this theory, and there are many, anyone whose senses are not blunted by the schoolmen would suspect it as being too "neat."

Similarity of behaviour is far more usually due to incompetence of observation than to actual identity of process. To the average non-travelled Englishmen all Chinamen look alike and are nearly indistinguishable from Japanese. But a Chinaman would not regard that idea as proving anything but the barbarism of the English.

Whether we are prepared to accept this conception of "rise and fall" at its face value or not, so far as our knowledge takes us, no Empire has previously "fallen" by proclamation, which appears to be the case with that of "Britain," unless, of course, the collapse of Jericho is an allegory from which we are intended to take warning.

### PERSISTENT PROPAGANDA

To add to the outstanding interest of the event, it appears to be the one contemporary phenomenon on which everyone is

agreed. Our leading newspapers (produced strictly in accordance with war-time economy standards both in paper and veracity) vie with our "British" organisation for relaying recorded Negroid disharmony in their agreement with General de Gaulle and Professor Laski that "Britain" is a second-class Power; exit visas and travelling expenses are happily provided for Manchester experts in crematorium oratory, so that the good news may reach the humblest foreign, and particularly United States, mourner for Britain's vanished splendours. 'Tis strange; 'tis passing strange.

Observe, also, how the history of the fall of the British Empire is being written while you wait. The high point of "Britain's" war effort was Dunkirk—in fact in a few years' time it will be the only battle in which British troops were engaged!

There is little or no mention of the Battle of "Britain," which, according to one American account, owed what importance it possessed to the "fact" that the Rolls-Royce engines in the Spitfires and Hurricanes were made in America! British troops were sometimes heard of behind the lines in Egypt and there are rumours of a British fleet in the Mediterranean, but there is not an inhabitant of the Middle West who cannot tell you how Rommel folded up before the generalship and fighting qualities of American strategists and troops whose location in Algeria (which he identifies with Egypt) effectively defeated the Germans two thousand miles away at El Alamein!

And, of course, everyone knows that the scattered and demoralised remnants of the British Army were finally rallied by the victorious Eisenhower, and Burma was recaptured by a couple of platoons of Americans, as conclusively proved by

## Significant Political Pointers

Not being able to defeat Great Britain militarily, the international gangsters who arranged the Second World War are using other methods of attack to crush the British people.

Regarding conditions in Europe, most observers appear to be agreed generally that food conditions in Great Britain are worse than on the Continent. There is no doubt that this is a deliberate policy.

While the war was on British airmen were dropping bombs on Germany in order to survive. There is no need to drop bombs on the Germans today; but neither is there any reason why the British people should be sacrificed to feed their recent enemies.

Great Britain is fighting for survival now just as she was fighting for survival in the Battle for Britain. And yet at this very time it is reported that the "British" Government has agreed to reduce wheat imports by 10 per cent, "in the interests of countries whose larders were even more grievously depleted" (vide Melbourne "Argus," February 13).

If the present madness continues much longer, no doubt Australians will be asked to suffer more restrictions and rationing, so that the Japanese may be better fed.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was reported as saying in Germany last week: "The Germans look as well fed, perhaps better fed, than the British."

According to Trevor Smith, London correspondent of the Melbourne "Herald," the various departments and officials in Great Britain all have different stories about the food "muddle."

There is nothing surprising about this. But there is something VERY peculiar about the food position in Great Britain.

One Labor member of the House of Commons, Mr. R. Stokes, claims that food reserves in Great Britain now are three times as large as they used to be in peacetime.

It would appear that the bureaucratic planners are doing their best to help the

international financiers to smash the British people.

All the talk in the world about the necessity of increased food production will not help while the bureaucratic planners and the controllers of financial policy grimly maintain their campaign for planned scarcity.

"Wheat has, of course, been 'controlled'—to such purpose that the area under crop, 14,346,000 acres in 1938-39, had got down to 7,860,000 acres even in 1943-44.

"One utterly mad feature has been the distribution of huge sums, under the heading of 'acreage restriction,' among Westralian farmers whose wheat belt had pretty good seasons when the other wheat-growing States were drought-stricken. Even when the English were hungry and when famine and pestilence were raging over a great part of Europe, the 'Government' put £285,000 on the estimates to compensate Westralian farmers for NOT growing 1945-46 wheat. Previous payments to Westralian farmers in consummation of their outrages on nature and humanity, as well as commonsense, were £599,348 in 1943-44, and £586,964 in 1944-45, all the payments coming out of taxes or loans.

"And even when the British food situation was moving towards a crisis, and the European food situation towards a catastrophe, it was announced from Canberra that the potato-crop 'target' would be reduced by 25 per cent, and that the 'Government' would no longer buy canned and drying classes of mutton. There are now, we are told, to be great bursts of energy in the export of foodstuffs to Britain, the Canberra restrictionists having been touched by the confessions of the Labor Food Minister and the appeals of Mr. Atlee."

—Sydney "Bulletin," Feb. 13.

(Continued on page 2.)

Messrs. Warner Bros. in their historic film, "Objective, Burma."

### SIZE AND POPULATION

All these things being as they are, some examination of the nature of our "decadence" seems not merely desirable, but obligatory.

Let us first consider that modern criterion of greatness: size. The British Empire has in round numbers an area of 14,000,000 (fourteen million) square miles; the U.S.S.R. is second with 8,250,000 square miles. France is third with 4,336,000 square miles, and the United States ("unquestionably the greatest Power in the world today"—vide any press, anywhere) has an area, including its Mandatory Jurisdiction, of 3,750,000 square miles, or slightly more than one quarter of the area of the British Empire.

As to population, the British Empire has a population of 498,000,000 (four hundred and ninety-eight millions) or just over a

quarter of the total estimated population of the earth.

Russia (U.S.S.R.) is estimated to have a population of 166 millions, or about one-third of that of the British Empire. And the United States has a population of 137,000,000, or rather more than one quarter that of the British Empire. Thirty millions of these are predominantly non-European in origin.

It is stated by the Proclaimers that the British Empire is breaking up—in fact, it is, according to propaganda which is circulating everywhere in South Eastern Europe, due to disintegrate completely in a mere matter of months. This being so, it is rather odd that the British Empire is, at the time of writing, December, 1945, the only political area on the world's surface in which no fighting is in progress, if we extend this phrase, as we are entitled to do in this connection, to "spheres of influence" (Continued on page 2)

## NOTES on the NEWS

**BARRY'S BURGLAR BILL:** Potential housing dictator, Mr. Barry, M.L.A., under the plea of helping the homeless, sponsors a Bill to seize homes vacant for more than seven days, and to authorise (and presumably compel) the subdivision of houses. It is expected that this totalitarian Bill will be quickly passed.

It will be clear to all that such a measure will not touch the fringe of the problem, and that it is an admission of failure to allow builders to freely produce houses. It is clear that householders share their houses with their own kith and kin to the best of their ability and resources; naturally, they would resent dictator Barry selecting people and billeting them. He must not be permitted to resort to Fascistic methods. State Members should be reminded of this immediately.

**FOOD FRONT:** The urgency of the call for food for Britain should be a warning to push aside our food bureaucrats and waive their stupid controls, so that producers can get on with the job of providing the food. However, these bureaucrats are seizing the opportunity of extending their rationing. Another aspect is that food for Britain should go to Britain, not to Europe. This condition should be stipulated and strictly observed otherwise the whole scheme will be a fraud. Under no circumstances should it go into the U.N.R.R.A. "food bank." Federal and State Members should be told that food raised for Britain must go to Britain.

**LOAN LEVERS:** Russia is expected to seek a large loan from U.S.A. very soon. Commenting on this, the "Sunday Despatch" says: "The possibility of such a loan being granted hinges on whether Russia will ratify the Bretton Woods proposal." U.S.A. is apparently following the strategy employed against Great Britain in this matter; but it seems that Russia is refraining from accepting the Bretton Woods plot for a while, as a lever for squeezing out more favourable terms. It would be odd if U.S. financiers were outwitted at their own form of blackmail, and it would also be very interesting if Russia received more favourable terms than Great Britain. U.S. financiers are prepared to pay almost any price to have the Bretton Woods gold standard restored, so as to capture world trade and to justify the stupid policy of hoarding gold. Many American citizens are getting inquisitive about this gold fetish; they note that it does not improve their living standards or well being.

**COMMO CAPERS:** Addressing the Federal Convention of the Australian Workers' Union, Mr. Rosevear reminded them that the Communists were out to destroy the Government. He also pointed out that "these people have a fund which the Liberal Party and the Labor Party might well envy . . . and they are trying to dictate a foreign policy to Australia." He then alleged, "Some Communist-controlled Unions were using their funds to support Indonesians and Lascars." He concluded on the note that "we've got to see that these cuckoos don't jump into the Labor nest." That's all to the good, because the menace of Communism is immediate; but just the same, rank-and-file Laborites have also to rescue themselves from the clutches of their own entrenched executives.

**PRICES PROBLEMS:** The unworkability of arbitrary price-fixing control is rapidly manifesting itself. Meat control has now developed Gestapo practices; pegged car prices are a bad joke, and admitted to be beyond control; and now comes the fish crisis, caused by price control, and, of course, blamed on black marketers. The last thing officialdom will do is to re-

move the stupid controls which prevent the people from getting the goods. Crimping taxation also plays a part, because people will not have the tax master robbing them of their legitimate rewards; as well as limiting their production, people avoid selling through channels which provide a check for tax-gatherers, they prefer to sell direct for cash. Free competitive enterprise is the only way to correct the position; but our socialistic bureaucrats prefer to extend the Gestapo.

**WATER WORRIES:** The water supply position has been so bad that Hobart residents recently had to cart water, at up to £1 per load; then they had to chain watchdogs to the tanks to prevent the tanks from being "milked." It has not been quite so bad here in Melbourne, but in outer suburbs some residents have had to cart water, even though the water main is within a hundred yards or so. The socialised Water Trusts and Boards blame lack of manpower and the war for this situation, but it existed long before the war. Actually, a war situation is an urgent reason why water supplies should be above ordinary needs, or even drought requirements.

**HERRENVOLK HEBREWS:** Giving evidence before the Anglo-American Palestine Committee, Arabian Semite delegates submitted "the suffering Jews of Europe were not a question to be linked with the political problem of Palestine." Faras Elk-houri, an Arab spokesman, declared that "Jews could not be assimilated with other people, as they believed they were the chosen people of God—a superior and isolated race." Argument for the Jewish case occupied six days, but so far none of this evidence has been featured in the newspapers. Incidentally, members of the "British" Communist Party appeared on the scene to give evidence. They denied being a Jewish organisation, but urged that the British mandate be ended. Despite the denial, here is further interesting evidence of the close affinity between Jewry and Communism.

**SOVIET SCHEMES:** The published December lecture of "The Round Table Club," entitled, "The Awakening of Asia," deals with Soviet imperialism as being a far greater menace than any capitalistic imperialism. It features Russia as the militant core of the coming Asiatic-Western struggle, and points out that Russia publishes propaganda, translated into Asiatic languages, to assist this cause through secret agents trained and placed in Asia. The article also deals with the "Congress of Eastern People," held at Baku, and Communist announcements in this connection. The conclusion is that "Soviet imperialism will so gird Asia to battle that she will set out on world conquest." It is to be hoped that the local Communists' dupes will realise in time that their leaders are preparing them for the slaughter. O.B.H.

(A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown.)  
**DISSENTING BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS**  
Sir,—At a public meeting in Hawthorn (Melbourne) on February 13, Mr. F. L. Edmunds, M.L.A., debated with Mr. O. B. Heatley the question of Uniform Taxation. (Report elsewhere in this issue.—Editor.)

In this letter I merely want to call attention to three important aspects of Mr. Edmunds' contribution to the discussion, as follows:

1. He stated that he was disturbed by the constant bickerings between the State and Federal Governments.

2. At question time he admitted that such bickerings arose from financial conditions.

3. He told a questioner that taxes were inescapable, and that even if Mr. Bruce Brown were put into Parliament he would have to collect taxes just as the present politicians are obliged to do.

It cannot be denied that there is contention between the Governments, and this condition will continue so long as Parliaments are not sovereign institutions, and so long as Governments struggle with the citizens in general to collect a portion of the stuff which neither of them produce, namely, MONEY.

**WHO HAS DECREED THAT GOVERNMENTS MAY HAVE ONLY THE MONEY THEY CAN COLLECT FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY?**

WHO benefits from such a canard? Such ideas are not accidental, and the perpetuation of them is largely the work of politicians, parsons, press, and paid propagandists. That is why there is a strong movement afoot to dissuade the general public from offering objection to the continuance of the Uniform Tax scheme, and already we see special articles appearing in the so-called conservative press telling us it would be a pity to go back to the system under which taxation could be imposed by the States. It will be noticed also that many of the inspired articles are contributed by "A Special Correspondent."

These circumstances make it necessary for all responsible citizens to look carefully into the whole business and to stand firm against the regimenters and medicine men.

#### THE STATE GOVERNMENTS

It is obvious that the State Governments can never be at peace with the Federal Government so long as local activity is directed or retarded by Commonwealth financial policy. The State Governments could immediately do the right thing about hospitals, nurses, schools, teachers, policemen, and everything else coming within their province, IF ONLY THEY HAD THE FINANCE. So long as they are dependent on another authority for the funds, so long must they be subservient to that authority, and all talk of sovereignty is so much humbug. Mr. Menzies was undeniably right when he said some years ago that administrative independence is impossible without financial independence.

And yet it is definitely within the power of the State Governments, under the EXISTING Constitution, to have financial independence. Strange, is it not, that their financial "advisers" never appear to tell them about it. Alberta, part of the British Empire, is an example of what CAN be done, and full information about that wonderful Province is available for the asking.

It is obvious that the State Governments have not benefited from the Uniform Taxation scheme. All Premiers are reported to have "fought" strongly against its continuance, and even the States receiving the largest "allocation" realise that the system has already undermined their local sovereignty. Notwithstanding this, to say nothing of the serious doubts regarding the Constitutional aspect of the Federal action, it has been reported in the daily press that the Prime Minister told the Premiers "straight" that their opposition "cut no ice" with him, that they were talking "bloody rot," and that the unwanted system WOULD be continued. Some people would call that dictatorship—but, then, of course, they would have a queer understanding of the meaning of the word!

#### BURDEN OF CANBERRA TAXES

Australian citizens have received no benefit. On the contrary, they have been stung more severely than ever before.

Not only have they been robbed of their purchasing power, but the Uniform Taxation has caused an increase in the cost of living and a decrease in the quantity of goods.

As if that were not enough, thousands of citizens, after having heavy deductions made regularly from their pay envelopes, receive a peremptory notice at the end of the year that a large balance is outstanding, to which is added a "penalty" for late payment. Pay-as-you-earn, forsooth!

These are the kind of "benefits" which create the spirit of revolt, and the development of this spirit is to be observed amongst men who have hitherto been the very backbone of organised society.

The effect of a robbery from the individual is not altered by the allocation of the proceeds; and so whilst the politicians may fight over the "allocation" of the tax money, the citizen is concerned about the nature and weight of the "slug."

#### FETTERED BY FINANCE

It was quite refreshing to hear Mr. Edmunds publicly admit that bickerings between the Governments arise from financial considerations, but pathetic to hear him refer to the Federal Parliament as the "supreme national authority." Soon after saying that, he informed a questioner that

"the Federal Government had to look around for money." That's what all of us have to do, and no one in his or her right mind would suggest that we are "supreme." Despite his learning in other directions (I understand he is, or was, a master at one of the public schools), he has the childish idea that money is something sacred and inherently scarce, that it comes into existence in some mysterious and miraculous way, and that the "supreme" national authority can be supreme to the extent made possible by its success or lack of success in the scramble with the not-so-supreme State Governments, the even-less-supreme municipalities, and the entirely subservient multitude of individuals, all "looking around for money." In Mr. Edmunds' undeveloped view, Governments may be collectors only.

The idea that they should require the stuff to be produced on scientific principles, according to productive capacity and the people's needs is just too "fantastic" for him!

## OPEN LETTER TO WALTER MURDOCH

Dear Professor,—It is time someone offered you a little advice on the necessity of a man in your position thoroughly understanding the implications of statements made in public comment.

According to the Melbourne "Herald" of February 16, a correspondent asked you the question: "Why do you object so much to Franco's dictatorship and say nothing about Stalin's?"

You dodge this question very neatly by saying that your comment on dictatorships had been prompted by a question concerning "Fascism," and that "the most prominent surviving Fascist leader naturally came into the answer."

Allow us to disagree with you concerning the "most prominent surviving Fascist." Fascism is a term that indicates a certain political and economic system. If you can point out one basic difference between the political and economic systems of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy or Soviet Russia, we will be interested to note it. The only marked "differences" between all the totalitarians are the labels they wear. This being the case, talk about "surviving Fascists" obscures the real issue: Who are the "most prominent surviving" totalitarians.

To compare Franco with Stalin and claim that Stalin has done more for the Russian people than Franco has done for the Spanish people may be all right for the uncritical readers of the Melbourne "Herald," but intelligent people expect a little better than this from you, Professor.

It is true, as you point out, that there are degrees of dictatorship. That is why we are not disposed to exchange the dictatorship of this country, which masquerades as democracy, for dictatorship of either the Franco or the Stalin variety.

Despite all the inspired propaganda from all over the world—you have obviously

swallowed a large dose of it—it is not Franco who endangers the remnants of civilisation. The real danger is the Asiatic tyranny now smashing up large portions of Europe. It wasn't Franco who murdered Poland, Professor. It isn't Franco who is seeking to export his dictatorship to Australia and other parts of the British Empire. Stalin today has his fifth column in nearly every country of the world. Early in World War 2 these fifth columnists, the Communists, indicated very clearly that they place Soviet Russia before all national considerations.

International Communism, International Finance, and International Jewry are nearly synonymous terms. While the "capitalist" press is working itself into a frenzy about France, every apology is made for Soviet Russia. You quote the "New York Times" on Franco, saying that no one could accuse this journal of having "Left-wing tendencies." We make that very accusation, Professor, and we make a similar accusation concerning the journal printing your material, "The Melbourne Herald."

We are not particularly interested in how Franco is governing the Spaniards or how Stalin is governing the Russians. We believe in minding our own business. But the forces behind Stalin appear to be determined to do all in their power to mind it for us. Every writer who joins the anti-Franco campaign, while neglecting or apologising for the international Communists, is not rendering much service to the cause of individual liberty and security.

Think this matter over, Professor.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,  
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2.  
17th February 1946.

—Yours faithfully, "THE NEW TIMES."

## WILL THE BRITISH EMPIRE DECLINE TO FALL?

(Continued from page 1.)

such as Azerbaijan, China, and the puppet State of Panama: the preserves of Russia and the United States respectively.

#### THE BRITISH WAR-EFFORT

Let us now take, without asserting, war as a criterion of greatness.

No one will dispute the pre-eminence of air power and its counter-measures as the deciding factor in this (present tense) war. The dominant and decisive aircraft at the decisive period of the war were British, powered by British designed and built engines, and, for the major part, fought by natives of these islands. The decisive counter-measure to aircraft was radar, invented, designed and built in Great Britain.

No decisive weapon used in this war originated outside the British Empire.

But perhaps "Britain" did not exert herself? In 1940 "Britain" spent 39 per cent, Russia (not at war) spent 27 per cent, and the United States spent 3 per cent on war. In 1941 the relative figures were 49 per cent, 35 per cent, and 11 per cent. In 1942, 53 per cent, 45 per cent and 35 per cent. In 1943, 54 per cent, 48 per cent and 46 per cent. In 1944 54 per cent 44 per cent, and 46 per cent.

In 1943 and 1944, every British Dominion, as well as the British Isles, contributed a greater proportion of its national income towards winning the war than either Russia or the United States.

And over the whole period the output per man was greater than in the United States and incomparably greater than in Russia.

But the amazing feature of the whole situation is that Great Britain, the keystone of the Imperial arch (not excluding the British Dominions, to whom "Britain" owes large sterling, and in the case of Canada, dollar, debts) is the only major contestant emerging with a loss of overseas investments, a largely increased foreign debt, and a fantastically reduced standard of living.

#### FALL THROUGH FINANCE?

Can it be that the Fall of the British Empire is a book-keeping transaction? In considering situations of this character, it is important to avoid a common error—

## Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

Mr. A. W. Coles has been suitably rewarded for his political (and other?) assistance to the Socialist monopolists; he has been appointed to preside over the Government's projected airways network—which is intended to become a monopoly.

Mr. Coles was, of course, a monopolist long before he went into the Federal Parliament. He was managing director of one of the biggest chain-store monopolies in Australia.

No doubt the practical experience he has had in crushing the small businessman is expected to stand him in good stead in his attempts to crush the air services provided by private enterprises.

Australian taxpayers received a nasty shock last week when they learned that, although the war ended several months ago, the Federal Government spent more over the past six months than it did during the corresponding six months of the previous financial year.

It is still spending £1,000,000 a day. Peak spending during the war was £1,500,000 a day.

Just to show that it intends to maintain the bureaucracy to push people around and spend as much of the people's money as possible, the Federal Government bought Craig's buildings in Melbourne last week. This will cost the taxpayers £370,000.

There is only one solution to this bureaucratic madness: a reduction of the number of bureaucrats to the 1938 level or lower.

Recent authoritative figures from U.S.A. reveal a further striking demonstration of modern non-Socialist productive capacity. During the war U.S.A. had 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, and millions more in munitions manufacture. But, despite this, the general standard of living in U.S.A. INCREASED by 40 per cent.

The Canberra dictators have undertaken to make Australians contribute £6,000,000 this year to U.N.R.R.A.

Soviet Russia, at present engaged in a bitter propaganda campaign against the British Empire, will be one of the beneficiaries of Australia's contribution.

It is about time some blunt questions were asked about Russia's contributions, if any, to U.N.R.R.A. Ask your Federal MP. E. D. B.

#### THAT MAN AGAIN!

From "The Social Crediter" (Eng.), 15/12/45:—

The Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Hewlett Johnson) speaking at a luncheon at the Savoy to a Russian Trade Delegation, made a moving appeal to British industrialists to furnish Russia with everything she wants, in the hope that at some future, but unspecified, date, payment may be made in flax, timber, etc.

Russian debts to this country for railway and other construction, to the value of nearly £1,000,000,000, are still unpaid.

It is no doubt an accident of make-up that the notice of his speech in "The Times" of December 1, was printed vis-à-vis an equally moving appeal headed "Mental Patients."

#### FEDERAL ELECTION ISSUE

The Canberra bureaucracy is sabotaging production. Government by bureaucracy is destroying local self-government.

The big Government Departments are taking over every form of economic activity.

The bureaucracy is using the financial and taxation system to introduce a dictatorship.

No worthwhile reforms can be introduced in the face of a highly centralised bureaucracy.

The next Federal Elections must be used to ensure that all candidates, irrespective of label, who will not pledge themselves to reduce the number of bureaucrats to at least the 1938 level, receive a stream of last preference votes.

Use these booklets in the anti-bureaucracy fight: "Sack the Bureaucrats," by Eric D. Butler, 6d. "Democracy Flouted," 6d. (Both plus 1d if posted.) Both booklets obtainable from all Social Credit Movements.

#### HAVE YOU READ THESE BOOKS?

"Federal Union Exposed." Price 1/-. "Communism, Why Not?" Price 2/6. "The Answer to Tax Slavery." Price 1/-. "Stop That Thief." Price 1/6. "The Answer to Socialism." Price 2/6. "Reconstruction on Christian Principles." Price 6d. "Progress in Alberta." Price 6d. "Problem of the Medical Profession." Price 1/-. "Money?" Price 1/-. "Red Glows the Dawn." Price 6d. (All plus 1d postage.) Obtainable from the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.1.

#### IT IS YOUR FIGHT!

You Can Help To Double The Circulation Of "The New Times" By The End Of 1946,

How? By Obtaining One More Reader.

Why Not See How Many New Subscribers You Can Get Before The End Of The Year?

# A DEBATE ON "UNIFORM TAXATION"

By J. BRADSHAW, A.F.I.A.

Arising out of an incident at the meeting held in Hawthorn Town Hall on January 30, under the auspices of the Victorian Social Credit Action Group, a debate on the subject of Uniform Taxation took place at Hawthorn Hall on February 13 between Mr. F. L. Edmunds, M.L.A., and Mr. O. B. Heatley.

Mr. J. M. Atkinson, who was chairman, in introducing the speakers, referred very pointedly and appropriately to the dangerous position of drift and decay in our social life, which is so largely contributed to by the indifference and apathy of the people toward such vitally important questions as Uniform Taxation.

Mr. Edmunds declared that he is opposed to a continuance of Uniform Taxation on the existing basis. He made it clear, however, that he strongly supports the principle of Uniform Taxation, his objection being confined to the prevailing METHODS by which the principle is applied. His speech also further emphasised that, on basic principles, there is no cleavage between the Labour and non-Labour Parties; for he reminded the audience that it was Mr. Fadden who had first made a move to introduce uniform taxation.

## THE STOCK ARGUMENTS

Mr. Edmunds used the stock arguments regarding the complexity of taxation machinery, the need for simplification of methods of collection, and the "necessity" to give the Commonwealth a larger volume of tax revenue.

He invited the audience to find any "public man" who does not agree with uniform taxation. (He need not have gone outside the hall in which he was speaking to have found a few. Unless Mr. Edmunds believes that anyone who is opposed to it thereby forfeits his claim to recognition as a "public man," he surely must have forgotten his colleagues in the State Liberal Party.)

Continuing, he quoted a speech by Mr. Menzies, who had declared it to be amazing that the High Court could have given a decision upholding the right of the Commonwealth to impose uniform taxation. In the considered opinion of Mr. Menzies, the uniform tax scheme is ultra vires the Constitution, and therefore illegal.

Mr. Edmunds contends that it is a pity to make this issue one of State rights. He advanced the specious and unsound argument concerning the alleged necessity to amend the Constitution because of the emergence from an era of transport by oxen, horses, etc., into an era of transport and communication by motor vehicles, railways, aeroplanes and wireless. (This point of view overlooks the fact that such environmental changes do not alter those principles of association which govern human society, and which partake of the character of natural law.) "We face internal crises--there are also international crises ahead," said Mr. Edmunds. He therefore advocated amendment of the Constitution, and asserted that there would be no inherent danger of dictatorship, even in the substitution of a Union, on the lines of the Union of South Africa, for the present Federation of partly sovereign States.

## CENTRALISATION DANGER

Mr. O. B. Heatley stressed the fact that the Uniform Tax scheme was introduced ostensibly for a specified and limited time. That Canberra now had no intention of abandoning the scheme, afforded indisputable proof that the purpose for which it was introduced was quite different to that represented at the time of its introduction. The uniform tax scheme, declared Mr. Heatley, is an essential part of the all-embracing policy of centralising power. He mentioned the inspired efforts made through the daily press and radio to encourage the people to accept the idea that there are "trends" toward centralisation, which they can do nothing to arrest. "But," Mr. Heatley truthfully told his audience, "the 'trends' are, in reality, a definite and planned move towards the concentration of more and more political and financial power in fewer and fewer hands." He then quoted from Professor Hayek's book, "The Road to Serfdom," a passage in which the author gives a warning of the unpalatable fact that, by reason of the ever-increasing centralisation of power in politics, industry, and finance, we are in danger of repeating the fate which befell Germany. The United Nations' Organisation and the Bretton Woods scheme represent in the respective fields of politics and finance the ultimate in concentrated power. These were not "trends"--they were the product of a carefully calculated and deliberate policy to impose world dictatorship.

Mr. Heatley expressed the view that many of the politicians through whom the policy of centralisation is imposed are well intentioned and really believe they know what is best for the people. The more well intentioned they are the more alert should we be in guarding against their acquisition of more power over us. "It is erroneous to assume," said Mr. Heatley, "because we are opposed to uniform taxation, that we advocate secession." He pointed out, however, that, owing to the disabilities suffered by certain of the smaller States under Federation, strong secession movements had sprung up in those States.

## POLITICIANS AND ADVISERS

It had been made so clear by Mr. Heatley that the function of Members of Parliament in a democracy is to re-present the policy of electors, that Mr. Edmunds, who has other ideas in this regard, deemed it fitting, when speaking for his second period, to impute to Mr. Heatley and those who share his point of view, ideas to which they do not subscribe. Mr. Edmunds suggested

that control of Members by their constituents is "dictatorship of the proletariat." He declared that the desire for such electoral control indicated that politicians are regarded as "a perfect blend of idiocy and moral obliquity."

In his opinion, it would do "amateur economists" a lot of good were they to have to bear responsibility for guiding the affairs of the nation. Although Mr. Edmunds warmly denied that politicians are controlled by the powerful forces to which Mr. Heatley made reference, or that they are unduly influenced by "advisers," he defended the retention in the capacity of "economic advisers" of men such as Professors Copland and Giblin. He ridiculed the idea that any "amateur" knows as much about economics as the great Professor Copland (who, however, did not know enough to distribute a super-abundance of food and other necessities to starving and ill-clad people). Mr. Edmunds said that people who required medical or legal advice went for it to those properly qualified to supply it. He maintained that it is proper for Governments to act on that principle in relation to economic advice.

## "BY THEIR FRUITS . . ."

Some of his constituents should write asking Mr. Edmunds if he, as an individual,

# FOOD CRISIS AND DOLLAR DIPLOMACY

(A Broadcast by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., from 7HO, on February 17.)

**The housewives of England are holding meetings all over the country protesting loudly against the new cut in food rations. Members of Parliament are being inundated with letters of protest from long-suffering women now driven desperate.**

Members of both Parties in the House of Commons are being stung into activity by the electors, and both Parties are criticising the Government's mishandling of the food position.

**According to the A.B.C. news session on Wednesday, pandemonium broke out at a women's meeting in Liverpool, when a soldier returned from Germany said that there was food enough and to spare in Germany.**

The "British" Government says it hasn't got dollars to buy American food, but the housewives are asking where it gets the money to pay for American films and American petrol." The Government hasn't answered these questions yet.

According to the British paper, what aggravates the situation is the lavish rations supplied to soldiers who are doing nothing, and huge empty Army lorries touring about the country burning up large supplies of petrol, which the war-weary citizens cannot get.

There has been, too, the destruction of valuable war equipment without any attempt being made to let the people have the parts, which, of course, they have paid for.

## IMMEDIATE ACTION NEEDED

The food situation in Great Britain is serious, and everything we can do as a community or as individuals should be done immediately.

The British people put vastly more into the war in proportion to their numbers than any other nation; this was done at a colossal cost in treasure and human effort. The people of Great Britain are very tired, very hungry, and very bitter at the way they have been treated. For the second time they have come out of a long war victorious, and for the second time they have been treated as a defeated nation by the United States, with the British Dominions looking on helplessly, or, shall I say, paralysed by their Governments.

To continue fighting the National Socialist armies of Germany pending the time the other nations had their minds made up for them, and also to conserve shipping, even old men and women and women with children had to work long hours in the factories while their houses were being bombed. Surely after six years these folk are now entitled to a decent meal?

## DOLLAR DIPLOMACY

America forced Great Britain to give up all her overseas dollar assets, and probably, if the last war is any guide, a great deal of valuable assets in England itself, and now, having got hold of those valuable assets from a nation in its hour of peril, and having got hold of all the gold, and having watched Great Britain turn her country up-side-down and pour her blood and treasure and her great genius into the common pool--now, America withholds food from an ally because she has no dollars! Where is England to get these dollars?

America is using the food situation to force her own terms on the British Empire and other countries, but especially on the British Empire. Her terms are embodied in the terms of the Bretton Woods Agreement, which is probably one of the most dangerous documents ever signed. The British Labour Government signed that document under pressure, no doubt, but in so doing it signed its own death warrant.

The Australian Labour Government cannot be starved into submission, but it will probably sign too, unless the people protest loudly enough. Judging from the ease with which the State Premiers sold their States for a promise, the Federal Labour Government should prove chicken feed for the Big Boys of New York.

would retain the services of a medical adviser under whose treatment his health grew steadily worse. There can be no doubt that the conditions under which the vast majority of people exist have grown steadily worse since the advent of "economic advisers" like Professors Copland and Giblin. Mr. Edmunds declares himself to be a follower of Jesus Christ, Who said on one occasion, "By their fruits ye shall know them." But does Mr. Edmunds forget that Jesus was not an "expert"? According to the "recognised authorities" of His day, He was what Mr. Edmunds would no doubt term an "amateur economist." He was not "qualified" to speak on many matters with which He concerned Himself.

The condition of the world today almost exactly corresponds with that of the woman of whom we read in the Gospel story: ". . . which had an issue of blood twelve years. And had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse." So she went to "The Amateur," Who was able to do what the "properly qualified" "advisers" found beyond them.

After a lengthy and animated question period, the meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the chairman and speakers.

In his response, Mr. Heatley said that although he and many of those present did not agree with Mr. Edmunds' ideas as to the function of Members of Parliament, Mr. Edmunds should be applauded for his political courage in thus taking the platform to debate a current and major political issue.

## UNCLE SAM SHYLOCK

If America carries on with her methods of intimidating her gallant ally and demanding her pound of flesh nearest the heart, she will become one of the most despised nations in the world.

I have no doubt many informed Americans are more disgusted with the whole sordid business than are the people in England; but they are in the minority. Judging by conversations with American officers, they seem to be doped in their schools in the same way as the Germans were doped; and, reading their popular history books, one can see why they remain so ignorant of the world they live in.

The Americans have probably as little say in the government of their country as Australians have--which is, practically none. The United States is in the control of a gang, mostly German in origin, and largely the same gang, which used Germany to destroy the world peace--and, incidentally, destroyed Germany. The Americans should read the writing on the wall and wake up before the same gang uses her and her wealth to destroy the world and herself. This gang, of which Bernard Baruch is the spokesman, is probably the present guardian of the Atomic Bomb.

Any listeners who have friends in America or have access to American newspapers or who buy American newspapers should write to America and say what they think of America's action towards England. A little pressure here and there may work wonders.

## SINISTER FOOD CONTROL

Great Britain, in spite of the wishful thinking of Professor Laski and his Leftist friends, is still a powerful nation; she has been sold by her politicians, but she will come back with the added strength gained from the knowledge of who are her enemies. But it is still a terrible thing to realise that such a powerful and resourceful nation can be forced to submit after a victorious war to sell her heritage and her freedom in order to get a square meal for her people.

This control of food is a terrible thing, and it is being used as a very powerful instrument of coercion. This control of food by a few men becomes more terrible when you consider that the whole position must have been known long before the end of this war, and there is not the slightest doubt that the cutting off of England's food supply has been done for a very definite reason. The position becomes more sinister when you realise that the Federal Labour Government has paid the West Australian wheat-farmers more than one million pounds to NOT grow wheat; that in the Argentine mountains of wheat have been burned; that the Australian Government has said that it is short of shipping, yet America has more "Liberty ships" than she knows what to do with.

One wonders, too, what has happened to the mountains of food that were prepared for Australian and American armies. According to the Government, the war stopped a year before it was expected to stop; where, then, is all the food that was prepared for that year of war?

## THE UNWANTED LOAN

From "The Social Creditor," England, of December 29, 1945:—

Two apparently disconnected facts ought to be kept in mind in connection with the American Loan.

The first is that it has about as much to do with Americans as the Labour Party has with labour. Both are merely tools, to be manipulated as Messrs. Baruch & Co. desire.

And the second is that every single ounce of material exported from this country is in itself a dead loss. Not a single word has been officially spoken as to what we are going to import—we are too busy explaining that we are sending millions of tons to the Continent through U.N.R.R.A. and otherwise. There is no automatic payment for exports any more than for sinking ships.

It is obvious that we are repeating, almost without variation, the history of 1919-1927. The German-American Jews in New York are once more in control; and Britain is once more losing the peace for their benefit, and with the hearty assistance of Mr. Attlee, successor to Mr. Lloyd George.

**Socialists have a passion for figures, mostly useless. It will be interesting to see what figures we get of the prices in dollars (either direct or by exchange) for our exports in comparison with the prices at which they are sold at home, and the prices we pay in dollars of the present loan, for imports from America, as compared with the prices at which the Americans sell to, say, South America.**

**WE ARE COMPLETELY UNCONVINCED OF THE NECESSITY FOR THE LOAN. WE DO NOT BELIEVE IT IS TRUE THAT THE EMPIRE IS NOT SELF-SUPPORTING; and we believe that the main object of the loan is not to help us but to hurt us.**

The nauseating cant which is prevalent on the subject of our receiving "a raw deal" suggests that either the strain of war has been too much for our poor weak heads, or it has some ulterior object which cannot fail to be prejudicial. Anyone of ordinary intelligence who was of adult age in the armistice years knows that we have always had a raw deal from the "United States," i.e., Messrs. Kuhn, Loeb, Warburg, Baruch and Co. What is the use of having a war if "Britain" doesn't suffer and Wall Street benefit?

## U.E.A. FIGHTING FUNDS

It will be obvious to all serious-minded supporters that unless the coming Referendum is defeated, our past efforts to preserve our democratic machinery will have been in vain. Realising this, we recently appealed for £1 from each supporter to build up a fighting fund to meet this new threat. So far, the response leaves much room for improvement. In these circumstances, we urge YOU to give this matter your immediate attention, and to let us have your £1 without delay. Will YOU please regard this as urgent and forward those vital "money-bullets" to The United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne—NOW Thank you!

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

## LEARNED ELDERS OF LONDON

In the recent Municipal Elections, the following were among the successful candidates in London:—

Rosen, Sokoloff, Shapiro, Greenbaum, Reinstein, Tanaman, Piratin, Barsk, Elbog, Goldberg, Bermel, Weinberg, Mushin, Arnholz, Dvorkovitz, Faldo, Almeyda, Landau, Hamburg, Zeital, Touchard, Blau, Caro, Alergant, Levoi, Jago, Bryna, Saldanha, Littman, Ott, Kangeisser, Immerman, Gulatt, Kilch, Sueffert, Inter, Periotti, Leutchford, Naftel.

Zac and Ogos were unsuccessful!  
—The "Social Creditor" (Eng.), 8/12/45.

## ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

(Obtainable from New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.)

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE." A short history of the Bank of England. Price 9d. Postage 1d (6/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price 9d. Postage 1d (6/- per dozen, post free.)

## "PROPHETS OF THE PAST"

Hear—

MR. C. A. ALLEN,  
Thursday, February 28, at 8 p.m.  
at the

Douglas Social Credit Movement of Victoria, "The Block," Melbourne. (Entrance through grille in Elizabeth Street.)

**THE "NEW TIMES" IS OBTAINABLE AT ALL AUTHORISED NEWSAGENTS**

**WHY WAS "BRETTON WOODS" PUSHED**  
**On December 6, 1945, a Government spokesman told the House of Commons that a few days later the House (of several hundred Members) would have only a couple of days in which to debate the Bretton Woods Agreement and associated matters.**

This announcement was immediately followed by many strong protests and pertinent questions, which were hardly reported at all in the Australian daily papers, although a matter of historic importance to the whole British Empire was involved. The following report is taken from the British "Hansard": —

**Mr. Norman Smith (Nottingham, South):**

The House has had from the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister a statement of policy which must have a tremendous effect upon the future history, not merely of this country, but of the world. The Prime Minister was followed by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, who told the House that it was necessary not only to focus opinion quickly, but also to take action speedily. Following the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Woodford (Mr. Churchill) we have had the right hon. Gentleman the Lord President of the Council, who has announced the Business for next week involving among other things legislation to implement this agreement, legislation to be rushed through the House by Friday next. I have a very vivid recollection, Mr. Speaker, that when you were installed in your Chair at the beginning of this Session, you told the House that you were the champion of the back-benchers. It looks to me as though there is here collusion between, on the one hand the Leader of the Opposition, and, on the other hand, His Majesty's Government; and I am asking that this House shall not be required to pass legislation at this very rapid rate. I am asking that my right hon. Friend on the Front Bench shall not require this House to honour the date, December 31, for ratifying the Bretton Woods Agreement. This House is being asked to take far too rapid action on a tremendously important matter. I beg, Sir that a decision on Bretton Woods shall not be taken in this hurried fashion.

**Mr. Boothby (Aberdeen and Kincardine, Eastern):** I would like to ask one question of the Prime Minister, and that is how he reconciles the statement he has just made with the repeated pledges given by successive Governments to this House that no decision would be taken on the Bretton Woods Agreement, unless this House had had an opportunity of discussing that agreement. Some of us have been pressing for a discussion on this for the last ten months. We have never been allowed to have a discussion. Now we have a pistol pointed "at our heads, and are told that we have to pass the whole thing in three days. I think, with all due respect, that the Prime Minister is not honouring the undertaking repeatedly given by this Government and by both the preceding Governments, to this House. I would like to ask how he reconciles this statement with those undertakings.

**The Prime Minister:** My statement was that before a decision on Bretton Woods is taken, the House will have an opportunity for full discussion and debate. And it is proposed that there should be a two-days' debate on this matter. I think that is fully honouring the pledge.

**Mr. Stokes:** As it is evident that the terms of this loan are dependent on the Bretton Woods proposals being accepted, I support the plea made by my hon. Friend the Member for South Nottingham (Mr. N. Smith) and the hon. Member for East Aberdeen (Mr. Boothby) that more time should be given to this matter. May I ask the Prime Minister, in view of the fact that the whole of this arrangement depends on the acceptance of the Bretton Woods proposals and the whole intention of America is to get us back on to the gold standard, will he make it abundantly clear to the country, that acceptance of this policy means a return to the gold standard—

**Several Members:** No.

**Mr. Stokes:** And if the Debate must take place next week will the right hon. Gentleman see that Whips are taken off so that Members can be free to vote according to their opinions?

**The Prime Minister:** My hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Stokes) will be able to make that point, but I do not accept his premises.

**Mr. Beverley Baxter (Wood Green):** The Prime Minister, in his very important announcement, mentioned the scaling down of Imperial preferences in return for compensations and advantages, which will have to balance what already exists. I would very much like to know whether we are to be presented with legislation to be carried through by the Government with then majority, or whether we are first to have a chance to debate this very important issue before we are presented with Government legislation with, in the end, the imposition of the Government majority.

**The Prime Minister:** I am afraid the hon. Member for Wood Green (Mr. Baxter) has not got it right. There is no question of legislation on the commercial agreement. The commercial agreement is a point which is going to be discussed at an international conference, and the matter is intimately bound up with other matters. All that is suggested is, not a unilateral abandonment

of preferences, but discussions for a general reduction of trade barriers, in which the reduction of preferences might form a part. No legislation is required on that.

**Mr. Stanley Evans (Widnesbury):** In view of the fact that many hon. Members, and many people throughout the country, regard Bretton Woods as economic strangulation for the British Commonwealth of Nations, will the Government consider taking the Whips off on the occasion of this Debate?

**The Prime Minister:** No, Sir. The fact that certain people hold certain opinions does not necessarily mean that, therefore, we should take the Whips off.

**Mr. N. Smith:** What is the Prime Minister afraid of?

**Mr. Churchill:** I would like to ask the Leader of the House whether we may take it that, in regard to the outline of Business for next week, in connection with the statement made by the Prime Minister—a suggested outline but one which will, of course, be interpreted in accordance with the general wishes and desires of the House—if more time is required, we shall not be held to be agreeing at this moment to the allocation that has been proposed.

**Mr. Morrison:** "I understand the right hon. Gentleman's position, which is not unreasonable, and, of course, if discussions are desired through the usual channels, they shall take place, but I am bound to say that I am in a very real difficulty. I am up against the clock and the calendar. The Bretton Woods agreement, if it is to be effective, must be implemented by 31 December by legislation, and, in order to get it into another place [House of Lords] at the proper time, I am advised—and, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Warwick and Leamington (Mr. Eden) knows, we have had discussions and have put it off a bit to give more time for consideration—but I must get it into another place, I am advised, by two o'clock on Friday of next week. That is the difficulty I am in, and having pointed out this very real difficulty that really ties me up, certainly I would not wish to prevent any real discussion."

**Mr. Stokes:** On business, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. N. Smith:** May I ask if it is on your authority. Mr. Speaker that this House

**MENZIES AND SOCIALIST "ADVISERS"**

**The following correspondence between a Victorian elector and Mr. Menzies should prove most instructive to those who think that the "Liberal" Party bosses propose to challenge the power of the Socialist economic advisers such as Professor Coombs:**

January 9, 1946.

Mr. R. G. Menzies, M.H.R.,

Federal Members' Rooms, Melbourne, C.I.

Dear Mr. Menzies, —As one who has always prided himself on being a liberal in political and economic matters, I am gravely concerned about the manner in which the socialist economic advisers appear to have completely captured control of the present Federal Government's policies. Socialists, and, in some cases, Communists, appear to have all the key positions in the vast Canberra bureaucracy.

Frankly, I can see no hope of any impression being made on the socialist totalitarians unless those who call themselves liberals are prepared to challenge the socialist professors in an uncompromising manner. As leader of the Liberal Party, why not come out publicly and state that, if elected at the Federal Elections this year, you will remove from positions of authority all known socialist economic advisers? I think that a great number of people would welcome this lead.

Sincerely yours .....

\* \* \* \* \*

30 Selborne Chambers, Melbourne, C.I.

19th January 1946.

Dear Mr..... Thank you for your recent letter.

I certainly do not favour any system by which supporters of one political party are excluded from employment in the Civil Service. If it were permissible for me to take steps to get rid of socialists, that is, Labour supporters, equally it would be permissible for the Labour Government to get rid of Liberal Civil Servants, and that emphasises that the right way to treat the Civil Service is to ignore politics in dealing with it. In the same way, of course, the Civil Servant should ignore politics in the performance of his duties.

With appreciation of your interest and with every good wish for the coming year,

I am, yours sincerely, (Sgd.) R. G.

MENZIES.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dear Mr. Menzies, —Many thanks for your letter of January 19. Please excuse me for writing again, but you appear to have misunderstood the point I raised in my first

letter. I agree with your attitude towards the Civil Service generally—providing the Civil Service merely carries out a policy laid down by the people through their Government. But I had in mind such economic advisers as Professor Coombs, who obviously help to frame policies. These socialist planners are imposing their disastrous policies on the people today, and, it appears to me, that those who believe in liberalism, free enterprise, etc., should make it clear that these socialist economic advisers will be removed from their present positions if the Labor Party is defeated at the coming Federal elections.

As a vigorous anti-socialist, I would like a clear-cut statement from you, declaring what you propose to do about economic advisers such as Professor Coombs. Surely such men could be given some job in the Civil Service where they would merely help to administer policy instead of helping to frame it, as they do today?

I trust that a further reply will not inconvenience you, but I and other rank-and-file liberals would be able to combat the socialist menace much more adequately if we could say what was intended about such men as Dr. Coombs.

Thanking you for your good wishes,

I am, Sincerely yours.....

\* \* \* \* \*

Federal Members' Booms, Sydney,

11th February 1946.

Dear Mr.....—Mr. Menzies has directed me to acknowledge your further letter and to say that he appreciates the point you are getting at.

Yours sincerely, (Sgd.) E. G. LENIHAN,

Private Secretary.

\* \* \* \* \*

We hope the rank-and-file of the Liberals like the "fight" their "leaders" are making against the socialists!

Edgar Holt, "Smith's Weekly" political commentator, writes on February 9: "One shrewd politician among the Liberals said to me recently: "Our job is to get our policy as close as possible to that of the Labor Party."

"The day after the Liberals published their new draft policy, a Federal Labor member cracked: 'I'd have thought it was our policy if they had mentioned beer as well.'"

Yes, Mr. Menzies no doubt "appreciates the point."

is required either to implement or reject the Bretton Woods agreement by 31 December?

**Mr. Speaker:** That is a most improper suggestion. I had nothing to do with the Bretton Woods Agreement or with the arrangements. If the hon. Member wishes to object to any arrangements made, when the Bill comes before the House he will be able to vote against it and show his protest.

**Mr. Stokes:** May I ask the Lord President of the Council, in view of the very serious statement he has just made as to the effect of this on Business next week, whether it is the Government's intention to ask this House to put this country back, as the result of acceptance of the Bretton Woods Agreement, on the gold standard next week, when some of us have spent about 25 years fighting against it?

**Mr. Morrison:** I am not, myself, a conclusive authority on the gold standard—

**Mr. Stokes:** The right hon. Gentleman ought to know what he is asking for.

**Mr. Morrison:** In this matter, I am concerned with the business of the House, not the gold standard. It does seem to me that, if the Bill is published and the White Paper is available tomorrow, with the Prime Minister's statement, it is not unreasonable to ask that the House should begin the discussion on Wednesday and conclude it, over all, by 2 o'clock on Friday. I really do not think we are treating the House badly. Naturally, the House will have opportunity for all points of view being heard, and, in the meantime, there will be considerable discussion in the Press and otherwise. I do not think we are treating the House in a way, which can be described as thrusting this down the throats of the House, without reasonable opportunity for discussion.

**Mr. Janner (Leicester, West):** May I ask a question of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, on Business? We have been promised for some time a Debate on Palestine. I would like to know whether there is a prospect of that taking place before the Recess.

**Mr. Morrison:** As I said last week, I have no objection to that, but I think that, in the new order of things, whereby we have had two days on the Motion of Censure, and there will be the two and a half days on financial and economic matters next week, I am bound to say; whilst I will do my best, the prospect dims and dims, and whether we can get the Debate this side of Christmas I do not know.

**Mr. Bracken (Bournemouth):** May I ask a question not based on party bias?

**Mr. N. Smith:** In view of what Mr. Speaker said to us last August, when we first took our seats, I want to ask who is it that governs the Business of this House? Who said this legislation must be passed by December 31?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have already informed the hon. Member that I do not govern the Business of this House. The Government governs the Business of the House.

(To be concluded next week.)

**COUNTRY MEETINGS IN VICTORIA**

The highlight of the two country meetings addressed by Mr. Eric Butler last week, was the selling of just on 100 booklets and the signing up of twelve new direct subscribers for the "New Times."

On Wednesday, February 13, nearly 70 people listened attentively in the Yackandandah Shire Hall. Mr. Mark Mongan was mainly responsible for an excellent meeting in such a small centre. There was some very keen discussion after the meeting. The local paper published an adequate report of Mr. Butler's address.

On Thursday evening, February 14, practically the entire population of Sandy Creek was present in the local hall. Mr. Dan Moore, Mr. K. Dyer, and other stalwarts were responsible for this outstanding meeting, over 50 people being present. The speaker was given a very enthusiastic hearing, and was still being keenly questioned at 11.30 pm.

Messrs. Mongan and Moore are so pleased with the results achieved in small centres that they intend to arrange meetings in adjacent country centres, where there is a local hall.

Mr. Butler recommends this line of activity to other country supporters in small centres, pointing out that it is much better to arrange a meeting of 30 or 40 people in a small centre with very little expense, than to spend a lot of money and energy in getting 100 people to a meeting in one big centre. His idea is to work from the small centres to the bigger centres.

Next week he expects to address several meetings in Gippsland. The following week he leaves for a tour of the Wimmera and Mallee.

Once again, all country supporters in all parts of Victoria who can co-operate with Mr. Butler are urged to contact him care of Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

**MEN OF FIGURES CONTROL PRACTICAL MEN!**

From the "Social Crediter" (Eng.).

The extraordinary lengths to which the Bloomsbury Cult—the exaltation of a special type of intellectualism divorced from practical experience—can tinge policy, is well illustrated by the appointment of a Chartered Accountant to control Krupps. Although, fifty years ago, such an arrangement would have excited derision, it has become quite a commonplace, evoking little or no comment. It was a feature of the post-1918 period, and contributed noticeably to the tragic decadence of British affairs, which we are evidently being urged to repeat—almost step by step.

Yet it is possible that it is a phenomenon, which lies close to the heart of things. A very able Jew, when taxed with the desire to enslave the Gentiles, replied: "You Gentiles will always be slaves until you can learn to distinguish between numbers and things." The growing ascendancy of the accountant, as a link between the actual producer and the control of the Financial Centre—in this country Somerset House and the Bank of "England"—would seem to indicate that we are getting deeper into slavery with every day that passes.

**SIGNIFICANT STATEMENT**

Near-millionaire Victor Gollancz, speaking on the Jewish Problem to the Left Book Club, London said he believed there could be no permanent solution to the Jewish Problem without International Socialism.

—"Australian Jewish Herald," January 11, 1946.

**FACTUAL FINDINGS**

After an exhaustive survey covering every country on the face of the globe, it has been discovered by an "eminent authority" that wherever an acorn is planted and the associating elements of soil, sun and moisture are suitable to produce growth, the answer is never A LEMON!

\* \* \* \* \*

A CRANK is a person who understands something, which others do not.

\* \* \* \* \*

Following on publication of the casualty lists of the various nations engaged in the recent war, it can now be definitely admitted that some Gentiles also suffered, and that a number were even exterminated!

—"The Gleaner."

**"THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIAL CREDIT"**

By ERIC D BUTLER

Price 1/1d posted.

Advance orders for this new booklet will be accepted immediately. Supplies should be available at the end of this month.

Here is a booklet, which clarifies Social Credit and exposes the attempt to foster the idea that the Federal Labor Government's 1945 Banking Legislation is similar to Social Credit.

No social creditor can afford to be without this booklet. Order now from New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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