

THE NEW TIMES

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

£2 per annum post free.

Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

Vol. 31, No. 4

April 1965

DISASTROUS FOREIGN POLICIES BASED UPON UNREALISTIC DOMESTIC ECONOMIC POLICIES

ERIC D. BUTLER LECTURES TO LEAGUE OF RIGHTS RESERVE

The following are the notes of an address by Mr. Eric D. Butler to members of the League of Rights Reserve on Friday, March 19:

During the first twelve months in the life of the League Reserve, I suppose that most members have learned that International Communism is waging a form of total war against what remains of the free world, and that economic warfare is a vital aspect of this total war. Lenin correctly predicted in 1920 that the time would come when the "capitalist" nations would attempt to solve their own internal economic problems by competing with one another to gain access to the markets of the Communist world. Lenin also said that the "capitalists" would provide the financial credits to the Communists so that they could obtain a flow of economic assistance. This was happening at present, with Australia and Canada competing against France to export grain to Red China, while Britain, West Germany and the U.S.A. were making credits available to various Communist countries in order that they could import industrial products.

There was surely something wrong when Australian political leaders were saying in one breath that Communist China constituted a deadly threat in Asia while in the next breath they justified strengthening this threat economically by exporting vital food supplies to China, and justifying this by claiming that Australia's economy was "strengthened" by the supplying of such a big export market. It should be carefully noted before we proceed any further, that acceptance of this viewpoint is in fact an acceptance of the Communist doctrine of economic determinism; that the "capitalist" nations are so dominated by their mode of economic production that they are forced by economic developments they cannot control to go on assisting the development of World Communism. As there is no such thing as free will, then it is impossible for any people to halt these developments. But is this true?

A Lesson From World War II

We can answer this question by recalling that when war was declared upon Hitler's Germany in 1939, Australia was faced with a major export problem concerning the disposal of her wool clip. Australia's wool flocks, the biggest in the world, did not hear about the declaration of war --so they went right on growing wool! Now no political leader during the war years urged a "realistic" approach to this problem, such as, "Yes, we realise we are fighting for our lives against a deadly foe. But Germany requires our wool for soldiers' uniforms. A big export trade would strengthen our economy. Let us be realistic about this. And, after all, it is anti-Christian and inhuman to deny the German people access to our abundant wool supplies." Anyone talking like this would have soon found himself in a concentration camp and labelled as a traitor.

International Communism is a much greater threat than Hitler ever presented, with its promoters dedicated to a policy of conquering the world for Communism, irrespective of how long it takes. And yet those who advocate providing the expanding Communist Empire with continuous economic blood transfusions, are hailed by many as statesmen of vision!

Australia during the war demonstrated that there is no such thing as economic determinism; a policy was evolved for the purchase and storing of Australia's surplus wool until the war was over. It is not economically "inevitable" that Australia must send wheat to Red China, helping the Communist masters to keep their vast army well fed, and to obtain foreign credits by using some of the wheat to replace rice which can be exported at nearly twice the price. The Western nations could quite easily evolve a policy of cutting back on wheat production with-

THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS RESERVE

The League of Rights Reserve, brought into existence early last year to recruit and to equip young people for the League, has made splendid progress under the directorship of Mr. and Mrs. Phil Lambert. Supporters who have children who would be interested in attending League Reserve meetings and participating in other activities, or who know young people likely to be interested, are invited to get in touch with Mrs. Lambert care of the League, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne. Correspondence with country and interstate young people will be welcomed.

out financial loss to wheat farmers, or they could build adequate storage space to hold the wheat until such time that it could be used effectively as an instrument in the cold war against International Communism. As a preliminary to understanding what might be done, it is first essential to clear away a number of dangerous, though widely held dogmas concerning economics and money. The continued blind acceptance of these dogmas enable the Communists to exploit the results they produce to their own advantage.

The True Purpose Of The Economic System

At the risk of appearing elementary, let me first pose the question, "What is the true purpose of the production, or economic, system?" Ask half a dozen people this question, and they will probably give half a dozen different answers. But it is more than likely that most will say something about providing full employment, developing the nation, or some such similar answer. But the true, or realistic answer is that, just as all systems should serve individuals, and not individuals serve systems, the economic system should serve in the most efficient manner the real wishes of the individual consumers. To some extent it does, because in a money economy and free, competitive enterprise, money is a flexible voting system which enables the consumer to indicate to the retailers and producers what he requires, and in what priority. So long as they have the money "votes," minorities can obtain what they want as well as majorities. This is probably the nearest to a real democracy, with the power of policy making in the hands of the individuals of the community, human beings have ever experienced. That is why various totalitarians are working to progressively destroy it.

Now it will be noticed that we have said that the true purpose of the economic system is not only to produce what the consumer wants, but also to produce it efficiently. This means that each producer is endeavouring to reduce his production costs by replacing human labour with semiautomatic, and eventually automatic (automation), machinery. Over thousands of years, at an ever-increasing rate, man has been striving to increase production while at the same time reducing labour costs. But at the same time that he has been striving for the exact opposite of "full employment." man has also been supporting the policy of "full employment," a contradiction that is producing disastrous results. There are several reasons for this, the basic one being philosophic, this being responsible for accepting money as actual wealth, instead of a most convenient mechanism for enabling the individual to obtain the results he desires from his economic system. It should also be noted that the money system can be, and is, regarded by many as a system of Government and control. Control of the monetary system today, except in primitive communities, means control of the economic system, control of life.

Brief History Of Money System

A brief history of the evolution of the money system, from its earliest and simple beginnings to the banking

and credit system of today, will assist us to see the basic realities of money. But before doing this, let me ask you a question: Suppose I were to set myself up in competition with the note-manufacturing department of the Government Reserve Bank, making five pound notes which circulated without question in the community, what would give these notes their value? And the answer is, of course, that they were acceptable to all those handling them. Money can and has taken many forms over the centuries, including that of shells, but its major feature has been the faith of those accepting it that they can exchange it for goods or services. Now originally, just as a bus company manufactures its own tickets, the wealth producers also produced their own money, the earliest form probably being leather discs representing cattle. The modern word pecuniary is clearly derived from the Latin for cattle, pecus. It is important to notice that the early creators of money were creating claims issued against their own wealth.

Much later in history gold and silver were regarded not only as wealth, but also as a form of money. The goldsmiths were the people with whom the owners left their metals. Instead of drawing their metals of the goldsmith's safes out every time they wanted to make a transaction, the owners eventually found that it was more convenient to use the receipts given to them by the goldsmiths. Thus came into existence the first originals of our modern bank notes. It was an incident of great historical importance when, for the first time, the creator of money, the goldsmith, was not the creator or owner of the wealth, but only the custodian. Later came a further significant historical development when the goldsmiths

ERNEST CHARLES PARKER

It is with deep regret that we record the death of Mr. E. G. Parker of Auckland, New Zealand, on February 24. Unfortunately our March issue had gone to press at the time we received the news of Mr. Parker's passing. Mr. Parker was a most active agent for "The New Times" over many years. He played a major part in ensuring that the true message of Social Credit was kept alive in New Zealand. A delightful personality, E. C. Parker will be missed by his many friends.

discovered that they could safely issue receipts in excess of the value of the metals they held in their safes, confident that never at any time was it likely that all the owners of the wealth would want to draw it out of the safes at the same time. It may be argued that this was a fraudulent practice, but it also served a very useful purpose. The additional receipts issued by the goldsmiths acted as money, helped to facilitate trade, and generally speaking were an advantage.

Creating Financial Credit

Prior to the First World War there was widespread acceptance of the convention that banks were the cus-

todians of a certain amount of tangible wealth, gold coins, that could be drawn out either by bank note or by cheque. But this was not the case. For at least a hundred years bankers had been creating yet another form of money, bank credit, allegedly against the tangible wealth they held. But in fact they were creating bank credit by the simple procedure of permitting borrowers to write cheques up to a certain amount. The bulk of the nation's money supply today is in the form of bank credit, not in notes or coins. As an administrative convenience, this type of money system is near perfect. There is literature available for those who wish to study the mechanics and details of the present financial system, how the volume of credit creation is controlled, and what jargon such as "liquidity" really means. All we are concerned with here is to grasp the important principle that all forms of money are created, and that monetary policy in a free, democratic society should enable the individual to control the economic system.

It is impossible to understand the feverish drive for exports, becoming progressively more intense as a nation is more highly industrialised, without an examination of the fallacious theory upon which the present finance-economic system operates. It is accepted without question that money issued to consumers as incomes in the form of wages, salaries and dividends is sufficient to meet the total prices of what has been produced over any given period. This belief only bore some relationship to reality in dominant handicraft economies. The opposite of the primitive handicraft economy is one where there is complete automation. If we visualise complete automation, we can readily see that so far from there being distribution of sufficient wages, salaries and dividends to meet the prices of the automatically-produced goods, no purchasing power would be issued at all. Our modern economy is somewhere between the primitive handicraft economy and complete automation, with scientists striving all the time to advance the economy further towards complete automation, and the result is that sufficient purchasing power is not distributed over any period to meet the prices created by industry over the same period.

The brief answer to the claim that, if what has been said is true, the economy would have ground to a halt long ago because of lack of purchasing power, is that this would have happened if there had not been implemented policies to try to deal with this deficiency. Ever-increasing capital expansion, directly or indirectly fostered by Governments, helps to increase the amount of money without immediately increasing the supply of goods for sale. Hire purchase and lay-by schemes are also essential to help consumers take from the shops the enormous quantities of production provided by the economic system. Then there is the drive for a "favourable balance of trade". This is one of those dogmas, which fit so neatly into the Communist strategy of economic warfare. The first thing necessary to be said about this dogma, is that every exporting nation cannot have a favourable balance of trade. If some have this favourable balance, then obviously some

must have an unfavourable balance. One of the results of this striving for a "favourable balance of trade" is growing trade war and increasing friction between the non-Communist nations.

The Reality Of Export Drives

From a realistic viewpoint, any nation with a "favourable balance of trade" over any given period has sent more production out of the country than it has imported. It suffers a physical loss. One of Australia's leading economists, Sir Douglas Copland, later to distinguish himself by returning from China to say that the Chinese Communists were not real Communists at all, was asked at a public meeting in Melbourne before the last war whether he believed that Australian prosperity would increase if the nation's balance of trade could be improved by 25 per cent. The learned gentleman agreed that it would. "Well, suppose we could send 50 percent more production out of the country than we imported, would that improve the position still further?" asked the questioner. Once again the answer was in the affirmative. "Then," persisted the questioner, "if we exported all our production and imported nothing, we should, according to your theory, have reached the millenium." At this stage the learned economist made a rude remark.

Now surely the true purpose of exports is to obtain necessary imports. But this would defeat the attempt to overcome a deficiency of internal purchasing power by exporting portion of the nation's production out of the country, thus reducing the supply of production for sale while increasing the supply of money to pay producers for the exports. It is not generally realised that one of the causes of the comparative prosperity which followed the outbreak of the last war, which ended the situation where there were hundreds of thousands of unemployed with enormous resources not being used, was an enormous expansion of financial credit by the Government to foster what was, in economic terms, an enormous export drive in the form of military effort. There was in fact a most successful, favourable balance of trade! The new money created against the production hurled at the military enemy was distributed in the form of wages and salaries, increased the purchasing power of many people who in turn were able to spend it on what consumer goods were still available, or were able to build up reserves in their bank accounts. The productive capacity of the Americans was so great that in spite of the millions in the armed forces, and the many more millions engaged in producing for the military export drive, the real standard of the American people actually increased considerably. An even greater increase before the war would have been possible—if financial policy had permitted.

The West's Achilles Heel

Since the war "foreign aid" programmes to help the "underdeveloped nations", have assisted the Western nations to develop another form of the "favourable balance of trade". The fact that much of this aid eventually assists the Communists is overlooked. Some years ago the

American Secretary of State, Mr. Foster Dulles, a man usually described as one of the strongest anti-Communist leaders of the Western nations, was questioned by an American Government committee concerning the question of whether it was desirable to be providing enormous dollar aid to Communist Tito. Mr. Dulles answered that if dollar Credits for Tito were cut off, this would have a serious effect upon the American economy. Therefore Mr. Dulles urged against this policy. This one incident highlighted the Achilles Heel of the West in its struggle to deal with the Communist offensive. Even men, who would be annoyed if their anti-Communism were questioned, believe that increased exports to the Communists are both inevitable and desirable.

When Mr. Dulles said that the American economy would be seriously affected if Tito were deprived of American dollar credits, he was not saying that these credits were being sent to Tito. What he meant was that unless certain economic production took place, some of it military equipment, then the American economy would suffer because the new financial credits made available for this production to take place would not be distributed to Americans as purchasing power. Here we had a clear-cut example of exports being used, not to obtain necessary imports, but to distribute increased American purchasing power in order that Americans can buy their own consumer production. No wonder the Communists sneer at the "decadent capitalists." The underlying insanity of the export-or-perish dogma was graphically highlighted several years ago when two American economists seriously suggested that outer-space projects would play a vital part in solving America's internal economic problems; that enormous quantities of American production could be "exported" into space without any fear of any other people—not unless it was found that Mars was populated with human beings as silly as the people on Earth! - - wanting to export their production to the Earth. What we have to consider is the use of the financial system to enable the individual to gain increasing access to the greatest potential result of the modern production system- freedom from the compulsion to spend so much time obtaining the material requirements for civilized living. A start could be made with an earlier retiring age. Even with the production systems of the non-Communist world being used to supply enormous quantities of necessary military equipment to meet any military challenge by the Communists, it could, if used efficiently, still provide greater freedom than is the case at present. And if the necessity to try to solve internal economic problems by exporting were ended, the non-Communists would be in the position to apply tremendous pressure to the Communist Empire. There are many ways in which this could be done. For example, surplus food from the West could be offered, not as part of an export drive, but in exchange for a Communist grant of free elections to people like the Hungarians. Many similar policies could be adopted. But a realistic foreign policy, one designed to defeat Communism, is impossible while unrealistic domestic policies are pursued.

Labour Does Not Produce All Wealth

In a brief consideration of what is necessary to ensure that adequate financial purchasing power reaches the individual in a production system where labor power is a diminishing factor, it is most important to grasp the rather startling fact that the prevailing view that financial incomes can only be distributed only through wages, and not through any form of dividends, is based upon the Communist dogma that labour produces all wealth. It is because of this dogma that the Communist and his allies have a deeply seated hatred of any form of unearned financial income. Profits, dividends, the inheritance of property are all evils, which must be attacked and destroyed at all costs. True freedom is based upon economic freedom. Human labour is not the main factor in creating wealth. One of the most basic truths we must grasp if we are to do something effective preserving and extending freedom against the various forms of threatening totalitarianism, is that the basic requirements for life, real wealth, the living soil, solar energy and water, have not been provided by human labour. The Christian says with proper humility that these are pure gifts from God. What then of the industrial arts which enable man to make use of the capital basis of life? Human labour did not create, for example, the mechanical advantage, a truth of the universe, which, having been discovered by man enabled him to do things he could not do previously. Today we are heirs to a rich heritage built up over a long period of time by our forefathers. If it were not for the fact that we have perverted the true purpose of the economic system, and have failed to understand that the main factor in the ever-increasing productive capacity of the economic system is not human labour, but inheritance in various forms, we would see that the money or distributive mechanism should reflect this fact. Some form of national profit-sharing scheme is essential, with dividends supplementing wages, salaries and dividends.

Decisive Years

We need not concern ourselves with the detailed application of the policy indicated. But it is essential that we grasp the fundamental principles involved. If the non-Communists insist upon blind adherence to present economic and financial policies, then there must be increasing centralisation and Government-control of the economic system domestically a major step towards Communism, irrespective of what it is called — while internationally the intense struggle for export markets plays into the hands of the Marxist-Leninists. The coming years are going to be decisive in the struggle concerning the future of the world, and those of you listening to me tonight can play a decisive role in that struggle if you will make every effort to equip yourselves with as complete an understanding as possible of the matters I have touched upon tonight. You can be the leaders of tomorrow. Not only can you turn back the mounting tide of totalitarianism, but you can lead the way into the greatest Civilization yet created by man, one in which the individual has expanding freedom to develop himself culturally and spiritually.

D. J. KILLEN'S APPEAL FOR REFERENDUM ON CANBERRA FLUORIDATION

"BASIC PROPOSITION OF ALL POLITICAL ENDEAVOUR HAS BEEN THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE INDIVIDUAL TO THE STATE"

Although the Australian press featured the fact that Mr. D. J. Killen, Government backbench Member from Queensland, defeated the Government in the House on his motion that "the citizens of Canberra have a right to say whether or not they want fluoridation in their water supply," no publicity was given to the arguments advanced by Mr. Killen concerning basic principles. The following is the "Hansard" report of Mr. Killen's addressed at Canberra on March 18:

I should like to make one or two preliminary observations concerning the motion and the fact that this issue is again before the House. First, I interpret the Government's attitude on this matter to be simply that all Government supporters may regard themselves as having a free vote. In other words, they will not feel themselves committed to a Government attitude or to a ministerial stand. My argument, as I shall unfold it, is this: Whereas loyalty to a Minister and to a government is an admirable quality that we all respect, there are occasions when there devolves upon the individual a clear responsibility to show a greater loyalty, that is, loyalty to the House of his election. I hope to make it crystal clear, in the time available to me this morning that this argument does not centre merely upon the question of water. It centres in great measure upon the authority of this House and the respect to which it is entitled from every Minister of the Crown.

Time Does Not Make Wrong Right

The second thing I want to say is that I offer no apology for my persistence in this matter. In point of fact, my persistence has been sired by the baffling reluctance of the Government to treat the matter properly. Thirdly I should like to dismiss summarily the view that because of the mechanics of the situation, that is, because the system of fluoridation is in operation it should not be disturbed. On that argument I say, Sir, with the utmost frankness, that time does not make any wrong right. This House has been treated on previous occasions, I venture to say in a rather offhanded way. That is to use a euphemism: I should like to indulge in stronger and franker language to the Minister. Because the House has been treated in this shabby, offhanded way, it is entitled, I think, to redeem something of its authority and something of its honour.

What are the facts of this matter? I raised it some years ago. The present Minister for Shipping and Transport (Mr. Freeth who was then Minister for the Interior, allowed the debate to proceed. It was one of those delightful every other Thursday morning debates in which members, if they are interested, can waffle away and pass one or two discursive observations about the matter before them. But precisely nothing was done about the matter. There is an overwhelming and long-entrenched temptation in this place. I regret to say, simply to regard the rights of private members - - not ordinary members - - of the Parliament as though they were merely entitled to have a talk. There are some provinces, I submit, in which

members are entitled to do more than merely talk, and this is one of them.

On the second occasion, when this matter had deteriorated, I pressed for the appointment of a select committee. My argument on that occasion was simply this: There was such a tremendous conflict of evidence in this field on the clinical and therapeutic side that it would be useful if the country were given the opportunity to have all this evidence before a select committee. I thought that surely by now it would be clear, even to the most mule-like individual in the community that on every occasion when this matter is raised people want to silence it. They want to silence it either by raising a smear or raising an argument, which frankly, could not be described as respectable. We had another one of those every other Thursday debates on my motion for the appointment of a select committee. The debate was adjourned, and then what happened?

House "Hobbled"

It is not for me to give any ex parte account of any discussions that took place elsewhere or, for that matter, to give any account of any correspondence that may have ensued on this matter, but what was the position as far as this House was concerned? This is the crunch. This House had before it an adjourned motion and no member could ask a question on any matter relating to that adjourned debate. No member could proceed so far as that adjourned debate was concerned. In other words, the House was hobbled on the issue, and what happened? The Minister for the Interior (Mr. Anthony) went outside and issued a Press statement. Let me state without ambiguity that if there is any business before this House on which the House is properly entitled to hear a statement, the statement should be made in this House and not outside the House. That is my conviction. I live with it and I am prepared to perish with it, politically or in any other way. The Minister's stand in this business has been this: We want to leave it at a local government level. That is his attitude and he dare not deny it. That has been his attitude through and through. Let me say to my honourable friend with all of the benevolence of mind that I can command, that the cats of Canberra are still giggling at the fact that he described the Australian Capital Territory Advisory Council as a local government authority. Time and again the Minister has received recommendations from the Advisory Council, but they have been tossed to one side with a summary despatch that must certainly

confuse and bewilder the members of the Council, but on this occasion the Minister venerates the recommendation made to him by the Council. The Minister has said on occasions: "Look, we cannot possibly have a referendum on this issue because too much emotionalism will be created." That is the Minister's argument. I put it to him again with good will and benevolence that it is an incredibly stupid argument. Here in Canberra, there was a referendum on liquor hours. I venture to say that the question whether or not we should have the pubs open till 10 o'clock or whether we should close them at 6 o'clock could generate a great deal of emotionalism. I am not one who contends that emotionalism can or cannot be injected into the question of a referendum but on the matter of liquor hours here in Canberra, the then Minister for the Interior approved of a referendum.

People Entitled To Say

Take the Minister's own argument a little further. Take it into the field of conscription during the First World War. I should imagine that if there were any quality of emotionalism it would reside in the argument that you can say to a man: "You are likely to be conscripted, sent overseas and shot." But on this occasion the Minister says: "No." I put it to the House — I hope I put it to a wider audience — and to the people who want to quieten an exchange of views that if that is their argument then I describe it as a refuge of the timid, the weak and the tyrannical.

Let me take it a little further. A former Minister for Health in this Parliament who, I hasten to say, was a doctor, is reported on page 1539 of "Hansard" of 3rd October 1961, as having been asked this question by the honourable member for the Australian Capital Territory (Mr. J. R. Fraser)—

... Will an expression of opinion of the people of Canberra be sought before this step is taken?

The then Minister for Health, Dr. Donald Cameron, is reported as having replied—

I cannot be precise as to the investigations that have been made without refreshing my memory by reference to my department; but it is unlikely—

"Unlikely" is the operative word—

that any programme of fluoridation would be put into effect in the A.C.T. without obtaining an expression of opinion from the inhabitants of the Territory beforehand.

What does the Minister say about that? I ask him whether he would be prepared later, when he gets an opportunity to reply, to go on record in this Parliament as describing Dr. Cameron as emotional. I invite the honourable gentleman to say that. That is the crunch on that issue. I hope the honourable gentleman will be prepared to address his mind to this matter. I venture to say that the Minister is on a hook on this matter, and that the Government is on a hook on this matter. I have long contended — and I contend again — that the people of Canberra are entitled to some say in this matter and that the country is entitled to a little more enlightenment in the matter than has hitherto been accorded to it.

Snubbing Parliament

Let me turn to the powerful Press statement issued by the honourable gentleman, snubbing this Parliament - a statement issued outside in the paddock to the crows, and other birds and to the pussy cats which are still giggling. First, the honourable gentleman said—

It had been accepted throughout Australia that the responsibility for deciding this issue or putting it to a referendum in any community rested with the local authority concerned.

That is clear. There is no ambiguity about that. Ergo, the only local governing authority that I know of in existence in Canberra is the Canberra Advisory Council. The statement goes on—

Mr. Anthony said that the A.C.T. Advisory Council - - a largely elected body—

Not completely elected, mark you, but largely elected— representing the people of Canberra — had twice recommended in favour of fluoridation. Their second recommendation followed an independent inquiry—

You can almost hear the creaking humbug in this— into the matter by a council sub-committee, which was unanimously in favour of fluoridation.

Let us now look at this powerful sub-committee's report. For a start, it contains only 124 words. There is a touch of Moses on Mt. Sinai about this. If it were such an impressive document, I venture to say that it would have been treated with the utmost decor and with all the sensitivity of approach in the world. How was it treated? Listen to the raconteur of this sub-committee. He said—

I propose at the next meeting of Council to move a motion consequent upon this finding of the committee. I must apologise for the fact that we have not copies of this report to circulate to all members tonight. They were typed, but by inadvertence they were left in the office.

The Minister has a sense of humour. What would Gilbert and Sullivan do with this incredibly Gilbertian situation and with this powerful report of 124 words, to which the Minister clings like a limpet? What would they do? I say that the report would be ridiculed. It deserves to be ridiculed and it deserves to be rejected completely.

Again let me refer to this powerful Press statement by the Minister, hobbling this Parliament. Do not let any person be under any misapprehension as to my views on this matter. Parliament is entitled to respect not only from the members who sit in it but most certainly from those who act in an executive capacity, and I take a very poor view of the off-handed way in which we were treated on this occasion. The Minister went on to say—

I have already expressed, in the House, my reasons for opposing a referendum and my attitude in that matter was recently endorsed by the Advisory Council.

I ask the Minister why it is that on this occasion, without even one off-handed expression of regret or reservation, he is prepared to grasp hold of the Advisory Committee's report and to accept in toto the recommendation from the Committee.

A Philosophic Issue

I have not dealt with, nor do I propose to deal with the clinical or therapeutic argument that ranges about this matter. All along, my view has been simply that this is basically a philosophical argument. There may be some

Continued on page 8

COMMON MARKET ISSUE "HAS LEFT A DEEP BRUISE ON ANGLO-AUSTRALIAN RELATIONSHIPS"

Straight Talking By Australia's London High Commissioner

Recently the Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr. Arthur Calwell, complained in Parliament about a recent address given in London by Australia's High Commissioner, Mr. Alex Downer. Some references to the address were made in sections of the Australian press, several giving worthwhile extracts. But we learn from Mr. John Paul's "Political Intelligence Weekly" of March 19, that while a statement in Sydney by the head of the European Economic Commission's foreign relations division (he said that Britain would have to join Europe) was given extensive TV and press coverage in Britain, Mr. Downer's address to the Royal Commonwealth Society was mentioned only by "The Daily Express."

We are indebted to Mr. Paul's "Political Intelligence Weekly" for the text of Mr. Downer's splendid address:

"In your dealings with me you will, I hope, discover someone who not only knows this country fairly well (I spent altogether over 7 years here before the war) but who has a deep affection for England, and whilst naturally trying to advance the interests of Australia I am also directing my energies to drawing our two countries closer together, and attempting, in my own small way, to serve the Commonwealth at large.

"We in Australia attach the utmost importance to our Commonwealth association. Most of us, you know, prefer to call it the British Commonwealth, because though primarily Australians we are also British. The things that bind us are apparent in many ways, great and small. Commercially, you are still our largest export market, and in return we are your biggest customer. You still have the best of the bargain, because last year you enjoyed a favourable trade balance with us of nearly £60 million. You have invested £800 million in Australia since the war, for which we are thankful because without overseas investment our development cannot progress quickly. Equally important, we have been able to attract 1 million British settlers since 1946. In my own years as Migration Minister I placed additional emphasis on British migration, and made two visits over here in connection with it. I am glad to tell you that this year it seems that we shall achieve an all time record of 82,000 from the United Kingdom. This will be the largest movement of population from these islands to my country in any year since Admiral Phillip established the first settlement in Sydney in 1788.

Flying The Union Jack

"Let me remind you of some of the smaller, but nonetheless significant things, which place Australia in a special relationship to Britain. You frequently see the Union Jack flying as well as our own Blue Ensign (which in any case embodies the Union Jack in one corner). At the Adelaide Festival of Arts last year, the principal decoration throughout King William Street, the main thoroughfare of the city, was a central series of mammoth flagpoles flying Union Jacks. And, as some of you probably realise. Britain is still 'home' to many Australians particularly the middle and older generations, though not so much to the younger nor, of course, to those from Europe. One thing you may not realise is our legal status: in the language of the Nationality Act, which it fell to my lot to administer for nearly 6 years, we are

'Australian citizens and British subjects.' This duality is a factor, which I emphasised constantly at naturalisation ceremonies of European migrants, likening their status to the Civis Romanus Sum of the Roman Empire.

"I have said these things, elementary to any Australian, in order to come to one of my principal points. Despite the revolutionary changes in the world in the last 20 years, there is still a tremendous reservoir of goodwill and affection for Britain in my country. You know of our loyalty to the Queen, our enthusiasm for the Royal Family. You may not be so keenly aware of the essentially British flavour of our communities. But there are now danger signs. Events of the past few years have created an uneasy feeling, only recently assuaged, amongst all sections of opinion that Britain is no longer as interested in the Commonwealth as formerly. May I give you an example? Whatever the merits of the economic argument for entry into the Common Market, this policy has left a deep bruise on Anglo-Australian relations. There was genuine sympathy for the case as presented, but many of us were disconcerted at the professed political objective of Britain joining a European confederation. It seemed to us that if Britain were to become a prominent partner in a European Economic Union designed to evolve into a political confederation, it would be difficult to reconcile this with the role of Britain as the centre of a group of Common-

SOCIAL CREDIT TRAINING COURSE

The Director of the Social Credit Course has asked us to draw attention again to the coming annual Winter School starting in Melbourne early in May and proceeding weekly for nine weeks. A small charge is made for those attending this Course, with a reduction for University and other students. Those intending to attend should enrol immediately.

The Director of the Course also stresses that country, interstate, and overseas students may do the Course by correspondence. A panel of tutors is available to ensure that each student receives personal attention. This course is essential for those wishing to become competent Social Engineers. All enquiries to the Director of Social Credit Studies, Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne, Australia.

wealth nations. I know that the problem is a vast one, and I appreciate that the arguments on either side are powerful. What I am now principally concerned with, as a British Commonwealth man myself, is the effect already produced. All of us are involved by the manner in which this question ultimately will be resolved: whether England by a feat of political dexterity, as clever as landing on the moon, can enter the Common Market on terms such as not to impair her relations with the rest of the Commonwealth. This is one of the great conundrums of our times. Much as I like Europe, and revere the ineffable contribution of Europe to the world, I believe it would be one of the greatest tragedies in history if Britain were to become a European power at the sacrifice of four centuries of achievement of our ancestors in creating that compendium of British, Asian, and African nations spread all over the globe which today we call the Commonwealth.

"Who Are Your Best Friends...?"

"The next thing, no doubt equally controversial, I want to say is this. From an Australian point of view there seems to have been in recent years in London a tendency to regard the Commonwealth more and more in terms of its African and Asian members. I can well understand why. British statesmen have been immersed in the problems of the emergent nations of those continents. Please do not misconstrue what I am trying to suggest. All of us must try to make the new Commonwealth succeed. The primary requisite at the moment is tolerance. We cannot expect nations of a different race, history, religion, culture, to adopt British Parliamentary institutions and customs as if Divinely ordained. It is certainly disturbing to find in one country the Opposition leaders in gaol; it is discouraging in one or two other countries to notice political practices repellent to our own beliefs. What we are doing, particularly what you in Britain are doing, is making a calculated experiment; you and I, of the old Commonwealth, must do our best to make it succeed. If, after a period of trial, say 10 or 15 years, the answer is disillusionment, then we must honestly re-value the Commonwealth idea, as we now conceive it, in the light of experience. Meanwhile, let us by example, leadership, patience, practical assistance, and understanding, try to bind these new countries indissolubly to our side.

"Yet, having said this, may I plead for the spotlight from London in future to play more on Canberra, Wellington and Ottawa? The greatest mistake of all would be to take the old Commonwealth, the blood Commonwealth, for granted. After all, who are your best friends in the world? Australia and New Zealand, I should imagine, with Canada not far behind. I know we have many faults: rather trying at times, perhaps a little brash in our exposition as you may be finding me this afternoon; but nonetheless we are your own people, your own kinsmen, who have a deep feeling for you, who ever have been first at your side in your hour of direst need, and who in the past have been accustomed to look to you for leadership.

Encouraging Developments

"Having made this criticism, it is only fair for me to add, as I hinted a few moments ago, that in the last few months there are signs of a re-orientation of attitude. The Government's re-appraisal of Britain's Defence policy, its growing concentration of power east of Suez, its vigorous support of Malaysia (to which Australian and New Zealand also are contributing), are warmly applauded by all Australians. This is a new manifestation of British interest, a re-affirmation of British leadership, which is most encouraging. The old lion is growling again, and when it opens its mouth there are no false teeth! Welcome, also, is the projected Commonwealth Secretariat, decided in principle at the last Prime Ministers' Meeting, placed in concrete form two months ago, and now awaiting the imprimatur of the next Prime Ministers' Conference. I believe this could prove a solidifying and unifying force. It opens up new prospects in Commonwealth relations. But we shall be wise not to be too ambitious, and to make haste slowly. Much will depend upon the man chosen for the first Secretary-General. If it fulfils the hopes of people such as myself who have been urging its creation ever since we were young, then its ambit and influence will grow inevitably with experience. But we shall fall into grave error if we try to make it another United Nations; it would be equally damaging to Commonwealth relations were the Secretariat to become a Meddlesome Mattie in each other's domestic affairs."

Mr. Killen's Appeal

Cont from PAGE 6

who disagree with me. It is their right and prerogative to disagree with me, but it is also my right to maintain that it is a philosophical argument. I believe that if the responsibility for dental care is left with the individuals, that is where it should properly be left. If the philosophical concept is going to be that we should have a totalitarian society in which matters such as the eating of sugar, the drinking of alcohol, the driving of cars, indeed the doing of all sorts of things that wreak havoc to the human body and to human society should be resolved and settled according to the establishment of the day then, I say to those who support that concept that, on every possible occasion, I will savage it and give them no rest whatsoever. Right through from Plato to Aquinas and Burke and Mills the basic proposition of all political endeavour has been the relationship of the individual to the State, and that concept is as real today as it was 1,000 or even 2,000 years ago. I do beg of the Minister to recognise that in this matter the people of the Australian Capital Territory have a complete right, indeed a clear right, to be treated as respectable, intelligent individuals and that they should be given an opportunity to express their views on this matter in a free and democratic way.