

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. 16. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1946

"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.

Why Give Any More Powers To Canberra? Centralisation Already A Danger

(A recent Radio Talk by Eric D. Butler.)

As I pointed out last week, the more the central Government at Canberra tries to do things, which could, and should, be done by Local Councils and State Governments, the more legislation it has to pass. Legislation has grown to such a volume that no Federal Member has time to examine it thoroughly.

This dangerous state of affairs, which is undermining responsible government, can only be overcome, by reducing, not increasing, the powers of the central Government. Government must be broken down and de-centralised to the stage where, the people and their representatives can clearly understand the implications of all legislation before it is passed.

If Members of Parliament are endorsing legislation, which they don't understand, then the way is open for the introduction of a dictatorship by those who frame the legislation. The big Government Departments play an important part in advising Federal Ministers on the framing of legislation, and they make certain that everything is done to increase their powers as far as possible.

It is simply madness for any Government to say that there is so much legislation to be considered that enormous powers must be delegated to Government officials who in turn can delegate their powers to thousands of other officials. This leads to increasing government by an irresponsible bureaucracy passing its own regulations. Tyranny is the only word to describe this state of affairs.

Democratic government is not possible unless we have responsible government. Members of Parliament must be held personally responsible for every piece of legislation passed. Government officials should merely administer a policy given to them by the people's representatives; they should under no circumstances decide policy.

We can define policy as the results, which the electors desire. Parliament and such Government Departments as are essential exist to ensure that the electors get the results they desire. This idea is no doubt repugnant to many of our bureaucrats, who seem to believe that they are possessed of a higher intelligence than the ordinary elector, but the sooner it is made clear to these people that they are merely the paid servants of the electors, the sooner a move will be made towards real democracy.

It is a well-known fact that the more highly centralised a Government becomes and the more it takes over the work of local governments, the less control the people have over the Government, and the more policy-making is delegated by the Government to the bureaucracy.

The close connection between centralised Government and bureaucracy was made

very clear by American President Calvin Coolidge in 1926, when replying to a deputation urging the granting of increased powers to the Federal Government. Coolidge said:

"No method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced from self-government. No plan of centralisation has ever been adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, reaction and decline. Of all forms of government those administered by bureaux are least satisfactory to an enlightened and progressive people. Unless progress to Government by bureaucracy is constantly resisted, it breaks down representative Government, and overwhelms democracy. It is the one element in our constitution that sets up the pretence of having authority over everybody and being responsible to nobody."

Listeners should ponder carefully over those words by President Coolidge. Are they not proved true by experience? We have plenty of theorists in the community today. But, listeners, we must learn from actual experience. The results of highly centralised government in Germany, Russia, and other openly totalitarian countries should serve as a warning to any thinking person.

We must judge all government by results and results alone. Let us therefore examine in detail some of the results of centralised government in Australia. Last week I mentioned the Federal Government's main so-called Security Scheme, the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act, which possibly cannot be legally continued if the electors refuse to give the necessary constitutional power to do so at the next Referendum. This "Security" scheme was obviously drafted by the Government bureaucracy, who made certain that certain clauses were included giving the bureaucracy enormous powers. Clause 46 of the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act reads:

"The Director-General (of the scheme) may require any person whom he believes to be in a position to do so, to furnish to him a

confidential report relating to any matter which might affect the payment of benefit to any other person. And a person so required shall not fail to furnish a report within a reasonable time, and shall not furnish a report, which is false or misleading in any particular. Penalty, £50, or three months' imprisonment."

Here is the thin edge of the wedge for the introduction of the Gestapo. The bureaucracy knows only too well that the people are resisting its dictatorships, and that the only way to try and control the people is by compelling one section to spy on other sections. The bureaucrats in charge of the Taxation Monopoly openly appeal to the people to send in anonymous reports about any of their fellows who are dodging taxation in any shape or form.

Fancy legislation being passed in our Federal Parliament which can be used to force Australians to become informers. Any one of a hundred petty officials to whom the Director-General of the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Scheme can delegate his powers, can compel people to supply reports, even about their relatives. But this is not all. The bureaucrats administering this scheme can also dictate to those seeking unemployment relief under the scheme what work they shall do and where they shall do it. Never forget that the money for this scheme is taken out of the pockets of the Australian people by the Taxation Monopoly. But when the people want to get a few shillings of their money back, they have to submit to the dictatorship of the bureaucracy.

This is the type of tyranny we are being asked to endorse at the next Referendum. Is this the "New Order" for which we fought a long and exhausting war? Surely not.

The standard of living in Australia can

be increased without any difficulty over the next few years without any compulsion whatever. There is no argument about this being physically possible.

But the controllers of the Federal Government appear to be determined to do all in their power to prevent the people from getting on with the task of increasing production of goods and services. The Taxation Monopoly and Bureaucratic Departments are destroying the incentive to produce. Every day of the week I hear people saying that they are only prepared to do a certain amount of work, that they are not prepared to make any extra effort when most of the results of the extra effort are taken by the Taxation Monopoly.

Far from Canberra having increased powers, it should have its power over taxation and other matters taken from it. Why shouldn't the people of any one State decide what taxes they are to pay and how they shall be spent? Wouldn't this be far more democratic than the present set-up?

If it is argued that Uniform Taxation simplifies taxation by having only one collecting authority (i.e., no overlapping), then why not have the States collect all taxes as they desire, each within its own borders, and allocate to the Federal Government sufficient for the legitimate needs of the Federal Government? In this way the local State Governments would have some effective control over the power-lusting tendencies of the Canberra octopus. In fact, the States could ensure that the army of bureaucrats in the innumerable Boards, Commissions and Departments was demobilised by refusing to allow it the taxpayers' money to play around with.

Democracy can only be made operative in local government. That is why every demand for increased powers by Canberra must be firmly rejected.

In a reply to the Ballarat Trades and Labor Council, taxation boss Chenoweth admits the impossibility of accurate deductions under "pay as you earn." He also says that he himself finds the taxation Act complicated. He then trusts that the Council "can assure its members that every effort is made by the Department to conserve their interests."

For sheer hypocrisy that is hard to beat; but doubtless it is good strategy to use on the Labor Council, who may be trusted to frown on any criticism of the Labor Party for fleecing the workers through the taxing machine. If Labor were not in office, there would be forceful comments on "Capitalist Leeches," but apparently Labor can always fool the workers.

FOOD FRENZY: While featured press reports refer to food scarcity throughout continental Europe and tell dire stories of starvation, smaller news items rouse grave doubts about the position. For example, this is what U.S. Senator A. N. McLean tells us through the Melbourne "Sun" of April 16: "I was amazed at the amount of foodstuffs being landed from Europe at Boston, New York, and other Atlantic ports which I have just visited. . . . Fish products are being exported from Norway, Iceland, Spain, Portugal and the United Kingdom to get United States Dollars." He also says "ships loaded with fish products from America for starving Europe meet ships in mid-Atlantic with similar products from Europe for America." No wonder people are disinclined to be impressed by this famine propaganda.

MEAT "MUDDLE": Commenting on the low-grade meat unloaded on the Melbourne public by the Meat Board under cover of the recent meat hold-up, a South Yarra butcher remarked: "No self-respecting butcher would want such meat in his shop, even as dog's meat." He described the carcasses as "thin and wasted sheep which probably had been bought at a very low price for the skins, and the carcasses left in cool stores for seven or eight years." What a boon the meat hold-up was as an excuse for unloading this rubbish. Wonder if the Meat Board and the price-fixers realise how they helped this racket? And can we believe that "starving Europe" rejected this meat, or can it be that "starving Europe" insists on having only the prime meat and that we must eat the rubbish?

GESTAPO GANGSTERS: Proposals for a peace-time S.S. (so-called Security Service) are causing grave concern. This new Gestapo is visualised as an adjunct to the Attorney General's Department, which would no doubt permit it to be used for political espionage and intimidation, as was the case during wartime, when the Communists used it against loyal citizens who were members of the Australia First Movement. It is just another step towards Fascism,

and therefore should be resisted to the utmost. We have a Police Force in every State, with special C.I.B. squads, which can take care of espionage and similar investigations. Evatt and Co., or any other Party nominee, should not be trusted with a Federal Gestapo. Federal Members should be instructed by their electors to resist this attempt to emulate Hitler and Stalin.

N.Z. NEMESIS: A political sensation has been caused by a report by Mr. F. P. Walsh, one of the New Zealand Labor Government's most influential advisers. He says, in effect, that after ten years of "Labor" rule, the resources of the country have been sucked dry, and that in future only increased production and efficiency will raise living standards. Mr. Walsh is regarded as one of the ablest brains of the Socialist Party, and he is telling the world of the failure of Socialism to deliver the goods. He told his Socialist colleagues that "N.Z. was now facing serious economic dangers." From this it seems that the people of N.Z. are to suffer the inevitable result of Socialism: they have to choose between retracing their steps or going on to Fascism, as Germany and Russia did.

MONOPOLY MATES: The "downtrodden workers" and the "master class" have joined forces in an attempt to impose a bread zoning monopoly. Official documents circulated by the Bread Manufacturers' Association and the Bread Carters' Industrial Federation of Australia confirming this conspiracy have been published in the Melbourne "Sun" of April 13. From this it is clear that the union bosses' denunciation of monopoly is mere lip service.

CANBERRA COMMOTION: The recent nine days' wonder, the "horror ship," is reported to have caused considerable concern in Canberra. However, the concern was not for the victims on the "hell ship"—oh dear, no!—it was because of the possible effect on the Henty by-election and the general elections. This issue evoked much

Significant Political Pointers

The sooner the real significance of Soviet Russia in the present international set-up is more widely appreciated, the sooner action will be taken to avert the appalling catastrophe now confronting the remnants of civilisation.

The evidence that Jewish international financiers financed the Russian Revolution is overwhelming. Russia is the base from which Revolution is being directed. Revolution depends upon crisis after crisis in every country. The controllers of financial policy are obviously doing all in their power to ensure that the revolutionaries in every country, particularly in British countries, have an excellent field of discontent in which to work. Those well-meaning people who are aghast at the chaos being caused by socialist planning, of which high taxation is an integral part, can offer no help while they talk about "hair-brained" socialist schemes. There is nothing "hair-brained" about these schemes; they have the backing of some of the shrewdest brains that money can buy.

The fact that the production system is near collapsing, with resultant increasing strife, is no proof that socialist planning is failing. It is succeeding! It is bringing about what the promoters of revolution desire: the breakdown of the entire social structure as a necessary preliminary to the introduction of complete serfdom.

In a recent talk on international affairs at Canberra, Dr. Evatt asked the question, "Does Russia intend aggression?" Answering his own question, Dr. Evatt said: "Having no clear evidence to the contrary, and having during the last four years come to know some of Russia's greatest statesmen, I take the view that the Soviet Union's policy is directed towards self-protection

and security against future attack. In my opinion, its desire is to develop its own economy and to improve the welfare of its peoples."

No more dangerous nonsense has ever been uttered. Just as the people were deliberately bemused concerning Hitler's real intentions, so are they being bemused concerning real Russian policy.

What is this policy? Stalin has laid it down clearly enough, particularly in his "Foundations of Leninism" and "Problems of Leninism," both basic textbooks on revolutionary strategy and tactics.

Dealing with the strategy, which was reached with the Revolution in Russia, Stalin states: "Objectives to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries." Russia is the base. Stalin quotes Lenin as follows: "Revolution is impossible without a nation-wide crisis. . . ."

The war helped the general strategy considerably. Every country is experiencing one "nation-wide crisis" after another.

No doubt it is hoped that the present pressure on Spain will provoke civil war, which can then be spread.

Nothing can save the situation for the British Empire but a complete and ruthless exposure of the groups and individuals furthering the general campaign of destruction. If the genuine conservative elements in the community would only realise that

(Continued on page 3.)

(Continued on page 4.)

CALL OF PATRIOTISM OR MESMERISM?

(A Letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown.)

Sir, —One of my sisters has sent me a copy of the Hobart "Mercury" of April 8. It contains a letter from the Anglican Archbishop of Tasmania exhorting "all good Anglicans" to support the system of finance now being imposed on the community.

Coming as it did just before Easter, and Easter being an appropriate time for meditation about the Crucifixion, I wondered whether the Archbishop really knew what he was doing. Can it be that he wrote the letter at the suggestion of someone else?

The part of the letter to which I call attention reads as follows:

"All good Anglicans, I hope, have by now, like their Bishop, subscribed to the loan. We who are members of the mother Church of the British people need few, if any, admonitions to be patriotic. The support of these Commonwealth loans is a patriotic act, not a political gesture. It is well to be reminded of this in view of the coming election contest, which would appear, at the moment, to be anybody's game."

From this we see that in the mind of the Tasmanian Archbishop it is a patriotic act to put ourselves into irredeemable debt, and that, contrary to the warning of Jesus, it is virtuous to be financially enslaved and thus work against the development of the Kingdom of Heaven within the individual.

There is little doubt in the Christian world as to the fact of the Crucifixion or as to the horrible manner in which it was done. Fiendishness is not a new thing. Frightful examples of it have come from the days of old. The Crucifixion was but one of them, and of that event three things stand out:

1. It was the leaders of Jewry who had Him arraigned and described Him as a "perverter";

2. He was handed over by Pilate because the misguided PEOPLE demanded it; and

3. Those who actually took part in the Crucifixion didn't know what they were doing.

Confirmation of these statements may be found in the 23rd Chapter of St. Luke, from which I quote the following:

Verse 2: "We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar. . . ."

Verse 5 (After Pilate had told the chief priests that he found no fault in the Man): "And they were the more fierce, saying He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry. . . ."

Verse 10: "And the chief priests and scribes stood and vehemently accused Him."

Verse 23: "And they were instant with loud voices, requiring that He might be crucified. And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed."

Verse 34: "Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they, know not what they do. . . ."

Jesus was tortured and crucified at the behest of the representatives of Jewry, and there is abundant evidence to show that it is at the behest of the representatives of Jewry that the people of the world are being tortured and crucified now.

Jesus was called a "perverter" by the representatives of Jewry because He told the people they were suffering needlessly at the hands of their rulers. He told the people that they were not born for "work"; that if they served Mammon they could not serve God; that institutions were made for man, not man for institutions; and that He came that the people might have life and have it more abundantly. These divine ideas were contrary to the Jewish ideas and thus automatically "perverse," placing the propounder of them immediately into the "counter-revolutionary" category.

That is why criticism in Russia of anything Jewish is punishable by death. I assume that this comes about because the Communist Revolution was Jewish, and consequently anything anti-Jewish is anti-Communist and therefore counter-revolutionary.

Unfortunately, the Jewish ideas have been perpetuated and still control us—i.e., if we do not "work" we shall not eat, regardless of God's bounty; if we do not pay tribute to "Caesar" we shall be persecuted, imprisoned, and denied citizenship; life is not to be an opportunity for the individual to develop fully, but a period of financial enslavement paying perpetual tribute to the controllers of the money supply; man exists to serve the State, not the State to serve man.

And so, as in the time of Jesus, we are slaves to "work"; money and the controllers of money are more important than the gifts of God; "Caesar" is supreme; children are born to be treated little better than cattle; and they who were anti-Christ in the year A.D. 33 are still anti-Christ in the year 1946. Such a state of affairs is due to the fact that anti-Christ is still permitted to control the world through FINANCE, and the PEOPLE are misled into accepting this as the proper order by chief priests and elders, as they were misled nearly 2000 years ago.

Although the Anglican Archbishop of Tasmania apparently does not know it, the practice of financing governments by loans and taxation is part of the devilish system of the anti-Christ.

That government loans are not necessary has been definitely shown by the Canadian Province of Alberta, whose Social Credit Government has administered the affairs of the Province for more than ten years without borrowing at all. Not only so, but highways have been built without leaving any debt, taxation has been reduced, the provincial debt has been decreased, purchasing power for the people has been in-

BUREAUCRATIC RESTRICTION OF THE HOUSING EFFORT

Board of Treasury Valuers Asked to Resign

To the Editor: Dear Sir, —In view of the great urgency for relief from apparently willful frustration of all attempts to give effect to a quick house-building effort, I would be pleased if you can give space in the "New Times" for the enclosed letter. —Yours faithfully, F. J. TUCKFIELD, 51 Church Street, Middle Brighton, S.5, April 17, 1946.

To the Board of Valuers of the Commonwealth Sub-Treasury for Lands and Houses, 16 Queen Street, Melbourne, C.I.

Dear Sirs, —I hereby demand your resignations as Valuers for the Commonwealth Sub-Treasury for the following reasons: (1.) That the late war having been terminated over six months, there is no moral or right reason for continuing the present regulations affecting the sale of property.

(2.) That because of the basis for valuations forced on you for decisions, by the Government, your valuations are false and misleading to the public.

(3.) That in some instances, as for example when you recently refused the sale of property at a certain price but suggested a price as acceptable, which was less than one shilling and one penny per foot frontage less than the sale price, makes your objections to such sales utterly ridiculous. (4.) That the basis of values for land being on the "Comparable" prices paid for other land in the same street, having no regard to the special reasons why such lots have been sold for less than true value and having also no relation to exactly similar streets close by and where values have not been depressed for special reasons, cause such a basis to be inconsistent with true values.

(5.) That because your valuations are, in any and every case, to be those as at February, 1942, when, because of the early war conditions values were depressed, they do not also reflect fair and reasonable prices.

(6.) That the definite scarcity of building lots now existing is due almost entirely to the above reasons in paragraphs 4 and 5, and that, in consequence, very great hardship and injustice is being inflicted on returned soldiers and others desiring to build homes.

(7.) That present owners desiring to help returned soldiers, while at the same time obtaining just prices for themselves, are not able to do so, without making themselves liable to imprisonment.

(8.) That the great delay of weeks and months apparently necessary to give decisions on valuations submitted to you, is causing great loss and inconvenience to both buyers and sellers.

(9.) That the lifting of these regulations and those governing the production of all raw materials and all priorities, would enable builders and others to very quickly solve the housing problem.

(10.) That for the reasons given above, grave suspicions of your motives are rife among many people, who not knowing to the full the impossible nature of the positions you hold, consider that either you or your friends are being especially assisted by some of your inconsistent decisions, and, in their opinion, the Department of the Sub-Treasury is therefore "stinking to high heaven" in regard to these matters.

The Prime Minister's and other Ministers' attention having been called to the above unjust and deplorable state of affairs, without avail, and in consequence of the decision of the Cabinet not to lift the National Security Regulations, for obvious political reasons, until next December, and recognizing that, as a body, you are composed of gentlemen with business connections demanding responsibility and integrity, and, as such, holding the good name, not only of yourselves and your businesses, but also of organisations such as the Real Estate and Architects' Institutes, I feel that no course other than demanding your resignations can end and thus correct a condition of affairs galling to tens of thousands of citizens.

To enable you to obtain the backing of the public in this matter, it is my intention to offer this letter to the Press for publication.

—Yours faithfully, F. J. TUCKFIELD, 51 Church Street, Middle Brighton.

creased, and the Province has been developed more in that short period than had been done in the preceding fifty years.

If a Canadian Province can do that while in a position of financial subservience to the Canadian Federal Government, any State of the Commonwealth could do it, especially when it is remembered that the degree of their financial subservience is actually much smaller.

But what ought we to expect from a Federal Government having financial sovereignty? Manual work could be reduced to an absolute minimum; borrowing of money could cease (if the Government were short of finance, it could unbalance the Budget and work on the overdraft principle through the Commonwealth Bank WITHOUT ANY INTEREST CHARGE); money could be servant instead of master; the people could be liberated from the bondage of debt; every child born could have full opportunity to develop as the divine creator intends; all institutions could serve mankind; and for the first time in recorded history we could have both the opportunity and, I venture to say, the desire to serve God in the truest sense of the term.

What prevents that at present is the Jewish financial system, of which government borrowing is a part; and yet, notwithstanding the injunction of Jesus, the leader of the Anglican Church in Tasmania tells us that it is patriotic to support the continuance of these un-Christian things. Does he really know what he is doing?

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. April 21, 1946.

ERIC BUTLER COMMENCES SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOUR

Mr. Eric Butler arrived in Adelaide on Tuesday, April 16, and opened his South Australian tour with an address to Adelaide social creditors at the rooms of the United Democrats on Wednesday, April 17.

He addressed meetings at Henley Beach, Wesbourne Park, and Lincoln this week. Reports of these meetings will appear in our next issue.

Mr. Butler's future itinerary is as follows:

Saturday, April 27: Tumby Bay.

Monday, April 29: Cummins.

Tuesday, April 30: Kimba.

Wednesday, May 1: Buckleboo.

Thursday, May 2: Cowell (afternoon meeting).

Saturday, May 4: Address at United Democrats' Rally.

Sunday, May 5: Williamstown, 3 p.m.

Sunday, May 5: Gawler, 8 p.m.

Monday, May 6: Riverton.

Tuesday, May 7: Tanunda.

Wednesday, May 8: Ex-Servicemen's Meeting, Stow Hall, Adelaide.

Friday, May 10: Prospect.

Sunday, May 12: Forest Range, 3 p.m.

Monday, May 13: Barmera.

Tuesday, May 14: Berri.

Wednesday, May 15: Renmark.

Friday, May 17: Glenelg.

"TWENTY QUESTIONS ABOUT RUSSIA"

(Continued from last issue.)

The above heading is the title of a valuable little booklet written and published by H. W. Henderson in Great Britain during the latter part of the recent war, and obtainable from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7 Victoria Street, Liverpool 2, England, at 4d (sterling) per copy, plus postage. The following is taken from the booklet:

8. Have not the Communists introduced a greater degree of equality than that existing in the capitalist countries?

This is another fiction of Communist propaganda, which has shamelessly exploited the ignorance of those who know little or nothing of conditions in the Soviet Union.

"The real earnings of the Stakohovists (shock brigade workers) often exceed by twenty or thirty times the earnings of the lower category of workers," says Trotsky. "And as for specially fortunate specialists their salaries would in many cases pay for the work of eighty or a hundred unskilled labourers. In scope of inequality in the payment of labour the Soviet Union has not only caught up to, but far surpasses the capitalist countries." (Leon Trotsky: "The Revolution Betrayed.")

This view is supported by the American author, James Burnham, who writes: "According to Leon Trotsky, in an article published late in 1939, and to my personal knowledge based on a careful collation and analysis of statistics published in the Soviet press, the upper 11 per cent, or 12 per cent of the Soviet population now receives approximately 50 per cent of the national income. The differentiation is sharper than in the United States, where the upper 10 per cent of the population receives approximately 35 per cent of the national income." (James Burnham: "The Managerial Revolution.")

Of Stalin's own mode of life Alexander Barmine, formerly member of the Soviet Commissariat for Foreign Trade, has said: "He has four palatial residences in South Russia along the shores of the Black Sea, and several comfortable summer palaces in the suburbs of Moscow. All these homes are equipped with everything from billiard rooms to motion picture halls. . . . Stalin's estates employ hundreds of servants and guards the year round, and are always ready for his visits." ("Reader's Digest," May, 1940.)

The American Communist, Andrew Smith, and many others, have remarked on the comforts enjoyed by the ruling class while many of the workers live in poverty.

9. You have quoted the words of Trotsky on conditions in the Soviet Union. Is it not a fact that Trotsky was convicted of conspiring with the German General Staff for the assassination of Stalin and the establishment of Fascism in the U.S.S.R.?

This is one of the greatest falsehoods ever uttered by Communist propagandists.

Trotsky was the Arch-Apostle of World Revolution, the most uncompromising opponent of international capitalism. All his writings show this.

After the famous or infamous Moscow treason trials, in which the most intimate companions of Lenin, the men who made the Revolution, had confessed to plotting against the safety of the State under the guidance of Trotsky, and had been executed for their part in the alleged conspiracy, the Dewey Commission (sitting under the chairmanship of Professor Dewey of Columbia University and composed of well-known Liberals, Socialists, and Trade Unionists drawn from many parts of the world), following a nine-months' investigation of all the available evidence, pronounced Trotsky "not guilty" of the charges made against him and the trials a "frame-up." It was shown on the clearest possible evidence that several of the accused had confessed to crimes they could not possibly have committed, as the following examples show:

(1) The accused, Holtzman, said that he went to Copenhagen during Trotsky's stay

there, meeting Trotsky's son, Sedov, in the lobby of the Hotel Bristol and going on to see his father (November, 1932). The Dewey Commission showed that no Hotel Bristol existed in Copenhagen in 1932, the building having been demolished many years before, and that Trotsky's son was in Berlin at the time mentioned, a fact proved by six independent sources of evidence, including his university class books and attendance books, signed by the university authorities.

(2) The witness, Romm (alleged liaison man between Radek and Trotsky) said that he met Trotsky in Paris in July 1933. The Commission stated they had a "mass of evidence" utterly disproving this testimony? Trotsky, whose movements were known to the Surete Generale (the French police), landed at Cassis, near Marseilles, on July 24, 1933, and motored across France to Royan, where he remained until October 9. He was forbidden by the French authorities to live in Paris or any large working-class city. Romm's testimony, shown to be false, invalidated that of Radek.

(3) The accused Pyatakov testified that in the first half of December 1935, he flew in a special plane from Berlin to the aerodrome at Oslo, afterwards meeting Trotsky in the country. The Dewey Commission proved, amongst other discrepancies, that between September 19, 1935, and May 1, 1936, no foreign aeroplane had landed at Oslo Aerodrome. The official records of the aerodrome provided conclusive proof of this, but, despite the fact that this was brought to the notice of the Soviet prosecutor, Vishinsky, before the trial had ended, and notwithstanding the fact that sixteen lives depended on the truth or otherwise of Pyatakov's testimony, no attempt was made to bring the witness back for re-examination.

10. It is repeatedly asserted by British Communists that the Soviet Union is the only country in which unemployment has been abolished. What is the truth regarding this?

It is perfectly true that there is no unemployment in the Soviet Union, and for a very simple reason: In November, 1930, the Government closed all "Labour Exchanges" and ordered the unemployed to be put to productive labour wherever their services could be utilised, no time being wasted in bargaining over rates of pay.

They then proclaimed to the world that the unemployment problem had been solved and have gone on repeating it ever since.

The British Government could at any time abolish unemployment by similar means. Compel the unemployed to work for the dole and the trick is done! But how the Communists would howl at capitalist tyranny!

The assertion that there is no unemployment in the Soviet Union invites the retort—neither is there any unemployment in Dartmoor. For it is not the fact of employment that matters, but the conditions under which people are employed.

11. Has not the Soviet Government abolished all payment of interest on investments, which Communists in Britain denounce as robbery?

Nothing could be further from the truth. Not only may one man earn from 30 to 100 times the salary of another, but his earnings may be invested in Government bonds at 7 per cent, or he may lend them to the savings bank at 8 per cent—free of income and inheritance tax.

An investor in similar circumstances in a capitalist country would consider himself fortunate to obtain but half of this return. (To be continued.)

CANADIAN MP. ON THE ARAB-ZIONIST QUESTION

In the Canadian House of Commons recently a notable speech was made by Mr. Norman Jaques, Social Credit Member for Wetaskiwin. The occasion was the Debate on External Affairs, on December 17, 1945. According to the "Hansard" report, Mr. Jaques said: —

As a member of the Committee on External Affairs, I should like to make a few remarks . . . about a country that is very much in the news these days; and, since the question is a thorny one, I intend to follow my notes pretty closely. We read and hear a good deal about Palestine, not only in the press and on the air, but at organised public dinners and meetings.

I have no brief for either Arabs or Jews, but it seems to me that the public hears only the Zionist arguments, never the Arab side of the question. As I have said, I have no brief for either side; my sole concern is to establish the truth, for just as truth and freedom are indivisible, so mutual faith in the given word is the basis of friendship, individual and international. Once that faith is destroyed or even impaired, trust and friendship turn to suspicion and hatred. But instead of historic fact, the Zionists base their case on racial, cultural and commercial superiority. These claims on behalf of a favoured nation and a chosen people are upheld especially by Leftists and internationalists, by the very people who denounce racism and nationalism. They also are the people who claim especially to be the world's peacemakers but who, in the face of continued and fatal rioting in Palestine, are going out of their way to embarrass Great Britain in her efforts to maintain peace by encouraging tolerance by both Arab and Jew.

Some time early in the session I received a pamphlet issued by the Canadian-Palestine Committee. In answer to that, I wrote the director of that committee for a little more information, and received this letter from Mr. Herbert Mowat, executive director of the Canadian-Palestine Committee:

"Dear Sir, —Your letter of October 25 greeted me on my return to Toronto . . . and I wish to make the following comments.

"The Arab population of the Middle East totals 16,000,000, not 60,000,000, and the position of Iraq, Iran, Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Egypt is the same in respect to Palestine as is that of Canada—membership in the United Nations which is the official authority in regard to the disposition of Palestine. If the Arabs fight a United Nations decision on Palestine it is apparent they have forfeited their place of good standing in this world organisation. Our committee represents the United Nations point of view and technique in respect to Palestine. If the Arabs fight what the world agrees should be done about Palestine they fly in the face of world law and order, and, so far as the United Nations Organisation is concerned they are outlaws, and as such are subject to military measures to be taken by the Security Council of the United Nations, a body which Canada is bound to support in whatever action it takes according to the unanimous adoption of the United Nations Charter, which took place in our Canadian House of Commons and Canadian Senate not long ago. Whatever responsibility rests on Canada through membership in the United Nations Organisation accruing from the situation in Palestine our committee believes should be accepted.

"I do not think Arab threats directed at Great Britain, the United States and other members of the United Nations Organisation should be taken too seriously. They are a species of blackmail from a primitive people by which they have profited in gold and various concessions in the past. Threats of violence have been the Arabs' most profitable stock in trade. How much longer are the great powers going to appease them? There is no doubt that a policy on Palestine agreed upon by the United States, Great Britain, and the other united nations will be one to which the Arabs will be forced to adjust themselves. Such adjustment will be achieved with great benefit to the Palestinian Arabs; this has been substantiated clearly in the experience of the Jewish National Home project up to now. Our committee believes that the broad humanitarianism, which motivates the Jewish National Home project in Palestine on the part of both Jews and non-Jews, will ultimately vindicate itself by incontestable benefits to both Arabs and Jews in Palestine. —Yours sincerely, H. A. Mowat."

I maintain that this reply by the Canadian-Palestine Committee not only is prejudiced and one-sided, but is not even a true statement of facts, as I shall show. The contemptuous and dictatorial tone adopted by this committee towards the Arab people exhibits an evident and biased partisanship, which, in the end, will not advance their cause. The statement shows clearly that the United Nations Organisation is to be regarded as an instrument for clubbing the small States, and of power politics.

Let me refer briefly to the history of the Arab-Zionist question and the Palestinian problem. In the first place, the Arabs have made Palestine their own home for thousands of years, continuously for the past thirteen centuries. However, I shall not refer to anything that happened before the First World War.

Early in 1915 Great Britain needed the help of the Arabs to defend the Suez Canal from the German-led Turkish forces; and therefore, on behalf of the British Government, Sir Henry McMahon began to negotiate with the Arab leaders. In May, 1915,

the Arabs stated their conditions for their aid against the Turks. Their terms were the recognition by Great Britain of Arab independence within certain boundaries. I will not go into detail, but a main point in the dispute is whether Palestine was included in the Arab territory.

The whole situation is complicated by secret pledges and treaties; that is, subsequent agreements which, unknown to the Arabs, were concluded between the great powers; for instance, the Sykes-Picot Agreement signed in London in May, 1916. This deals with the disposal of the former Turkish Empire between Great Britain, France and Russia. This agreement was made six months after the last note exchanged between Sir Henry McMahon and the Arab leaders. By this agreement, under Zionist pressure, Great Britain broke her pledge for Arab independence.

Next came the Balfour Declaration of November 1917, which reads:

"His Majesty's Government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for Jewish people and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

The confusions and misunderstandings of the Palestine question mainly are due to the different interpretations to be put upon the phrase "national home in Palestine." For the political Zionist and for a great many of their Leftist fellow travellers and agents a national home has come to mean a national State, with or without consent of the Arabs. Cultural Zionism had been spreading slowly in Palestine even before the present century. Probably a Jewish national home is supported by some, though not by a majority of the Arabs. But all of them are opposed to a Jewish State in Palestine.

Confidence in the great powers by the Arab leaders, already shaken by a long chain of broken promises and pledges finally was lost by the decision of the Supreme Council at St. Remo in 1920, which placed all the Arab territory between the Mediterranean and Persia under mandate to Great Britain and France.

In 1922 the United States Congress passed the following resolution:

"That the United States favours the establishment in Palestine of a national home for Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christians and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine shall be, adequately protected."

Since 1921, there have been from time to time serious troubles in Palestine, which have resulted in the publishing of several White Papers, the most important of which was issued in May 1939. In this the British Government proposed that within ten years

an independent State be created in Palestine, but it limited Jewish immigration into Palestine to 75,000 for the next five years. After that date Arab consent would be necessary for further immigration; and it provided that land purchases by Jews would be prohibited in some districts and restricted in others.

Zionists and their henchmen in Great Britain, Canada and the United States have maintained terrific propaganda and political pressure to open the doors of Palestine to the fullest possible extent, so that ultimately it may become a free Jewish commonwealth.

In 1920 the Jews formed eight per cent, of the people of Palestine. In 1943 they comprised thirty-three per cent, while the rapid development of political Zionism and its growing power naturally increased the anxiety of the Arab people.

To sum up:

1. The Zionists claim Palestine is their own on historical and religious grounds. So do the Arabs, who have been there for many centuries, while the Jews left in A.D. 61. To three hundred millions of Moslems, Palestine is a holy land. A Moslem family has been entrusted with the keys of the Holy Sepulchre for several generations.

2. Zionists claim that the Arabs benefit from the colonisation of Palestine. Sir John Hope Simpson's report states:

"It ceases to be land from which the Arab can gain any advantage whether now or at any other time in the future. He is deprived forever from employment on, that land, nor can any one help him by buying the land and restoring it to common use. The land is in mortmain and inalienable."

3. Zionists claim they brought the benefits of civilisation to the Arabs of Palestine. Arabs have not benefited from Jewish education, since the language in Jewish schools is Hebrew. And as to medical facilities, Arabs do not frequent Zionist hospitals. According to the latest report to the League of Nations, out of 12,000 patients admitted to Zionist hospitals, only four were Moslems; seven were Christians; nearly 12,000 were Jews.

4. Zionists claim that by industrialisation Palestine can support a large Jewish population. Facts are that industry in Palestine is supported by charity and discriminatory tariffs. But the real issue cannot be settled on a material basis. The fundamental question is one of freedom. According to the Atlantic Charter we agreed, first, to seek no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, and, second, to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. It may be replied that the Atlantic Charter does not apply to Palestine, but in a letter to King Ibn Saud, dated April 5, 1945, President Roosevelt stated:

"Your Majesty will also doubtless recall that during our recent conversation I assured you that I would take no action in my capacity as chief of the executive branch of this Government which might prove hostile to the Arab people."

President Truman, in his speech on Navy Day October 27th, 1945, said:

"We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa as well as in the Western Hemisphere."

(To be concluded.)

DISILLUSIONMENT CAME TO BELGIUM

The following is an extract from a letter-dated Antwerp, December 23, 1945. It was published in "The Social Creditor," England, on January 19, 1946, and is reprinted from that source: —

"I don't know how life has been in England during this last year, but in Belgium, since the 'liberation,' it has been la grande disillusion.

"You know that during January and February of this year Antwerp was subjected to strong V1 and V2 bombardment. No need to tell you that it was hell. Everyone who had a penny left cleared out at very considerable expense. Antwerp was so dangerous that it was placed strictly out of bounds for all British troops not on duty; if an English soldier did come to Antwerp, not on duty, and was killed, his family could claim no indemnity.

"Well, that moment there happened the dirtiest trick imaginable. The English Town Major sent secret Gestapo agents, paid Belgians in civilian clothes, to seize all furnished flats belonging to people who had fled away because of the flying bombs. These agents, and I know their names, broke open the doors and installed British officers in them with all furniture, beds, blankets, sheets, heating apparatus and everything belonging to an ordinary household. When these people came back they were put on the street like dogs, and eight months after the end of the war they are still. I myself was warned when in Brussels and took my precautions. I was lucky. The first time the agent came to ask if we were living in the flat, the concierge, warned by me, told him 'yes.' But then he came back to ask if we slept there."

"I have friends who are in that bitter situation. They are trying everything to get back into their homes, but it is no use. Their claims do not even reach the Town Major, who is guarded by a numerous Jewish staff, who decide everything and even open the private letters addressed to the Town Major.

"Let me compare these methods with the worst crimes seen during the German occupation. Their biggest crime was the imprisonment and sometimes execution of Belgians. But those people were concerned

with espionage and sabotage of the enemy's occupying army. They were patriots who knew to what they exposed themselves. If a Belgian did espionage against the Allied armies, well, he, too, would be executed. Second to that German crime came the expulsion of civilians from their homes. The cases where they had to leave all their furniture and private belongings were very rare. But these did arouse immense indignation and disgust against the Germans. But they never broke open private homes. When the owner was absent the Germans sealed the doors, and when he came back he was given 24 hours to get out, and before he left an inventory was made. But in the present case the doors were broken open, the premises immediately occupied, and the owner expelled, and eight months afterwards, after the end of the war, they will not leave those furnished flats.

"What do you think of such methods? Can the English people be au courant of such methods?"

"A friend of mine has been many a time to the Town Major, but is not allowed to see him, and he is very lucky when he can speak to the secretary, who is a Jew. He has been there again this week, and when he very politely said that he could not approve the fact that his flat had been broken open and seized, the Jewish secretary gave the astonishing answer, 'Well, that is regular warfare, and we are authorised to expel civilians and keep their private belongings.'

"Well, in your opinion, is that the authorised policy of the British Government? I doubt it very much.

"Then what can my friends do to plead their cause? Nothing can be done with the Town Major in Antwerp since it is impossible to reach him. Is there in England any official court where he could present his claim? I am partly inclined to believe that this unworthy method has been used by that Jewish staff without the Town Major being consulted. Is there any way out?"

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

nothing less than a fundamental change in financial policy, thus eliminating the "nation-wide crisis" which Lenin postulated as necessary for the revolutionary plan, can turn the tide, they may have just enough time left for suitable action. Mr. Menzies and Co. will not help them.

Social creditors should spare no effort to make this issue as clearly and as widely understood as possible.

* * * * *

Electors must give more thought to the question of democratic government. If it is democratic for a Party, having obtained a majority of votes by every method known to modern propaganda experts, to then do as it likes simply because it "represents" the people, could it not be claimed that Adolf Hitler was a democrat? Obviously the political voting system has become a fraud, and a travesty of democratic government. No government should have the "right" to pass any legislation unless it specifically relates to results clearly demanded by electors. If Legislative Councils were doing the job they should be doing, they would reject practically all legislation passed by the State Governments and compel them to take it direct to the electors who would then perhaps have a chance of learning what it really means before endorsing it.

Direct control of individual Members of Parliament by the electors is the only hope of making the political voting system of any use. And hard experience teaches that electoral control can only be effective in small political units.

Eighty thousand electors voted in the recent Federal by-election in Henty. The idea of one Member effectively representing, or being controlled by, 80,000 electors is farcical.

The Canberra Monster cannot be controlled while it has the present powers. If democracy is to work in Australia, Canberra must be stripped of many of the powers it now possesses.

There is not one sound reason for giving any of the powers being sought at the coming Referendum.

* * * * *

Russian propaganda in America is cleverly suggesting that America and Russia practically won the war alone, and should be able, having first disposed of the British Empire, to divide the world into two spheres of influence, Russian and American. Dr. Evatt and other anti-British elements appear to be determined to help the campaign against the British Empire by their internal wrecking campaign.

* * * * *

What with suggestions in the Legislative Council of an official investigation of the Alberta experiment and threats by a Legislative Councillor to defy the Apple and Pear Board, we have been getting some refreshing realism from Tasmania lately. This realism is obviously growing in the "Speck."

A Mr. C. Keith has been giving the Deputy-Commissioner, of Taxation in Tasmania some of his views on the compulsion of private citizens to act as unpaid collectors for the Taxation Monopoly:

"I do not think that there is any law in the British community which seeks to make one individual carry out the duties and responsibilities to the State that are the sole concern of another individual."

Here is an important issue on which all those who have employees can act immediately. All those who have to collect taxes for the Taxation Department should assess the value of their time thus spent, and send an account to the Taxation Department. Also write to Members of Parliament about the matter. It may even be possible to challenge the legal validity of using private citizens as unpaid tax-gatherers.

* * * * *

During the recent debates at Canberra on the Bill to make Uniform Taxation permanent, thus further undermining local government in Australia, the only speaker who dealt with the basic issue at stake was Mr. G. Bowden, Country Party M.H.R. for Gippsland, Victoria.

No doubt the fact that Mr. Bowden has some knowledge of Social Credit helped him to make the following remarks:

"It (Uniform Taxation) means also that State development will not be determined by the will of the government of a State, but by the amount of 'dole' that any future Commonwealth Treasurer cares to allow it. I have no doubt that this meets with the wishes of those who claim to be unificationists, but I doubt if many of them have ever studied its implications. I am not a unificationist: I believe in State rights. I represent a province, which industrially could be one of the greatest in Australia. Whether or not that province shall be developed depends today upon the voice of Victoria. If the unificationists had their way it would depend on the voice of the whole of the Commonwealth.

"On the other hand, if authority were more equitably distributed, and Gippsland became a State in its own right, its development would be determined only by the people of Gippsland.

"That, of course, applies equally to every other province in Australia.

"Only by this wider distribution of power can there ever be full development of the resources of the Commonwealth in this connection." (vide Federal "Hansard," March 27.)

—E.D.B.

DOES S.O.S. MEAN "SAVE OUR SOIL"?

An affirmative answer to the above question is given by Major George Bruce in an article appearing in the "Kew Advertiser" (Melbourne) of April 4, 1946, and reprinted hereunder:

The soil, the material on which all farmers and gardeners work, is not a mass of inert matter, but is, or should be, full of life, animal and vegetable. Soil, as we all know, may be good, bad or indifferent. It may be rich and fertile—"in good heart," as the farmers say; it may be of low fertility, raising poor crops; it may be exhausted, "run out," capable of growing only coarse weeds and scrub. The difference is due to the amount of humus in the soil. And what is humus?

"Humus," the Latin word for "earth," is now solely applied to the dark brown substance made by the breaking-down of organic matter, vegetable and animal, which forms from one quarter to one half of all truly rich soil. The breaking-down is done by the millions of living things in the soil, microscopic algae and fungi, soil bacilli, and, to a large extent, by earthworms. Nature, in forest and grasslands, makes this humus on the spot, with fallen twigs and branches, dead leaves and grass, the droppings and dead bodies of animals, birds, reptiles and insects. Always the mixture of vegetable and animal organic matter.

This humus contains all the very varied chemicals which plants require to make their food: nitrogen, phosphates, potash, and a large number of minor elements. In Nature's farming, all this food drawn from the soil by plants and by the animals that eat the plants, is returned to the soil when the plant or animal dies, and by the

droppings of the animal while alive. The "Law of Return" is Nature's inflexible rule. So Nature's land never becomes "tired," "crop-sick," or "run out." It goes on producing lavishly, century after century.

Man's farming is very different. He clears the bush and starts on Nature's good land, full of rich humus accumulated during hundreds of years. He grows fine crops of grain, hay, potatoes, vegetables and fruit and sells them off the land. He raises stock, and sells meat, wool, milk, and butter off the land. All these take out of the soil large quantities of plant food, depleting the humus. Of the three chief sources of plant food, nitrogen, phosphate and potash, a fair crop of wheat will remove up to eighty pounds from one acre. Little of all this goes back to the land. Everywhere the Law of Return is being ignored and violated.

This robbery of the soil means that the humus is gradually being eaten up, and the land is getting poorer. All over Australia farmers and graziers admit that their land will carry far less stock than it did fifty years ago. The same with crops; the yield is decreasing. Where does all this stolen wealth of plant food go?

Mainly to the towns. It is a sinister fact that out of our population of seven millions, some five millions live in towns. These five millions take a vast amount out of the soil and put little or nothing back. A high authority has calculated the value as

manure of the excreta of the population as 10/- per head every year. The value of town waste is as much, or more. Our sewerage we get rid of in various ways, not all of them sanitary. Our town refuse goes to the destructor or the rubbish tip. Every year the towns destroy £5,000,000 worth of manure that would go far to restore the decaying fertility of our soil. Five-sevenths of Australia's people are slowly but surely devouring the very life of Australia's land. (To be continued.)

PROFESSOR HAROLD LASKI

An observer and listener to one of Professor Laski's orations in New York was asked what he thought of it. "Oh, he just suffers from foot-and-mouth disease," was the answer.

—"The Social Crediter."

CALLING ALL GIPPSLAND SUPPORTERS!

All social crediters residing in Gippsland (Victoria) will be pleased and interested to know that Mr. Butler, accompanied by Mr. John Weller, will commence a tour of Gippsland on Monday, May 27. All those who are keen to do something practical to advance the fight against encroaching tyranny should contact Mr. Butler, care of Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne, immediately. Even if readers feel that they can only get a dozen people together to hear Mr. Butler, they are urged to do so. There is not an indefinite time in which to turn the tide of dictatorship threatening civilisation.

OPEN LETTER TO A. CALWELL, M.H.R.

Dear Mr. Calwell, —We have long suspected you of having great admiration for the basic principles of Government which Adolph Hitler applied so vigorously in Germany. You no doubt recall that Hitler and his backers wiped out any semblance of "parochial" government—i.e., local, self-government—and concentrated all political and economic control in Berlin.

It is not without significance that Russia and the German Communists are fighting vigorously to maintain a centralised Germany, as you are fighting to have a centralised control of all Australia from Canberra.

Let your actual words outline your belief in totalitarianism: —

"I do not believe in the maintenance of the present States; the policy of the Australian Labor Party is that complete power should be vested in the Commonwealth Parliament, which should then delegate certain powers among provinces. We do not believe in the maintenance of the sovereignty of the States. Consequently, I am not much concerned about whether the independence of the States will be guaranteed or interfered with by this Bill (to make Uniform Taxation permanent), or whether they should have the right to raise their own revenues, and expend the money in whatever way they desire" (vide Federal "Hansard," March 27).

Centralised government in such a large country as Australia cannot be representative government; it must inevitably be anti-democratic. The further government is taken away from the electors, the less con-

trol the electors have over the Government.

But this doesn't concern you. You say that you are not interested in whether the Victorian taxpayers or the taxpayers of any other State have any effective control over what taxes they shall pay and how they shall be spent.

The electors will no doubt be very interested to know this during the coming Referendum campaign.

They will also be interested to note that the Communists are supporting your totalitarian ideas.

Do you remember, Mr. Calwell, when you used to attack the Communists? How quiet you have been since becoming a Minister!

How right Lord Acton was when he said that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely!

Continue making statements similar to the one we have quoted above, and the electors will be encouraged to repeat at the 1946 Referendum the decision they gave in 1944. In spite of your Department of Mesmerism, they still detest advocates of Hitler's—or Stalin's—principles of Government.

—Yours for local, democratic government,
"THE NEW TIMES."

BRITISH M.P.s SPEAK OUT ON RUSSIA

The following extracts are taken from the British "Hansard" report of the House of Commons debate on External Affairs which took place on February 20, 1946: —

Brigadier Rayner (Totnes): . . . I cannot imagine that there is any hon. Member of the House who will not desire to help the Foreign Secretary to stand up to the Russian colossus. If the House will permit me, I will make one or two suggestions as to how we can help.

Firstly, in the House, and in the country as far as we can, we should take foreign affairs out of party politics; secondly, we should do what we can to restore some balance to the one-way propaganda about Russia, which has gone on for so long.

Not very long ago, sitting in our mess in Germany, we heard an English girl speaking over the B.B.C. proclaim that she regarded the wearer of the Leningrad medal with more respect than the wearer of any other medal in the world. We had been dining a V.C. the night before, and were very glad he was not present. We decided there and then that it was about time all the bootlicking one-way propaganda about Russia came to an end.

I told the mess that night that when I was in Warsaw in 1938 the British Consul-General was endeavouring, in every way he could, to get two Australian families out of Russia. They had sold up everything they had in Australia, and had managed to be admitted into Russia, that place which they had gathered was a heaven for all workmen. Six months had been enough for them. We decided that night from our own experiences that no Britisher would stand more than six months of the Russian system and standard of living . . .

We continue to praise an Oriental civilisation, some hundreds of years inferior to our own, as being perfectly wonderful, and thus we encourage the Soviet Union to be even more unreasonable in their demands.

One way in which we can help to restore

that balance of propaganda is by attacking the cult of the catch-phrase, those clichés and catchwords which replace principle, and which make it so easy for people not to have to bother to think. A favourite one before the war was "Collective Security." A favourite one now is "Fascism."

"Fascist" was a very fair description of the Italian system before the war, but it is now used generally to describe anything we do not like or of which we generally disapprove. The Russians use it a lot, whereas their system is very similar to the Fascist system that obtained in Italy, and to the National Socialism of Germany. All three systems deified the State and nullified the individual. In all three the State has been held to be the monopoly of one Party, which has used it to liquidate all opposition. Nazism went in for a chosen Herrenvolk; Communism goes in for a chosen economic class. In each case the result has been the same, a collection of hard-and-fast classes covering the masses, the army, and various grades of political bosses.

The real difference, as I think a very great many hon. Members feel, is between British democracy, which allows an opposition to organise and express itself, and which recognises the dignity and freedom of the individual, and those three totalitarian systems. It is the British system, which our Foreign Secretary is defending at the meetings at U.N.O. and on other occasions.

Professor Savory (Queen's University of Belfast): . . . How were these confessions of 16 Polish gentlemen extorted? One of them has escaped into Italy. His name is M. Stypulkowski. What does he say:

"While in close confinement there, I was cross-examined by the N.K.V.D. agents 141 times, 500 hours in all, while other members of this unfortunate delegation as many as 200 times. The N.K.V.D. possesses a magnificent mechanism for breaking down human resistance. Under its treatment the victim gradually loses his senses of self-criticism and self-preservation and becomes

ATTENTION! ADELAIDE READERS,

At the Quarterly Rally of The United Democrats on Saturday, May 4, Mr. Eric Butler will deliver a special address. All Adelaide "New Times" readers are invited to avail themselves of this opportunity of hearing Mr. Butler. The address of The United Democrats is 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.

On Wednesday, May 8, Mr. Butler will address a public meeting for ex-Servicemen in Stow Hall, Flinders Street, Adelaide. "New Times" readers are urged to make this meeting as widely known as possible amongst their ex-Service friends.

NOTE ON TRUMAN

According to "Vers Demain" (Quebec), President Truman has just been initiated into the highest Masonic Degree.

President Truman may think so, but we doubt if Mr. Bernard Baruch does.

—"The Social Crediter" (Eng.), 23/2/46.

NATIONAL INSURANCE SMOKE SCREEN FOR GESTAPO POWERS

In these columns we have frequently drawn attention to the "Gestapo Clauses" in the so-called Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act passed by the Canberra politicians. That the same technique is being used in Great Britain is again indicated by the following extracts from the "Hansard" report of the House of Commons debate of February 19, 1946, on the National Insurance (Industrial Injuries) Bill:

Lieut.-Colonel Byers (Dorset, Northern): We went into the whole question of this Clause very carefully on the Committee stage. The Government gave the impression at that time, if my recollection is right, that this was the sort of thing that could be laughed off, that they did not intend to use these powers, that the powers were not as wide as they appeared to be—in other words, the usual arguments. I suggest to the Minister with all respect that there is a good deal of feeling about any Government taking such exceptionally wide powers as are conferred on inspectors in this Clause. They are wide powers, and I hope that the Minister will appreciate and admit that. I cannot understand, and I would like the Minister to give an explanation, why the inspectors under a Bill of this nature require greater powers than the police possess. It seems a remarkable thing that in the case of industrial injury it should be sought to arm the inspectors with greater powers than we are prepared to give to the police. Does this mean that we are prepared to give the police these powers in the near future? If so, then we are denying some of the elementary principles of British justice. If we are not seeking to do that, why should these powers be given to these specially favoured people, the industrial accident inspectors?

This Parliament has a big job to do in the future in safeguarding the liberties of the subject. I believe that will be one of our main tasks; I do not mean just because we have a Socialist Government in power, but because, having entered upon a planned economy, there will naturally be a desire on the part of the Executive to have things "tidy," to have things made easier for their inspectors as against the individuals in the State. It is the task of Members on all sides of the House to resist these attempts to encroach upon the liberties of the subject. I would ask for one specific answer. Why should these inspectors of accidents require greater powers than we are at present willing to concede to the police? . . .

Major Boyd-Carpenter (Kingston-upon-Thames): It is reassuring to those of us who sit on these benches to see hon. Members below the Gangway on this side at long last coming forward in defence of the liberty of the subject. I trust I shall not be indiscreet if I express the hope that their loyalty to that most important cause will flame steadily and not merely be an intermittent flicker. As the hon. and learned Member for Montgomery (Mr. C. Davies) has pointed out, the powers taken, or proposed to be taken, under this Sub-section are enormous, and the House are surely entitled to some explanation from the

subject to hallucinations which make him an easy prey in the hands of his tormentors. Its object is to extract from the victim complete admission of guilt, and this explains why every person that found himself in collision with the Soviet authorities admitted one and all of the crimes attributed to him by the N.K.V.D. (This method includes the placing of the victim on a table with his hands firmly tied down, and by breaking his resistance with the aid of a powerful electric lamp shining over his head for five days and nights, as well as threats alternating with cajolery.)

I want to get at the truth. This is the statement of that gentleman, Mr. Stypulkowski, who has escaped and has given this statement at the present moment in Italy ---

Government of the necessity, which demands that inspectors under this Bill shall be given powers so wide, and, I hope, so exceptional. If it were some question concerned with the military security of the State, I am certain there would be the greatest criticism, certainly from hon. Members opposite, about giving to any inspecting authorities such tremendous powers as are proposed to be given here. What necessity is there?

I hope the House will be told what danger is anticipated. What reason is there for giving these inspectors these tremendously wide powers, which go further than the right to interrogate; those whom there is reasonable cause to believe know something about the matter can be compelled to sign a statement. Mere physical presence on the premises is sufficient to render a person liable to be held up and compelled to sign a statement. The House will appreciate that the paragraph reads, ". . . every person whom he finds in any such premises or place, or whom he has reasonable cause . . ." etc. There is, therefore, if I understand it correctly, a liability on any person who is physically on the premises concerned, with nothing else whatever to connect him with the cause of the trouble, to await the attention of the inspector. As has been pointed out by the hon. and learned Member, this is a matter of the criminal law, since under a subsequent Sub-section a failure to comply with the instructions of these inspectors, however unreasonable, constitutes a criminal offence for which the man concerned can be brought before a court and fined.

I will say again that this House is entitled to an explanation of the reasons for these enormous powers . . .

I asked the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he agrees that a man may be compelled to answer questions, under penalty, the answers to which might forfeit to him any benefits under this Bill.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1)

public interest, and resulted in a "steady flow of protests to Canberra," which convinced Members that this episode aroused greater public feeling than any other for a long time. Here is further evidence of the value of "Electoral Campaign" technique. When thousands of electors adopt the technique of writing direct to their political representatives advising them of what they do or do not require, Members are sure to sit up and take notice. It is the only way to develop a responsive Parliament.

FLOUR FRAUD: Two thousand tons of flour intended for Great Britain was diverted to Germany according to a "Daily Mail" report of March 4. Radio orders were received when the ship was in the middle of the Atlantic; it was not stated from where the ship sailed, or who sent the order to divert. It is another illustration

of the mysterious hand, which seemingly overrides all Governments, a hand which is determined to impose the maximum hardship on Great Britain. Special steps should be taken to locate the owner of this master-hand.
—O.B.H.

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