

THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P. O., Melbourne, for transmission by Post a Newspaper.

VOLUME 15, No. 23.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 1949.

SIXPENCE WEEKLY.

CONSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS TO SERFDOM

The following is the first of a series of weekly radio talks being given over 3SR Shepparton (Vic.), by Mr. Eric D. Butler, Campaign Director of the Victorian League of Rights. Mr. Butler broadcasts at 10.10 p.m. every Monday.

In this first talk we desire to direct listeners' attention to the fundamental importance of the Federal Constitution as a barrier to the centralisation of all power at Canberra, and as a protector of the people's rights and liberties. It is often claimed by party leaders that their parties will protect the people's rights and liberties, but the facts of history show that Governments of all descriptions have tended to increase their powers at the expense of the individual unless prevented by constitutions.

At a Low Ebb

Political thinking is at such a low ebb in this and other British countries that constitutional safeguards of individuals' rights and liberties, painfully evolved over hundreds of years, are being destroyed rapidly without most people realising what is taking place. Unfortunately, the mere mention of the term "constitution" usually conjures up in the minds of most people a picture of lawyers arguing about dry, technical legal matters of no importance to the great majority of individuals — or beyond their understanding. Now, what is a Constitution? Most human activities are governed by the idea of a Constitution; the idea that it is necessary to define in advance relationships which individuals can observe. It is also necessary to lay down the relationships between Governments and individuals.

A Dangerous Idea

One of the most dangerous ideas being put forward in the name of democracy, is that once a group of politicians have obtained a majority of votes at an election, even if the majority be only 51 percent, these politicians should then, be free to do as they like for three years. This argument is really a plea for totalitarianism — the creation of the all-powerful Government, which can do as it likes to the individual. All those people who are forever criticising the limits placed upon the Federal Government by the Federal Constitution, are assisting the totalitarian drive. Governments are not ends in themselves; they are merely means to an end. No Government should have any more power than is necessary for it to fulfill its legitimate functions. Electors are in grave danger of forgetting the lessons about Governments so bitterly learnt by their forefathers: that Constitutional safeguards are essen-

tial to ensure that Governments do not obtain too much power over individuals.

Constitutional Safeguards

In their long struggle for freedom and self-government, our forefathers discovered that no individual, or group of individuals, can be trusted with too much power. They therefore evolved ways and means of dividing power. Constitutional safeguards were created for the purpose of guaranteeing to the individual certain fundamentals, which no Government could take away, irrespective of the majority it temporarily possessed. Local, decentralised Government was found essential for enabling the individual to control his governing bodies more effectively.

The menace of highly centralised Governments should be obvious to all thinking people. Centralised Germany was the instrument used to start the two world wars of this century. Soviet Russia is dominated from Moscow; there is no genuine local Government. Here in Australia we are fortunate that our forefathers in their wisdom created a Federal system of Government for the purpose of ensuring that political power was divided between the States and the Commonwealth.

The framers of the Federal Constitution endeavoured to limit the powers of the Federal Government to those matters, which might be better looked after by one Federal Government for the whole of Australia rather than by the various State Governments. Such matters as Defence, Post and Telegraphs, etc., were rightly regarded as Federal matters. But the major powers concerning the economic affairs of the people were to be left with the States. Every attack upon the Federal Constitution is, therefore, an attack upon the States — an attack upon the principle of local Government. Decentralised local Government, Government close to the people, is the basis of genuine democracy.

Labour's Past Attitude

Back in 1937, when the Lyons Government was endeavouring to persuade the Australian people to increase the powers of the Federal Government by Referendum, members of the Labour Party, some of them members of the present Labour Government, criticised as follows the proposal to weaken the States: "Whittling away democracy; once again democracy is attacked. There is never a bold, frontal attack. That would

alarm us, and we should unhesitatingly resist. But little by little control over the things that matter is stolen from the people. By delegating to unrepresentative, irresponsible authorities the reality of power, our 'elected persons' evade responsibility. Here . . . upon the pretext of an emergency is another attempt to whittle away our self-government . . . Protect the freedom which the Constitution guarantees . . . Resist every attack upon democracy. Vote NO."

(Continued on page 2)

OUR POLICY

1. The preservation of Australia's sovereignty as a part of the British Empire, and the exposure of all internal and external groups which attack that sovereignty.
2. The preservation and extension of genuine local government.
3. The preservation and strengthening of all Constitutional safeguards for the purpose of protecting fundamental individual rights.
4. The encouragement of all activities designed to bring Governments under more effective control by the electors.
5. The preservation and extension of genuine free, competitive enterprise and private ownership, and opposition to all Monopoly, whether it be "private" or State.
6. The support of a financial policy which will (a) permit free enterprise to make available to all individuals an increasing standard of living and greater leisure for cultural pursuits; (b) result in no further increase in the community's indebtedness and the sound business practice of gradually reducing existing debt.
7. Recognising that the basis of any sound economy is agriculture, the encouragement of agricultural policies which will ensure the preservation and building up of soil fertility by organic farming and gardening; and the prevention of soil erosion and the protection of forests and watersheds.

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

TO THE POINT

Initiative, Referendum and Recall

Although the Labour-Socialists claim that they are very keen to have all their Party's platform implemented as soon as possible, it is significant that they are very reticent about the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, which is still part of the platform.

Some time ago Mrs. Blackburn, Independent Labour, tested the sincerity of the Federal Labour Party when she moved a motion that steps be taken to implement this portion of the Labour Party's platform immediately. Mr. Archie Cameron said, in seconding the motion, that he did so, not because he believed in the idea of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall himself, but in order to see whether the Labour-Socialists were really prepared to adopt their own platform. As he pointed out, if the Initiative, Referendum and Recall power had been embodied in the Federal Constitution prior to Bank Nationalisation and other legislation, many

Constitutional Barriers

(Continued from page 1)

A Fair Question

In 1937 Labour Party spokesmen said that the Federal Constitution guaranteed the people's freedom. Why then do they now attack that guarantee by seeking either to amend or to by-pass the Federal Constitution? This is surely a fair question, which every Labour supporter should be asked to answer. It is a question, which all parties should be asked. The centralisation of political power, irrespective of which party does the centralising, always leads to the same disastrous results. One of these results is the growth of bureaucracy.

Bureaucracy

The growth of bureaucracy in Australia is a menace, which must concern every liberty-loving citizen. The more power the Federal Government obtains, and the more it tries to legislate on matters which could be better looked after by State Governments, or by individuals, the more impossible it becomes for Federal Members of Parliament to supervise effectively all legislation that is passed. These Members are only human beings, and there is a limit to what even the most conscientious can do. The result is that legislation is framed only in general terms, and power is delegated to the permanent officials to actually implement the legislation by regulations. This dangerous practice means that Government by regulation is superseding Government by Parliament. It is no excuse to say that this anti-democratic development had started before the Labour Government came to office. The time has arrived to call a halt before responsible Government is destroyed completely. The Federal Constitution must be protected, and firm steps taken to compel the Federal Government to disgorge all the powers filched from the States. This is probably the most important political issue confronting the Australian people today.

Labour Members would not now be in Parliament. No Labour member spoke on the motion. The Labour Party used its majority to have any debate on the motion "adjourned." Electors who have Labour members representing them might ask some pertinent questions on this matter. Replies should be given adequate publicity.

* * * *

Dictators and "Capitalists"

While "capitalists," like all other human beings, cannot be trusted with too much power without appropriate responsibility, it is necessary to draw attention to the fact that the various dictators who have played an important role in producing the mass madness which has been the outstanding feature of the twentieth century, have not come from the ranks of the "capitalists." Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin were all products of the Socialist Movement.

* * * *

Marshall Aid to Britain

"We have seen only one reference to the obvious connection between the delay in passing the Marshall Aid appropriation and the British assurance contained in the Budget that we shall get no benefit from it, but it doesn't matter anyway. We couldn't care less."

—English *Social Creditor*, May 7, 1949.

* * * *

Enterprise Being Strangled

In a recent review of employment in Australia, the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce says that big increases in the number of people employed by Governments is robbing industry and trade of more than 74 million man-hours per year. But these startling figures do not reveal the complete story, because the results of Government controls by the bureaucracy necessitate all private business organisations employing extra staff to deal specifically with the results of Government controls of various descriptions. The Socialist planners appear to believe that a community can grow prosperous by filling in forms, etc.

* * * *

Govt. Postal Service Increases Charges

The big increases in charges for postal services should provide electors with some food for serious thought concerning the "benefits" of "public ownership." Under the present financial rules it is probably true that the introduction of the 40-hour week has been responsible for increased wage costs which must be passed on to the consumer, but there is no violent outcry from the Socialists and Communists about a Government Monopoly doing what all sections of private enterprise have been forced to do. And it must not be forgotten that the Post Office pays no taxes. A great deal of its work in the country areas is done by mail contractors and small country stores. The remuneration received is miserable.

* * * *

Socialisation in Britain

In an article in the June issue of the *Reader's Digest*, former British Labour M.P., Alfred Edwards, who was expelled from the British Labour Party because he opposed the proposal to nationalise the British steel industry, writes as follows on

the results of nationalisation in Great Britain:

Before that die is cast let us look at coal under nationalisation and steel under private enterprise. Heaven knows coal under private ownership was no model. England's plight was desperate, and she needed full production. So the Labour Party took over the mines for the People, and voted £25,000,000 for mechanisation to increase the per capita production of the worker. Yet from June to October, 1948, in spite of the increased mechanisation, and in spite of the fact that it is now the People's coal — not that of greedy capitalists — the mines produced 158,000 tons per week *less* than in 1938.

Has the miner ceased to be a wage slave? He still works for wages. He still has a boss. Instead of working for a group of stockholders he now works for that vast, amorphous mass called the People. Instead of having a managing director at the mine with authority to deal with problems as they arise, he now has a bureaucrat who dares not say yes or no without sending the problem up through layers of other bureaucrats to the real directing boss, a remote being in London called the National Coal Board.

Most of the privately run industries have shown large increases in production since 1945. But coal actually shows a loss. England has done a little laughing at this. When Emanuel Shinwell was transferred from the Ministry of Fuel and Power to become Secretary of State for War in the Ministry of Defence, Winston Churchill said this was a good augury, for while he was in charge of mines we got no coal; now we might hope to get no war. One of our cartoonists pictured a coal miner talking to the Minister and saying: "You told us under Socialism we would get more money for less work. Well, we've given you less work. How about more money?"

Keep This Date Free!

"THE NEW TIMES"

Annual Dinner

on

THURSDAY, JULY 14th, at 6 p.m.

at

The Victoria Palace,
Little Collins Street,
Melbourne

Write to R. H. Weller, c/o Box 1226L
G.P.O., Melbourne, for full
particulars

Our Sham Democracy

AN OUTSTANDING BOOKLET

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

Price: 1/1d posted

GOVT. AIRWAYS MONOPOLY Socialistic Racketeering

Well folk, OUR socialised airways are going grand. According to the extracts published below from an article by Kenneth Green, taken from the Melbourne *Herald* of May 31, fares are sky-high and profits are conspicuous by their absence. What intrigues us is what stand Liberal and Country Parties propose to take in regard to this monopoly. If Mr. Holt's remarks in the House recently on T.A.A. represent Party policy, then all we can expect is an attempt to run them more "efficiently." A letter to your member on this matter should bring some interesting replies.

Australians, who enjoy the lowest airfares in the world on domestic inter-capital services, have to pay exorbitant rates when they want to travel overseas, even to the sister Dominion of New Zealand.

Tasmanian Labour's Dr. F. J. Gaha, M.H.R., recently had a flash of insight on this when, on a visit to N.Z., he declared publicly that "on a mileage basis" the 1,340 mile Tasman flight should cost between £16 and £18 N.Z. currency, instead of the present £28.

He is right. In Australia you can travel from Adelaide to Perth (1,415 miles) for £19 (£N.Z.15). That is a good yardstick by which to measure the justification for the present Tasman fare.

Everything, said Dr. Gaha, should be considered in terms of defence. The two countries must maintain transport air arms. Why not use them in peace on the Tasman service. As their present aircraft became obsolete they could be replaced by modern transport equipment adaptable, if necessary, for war purposes.

Impetuous Dr. Gaha has missed some important considerations in that suggestion, but the germ of his idea is right. Tasman fares (to Australians, £35 single and £63 return) are far too high.

Where he is wrong is that it does not need a highly subsidised and impermanent Air Force transport wing to run that service for the fares he suggests.

His idea could be achieved much more easily. I know that Australian National Airways, for one, would eagerly accept an offer to operate the Tasman for £22/10/- (£N.Z.18) single and £45 return. At that fare they could give a first-class Skymaster service and make a profit into the bargain. Unless Tasman Empire Airways Ltd. (TEAL) can do the same it is operating either inefficiently or with a monopolistic disregard of its responsibilities. The New Zealand Government owns 50 percent, and the Australian Government 30 percent of TEAL.

Sydney-London

There should also be a public demand that the Qantas (QEA) fare of £325 for the Sydney-London service be cut from £325 single—£585 return to £225—£450; and that British Commonwealth Pacific Airlines cut the Sydney-San Francisco fare from £200 to £150.

If they cannot do this let the services be turned over to private operators who can.

Where these overseas services are not now the monopoly of Government operators, Government bi-lateral agreements and pressures are dictating the present high fares in the interests of Government airlines.

The contrast between Tasman fares and those now ruling on the Adelaide-Perth

service is too striking to be easily talked away. The Australian internal service (75 miles longer than the Sydney-Auckland run) is operated by A.N.A. and T.A.A. for a fare of 3.29d. a mile.

The present Tasman rate is 6.26d. a mile, yet TEAL last year carried 12,844 passengers with 78.7 percent of its seats filled.

The maximum fare I have suggested (£22/10/-) allows 4.03d. a mile—surely an ample margin to cover any extra overseas operational costs.

With new Solent flying-boats arriving soon, the airline cannot claim equipment as an excuse for long—not, at least, without serious reflection on its purchasing judgment.

The £325 Sydney-London fare of QEA and the British Oversea Airways Corporation, who work in a close partnership, financially as well as operationally, has long been a subject of criticism.

The operation of migrant services by some highly reputable private airlines on the same route has now proved it to be unjustifiable.

The Australian Government has insisted that these airlines on migrant charters should charge not less than QEA-BOAC fares, and none has been permitted to carry passengers out of Australia.

The operators have not been discouraged by this. They have been able to make a profit out of QEA fares, even though they had to fly one way empty!

One such operator told me recently that on present fares he could run a Sydney-London service, even on a one-return-flight-a-week basis, and with a Skymaster only half-filled each way and make a profit of £4,000 a trip!

I cannot prove—nor, apparently, can the department—what truth there is in current suspicions that some of the migrant operators are cutting fares "under the lap."

I have heard it said, for instance, that some Mediterranean dwellers have come here for £135 sterling, although their fare should legally be £240.

They would not find it difficult to get round Australia's demands, however. One story is that operators are paying travel agencies 15-17 1/2 percent on any passengers they book. The agents can afford to "share the commission" with prospective passengers, thus cutting fares without any legal breach of faith by the airlines concerned. There would be no need for a lowering of standards on a fare of £225 from England to Australia. The Qantas service is not a poorly patronised one. Last year it carried 7,897 passengers with 70.1 per cent of all its seats occupied.

Work that out on a basis where a 50 per

cent load factor can yield a profit £4,000 a trip.

But Qantas is not solely supported passenger fares. There is also freight (789,799 ton-miles of it last year), and mail, too. And mail is the heaviest financial passenger of all. It is paid out of taxes.

Qantas, I am assured, gets the highest airmail rate permitted under the International Postal Convention—31/2 gold francs a tonne kilometre. That works out 10/- a ton-mile, and the QEA mail ton mileage last year on the Sydney-London service was 2,283,882.

That means a return to Australia's Government-owned international operator £1,142,000 for the carriage of 244 tons of mail.

Yet Qantas recorded a net profit of on £79,900 for the year ended March 31, 1949.

Some Questions

Now you start asking the questions. But ask, particularly, why Qantas and BOAC charge 6.7d. a mile for passengers when private operators are prepared to carry: you in equal comfort for 4.7d. a mile, and are prevented from doing it.

British Commonwealth Pacific Airlines charges 6.17d. a mile for its service, and has, perhaps, a slightly better case in the face of dollar restrictions, a passenger load factor of 49.5 percent and 226,662 ton miles of -airmail.

But remember this: when Australian National Airways operated the Sydney-San Francisco service it wanted to do it for £150 single fare (4.7d. a mile). It was forced to charge £200 . . . and I haven't heard that it lost money on the deal.

The same process that brings about high fares on international services is well demonstrated in Australia's domestic set-up by recent complaints from the Northern Territory about TAA's Adelaide-Darwin fares.

Although TAA, on the inter-capital services, where it is competing with private airlines, charges an average of 3.3d. a mile—the same fare as its rivals—on the 1,666-mile Darwin run it charges 5.6d. a mile.

The resultant fare—£31 single—contrasts very strangely with the fare of £25 charged by both TAA and ANA for the 1,821-mile Melbourne-Perth trip. On the Darwin route the Government has monopoly.

D.S.C.M. WOMEN'S GROUP

(VIC.)

Now Meets on

THE THIRD THURSDAY
of Every Month.

All interested are invited.

A. DUNN'S DETECTIVE AGENCY

(Regd.)

Estb. 1884. The Old Original Firm.

Known all over the world. Successful business firm with good reputation **Strictly confidential.** Advice Free. Cent. 5302, Talma Bldgs., 119 Swanston st., Melbourne. —[Advt.]

THE NEW TIMES

Established 1935

Published every Friday by New Times Limited, McEwan House,
343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.

Postal Address: Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. Telephone: MU 2834.

VOL. 15.

FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 1949

No. 23

THE THREAT OF DEPRESSION

Our regular readers are familiar with the much-quoted statement made just prior to the war by the Financier-Socialist Political and Economic Planning Group (P.E.P.): that only in war or under the threat of war will the British peoples and their Governments submit to Sovietisation. It is now obvious that the threat of another Great Depression is also being used by the International Financiers and their tools to speed up the programme of enslaving the peoples of the world.

News now coming to hand from the U.S.A. makes it clear that the growing business slump is being shrewdly used by President Truman and his "advisers" to further the policy of Socialism initiated by the Roosevelt regime under the New Deal. Truman's Fair Deal is claimed as the successor to the New Deal. Writing in the Melbourne "Sun" of May 30, 1949, columnist Douglas Wilkie, who consistently although subtly advances the cause of collectivism, writes of the American situation: ". . . liberal (!) economists like Professor Seymour Harris incline towards more controls — not socialist controls of production, British Labour pattern, but controls for 'socialistic consumption,' within the U.S. Hartley Grattan, U.S. publicist, well known to Australians, hails Harris' blue-print, 'Saving American Capitalism,' as 'the probable bible of those charged with providing a rationale for the Fair Deal.' Meanwhile, this Fair Deal — successor to Roosevelt's New Deal — is held up while Truman spars with a hostile Congress. Some say that Truman is waiting for a U.S. slump to prove its reality, and for Congress to provide enough rope to hang its more die-hard Congressmen."

The basic facts concerning the American economy should prove to all supporters of Free Enterprise that Free Enterprise is doomed unless there is a change in the present financial rules, and a widespread opposition to the policy of "Full Employment." The primary purpose of any production system is to supply to individual consumers the goods and services they require. Employment is, or should be, merely incidental to production. The high-pressure propaganda in favour of "Full Employment" as the great goat which the peoples of all countries must relentlessly pursue, simply means that as Free Enterprise becomes more and more efficient, and can supply more goods and services with less employment, all those not required in the production of goods and services for consumers must be organised on big public works and armament programmes. Adequate finance will, of course, be found for this programme.

During the war years the number of factories in the U.S.A. was doubled — adequate financial credit was found for the totalitarian programme necessary in time of war. The U.S.A. today has two-thirds of the world's industrial capacity. If sanity prevailed in the U.S.A., the American people would be re-organising their financial rules in order that, with greatly reduced working hours in their factories, they produced sufficient to give every American a high standard of living. Greater opportunities for more leisure and self-employment are an immediate possibility. But this would mean genuine freedom for individuals and conflict with the totalitarian policies of those who seek to bring all individuals under centralised control wielded on a world scale.

Here in Australia Mr. Dedman says there is no need for another depression; that the "Government" — i.e., the planners behind the Government — will spend hundreds of millions of pounds on public works. The programme appears clear enough: Dr. Coombs pursues a credit restriction policy, which cripples Free Enterprise. Wage earners can then be compelled to accept the totalitarian planning of Coombs and his associates or starve. Clause 45 of the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits

Insolence

We do not suppose that at any time in the history of these islands more than a tiny minority understood the principles, if any, which controlled their destiny. During the Middle Ages, by reason of education and travel, a considerable portion of this minority consisted of clergy, a word which then carried a different connotation, and, so far as words are concerned, has come down to us as "Clerk in Holy Orders." In consequence, and without minimising the corruption which culminated in the Reformation, a strong necessity existed for the preservation of the national proprieties. If Government in any form has always contained an element of racketeering, until recently it has paid the tribute of hypocrisy, which vice pays to virtue with a certain polish on its manners.

But the crudity, as well as the racketeering, has never previously, we think, reached its current level. When Mr. Attlee claims that the Labour Party, which he infers is his party, "believes" in four freedoms of which the fourth is freedom of the individual from the tyranny of economic power wielded by the few, he is either verging on insolence, or he does not understand the meaning of words. There have been tyrants in this country, more particularly since the rise of the industrial-financial capitalists who have brought Mr. Attlee and his Mond-Turner-P.E.P.-Fabians to power; but there has never been since Cromwell, if then, an all pervasive tyranny which would seize a man's property, force him to obtain a licence for every activity, say what he shall buy or sell, prevent him from building a barn, refuse to allow him to take his money abroad, conscript him, control his employment, steal his credit, debase his money, and indulge in many other lawless and tyrannical practices, and then proclaim that it believed in freedom.

"And none might buy or sell, save he had the Mark of the Beast . . ."

"Ye take too much upon yourselves, ye sons of Levi."

—*The Social Creditor*, May 14.

"SOCIAL CREDIT AND CATHOLICISM"

By George-Henri Levesque, O.P., Professor of Economics, Laval and Montreal Universities, Dominican House of Studies, Ottawa.

Introduction by Eric D. Butler.

Price 1/11 (post free). Order now from:
New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O.,
Melbourne.

Act, passed back in 1944, says that those who are unemployed must accept work to which they are directed under penalty of being refused any benefits if they disobey.

Printed by W. and J. Barr, 105-7 Brunswick Street, Fitzroy, N.6., for New Times, Ltd., McEwan House, Melbourne, on whose authority these articles appear.

CRUSADE FOR A WORLD GOVERNMENT

MARY H. GRAY

When Lord Beveridge was in Adelaide in June 1948, he referred frequently in public to his "Crusade for a World Government." This movement has been going for some time now with headquarters in London. The following brief outline of his plan is abridged from an article in the *Common Cause Newsletter* (S.A.). The President of Common Cause, Dr. Charles Duguid, obtained the information from the pamphlet "Plan in Outline," sent from England at his request. (Incidentally, Common Cause has stated that it is "wholeheartedly behind World Government").

The first step in the "Crusade" is to set up a People's Constituent Assembly. This, it is proposed, will meet at Geneva, in the autumn of 1950. In a preamble to the "Plan in Outline," the shortness of time and the imminence of war are stressed; it is stated that "There must be one central government possessing a monopoly of the more dangerous weapons." Because the United Nations Charter specifically retains and safeguards the sovereignty of nations, U.N.O. must be replaced by another organisation, *viz.*, World Government.

Accordingly, it is proposed that: —

- (1) Another World Organisation should be created with membership open to all the nations of the world who are willing to forgo national sovereignty;
- (2) A People's World Constituent Assembly should be elected to meet at Geneva in the autumn of 1950;
- (3) Representatives of the peoples of all countries, one for every million inhabitants, should be elected by the peoples to the Constituent Assembly;
- (4) Nation-wide ballots be held simultaneously in every country where possible during the summer of 1950 to elect the representatives;
- (5) The Constituent Assembly thus elected will draw up a Charter of World Government. This, it is hoped, will be completed by the summer of 1951 at latest, after which the Constituent Assembly will be dissolved;
- (6) Before the Charter can become effective, it must be ratified by the governments of the nations of the world.

This will be the task of the people of each nation; to take such action as will ensure this end.

Since the creation of a World Government cannot wait until every nation has ratified the Charter, it will probably contain some such provision as the following: —

"When 50 percent of the nations of the world, or the nations representing 50 percent of the peoples of the world, have ratified the Charter, the Legislative Authority herein described shall be deemed to be set up."

The "Plan" then explains the election of representatives in Britain — one for each million inhabitants, candidates for each "region" to present themselves to a group of Members of Parliament already at work upon problems of World Government, teams of voluntary workers, £1,000,000 to be raised, every method of publicity to be employed.

Next step to be the ratification of the Charter, which "must be made a prominent plank in the platform of each major party." If a quarter of the population can be induced to take part in the "unofficial ballot,"

the ratification may be regarded as a political certainty.

Powers of a World Government

It is considered that the following powers at least will be under the authority of World Government: —

- (1) A monopoly of armed forces to be used as a World Police Force. Participating States to be disarmed to the level of their internal policing commitments.
- (2) A monopoly of the processes involved in atomic development and other scientific discoveries capable of mass destruction.
- (3) The establishment of a World Bank for the purpose of creating a common currency throughout the world and of holding funds for the Central Authority in order that it may initiate and finance on a large scale economic planning such as that operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority.
- (4) The establishment of a World Food Board, similar to that advocated by Sir John Boyd Orr, at Copenhagen.

It will be the task of the World Government Assembly at Geneva to decide by what methods the members of the World Government will be elected; also whether, within the framework of World Government, Regional Federal Groupings should be created.

Thus do Lord Beveridge and his internationalist friends hope to circumvent constitutional obstacles and bring in World Government by a side door. There are organisations in Australia working to help him achieve this end, notably the United Nations Organisation (World President, Dr. H. V. Evatt), and the Institute of International Affairs (General Secretary for Australia, Mr. George Caiger).

Points to Be Noted

1. This is a definite plan, already at work.
2. It is for a world monopoly, of food, finance, raw materials, armed forces and armaments.
3. Once established, it will be impossible for any nation to resist the decrees of this World Monopoly.
4. The provisional clause to be inserted in the Charter — "when 50 percent of the nations," etc. — is specially designed to ensure that, if, in no other way, the Plan will go through by force of numbers alone. The countries of East Asia are said to contain more than half the world's population!

H. N. SMITH

WATCHMAKER AND JEWELLER.

Inspection of Stock Invited. All Work Guaranteed. 1st Floor, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins street, Melbourne. Phone MU2115.

Mr. STRACHEY IN TROUBLE

As if Mr. Strachey isn't already in enough trouble through fantastic miscalculations of his Ministry of Food? He so misjudged the sugar-starved people that, as an immediate sequel to the derationing of sweets, he is now warning the public that, unless the demand abates, rationing; may have to be reimposed.

Mr. Strachey also finds his 5/- meal limit collapsing in ruins around him. It is one of the greatest of Britain's many food farces. Its ostensible purpose was to limit the price of any meal to 5/-, and reduce the amount of rationed and unrationed food consumed in restaurants.

What has happened? So-called "luxury" restaurants have been allowed to add "house charge," also further charges when facilities for dancing or cabaret are provided.

Now there is a wonderful racket—crepes suzettes can be obtained as an extra course by paying £2 for the brandy used in them. Thus the rich can gorge themselves in magnificence while the rest are inflicted with such absurdities as being limited to spending 2/3 at the sandwich bars.

Mr. Strachey's orders are no longer respected. Enforced, they do not reduce the quantities of food reaching the restaurants, and make criminals of nearly everybody.

—Herald, Melb., May 30

COLLUSION

Take care that your enemy is not behind you. When you are busy fighting Communism, and facing staunchly up to the Russians, be sure that the policies which made Communism possible, even in Russia, did not originate in, and are being directed from, America — or for that matter, Great Britain. The experience of two world wars should have shown that we can sacrifice millions of lives in the cause of freedom, and emerge from war more securely bound than the nations with whom we are in conflict. Now we are being trained to stamp out Communism, as once we were schooled to stamp out Kaiserism and Hitlerism. Might it not be more profitable to stamp out the origins of these evil things? We can hardly enlarge on this theme today, except to point out a few facts. Exchange Control, the home of which is the International Monetary Fund in Washington, is being used with great success by Russia to finance Communism. Bulk-buying and State-trading are sponsored, not only by Mr. Attlee, but by the Food and Agriculture Organisation in Washington (where the technique originated). Is it not at all significant that these techniques enable Russia to mobilise an economic army in Eastern Europe against the West?

—Views, Eng., April 28, 1949.

SOCIAL CREDIT PRINCIPLES

Two propositions are essential to any Social Credit philosophy:

The first is that it is essential that the group shall have no conscriptive power over the individual; *i.e.*, the individual must have the power to contract out of any group.

The second is that the maximum decentralisation of initiative is in the interests of human welfare.

"New Times," June 10, 1949 — Page 5



CAN WE ELIMINATE SUPER?

By COBBETT

To the present generation of Australian primary producers this may seem a fantastic question.

Super phosphate is used in this country in much greater quantities than any other artificial fertiliser (Commonwealth Report, 1946: Super 1,064,394 tons, Sulphate of Ammonia 7,745 tons) and its use is increasing every year.

So necessary is its use considered by the Federal Government that for some years now a subsidy has been paid. Last year this was £2/5/-per ton, and cost the taxpayers of this country well over £2,250,000.

How has it come about that we have become enslaved to the "Super" complex in Australia?

For the last thirty years or more there has been a steady barrage of propaganda aimed at the man on the land. Most of the agricultural experts employed by the State Agriculture Departments, Universities, Machinery Firms, Seed Firms, the Press, and last, but not least, the Chemical Fertiliser Manufacturers, have been dinning into his ears on all possible occasions and in every possible way that Australian soils are deficient in phosphates, and that super is absolutely necessary in order to promote growth and increase production.

Now it is quite apparent that there are vested interests involved in this outpouring of free advice, which incidentally has cost the said interests a considerable amount of hard cash, and we must beware of attaching too much importance to it.

While it is not denied that growth is stimulated in most cases by the use of super, the claim that super replaces losses due to cropping, restores fertility and maintains and increases the productivity of the soil cannot be substantiated.

There is sufficient evidence to show that repeated applications of super will not maintain production of itself. The effect of the fertiliser is to bring about a more rapid rate of exhaustion of the original humid content of the soil, with a consequent gradual decrease in yields, BECAUSE SUPER DOES NOT RESTORE HUMUS.

So much has this been recognised to-day, for it has taken a considerable time for this fact to be made manifest, that in Australia, and in fact, all over the world, artificial fertiliser manufacturers are calling a different tune. They are now stressing in their propaganda the absolute necessity of returning organic matter to the soil in order to maintain fertility. In other words, THE REALLY IMPORTANT FACTOR IN SOIL FERTILITY IS HUMUS.

Mineral deficiencies in plants are usually caused, not by actual lack of minerals in the soil, but by a lack of the necessary bacteria and microorganisms, which break down the minerals in a form suitable for

absorption by the growing plants. The remedy is to increase the organic content of the soil and so encourage the growth of soil organisms. In other words FEED THE SOIL AND THE PLANTS WILL TAKE CARE OF THEMSELVES.

In cases where there is a definite lack of phosphates, the deficiency can best be remedied by the application of finely ground natural Phosphate Rock. This is not water-soluble and will not leach, but it will be broken down by the soil bacteria and made available to the plants as required.

We are reprinting an important article next week from "Organic Gardening" entitled ROCK PHOSPHATE, by J. I. RYDALE, well-known American writer on Non-Chemical Farming. The writer has been for many years in the forefront of

WATER MAY NEED QUALITIES BEYOND MERE PURITY

By NEIL M. CLARK

A Kentucky farmer named Herschel Weil, who lives in Lexington, made an odd discovery five years ago. Cattle that he was fattening for market on one farm made a daily gain of 1.4 pounds per animal. Those that he was fattening on another farm nearby made a daily gain of 2.1 pounds per animal. All the cattle came from the same Texas and New Mexico ranges. They were fed the same, cared for alike. Yet one bunch fattened fast enough to make them profitable, the others didn't. Why?

Weil is a graduate in agriculture from the University of Kentucky. He owns 4,250 acres in five farms and makes his living by buying, selling and feeding cattle and lambs. The answer to that big "Why?" was important to him.

There was only one difference he could see in the way the two bunches of cattle were treated. The good-gaining ones drank from a limestone spring and from a deep well: they preferred the well water. The poor-gaining ones drank from a rainwater pond and from troughs of city water. Perhaps, Weil thought, something in the water was responsible. But what? He gathered samples from all the places and had the samples analysed at the university. He learned that the well water, which the

THE FARM EXCHANGE

(J. E. Harding & A. E. Webb)

If you should think of coming to Central Queensland to live, we shall be glad to advise upon, and assist you to find, Fanning, Grazing, Business or House Property. We are Farm Specialists, both having had extensive practical farm experience. Write to us about your needs. Social Crediters will be very welcome. Central Queensland has much to commend it.

THE FARM EXCHANGE

Real Estate Agents, Auctioneers, Valuers.

DEN HAM ST., ROCKHAMPTON, C.Q.
Phone 3768.

the fight against super phosphate in America, and quotes facts and figures to support his case for the elimination of super.

cattle liked and thrive on, contained a larger percentage of minerals, particularly sulphur. Was that it?

Weil is curious and persistent. He began asking doctors, nutritionists and research experts for answers. He soon discovered that nobody knew.

To Weil, this seemed ominous. If water, he asked himself, is so important to cattle, why not to humans? It is known today that soils may be healthy or unhealthy because of Minerals they contain or lack, and people living on those soils may be similarly healthy or unhealthy. But people take in water as well as food, perhaps more water than food. Is it important, Weil asked, what kind of water it is? Is

(Continued on page 7)

DO AWAY WITH DIGGING

In Your Garden and Orchard

Mr. F. C. King, the well-known writer and lecturer on organic gardening, who has been growing fruit and vegetables in a big way for over thirty years, started something when he wrote *Is Digging Necessary?*

Seasonal digging and trenching have been considered an essential part of good gardening technique for as long as we can remember, and to suggest to men who have been doing this all their working lives that they were wasting their time, was bound to cause considerable controversy.

New ideas, as Social Crediters know too well, are the hardest things in the world to put over, especially when they are diametrically opposed to existing practices which have been well tried and found successful.

However, in spite of this, a considerable number of people who read the book realised the soundness of King's system, which is based on his observation of plant life under natural conditions, where the soil is rich in humus, and where the only cultivation is carried out by worms and micro-

WATER MAY NEED QUALITIES

(Continued from page 6)

water good enough if it's just wet? What, in short, makes good water good, and bad water bad? Cities, Weil considered, spend millions taking out bad things like the typhoid bacillus, and do a wonderful job providing pure water. Could they conceivably take out too much?

Weil laid questions like that before experts and still doesn't know. The experts don't know. But he did discover interesting things. The noted California physician, Dr. F. M. Pottenger, Jr., has found that patients with kidney disorders, when dieted on distilled water, which contains the minimum of minerals, may suffer from generalised demineralisation. Some physicians, like Dr. Eslye Asbury, of Cincinnati, and Dr. Jonathan Forman, of Columbus, Ohio, feel that water purification is something about which we are very ignorant, except as to taking out bad germs, and they feel that tampering with it may unbalance factors of importance for health.

The whole problem of drinking water today is entirely too much of a closed book. It has been assumed that water is water, whether it comes from an unsullied mountain spring or a city tap. We have insisted on purity, and we like our "pure" water cold and relatively tasteless. Beyond that, we haven't inquired much about what we pour down our throats a dozen times a day. Does water have a positive nutritional role? Many nutritionists think so. Does it make any difference what elements are in it, beyond H₂O? An increasing number of physicians think so. But as for actually knowing just how it works, we're about where we were a half century ago with food.

Here is an immense field for explorers. Doctors, biochemists, nutritionists, water-purification experts — all need exact knowledge about the desirable composition and balance of forces, and the essential bodily functions of water.

—*Saturday Evening Post*, Dec. 25, 1948.

organisms in the soil. They are able to ensure drainage and aeration, which are so necessary to plant growth.

These readers followed his lead and today, three years after he wrote his book, there are a great number of "no digging" enthusiasts in England, many of whom have had sufficient experience of the new method to be able to tell of the benefits to be obtained. One of the foremost exponents is Mr. A. E. Guest who has had, like King, considerable horticultural experience.

This is how he sums up the new technique in his book *Gardening Without Digging*:—

"No spade for digging.

"No hoe for cutting weeds.

"No artificial manures of any kind.

"No insecticides or poison sprays to deal with disease.

"No disturbing the soil except for potatoes."

The secret of the system advocated by King and Guest is to have plenty of humus to add to the soil.

As in farming the gardener's slogan should be "Feed the Soil and the plants will take care of themselves." So long as there is plenty of organic matter in the topsoil, worms, fungi and bacteria will flourish and provide the foods necessary for healthy plant growth in the form best suited for them.

Guest says you can grow bigger and healthier crops under this system with 40% less labour. At a time when all labour is at a premium, and many market gardeners in the Melbourne area are unable to put all their land under crop, this is of tremendous importance in enabling an increase in the food supply of the community to be maintained.

All those organic enthusiasts who already make and use compost for their vegetables

and fruit, and who realise the value of humus, should give this new system of "No Digging" a trial.

BRITAIN'S RULE

To the Editor.

—*The Adelaide Advertiser*, April 18.

Sir, —Would Mrs. Polkinghorne (11/4/49) say that the men who fought and died in the war were animated by a "false patriotism"? There is no such thing as "false" patriotism, but there is false sentiment. Patriotism makes men brave and unselfish, but mushy sentimentality about the brotherhood of man weakens character and helps nobody.

Left to themselves, all peoples — black, white or brown — tend to be friendly; hence the fraternising of the conquerors with the conquered after war is over. The friendly interchange of ideas between nations, too, was proceeding apace until halted by World War I.

In this advance Britain, since the early days of Empire, has been in the forefront, the champion of humane causes. It is due to her beneficent rule that her colonies of coloured people have made such progress; the advancement of India, Ceylon, Burma, Egypt, and the Sudan is testimony to her wise government.

Mrs. Heaslip (6/4/49) would like to see the millions of Asia helped to train their own doctors, nurses, etc. This is precisely what Britain has been doing for at least a century. Years before the war in 1914 Indian students were to be seen in large numbers at the Edinburgh University training as doctors and at Glasgow University as engineers, etc., and the churches were sending out year after year hundreds of trained teachers and medical missionaries to staff the Indian schools and colleges. Was this exploitation, or "Christian leadership of nations"?

Had this civilising process been continued by - Britain and extended to other illiterate peoples instead of being scrapped by an incompetent Government on the pretence of bestowing "freedom," the world plotters would not have had their way, nor would Australia now have the Communist terror threatening her from South Asia.

MARY H. GRAY.

Woodville.

IS DIGGING NECESSARY?

This important booklet must be in the hands of every organic farmer and gardener. The author, one of England's most famous gardeners, has proved over a long period that better and healthier vegetables can be grown without digging. He outlines the methods he has used.

Mr. King also demonstrates how weeds can be effectively controlled to assist in building soil fertility.

Is Digging Necessary? Contains an excellent section on compost making, and a complete list of literature dealing with soil fertility as the basis of high-level health in plant, animal and man.

Order now from *New Times Ltd.*, Box 1226 L., G.P.O., Melbourne, C.I.
Price 1/4 (Post Free)

BANK BUREAUCRAT GIVES AN ORDER

By O.B.H.

A recent direction given by Dr. Coombs to the Trading Banks has some sinister and ominous implications.

Our newspapers advised us that this "certified" economist had issued a directive (polite for command) to the Trading Banks "to tighten up overdrafts." In plain words, to reduce the supply of money available to the people. If this is persisted with, another depression or WORSE is in store for us.

Dr. Coombs, who has only recently been appointed financial dictator of Australia, has lost no time in furthering the policy of Communism, alias Socialism, alias centralised planning. Incidentally, he takes the power to direct Private Bank policy, under the 1945 Banking Act.

The stated reason for this directive is to "limit the excessive demand for goods"; this provides the clue, and relates the move to communistic philosophy as contrasted to the philosophy of private enterprise.

Here we note this pink professor insolently ordering restriction of our claims (money) to goods and services. He tells us by inference that he knows what is good for us; he knows what is essential.

This provides an example of opposite mental attitudes or philosophies; private enterprise gets busy and *satisfies the demand*, while Socialists get busy and *abolish the demand*; in this case the end is achieved by restricting the money supply of the community.

That is what happened in 1929—the result was a depression, that is what is happening in America today. The 1929 depression was caused by the Private Bankers who did not understand where their policy of restricting credit would lead.

To-day the Socialistic professors in charge of the Commonwealth Bank are directing private bankers, who now will be able to say: "Well, it's not our fault, we were merely carrying out orders."

Here it is worth noting that, according to Press reports, private bankers approve the direction, that is indeed ominous, especially when one remembers their strong objections to nationalisation or government interference.

Another significant aspect is, there is no adverse Press criticism of the order to restrict the peoples' money supply; also there is no opposition from the Liberal political party.

Are we to understand from this that they approve of this Stalin-like interference with our money supplies?

It is difficult to believe that these men have not yet learned that the depression of 1929 was a result of financial policy.

Can they not see that it is part of the Socialistic plan to crush the medium and small businessmen? It is obvious that these are the people who will suffer.

Looking at it from the worker's viewpoint, it is clear that those who now work for private enterprise will be at the mercy of the remaining monopolies, or, worse still, at the mercy of the Government monopoly, pledged to a policy of "directed labour" (conscription).

All the big shot Labourites and economists are pledged to industrial conscrip-

tion, their pronouncements on this question are on record—there's no doubt about it! And obviously restricting the money demand from private production, under the alibi of restricting "unessential" production is an effective means to this end.

Similar Plot in England

The socialised Bank of England adopted the same policy of withholding finance from what was considered unessential industries, and when such undertakings closed down, the employees came under the control of manpower bureaucrats—and were conscripted, sorry (directed)—not where they desired, but where the bureaucrats considered they should go. This was after they had won the war against Hitlerism.

What a tragedy! and it will occur here if these pink socialistic professors are allowed to meddle with our money supplies.

It should be clear that Dr. Coombs is merely furthering the same policy as those pinks in control of the Bank of England; you would not need to look very long to observe the similarity between this set-up and the Russian dictatorship.

Money Control and Other Controls Closely Related

To understand fully the issues involved in money control, it is well to consider, for example, transport control via petrol rationing, business control via capital issues and permits, propaganda control via the impending Broadcasting Bill, control of doctors via the so-called Free Medicine plot, which is merely the bait (supplied from taxes) so that the doctors can be used to police industrial conscription. Many other controls could be cited—each one designed to take care of a section of the master plot to complete the servile state; these are all closely related to this latest move to control our money votes.

It is the height of folly to permit theoretical economists or others to impose their theories by manipulating our money supplies.

The issue and cancellation of the people's money should be governed by predetermined recognisable factors—not the whims of this or that political party programme or "certified" economists.

Let us not be fooled by planners' alibis for interfering with our money supplies; it is not for them to assume to know what is essential goods or otherwise.

If you or anybody else wishes to exchange your money vote for a particular class of goods, that's your affair, and no bumptious jack-in-the-box bureaucrat should have any power to veto your action or interfere with your right of choice. This should be a good line to take in a letter to your Federal member.

Another ENWITE Speciality

[Regd.]

SOLVIT

For Clean, Easy Stripping

of

PAINT, LACQUER, VARNISH

Etc., from Any Surface

NO DIFFICULT NEUTRALISATION
WILL NOT HARM FABRIC OR WOOD

ASK YOUR HARDWARE STORE
FOR IT

"Science, Liberty, and Peace" By Aldous Huxley.

The central theme of this important book by a great writer and thinker, is to show how every increase in technological development has been exploited to concentrate increased power into the hands of a small minority of power lusters. Huxley clearly postulates the basic problem confronting modern industrial civilisation.

Price 5/8d. post free, from *New Times Ltd.*, Box 1226L., G.P.O., Melbourne.

CODNER BROS.

Builders and Joinery Manufacturers

HOMES AND HOME SITES AVAILABLE

Wheatsheaf Rd, GLENROY