

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. 22. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JUNE 7, 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.

## Canberra's Plea for More Federal Powers

### Realities Behind the Referendum

(A Radio Talk by Eric D. Butler, over 3MA, Mildura, and 3CS, Colac.)

Good evening, listeners. At a recent public meeting, at which I was outlining the necessity of curbing the never-ceasing demands of the Canberra bureaucracy for greater powers, I was asked whether my criticism of centralised Government indicated that I favoured a return to pre-Federation conditions in Australia, when each State had its own customs officials and there was some slight difficulty in sending goods from one State to another.

I agreed with my questioner that some ridiculous incidents took place when the States had complete self-governing powers. But I then put to him the following proposition, which I think was very reasonable:

"New Zealand is the same distance from Canberra as are large parts of Australia. West Australians are further from Canberra than are New Zealanders. Because goods being sent from Australia to New Zealand, or from New Zealand to Australia, are subject to certain customs arrangements, perhaps some of them silly, it is suggested that New Zealanders would benefit if they were governed from Canberra and thus permitted completely free trade between Australia and New Zealand?"

I am inclined to think that most New Zealanders would regard the abolition of local self-government as a very stiff price to pay for the abolition of a few restrictions on trade between Australia and New Zealand.

I think the people of Australia have paid a very stiff price in the near-abolition of local self-government.

I am not suggesting that Canberra be abolished, but that the Federal Government should be strictly limited to looking after Defence and other matters which may generally be regarded as matters on which the States desire to have a common policy. All other matters should be the business of the States.

If, for example, the people of Tasmania want to make financial rules which they believe will allow them to use their own resources in such a way that they will have greater individual liberty and security, surely they should be free to do so without having to get permission from the new ruling class at Canberra — the bureaucracy.

It is no use the advocates of centralisation saying that Tasmania or any other State is effectively represented at Canberra. That representation is only a very small proportion of the total representation, which means that, if the people of Tasmania can only get their policies attended to at Canberra, they must at least get the support of the majority of the people of the other States. But the people of the other States may not be interested in doing what the people of Tasmania want to do.

There are such widely varying conditions in Australia that they can only be understood by the people on the spot. But these people are in a minority, and, according to the centralisers, should have no power to do anything about their own affairs unless they can get majority support at Canberra. This means that, as all the people are in a minority at one time or another, they are virtually disfranchised.

Listeners must grasp the fact that all the progress of the human race has been the result of action by minorities. But minorities can only prove by example, by actual experience, not by theory, that a certain policy is successful and worth trying. When the majority see a successful demonstration of a policy by a minority, they then consider applying the same policy themselves.

It is, of course, undoubtedly true that most progress is made as a result of trial and error. This is another sound reason why political and economic units should be kept as small as possible. If a small political unit, such as an Australian State, tries an economic experiment which proves in practice to be a disastrous failure, then it is far better that the failure should be as local as possible, and suffered mainly by

those who supported the experiment—instead of having a highly centralised Government imposing a failure on large minorities opposed to the experiment.

If, for example, the majority of the electors in Victoria and New South Wales, who have the overwhelming predominance of voting strength in the Federal sphere, are so apathetic that they are not prepared to resist continued high taxation by the Federal Government, why should their voting strength be used to impose high taxation on the people of all the other States who may be demanding reduced taxation?

Government must be reduced in size until the rights of all minorities can be fully protected. A thorough understanding of this issue is fundamental to the taking of correct action against the powerful international groups threatening the British Empire.

This issue can be best examined in Alberta, Canada, where 800,000 people, living on one of the richest portions of the earth's surface, have consistently demanded the right to govern their own political and economic affairs. The Federal Government at Ottawa, controlled by a bureaucratic army of occupation similar to that which we have in Australia, has tried to deny the people of Alberta this democratic right. No doubt there is a great fear that a successful example in Alberta of an economy based on a sane monetary policy would soon commend itself to the people in other parts of Canada.

But even in face of bitter opposition and powerful obstruction by the centralisers, the Albertan Social Credit Government has done things, which no other Government in any part of the British Empire has done. Its successes are already indicating to people throughout the British Empire that its policies should be carefully examined. The determination of the Albertans to make

their Province a self-sufficient economic unit should interest Australian electors, particularly those of the smaller States.

Instead of succumbing to the clever propaganda against their State Governments, Australian electors should be attempting to make greater use of them.

Probably some of the most misleading propaganda against the State Governments deals with their alleged high cost to the taxpayer.

For example, a recent issue of "Smith's Weekly" published a very misleading article on this matter, in which it was stated that Australia is the most over-governed country in the world, and that, as Great Britain has only one Government, one Government would be sufficient for Australia.

I would suggest that "Smith's" work out on a map how many times Great Britain could be fitted into Australia. England, for example, is not even as large as Victoria, and in an area of that size there is some possibility of effective control of the Government by the electors. To talk about one Government only, for a continent the size of Australia, is dangerous nonsense.

"Smith's" also gives some figures relating to the alleged high cost of State Governments.

The facts are, of course, that the average cost of State Governments to the electors of Australia is about 2/- per YEAR for every citizen.

Is it seriously contended that 2/- a year is too much to pay for the right of self-government? I, personally, am prepared to pay £1 or more a year if I have even greater power to govern myself through my local State Parliament.

For the benefit of those who think that the cost of Government in Australia would be reduced by abolishing the State Parliaments, it might be pointed out that there (Continued on page 4.)

## NOTES on the NEWS

The prolonged partial failure of the socialised electricity supply on which most Victorians depend again demonstrates the dangers inherent in centralised control; it could just as easily have happened when the Japanese were knocking at the door. Even country towns have in most cases had the supply restricted, because local power stations were replaced by the State colossus. It is reported that Perth is in much the same plight and Sydney recently had a similar experience.

This is a serious matter, which needs a searching enquiry—especially the aspect of possible sabotage by revolutionary fifth columnists. These partial failures of supply could easily be trials in each State, which could be synchronised later to create the necessary civil chaos as a prelude to an attempt to seize the machinery of government. We have already been warned of the fifth column in Australia so why take chances?

**MALONEY'S MESSAGE:** Addressing the Institute of Journalists, Mr. J. J. Maloney said: "Soviet Russia is an aggressor nation, and she would take advantage of the present turmoil to further her own imperialistic ends . . . We can be sure that Russia will not help in the rehabilitation of any country; the longer a country remains in trouble the better Russia will like it . . . When the crisis comes in Australia, there will be not only a fifth column, but a fifth army to contend with. In Australia there is a vicious organisation under the direct control of Moscow, which would not hesitate to quell democratic freedom." ("Age," May 25.) All serious-minded Australians should heed that warning. Mr. Maloney's statements merely corroborate the evidence that has repeatedly appeared in these columns.

**TAX TORNADO:** The following figures indicate the terrific increase in prices of certain commodities by customs and excise duties and sales tax (all deliberately imposed by Governments, and so-called Workers' Governments at that), viz.: Matches, 9id total taxes on 1/6; cigarettes, 1/1 on 1/8; petrol, 11jd on 2/6Ad; beer, 9d on 1/7. There are thousands of other items also carrying the burden of taxes as a substantial part of selling prices. The real villain of the piece, in increasing living costs, is the Government, which, in order to shield itself from the wrath of the people, denounces manufacturers and retailers and appoints a Prices Gestapo to harass them. What a splendid crime-thriller story for an author: the Government as the Master Crook!

**COMMUNIST CONCEPTS:** Mr. Maxwell, of the Tramways Union recently resented a suggestion in the Press that "Communist ideals had much in common with Labor," and asked, "is revolution in common?" The answer to the latter may be "No"; but since the

Labor Party's objective is socialisation of production, distribution and exchange, and therefore is identical with Communist aims, the answer to the first question is "Yes." It is only in the intended method of achieving the objective that the difference lies. The Labor Party claims that it will win the people to accept Socialism through constitutional and legislative means, but it never asks the people to vote for outright Socialism at election time. As a matter of fact, this objective is rarely if ever mentioned at such times; many people who vote for "Labor" are very definitely opposed to Socialism.

**CARDINAL'S CONCERN:** Concern for the workers expressed by Cardinal Gilroy, along with his appeal for a higher basic wage, was reported in the "Age" of May 25. He said: "This would mean more money in circulation, which would in turn help small shopkeepers, the building industry and all other undertakings." It is good that the Cardinal displays an interest in such matters, but it is a pity he does not advocate more purchasing power instead of an increased basic wage. There is an important difference between the two objectives. Basic wage increases become production costs, and higher costs must mean higher prices. Increased income must be provided in such a way that it goes direct to the individual without going through industry as a cost.

**CONTROL COLLAPSE:** In Victoria deep concern is being expressed by Egg Board bureaucrats because their monopoly is due to expire on June 30. Frantic efforts are being made by big-shot racketeers because the Legislative Council refused to pass amending legislation that would have given these bureaucrats an extended tenure by creating a new set-up, "Egg Boards of Australia." Commenting on this, "Labor" Premier Cain expressed fear of that good (Continued on page 3)

## Significant Political Pointers

Dr. H. V. Evatt, who appears to regard himself as one of the world up lifters, is a friend of Professor Harold Laski, a noted enemy of the institution of the British Crown. The Melbourne press of May 31 reports that Dr. Evatt has joined with the Russians in asking whether the public appearances of the Japanese Emperor are "designed to strengthen the promonarchistic or anti-democratic sentiments of the population."

If Dr. Evatt believes that it automatically follows that any people who are promonarchistic are therefore anti-democratic, Australian citizens who regard the British Crown as essential to the stability of the decentralised British Empire would be interested to hear Dr. Evatt express his views openly. The public reaction would shock him.

Mr. J. M. Atkinson, President of the Builders' and Allied Trades' Federation, said last week that the gazettal of the Victorian Labor Government's Building Operations and Materials Control Act, had sown the seeds of an increased black market in building materials.

"The full flood of confused State control has been loosed on the builder, and the weapon so dear to bureaucrats and petty dictators—the £500 fine and imprisonment—is to be the fate of those who dare to oppose the Act.

"The tendency of the Act will be to slow down building, add a small army of book-keepers and inspectors, and result in increased cost of homes to all servicemen and others."

The excuse for all new controls is shortages. Shortages are the direct and indirect result of crippling taxation, plus existing controls. Nothing less than a 50 per cent. reduction in all taxation, and a reduction of the Federal bureaucracy to the 1938 level, will allow the Australian production system to recover from the present chaos.

At the coming Federal elections, electors should work and vote against all candidates who will not give a written pledge to work for these reductions if elected.

It is amazing to see the manner in which some anti-Socialists fall for every trap set by the Socialist planners.

Mr. Bernard Corser, M.H.R., a Country Party Member, said at Canberra on April 9 that he wants the Commonwealth Government to have control of "organised market-

ing of commodities on an Australia-wide basis."

He doesn't think this will lead to Socialism! The simple faith of some people is really touching.

The Warragul "Gazette" (Victoria) of May 28 contained a Wonthaggi advertisement, which included the following interesting statement:

"No lighting restrictions at Wonthaggi, which generates its own electric power."

Most Victorian centres used to generate their own electricity before they fell into the clutches of the monopolistic State Electricity Commission.

It is to be hoped that many Victorians are now appreciating the folly and danger of centralised electricity supplies.

Incidentally, what a howl there would have been from the anti-private enterprise groups if a private firm had been responsible for the breakdown of essential power supplies!

Those Victorian centres still controlling the generation of their own electricity supplies should learn a valuable lesson from the Yallourn failure, and continue to maintain their independence.

"Who are the alleged leaders of the wheat industry to whom the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture (Mr. Scully) runs for advice almost every week? They are all on the pay roll of the Government."

"For instance, the Minister seeks advice from Sir Louis Bussau, former President of the Wheat Growers' Association, but, in effect, he is seeking advice from one of his own officials, because Sir Louis Bussau draws from the Department of Commerce and Agriculture £1750 a year, plus expenses. "The Minister does not say, 'I shall consult one of my officials,' which would be the frank thing to say; he says, 'I shall (Continued on page 4)

## SIR I. ISAACS AND THE REFERENDUM

A news-item in a recent issue of the Melbourne "Age" reported a public statement by Sir Isaac Isaacs on the forthcoming Referendum. Subsequent issues of the paper contained relevant letters to the editor from Mr. J. Bradshaw, A.F.I.A., from Sir Isaac Isaacs, and again from Mr. Bradshaw. Although some of our Victorian readers presumably have read these items when they appeared, we think they are sufficiently interesting, important and significant to be recorded in these columns, and we therefore reprint them hereunder exactly as they appeared in the "Age": —

### SIR I. ISAACS ON WIDER POWERS

Sir Isaac Isaacs, former Governor-General, at last night's anniversary dinner of the Australian Natives' Association, urged members to join the "ayes" during the forthcoming Referendum on the question of increased powers to the Federal Parliament.

"In the measures to be placed before the people is invested only a portion of the powers necessary to make Australia great," he declared.

A Voice: "What portion?"  
"I am sorry to find any Australian endeavouring to deny that every one of those powers is necessary to make this nation what it ought to be," he continued.

He said he affirmed his non-party attitude and that he thought only two political parties existed in the country—Australians and "electoral-plated" parties—that the Commonwealth Government needed extra powers to help it carry out the provisions of the San Francisco charter, and that the people were duty-bound to say "yes" and help Australia satisfy her pledges.

A Voice, "I will not be voting 'Yes'."

### REFERENDUM ISSUES

According to the "Age" report (27/4/46), Sir Isaac Isaacs declared that in the constitutional amendment proposals to be submitted this year, to which he urges the people to vote "Yes," "is involved only a portion of the powers necessary to make Australia great."

In view of his eminence as a legal authority, we are warranted in accepting his statement that the Commonwealth Government needs extra powers to enable it to carry out the provisions of the San Francisco Charter. The wisdom of vesting in any Commonwealth Government legal power to commit our people to entanglement in international plans of dubious origin and aimed at establishment of world dictatorship is, however, another matter. Cogent arguments as to the folly of this have been advanced in your columns, and the statement of Sir I. Isaacs should make all who cherish freedom realise that they must vote "No" to each question.

If we give a central authority power to make this nation "what it ought to be" we thereby give it dictatorial power to enforce upon us its own conceptions of "greatness," of what the nation "ought to be." This is the direct opposite of individual freedom. Having regard to the practice of party government of all types of inflicting upon the people, at the behest of some power above and behind the Government, policies for which they have no mandate, and which cause intense dissatisfaction and widespread corruption, it is absurd to contend that any extension of Federal powers can be granted without our taking another long step on the road to complete serfdom. Localised government stands for liberty; centralised government for tyranny. Let us not cast away our British heritage of liberty. —J. BRADSHAW (South Yarra).

### POWERS FOR THE PEOPLE

The courteous tenor of Mr. Bradshaw's letter (30/4/46) induces me to address a few words in advance on its important subject matter. I say "in advance" because I purpose to place a fuller statement on the Referendum before my fellow citizens.

In the meantime I would point out that the central and fatal error of Mr. Bradshaw's letter is that it overlooks the dominant fact that the powers proposed are not to be powers automatically entrusted to any Commonwealth Government, but to the whole people of Australia in Parliament assembled, to enable them by their freely elected representatives, with equal representation in the Senate, to avert undue centralisation, to guard their liberties, to enlarge them, to advance their mutual welfare, and to measure out justice to their fellow citizens as their corporate conscience guides them.

If "Yes" is the answer, no Government would have the smallest additional authority, unless and until the people themselves by their Parliamentary representatives chose to grant it—an authority which Parliament could always withdraw. The powers sought are still less than are possessed by the peoples of Great Britain, New Zealand, and South Africa, for instance. I maintain that Australians are no less trustworthy, no less conscientious, or less capable of exercising justly and wisely such powers as are proposed than the peoples of those countries.

### 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?

I cannot agree with the inevitable conclusion of Mr. Bradshaw that the constitutions of those great countries, which embrace all the proposed powers, tend to corruption or that those peoples are on the road to complete serfdom. And if not, neither would Australians be in that parlous situation. Indeed, consistency with his conclusion would require abolition of State Parliaments and substitution of independent municipal councils.

I leave the question until I deal with it methodically and comprehensively, including the effect of the San Francisco charter. —ISAAC A. ISAACS (South Yarra).

### POWERS FOR THE PEOPLE

The dignified manner in which Sir Isaac Isaacs (2/5/46) has expressed his point of view on an issue, which for Australians overshadows all others in importance, accords with the pattern of his distinguished and exemplary career. I find it impossible, however, to accept as being related to reality his assertion that "the powers proposed are not to be powers automatically entrusted to any Commonwealth Government, but to the whole people of Australia . . ." If a "Yes" vote will place the proposed powers in the hands of the people, it follows that at present they are exercised by some authority other than the people. By whom, then, are they exercised, and how can it logically be contended that a vote of the people by which more power would be vested in the Canberra financial and bureaucratic dictatorship would give the people

### WHAT IS BUREAUCRACY?

"A system of carrying on the business of government by means of departments or bureaux, each controlled by a chief who is apt to place special emphasis upon routine officialdom; also government conducted on this system. Hence in general, a system, which has become narrow, rigid and formal, depends on precedent and lacks initiative and resourcefulness. (2) Similarly, a system of government by bureau heads responsible only to administrative officers above them, having complete power over subordinates and in official duties generally not subject to the law of the land."

—Webster's International Dictionary.

Lord Hewart, former Lord Chief Justice of England wrote in his great work, "The New Despotism": —

"A mass of evidence establishes the fact that there is in existence a persistent and well contrived system, intended to produce, and in practice producing, a despotic power which at one and the same time places Government Departments above the Sovereignty of Parliament and beyond the jurisdiction of the Courts."

In order to introduce real, responsible, democratic government, it is first essential to expose the powerful groups contriving to produce the despotism that Lord Hewart warned about.

President Woodrow Wilson once said: —  
"When we resist the concentration of power we are resisting the process of death, because concentration of power always precedes the destruction of human liberties."  
The time left for Australians to resist "the processes of death" is not unlimited.

### NATIONALISATION OF ELECTRICITY

#### Opposition in Britain

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —The following item, which appeared in the March 21 issue of the "Electrical Times," indicates that there is some opposition to the British Government's proposals for the nationalisation of the electricity supply industry.

—Yours, etc., C. H. CHRISTOPHER, 5 East Cross, Yallowm, Vic., 20/5/46.

### TO FIGHT NATIONALISATION

Beneath the superficially placid waters of the electricity supply industry, currents are flowing. Moreover, they are beginning to ruffle the surface, which may soon become rough water. In that event the barque "Nationalisation" is threatened with a stormy passage before reaching port; it might conceivably founder on the way. The first sign of a meteorological change was the I.M.E.A. memorandum issued in mid-February. This advocated a vigorous extension and development of local authority ownership. The association speaks for 349 member undertakings, representing 95% of the local authorities in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, owning and operating electricity undertakings. Last week the Incorporated Association of Electric Power Companies announced their determination to resist, by every legitimate means, nationalisation of the electricity supply industry. Both memoranda place the interests of consumers first, and it is common ground that this will not be best served under State ownership.

that authority over their representatives which is now lacking?

Surely Sir Isaac Isaacs will not deny that every major political development aims at increased centralisation of power. As examples, I mention the Statute of Westminster Adoption Bill and the measure complementary thereto, viz., the Constitution Alteration Bill, and the Uniform Tax Bill, all of 1942. He must be aware that, due to rigid control of both Labor and non-Labor party machines, the Government, and not Parliament, controls legislation. Governments come and go, but experience proves that the corrupting policy of centralisation does not change. This is true not only of Australia, but of all other countries.

Two books by Dr. Evatt, viz., "The King and His Dominion Governors" (1936), and "Post-War Reconstruction in Australia" (1944), are of vital significance. In the former, Dr. Evatt declares that under the Statute of Westminster Adoption Bill, "without the slightest reference of the issue to the people of the Dominion, the status of any of the Dominions may be formally surrendered by its Parliament (for the time being), requesting the necessary constitutional legislation from the Parliament of the United Kingdom." In the latter publication he states that, though the High Court has held that the existing "External Affairs" power (in Section 51 of the Constitution) enables a Government to enter into international legal obligations, strictly so-called, it is doubtful if the High Court would interpret this power as giving authority for adoption of "guiding principles of economic and social policy." As Dr. Evatt introduced the Statute of Westminster Adoption Bill, and has also been mainly responsible for the determined bid to gain wider Federal powers, it is obvious that there is a close relationship between the Referendum proposals and the implementation of international agreements such as the Bretton Woods scheme.

I trust that Sir I. Isaacs may see fit to have regard to those weighty issues in the fuller statement he intends to issue. I still urge a "No" vote. —J. Bradshaw (South Yarra).

### POULTRY FARMERS MAY DEFY EGG BOARD

The revolt against National Socialism in Australia seems to be spreading and gathering force.

From Tasmania recently came the refreshing news of the action taken by Mr. Wedd, M.L.C., to challenge the Apple and Pear Board's devilish policy of deliberate sabotage.

Since then a correspondent in New South Wales has sent us a cutting from the "Sydney Morning Herald" of 23/4/46, which indicates that the poultry farmers in that State may revolt against the strangling control of the Egg Board. This news-item is doubly interesting because it also shows that the bureaucratic middle-men in the socialistic "planned economy" are not only restrictive but a great financial burden.

The item in the "S.M. Herald" reads as follows: —"POULTRYMEN MAY IGNORE BOARD."

"Because present egg prices were unpayable, there was a move among producers to market their eggs direct during the winter, a metropolitan poultry farmer said yesterday.

"This would be tantamount to defying the Egg Marketing Board and would save producers the charges now levied by it.

"The farmer stated that the producers were desperate, but if they could sell direct at the present retail price they would be able to carry on. They could not, however, pay their way if compelled to pay the Board 2½d a dozen on all sales.

"Although there was plenty of bran and pollard at the mills, many small men could not get sufficient for their needs. Wheat was severely rationed and producers were buying expensive substitutes, but no allowance was made for this in fixing prices."

### ERIC BUTLER STARTS TOUR OF GIPPSLAND

Accompanied by Mr. John Weller, Mr. Eric Butler started a tour of Gippsland (Victoria) on Tuesday, May 28.

In spite of the cold night, Mr. Butler was given an enthusiastic reception by the Garfield meeting on the Tuesday evening. Eight new subscribers to the "New Times" were obtained and a quantity of literature was sold. Many of those present indicated a desire to organise a further meeting in the near future. Mr. Butler and Mr. Weller were the guests of Mr. and Mrs. Jim Stewart while at Garfield.

On Wednesday, May 29, the two campaigners moved on to Warragul, where they stayed with Mr. and Mrs. W. Stewart. A canvass of leading business and professional men resulted in a large number of new direct subscribers to the "New Times" and an invitation for Mr. Butler to address members of the Rotary Club in the evening. Mr. Butler's short but hard-hitting address on the coming Referendum was enthusiastically received, and some of those present voluntarily expressed their desire to become subscribers to the "New Times."

Further successful canvassing of businessmen was continued on Thursday.

Supplies of the booklet, "Alberta Now," were placed with the local newspapers, who have agreed to have them on display.

On Sunday afternoon, June 2, Mr. Butler and Mr. Weller addressed a small meeting at Vervale. Booklets to the value of £1 were sold.

Further reports will be published as they come to hand.

## CURRENT COMMENT

By JOHN WELLER

**The Chairman of the State Electricity Commission of Victoria is theoretically presumed to be responsible to the citizens of Victoria for producing results.** Why has he not been called to account for his stewardship?

It is now contended, under highly suspicious circumstances, that the Commission, which has followed a policy of selling every electrical device imaginable to industry and the home, would not have had sufficient power for unrestricted consumption this winter anyway, ALTHOUGH DURING THE WAR THERE WAS RECORDED NO DIFFICULTY IN SUPPLYING POWER, NOT ONLY FOR NORMAL CONSUMPTION, BUT ALSO FOR LARGE WAR-TIME UNDERTAKINGS NOW OUT OF OPERATION.

Just how much longer are Australian citizens going to allow the Gauleiters of Government Monopoly to exercise, with disastrous effects, almost unlimited power without responsibility?

### THE FALLACY OF "EFFICIENCY"

Another aspect of this matter is that the partial breakdown of electric light and power supply in Victoria (except where independent local supply still exists) has demonstrated how much genuine efficiency may be expected from large-scale monopoly concerns.

Every move made to further centralise electricity supplies has been made on the plea of greater efficiency. By bitter experience the people are learning that large-scale monopoly undertakings are NOT more efficient.

**In 1940 the U.S. Temporary National Economic Committee made an exhaustive investigation into the much-boasted theory of large-scale efficiency. It was concluded that:**

"THE SUPERIOR EFFICIENCY OF LARGE ESTABLISHMENTS HAS NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED; the advantages that are supposed to destroy competition have failed to manifest themselves in many fields. Nor do the economies of size, where they exist, invariably necessitate monopoly . . . The size or sizes of the optimum efficiency may be reached long before the major part of a supply is subjected to such control. The conclusion that the advantages of large-scale production must lead inevitably to the abolition of competition cannot be accepted. It should be noted, moreover, that monopoly is frequently the product of factors other than lower cost or greater size. It is attained through collusive agreements and promoted by public policies. When these agreements are invalidated and when these policies are reversed, competitive conditions can be restored."—Monograph 21.

**C. H. Douglas, famous economist and engineer, has said: —**

"The 'efficiency' of very large undertakings is a paper efficiency based on access to credit, bulk buying, and price making, and in many cases has no physical basis, the genuine efficiency of the smaller undertaking being frequently greater."—Macmillan Report.

### EGG BOARD CONTROL DEBUNKED

The so-called efficiency of Egg Board Control was again exploded in an excellent letter recently published in the Melbourne "Age."

Dealing with the Egg Board, it was pointed out that prior to the marketing control there was no monopoly in the poultry industry. Poultry men came from far and near to sell on a healthy competitive basis and the industry grew to become the fourth most important in the State.

**When "control" was introduced, however, hundreds of farmers of competence and initiative abandoned their runs rather than "suffer the dictates of bureaucratic inefficiency."**

According to the Auditor-General's Report, the Egg Controllers showed a loss in 1944 on new-laid eggs, egg-pulp and cold-store eggs, in spite of the fact that British, American and Australian Governments were desperately seeking enough eggs for the fighting services.

**The Bureaucracy has a vested interest, and that vested interest is based on SCARCITY.**

"The liberty which a citizen enjoys is to be measured, not by the nature of the governmental machinery he lives under, whether representative or not, but by the relative paucity of the restraints it imposes on him." —Herbert Spencer.

### WHO IS THE GOVERNMENT?

"IT IS NOT THE POLITICIAN WHO DOMINATES CANBERRA, BUT THE SUPER-BUREAUCRAT."—Arnold L. Haskell, in his book, "Waltzing Matilda."

This, then, is the Issue before Australians: The Bureaucracy is the real Government today. It is the Super-Bureaucrat, working according to London School of Economics blueprints, who drafts the legislation, which aims at our complete dependence on and subservience to him and his minions. Further powers to Canberra means further powers to the Super-Bureaucrats. Is that clear?

Now, there are ONLY TWO alternatives: **Either Australians are going to accept a condition of serfdom imposed from alien Sources, OR they will demand, not merely no further powers to the Canberra Bureau-**

(Continued on page 3.)

# THIS "CAPITAL V. LABOUR" BUSINESS

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

When we consider that wars, especially the last two gigantic struggles, were waged by Governments, and that astronomical sums of money, taken from the people in taxation, are taken by Governments, and that the last financial depression in Australia was organised by the Federal Government, we begin to realise that the game of politics is very expensive, and is becoming altogether much too dangerous to be tolerated in the old complacent way.

Politics, as we know it today, has become an elaborate propaganda machine controlled by a few men, and the chief object of this is to deceive most of the people most of the time; or, to put it more precisely, to divert the attention of the majority of the people from the plans which are being put into operation for their undoing.

Very few people in the professional and business world, outside their own narrow experience, do any real thinking; most of the thinking is done for them. In the realm of ideas, they are consumers, not producers, and today there are ideas and theories in circulation, which will not bear five minutes' analysis.

Most of the theories in circulation in the political world are untenable; they won't hold water. But unless these theories are examined and exposed, the whole civilised world will have to shed rivers of blood, and plunge into another war more devastating than the last.

The whole of the Leftist movement—that is, the Socialists, the Communists, and Labour movements, hold that the present chaotic state of the world is due to capitalism; they state that by means of control over employment and over the avenues of publicity, capitalism controls the world today.

Now this statement is either true or it is not true. If it is true, it means that the principal Governments in the world are under the control of capitalists, and, in particular, it means that the Australian and British Governments, to mention no others, are under the control of capitalists. That means that the Socialist Governments in these countries are taking their orders from wealthy capitalists; it further means that the present Socialist and Labour Governments came into power with the permission of the capitalists.

If what the Socialists and Communists say is not true, it means that most of the bloodshed and slaughter and tragedy in this world is caused by Socialist Governments carrying out a Socialist policy, because Russia, Germany, Britain and Australia all have Socialist Governments.

The position, then, is that the Socialist Governments either have been willing tools of the wealthiest and most unscrupulous men in the world, or that the present world chaos is directly attributable to Socialist policy, and is carried out by Socialist Governments. I cannot see how any political observer can honestly escape from coming to this conclusion.

Now the theory of Karl Marx and his followers may be summarised thus: There is nothing the capitalists can do to save their system; the capitalist system is so full of contradictions and conflicts that it must automatically destroy itself; a crisis will arrive, and that crisis will be the signal for revolution and for the Communists to take charge of the country.

When we examine the so-called capitalist system we find that it is entirely dependent on profit making, and the profit is entirely a money profit. It is scientifically correct to say, therefore, that the capitalist system is entirely dependent on the financial system.

Therefore, the automatic destruction of the capitalist system, as prophesied and hoped for by Karl Marx and his disciples, will depend entirely on automatic rules of the financial system.

So, if Karl Marx is correct, the only salvation for the world is to entirely abolish money in all its forms. We find, however,

## CURRENT COMMENTS

(Continued from page 2)

cracy, but the reduction of the Bureaucracy at least to the pre-war level.

Is that clear?  
Only when that is done can ANY Government drastically reduce crippling taxation. This will allow the only practical incentive for primary-producer, wage earner and businessman alike to provide full production as a first step to winning the Peace. Is that clear?

## DANGER OF CENTRALISED GOVT.

"IT IS AXIOMATIC AND A MATTER OF COMMON EXPERIENCE THAT THE FURTHER THE PEOPLE ARE FROM THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT THE MORE DIFFICULT IT IS FOR THEM TO CONTROL THAT GOVERNMENT."

"The real dangers which confront Australia as a result of extreme centralisation are mainly three:

(i) An excessive increase in numbers of the civil service bureaucracy, and government-by-regulation.

(ii) Extreme standardisation of legislation and increasing stagnation and neglect of the outlying parts of the continent.

(iii) Dictatorship of the extreme Right or Left, with consequent tyranny and suppression of individual liberty."

—D. H. Drummond, M.L.A., in "Australia's Changing Constitution."

"The insatiable appetite to control other men's affairs is often evinced by those whose capacity to manage their own is in inverse proportion to their desires."—Mr. Justice Eve.

that the rules of the money system are not automatic; that our currencies have been managed and manipulated for a good many years; that Russia still uses a money system; and that the system in Russia and in other countries has been changed.

The rules governing finance, and therefore industry, are, therefore, not automatic, as the Communists allege. The mistake, then, that this Socialists and Communists have made has been to lump Industry and Finance under one heading, and call it Capitalism.

The production system and the financial system are two separate systems, and although those who control the financial system also control some of the big production monopolies this does not invalidate the fact that the financial system is highly centralised, while the production system, except in a few cases, is not.

Now for a few facts: When the Alberta Government in Canada tried to change the financial rules so as to allow production to go full steam ahead, every power that centralised finance could collect was brought to bear on the Alberta Government to prevent any changes being made, and in the continuous and vicious attack made by centralised Finance, the Communist and Socialist parties helped in every possible way. In addition to this, there is documentary evidence that international financiers financed the Russian Revolution, and received monopolies in the industrialisation of Russia.

The so-called capitalist press has not only supported Communist movements throughout Europe, but the daily papers of England, especially the "Times" of London, paved the way for a Socialist victory at the last election. You will find, too, that big Australian dailies, especially the Sydney and Melbourne papers, are doing exactly the same thing.

The position, then, is clear enough: The policy of Governments, and of the productive system, is controlled by International Financial monopolies operating through the Central Bank of each country. The ever-increasing crises, and the rapid advance towards chaos and world revolution, are the direct and conscious results of the men who control the policy of international finance.

The responsible agents of International Finance, by control of money, have created an artificial famine in food; they have driven Great Britain to her knees, and forced her to sign the liquidation of the British Empire; they have created another war scare; and are financing revolutionary forces in every country.

We are seeing in action what has been seen in every revolution: The wealthiest

## GIVE CANBERRA NO MORE POWERS!

Professor Copland, self-designated bureaucrat and economic adviser to successive Federal Governments, in commenting on the "No" vote in the 1944 Referendum threatened that "another day" would come. It has!

Skilfully giving the impression that their demands for increased powers have been drastically modified from the demands made in 1944, Socialist Dr. Evatt and his backers are making another determined effort to have the Federal Constitution altered in order that a Totalitarian State may be imposed on the Australian people.

The present industrial strife and the sabotage of the production system by hampering controls, regulations and confiscatory taxation are being used to try and persuade the electors that their only salvation is to hand over powers of self-government to the Federal Government.

It is instructive to recall that Hitler came to power as a direct result of chaos and unrest in Germany. There are good reasons for believing that this chaos and unrest was deliberately created in order to bring Hitler to power.

What is urgently wanted in Australia today is a determined effort, by those who believe that individual security can be assured without destroying individual - liberty to get to grips with the ever-growing threat of centralised tyranny.

It is suicide merely to talk about "trends." "Trends" don't just happen; if certain policies are pursued, that is the result of actions by certain individuals. We have got to learn more about these individuals, their interests, and what they are trying to do.

There is a considerable literature available today, giving factual evidence to prove that the more centralised political, financial and economic power becomes, the less control the individual has over his own affairs and the more powerful becomes the inevitable bureaucracy which cannot be dissociated from centralised government.

The Canberra Bureaucracy is the real Government in this country today. But it wants still greater powers. Why? Let one of our leading Canberra bureaucrats, Dr. Lloyd Ross, answer:

"But we need also the recognition of the need for more State control, State guidance, and State ownership."

The "State" is, of course, the bureaucratic army of occupation, which wants to decide for the people what they shall produce and what they shall consume.

In order to do this it has to ensure that

men in the world combining with and using, the scum of the earth for their work of destruction.

The great mistake the Conservative and Liberal parties made was to think that International Finance had any interest in private enterprise. International Finance is interested only in Monopoly, and it finds it has useful tools in the Communist and Socialist parties.

There is nothing automatic about the financial system. The rules have been altered to help every revolution, and also to prevent any revolt against the men who are planning the Third World War. This war is now inevitable unless sufficient men and women can see the real forces creating war, and can expose them in time.

## HIGH TAXES KILL INCENTIVE

"Now that the Income Tax is hitting the worker, he is just packing up after he has reached a certain level.

"Many coal-miners, for instance, are now working only three days a week, in order to escape Income Tax. The tax is seriously reducing the coal output . . .

"When the war began, our Income Tax was 5/6 in the pound. It was almost intolerable. It was high enough then to be restrictive, but when it rose to 10/- it became destructive.

"When the Government says to a man —'You take all the risks but we'll take half your profit,' then the man has no incentive. He will, for patriotic reasons, go on in wartime, but he'll not go on in peacetime.

"Last month, I noticed that a certain branch shop in London is open for business only two days a week. I went in and asked the reason. The manager said —'The reason is that our firm had to pay £6000 Excess Profits Tax last year. So we had to put a stop to profitless selling.'"

—R. Edmonds, in "Efficiency Magazine," London. (Quoted in "N.Z. Financial Times," March, 1946.)

## BRITISH MOTORCAR EXPORTS

From the "Social Creditor" (Eng.), 23/2/46:

We find it difficult to follow the vagaries of our ostensible politicians, although much easier to grasp the intentions of the secret powers behind them, and we are awaiting a demonstration of Sir Stafford Cripps' determination to export British motor cars.

A good-class English-made 16 h.p. car is a little better, for conditions that suit it, than a car of the class of the Chevrolet in U.S.A. The former costs the home user a little under £800 at present prices, the latter under £200. Is the bright idea to sell the British car abroad at one-quarter the price charged to the home user? We are aware that textiles, coal, etc., for many years have been cheaper ten thousand miles away than in Lancashire, but, as we are always being told, we were rich then. How long is it calculated that the home market can subsidise the export market? Or just isn't it?

## Notes on the News

(Continued from page 1)

old bogey, "chaos," and lower prices. Funny how these "workers' friends" fear that workers will benefit by lower prices; if that means chaos, workers will surely welcome it. Meanwhile, resistance to the new Board stunt is being organised by a number of egg producers, who are publishing warnings in the daily press. These men may welcome electoral campaigners' advice and assistance.

**STRIKE SUPPRESSION:** U.S. Labor leaders say that President Truman's anti-strike laws would make American Unionists slave labourers under Fascist control, as they would enable the President to force men to work at the bayonet point, and to draft workers into the Army if they defied him. We remember that "Labor" leaders in Australia conscripted workers into the Army during war-time, so it is not a anti-Labor prerogative, which suggests that workers are doomed to tyranny and slavery under either Party fuehrers, and that it is just a race to see which gangsters will use the bayonet. Right and Left fuehrers do their utmost to stir up the class struggle to retain their jobs. None will institute a system, which will provide individual security for all, so that men may choose a job and leave it if they do not like it, without involving other workers in a strike. Unless this fact is realised by the Party dupes of the Left and Right, industrial strife will continue.

**CHURCH CAMPAIGNS:** The Presbyterian Assembly adopted a resolution approving an approach to other Churches to set up a committee to combat "anti-Semitism." (Melbourne "Sun," May 10.) Similar moves can be noted in all States, and no doubt they will receive heavy financial support from the Jewish community, even though Jews themselves will not be publicly associated with the propaganda. Most of these bodies strongly support the displacement of the Arabs (Semites), and in this way help to make the British task in Palestine more difficult. It would be most fitting in the circumstances if Jewish religious bodies overcome their aversion to the Christian belief and set up committees to combat anti-Semitism. Maybe each could do the other's job more effectively!

**SOVIET SECRECY:** Soviet ideas of secrecy are to be seen in the adoption of the U.N. Security Council of a proposal to "deny a record of private meetings to every U.N. member not on the Council." An Australian delegate, Mr. Hasluck, made it clear that "Australia disliked the idea of the Council deliberating in secret." There seems to be a nominal change of front by Australian delegates, who thus oppose Russian tactics; even Evatt has incurred the wrath of Soviet newspapers by insisting that "middle and small nations should not be asked to accept as binding, decisions made without their full and free participation." Surely Evatt cannot have been smitten with the Democratic bug!

**SCHOOL SCIENCE:** British education authorities are instituting new methods under which the importance of examinations will be greatly reduced. Once more Great Britain will lead the world in reform. A series of progressive objective tests will in future determine education, character and talent. The higher school academic certificate, which was used for the selection of State and other university scholarships, will be abolished. This method will remove the injustice of children failing to pass exams, merely because they were not good at theoretical tests, or developed nerves on the critical day. It will be a generation before the result of this experiment will be assessable, but it is certainly worth while. —O.B.H.

## GET YOUR COPY NOW!

"THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIAL CREDIT"

By Eric D. Butler.

Price. 1/1d posted.

After a series of unavoidable delays, supplies of Mr. Butler's valuable book are available. All advance orders are being attended to as rapidly as possible, and should be fulfilled in the immediate future.

"The Truth About Social Credit" removes many misconceptions regarding Social Credit. It is a detailed exposure of how the Federal Labor Government's 1945 Banking Legislation, far from having any connection with Social Credit, was an important step in the long-range policy to impose complete serfdom on the Australian people.

"The Truth About Social Credit" states clearly what Social Credit is and what it is not.

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

# ELECTORS, BEWARE OF R. G. CASEY

(A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown. Continued from last issue.)

Sir, —In the year before the war, namely, 1938, the late Mr. John Curtin issued a warning that the financial institutions were again restricting credit, and that if they continued to do so there would be another serious depression. He was roundly rebuked by Mr. Richard Gardiner Casey, then Commonwealth Treasurer and this rebuke was reinforced by the Melbourne "Argus."

On that occasion Mr. Curtin was, of course, positively right in what he said—and his warning was supported by none other than Mr. Colin Clark, the economist, whose appointment to lecture to students at the Melbourne University has been described by the "Argus" as "part of a plan to bring to Melbourne for a short period distinguished scholars from overseas, so as to give students the stimulus of new teachers and new points of view."

In the Melbourne "Sun" of 29/7/1937, Mr. Colin Clark is recorded as having told the Junior Chamber of Commerce that he found it difficult not to foresee some recession in 1938 in business activities; that Australia was so influenced by British affairs that any fall in demand in Great Britain would have its corresponding effect here; and that unless there was an unforeseen EXPANSION IN ARMAMENT EXPENDITURE, there was not likely to be any counteracting factor to the anticipated building decline. Sure enough, there was a tragic fall in that year in the price of two of Australia's chief export products—wool and wheat. That was a deliberate blow to the economic life of Australia, and there is no doubt whatever that had war preparation not been put in hand when it was we would have been struggling for money in 1939 even more fiercely than we were struggling for it in 1930 and 1931.

My reason for recalling this is the fact that Mr. R. G. Casey is here again seeking to be accepted as one of our "leaders," and consequently it is vital to our own interests that we should know clearly the sort of "leadership" we got from him when we trusted him previously.

According to the "Argus" of 15/8/1938 Mr. Casey had been the chief guest at a smoke concert arranged by the United Commercial Travellers' Association, and in the course of his response to the toast of "The Federal Parliament," he made statements which may be summarised thus:—

1. Depressions largely arise from a state of mind.
2. If we speak of depressions as inevitable, depressions will inevitably arrive.
3. Depressions do not arise in Australia, but come from overseas.
4. We can choose whether we will have a cheerful and abounding prosperity or a dismal, heart-eating depression; it all depends on the individual.
5. We can think ourselves into a depression.

Anyone who has looked into the CAUSE of depressions will know at once that statements of the kind set out above, besides being contradictory, are laughable, and the explanation for a Melbourne Grammarian talking such rubbish is probably to be found in the fact that he takes his cue from his master—the international financier—and therefore speaks his master's language, perhaps without understanding it.

To those of us who paid attention to the words of Mr. Casey in 1938 it must have come as a tremendous surprise to hear that the 1931 cuts in our pensions and salaries were the result of our own state of mind.

For myself I can say definitely that the cutting of my pay was entirely contrary to my state of mind. I was strongly opposed to it and all the people I knew were opposed to it. The Unions fought against it and the Federal Government went so

far as to ask the Arbitration Court not to submit to the clamour of the bankers for a cut in the basic wage. But the Court did submit to the clamour of the bankers, and if that WAS the result of a state of mind, then we ought to be given the identity of the mind and an explanation of its condition.

If No. 2 of the above summary is right, there should have been no depression in 1929-1931, because at that time the people, so far as financial matters were concerned, were as ignorant, as quiet, and as apathetic as cattle. All the talk about the impending financial emergency emanated from men like Mr. Casey, Mr. S. M. Bruce, and the bankers, and the depression came notwithstanding the silence and docility of 99.99 per cent. of the population. And if speaking of a depression is so serious a danger, why was it that Mr. Casey did not urge his Government to make it an offence for such things to be mentioned? That would have been a simple remedy, but, of course, the fact is that depressions have hitherto come whether we spoke of them or not.

No. 3 of the summary seems to have slipped accidentally, for it doesn't "suit the book" at all. Obviously, if the depressions come from overseas, they are NOT suggested by the people of Australia.

As to No. 4, it is true that we can choose whether we will have a cheerful and abounding prosperity or a dismal, heart-eating depression. Up to now, however, the PEOPLE have never exercised that choice, with the result that cheerful and abounding prosperity has never been known. When the ordinary citizen has been given an increase in his income, costs have been thereby increased and he has been automatically deprived of the expected benefit of it through higher prices. Scientific discoveries and mechanical developments have brought little or no general economic benefit, and have in some cases brought about

## Realities Behind Referendum

(Continued from page 1.)

is not the slightest evidence to suggest that the Federal Government could do the work being now done by the State Governments at a lower financial cost. But there is plenty of evidence to suggest that it would result in a higher financial cost. There are hundreds of members of Federal Departments who wouldn't dream of working for the salary most State Members of Parliament get.

Admittedly a lot of stupid things are done by State Governments, but at least electors can, if they assert their sovereignty, control their State Members much more effectively than they can control their Federal Members. They certainly could not control the Federal bureaucracy if it took the place of responsible State Members.

Those people who allow their judgment on the subject of local Government to be perverted by the clever playing up of all the little stupidities, which all Governments indulge in at present, are doing exactly what Germans did.

The totalitarians in every country are past masters at ridiculing the people's institutions. In this country they sneer about the present Federal Constitution, which they call "the Horse and Buggy Constitution." Unthinking people repeat this term and think they are being smart. They are merely being very stupid.

Listeners are urged to think about this matter of local self-government for themselves. Between now and the Referendum an enormous amount of propaganda is going to be used to persuade the electors to vote "Yes" for greater powers for the Canberra bureaucracy.

Incidentally, listeners, you pay for a lot of this propaganda. You wouldn't let your local Councils spend one penny of your rates on propaganda against you—there is some check on the actions of your Councilors because they are local. But the power-lusters at Canberra do as they like with your money.

You will have to put a stop to this drift towards complete totalitarianism by not only voting "No" on all three issues at the Referendum, but by also persuading as many of your fellow-electors as possible to do likewise.

Remember: Local Government means **Self** Government, government, which electors can control to get the results they want. By fighting to preserve and extend local government you are fighting for the right to govern yourself.

Good evening.

## AN ANTI-BRITISH CENTRE

Anyone familiar with the United States will agree that Chicago is the main focus of anti-British agitation in America, and that the notorious Colonel McCormack is only an exploiter of a pre-existent sentiment. It is significant that Louis Wirth, a Jew, in his book, "The Ghetto" (University of Chicago Press, 1928), remarks of Chicago: "The centralisation of fund-raising and communal institutions has brought about a degree of unity in recent years which eclipses the solidarity of the Jewish community of any large city of the country."  
—"The Social Creditor."

a lower standard of living, when they should have raised the general standard beyond recognition.

If it is true that we can think ourselves into a depression, as stated in No. 5, ought it not be equally simple to think ourselves out of one? For the benefit of those who may not have studied the subject seriously, let me re-state that a depression is the result of the following action:

Firstly, —The banks adopt a "more cautious" policy regarding the "availability" of credit. This tends to increase the bank rate, to shorten the general supply of money, and to cause a fall in prices.

Secondly, —The financial institutions, led by the banks, precipitate a selling wave on the stock exchanges, causing "recession" to develop into a serious slump.

Confirmation of this may be obtained from the Report of the Australian Monetary and Banking Commission, in which it is shown that the Australian banks adopted a "more cautious" policy in 1928 and followed it up in 1929 by calling in overdrafts and selling securities—disposing of no less than eighteen million pounds' worth within a period of two years. In 1932 the Australian banks began to BUY securities again, and at the same time to adopt a more liberal policy in regard to credit. Their policy of 1928-29 coincided with the beginning of the depression, and the reversal of that policy in 1932 coincided with the beginning of our emergence from it. According to Mr. Casey, the people "thought" the banks into that variation of policy! It would be as sensible to say that the people also "thought" their much-loved sons into the fiery furnace of the 1939 war, and that the populations of so many countries thought themselves into the condition of starvation in which they now find themselves! Any man who talks lunacy of that kind has no right whatever to be parading himself as one who has served his country well. My own view is that Mr. Casey played a bigger part in bringing about the conditions of depression and war than he himself would be prepared to admit, and on that ground alone is unworthy of further public trust. But there is another equally serious objection to his plans, and this I propose to mention next week.

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

## GREAT BRITAIN UNDER THE SOCIALISTS

From the "Social Creditor" (Eng), 30/3/46: The Socialists are, not unsuccessfully, covering up the colossal mismanagement of the country's business by a skilful combination of Mad Hatter finance (which we feel sure will be enthusiastically acclaimed in various quarters as "bringing in Social Credit by the back door") and down-right tyranny of the well-pondered Russian type.

There are probably ten millions of the population on the dole; but they are camouflaged as "transitional workers," "reserve troops" or any other name which combines well-fed slavery with industrial and political demoralisation. Meanwhile, ferocious penalties, such as seven years' penal servitude for doing a little building, cut straight across Magna Carta and every right gained by the individual in a thousand years, not even by legislation passed in a supine parliament, but through the agency of an "Order-in-Council" concocted probably by some olive-skinned alien under instructions from some Asiatic Sanhedrin.

One very important aspect of this darkening scene is brought into relief by a letter printed in the "Scotsman" of March 20, which concludes: "There is far too little made of the part played by the employers, compared with the unstinted praise given to the employees."

A not inconsiderable part of the world crisis is comprised in that sentence. The attribution of responsibility and unlimited praise to those whose only responsibility is to perform an industrial drill becoming ever simpler and better paid, and dispossession of those from whom importance has been withheld so that failure on the part of the dispossesses will be attributed to the "workers"—a situation which will supervene just as surely as tomorrow's sun will rise. This will be met by a further dose of Russian medicine, by which time we ought to be reduced to a condition for partitioning between Moscow and New York.

We have no doubt whatever that in this matter (as probably in most others nowadays) the famous indiscretion of the Moses Israel Sieff of P.E.P.—"only in war, or under threat of war"—indicates the unity of foreign affairs with home policy. "Russia" is merely an instrument, just as "Germany" was an instrument (and they are both very much the same instrument) by which a war of nerves can be used to universalise slavery. Most of the figureheads in the Socialist Government are conceited dupes; we believe Mr. Ernest Bevin to be an honest, if almost comically self-centred individual; and some of the remainder are traitors whom we trust will in due time meet their reward. But in the meantime, they are powerfully protected, and know it.

## AN IMPORTANT NEW BOOKLET

"OUR SHAM DEMOCRACY"

By James Guthrie, B.Sc.

Price: 1/1d posted

Now Obtainable from: The United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.1.

## Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

consult a recognised leader in the wheat industry."

"Another of the Minister's favourite consultants is Mr. Everett, whom the Minister himself appointed to the Wheat Board. More recently, it is true, Mr. Everett has been elected to the Board, but he became a member originally because the Minister appointed him at a remuneration of £500 a year for a very part-time job.

"When the Minister consults Mr. Everett, however, he does not say, 'I am consulting one of my paid officials, to whom I gave a good job.' He says, 'I am consulting one of the chosen representatives of the wheat growers.'

"Occasionally, too, the Minister goes to Mr. Cullen for advice. The gentleman until recently was president of the Victorian Wheat Growers' Association. There, it might reasonably be said, surely, is the right man to consult!

But Mr. Cullen draws from the Department of Commerce and Agriculture £1000 a year, plus expenses—and, of course, his advice is completely impartial!

When I lift my eyes to the press gallery in this Chamber, I find that the public relations officer of the Department of Commerce and Agriculture is the former editor of my own [Country] Party's journal, who is now on Mr. Scully's pay roll.

"I see, too, one of the Minister's liaison officers who advises him on matters industrial and political, mostly political. I refer to the former chief organiser of my Party, who was offered a better job at more money by the Minister."

—Mr. J. McEwen, M.H.R. (vide Federal "Hansard," April 9)

Having given the above interesting and significant information, Mr. McEwen went on to say: "No vested business interests are concerned in the payment of social benefits."

Has Mr. McEwen never heard of the bureaucratic army of occupation?

It has an enormous vested interest in ensuring that taxpayers have as much money as possible taken off them and as little as possible of this money given back to them in the form of social "benefits." The bureaucracy decides the terms on which the tax payer is permitted to get a little of his own money back!

—E.D.B.

## SOCIALISED MEDICAL SERVICE

"For the medical profession to be converted into a technical branch of government would be disastrous both to medicine and the public. The doctor's primary loyalty and responsibility should be to his patient. He should be free to act, to speak and to write unhampered by interference from above. The doctor should be the patient's doctor and not the Government's doctor. A whole-time salaried service is inconsistent with free choice of doctor. It would tend to impose uniformity in a form of work in which initiative and originality are essential. It would tend to bureaucratise a human service. It would destroy a proper incentive, the relationship between remuneration and the amount and value of work done or responsibility accepted. It might tend to replace competition for patients by competition to avoid them."

—B.M.A. secretary, Charles Hill, writing in London "Times" on British Government's Health Bill. (Quoted in Sydney "Bulletin," May 8, 1946.)

## INDUSTRIAL PEACE IN ALBERTA

"During the past year strikes have occurred in many parts of the Dominion of Canada. This has not been so in Alberta, where, during the year of 1944, there were no strikes and no cessation of work."

"Out of the sixty-one labour disputes which developed in the Province last year, the Board of Industrial Relations successfully conciliated sixty of the said disputes. One dispute concerning a jurisdictional union problem went to a board of arbitration and was settled by the ward of the board. Thus, Alberta enjoyed a year of industrial peace."

—"Your Opportunity In Alberta," official Alberta brochure published in 1945.

## SINCERITY IS NOT ENOUGH

"The worst types of humanity are always sincere. Thugs, hoodlums, and criminals are sincere. Bigots and fanatics are sincere. Dunderheads are sincere. Franco is sincere and his Red enemies are sincere. Hitler was sincere. The hangman is sincere. Most murderers are sincere. The Kaiser was sincere. The Russian firing squad are sincere. The OGPU are sincere. Al Capone was sincere. Militarists are sincere. Killjoys and spoilsports are sincere. Bad artists of every kind are sincere. The worst singers I have heard have been the most sincere. Bad speakers are always disgustingly sincere."

—"Bonar Thompson's Monthly."

THE "NEW TIMES"  
IS OBTAINABLE  
AT  
ALL AUTHORISED  
NEWSAGENTS