

# THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

\$5.00 per annum post-free. Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

Vol. 38, No. 9

SEPTEMBER 1972

## BUDGET A MAJOR STEP TOWARDS DISASTER

**It is comparatively irrelevant whether or not the 1972 Federal Budget presented by Mr. B. M. Snedden saves the political skin of the McMahon Government. It is but another major step down the road to increasing economic, political and social disasters. It is as certain as the sunrise that inflation will be given a new impetus, leading to yet another crisis, this in turn requiring more "emergency" controls. No candidate at the coming Federal Elections must be allowed to avoid some straight answers and firm pledges on the all-important inflation issue.**

The Federal Government has for years engaged in the most hypocritical double-talk on the inflation issue, constantly "warning" that excessive wage increases are the basic cause of inflation while at the same time quietly taking an increasing proportion of the increased wages in taxation. The Federal Government has been using its taxation monopoly to strangle the States and Municipal Government by forcing them to go deeper into debt while it uses its growing volume of taxation revenue to finance its expanding activities.

When the Arbitration Court awarded its six percent increase in national wages the Federal Government took approximately one-third of the increased wages. The Arbitration Court this year awarded a \$2 a week increase in the national wage case. But on the average about 70 cents out of the \$2 will go to the Federal Government. With the current rate of inflation, still continuing in spite of Mr. Snedden's "cure", this means that increased wages after taxation are barely keeping up with price increases. This is the reality against which Mr. Snedden's income tax reductions must be judged. A careful reading of Mr. Snedden's Budget speech reveals that Mr. Snedden anticipates an increasing flow of tax revenue as a result of further wage increases. All that the Budget means is a temporary slight easing of the tax screw until, it is hoped, the elections are safely over.

### A CONSCIOUS POLICY

Events are now dramatically confirming what we have been warning about for years. The author of *Social Credit*, C. H. Douglas, analysed the inevitable consequences of present finance-economics at the conclusion of the First World War. He predicted that if these policies were persisted with, Civilisation was threatened with one convulsion after another, leading either to a complete collapse into another Dark Age, or to a totalitarian hell on a global scale. Douglas was eventually driven to the conclusion that the direction in which mankind was being driven was not because of mere stupidity, although he agreed that there was plenty of that, but because those who had the power over financial policy knew what they

were about. The brilliant American writer Gary Allen has more recently come to the same conclusion in his best seller *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*. Allen writes: "We

### LAST CALL FOR ANNUAL DINNER

This is the last call for the Annual Dinner, to be held at The Victoria, Little Collins Street, Melbourne, on Friday, September 22. A small number of seats have been reserved for regular attendees who have as yet not booked. A donation of \$6 must accompany each booking. Guests of honour will be Mr. and Mrs. Ivor Benson of South Africa. Mr. Benson will be one of the Dinner speakers. One of the highlights of the Annual Dinner is Mr. Eric Butler's address. He will have something really special to say this year. Guests should arrive at 6.15 p.m., and be prepared to move to the dinner tables at 7 p.m.

Will all those sending Dinner messages please ensure that they arrive at least 24 hours before the Dinner.

### DO NOT FORGET NATIONAL LEAGUE SEMINAR

"Southern Africa and Australia's Future" is the theme for this year's National League of Rights Seminar, to be held at the I. Younger Ross Hall, 110 Keppel Street, Carlton, starting at 2 p.m. Three brilliant speakers: Mr. Carlos de Lemos, to speak on the Portuguese Territories; Mr. Walter Henderson of Gray's Inn, on Rhodesia; Mr. Ivor Benson on South Africa. Entrance fee \$1.00. Will those attending please note that they may bring a basket tea and eat at the hall, where facilities are available for heating and making tea.

believe that many of the major world events that are shaping our destinies occur because somebody or somebodies have planned them that way. If we were merely dealing with the law of averages, half of the events that are shaping our nation's well being should be good for America. If we were dealing with mere incompetence, our leaders should occasionally make a mistake in our favour."

The present Australian Coalition Government was elected in 1949 "to put the shillings back into the pound". That Government has failed disastrously. The rate of inflation over the last five years has progressively

Continued on Page 8

## CENTRALISATION OF POWER THE "CENTRAL QUESTION"

The following report, which was featured on the front page of the "Walcha News" ("serving the rich New England Tableland of N.S.W.") of August 24, is an excellent condensation of the address given by Mr. Eric Butler on his recent five-week tour of Queensland and N.S.W.:

All our problems whether in the political, economic or social world were increasing because of the central question as old as man himself; that of centralised power.

This was stated by Mr. Eric Butler, the National Director of the Australian League of Rights, at a well-attended public meeting held at the Bowling Club on Thursday night.

He said that from the beginning of history some men sought complete power over other men, and that the power question was the central issue of history.

"We have to make up our minds whether all power should be centralised into fewer hands or so decentralised that individuals, as individuals, can have effective power over these groups," said Mr. Butler.

"Christianity is basically concerned with the subject of how to restrict centralised power.

"In man's history the most dominant feature has been the will to power by the use of straight military force by such men as Napoleon and Hitler.

"The greed for the power struggle is on today in all facets of life.

"Mass media are being controlled and centralised all over the world. Our views all depend on these media so that we are being brainwashed by a gathering momentum of monopolies.

"Centralising power is guided by the power of finance. Money power is the exercising influence and key to the understanding of our problems.

"The most dramatic event in recent times has been the visit to Peking and Moscow by the American President, Mr. Nixon. The major underlying reason to visit these countries was related to providing both these Communist countries with large-scale credits with which they could gain access to vast quantities of American production.

"There are two great super powers at the moment and the thesis is to build up a third super power to form a pyramid.

"Russia is taking the greatest quantity of grain ever from America, financed by credit from the American administration.

"We extend credit to the Communist countries but can't extend credit to ourselves to solve our own problems. Why is it dangerous to suggest that we solve our own problems, but not dangerous to solve those of the Communist world? We should be vitally concerned about providing the increasing flow of economic blood transfusions to those pledged to destroy what is left of the free world.

"The League of Rights hits at those controversial points that the politicians dare not. The League of Rights deals with such issues of the day that are not for weak

boys or weak spirited men, and seeks to find enough men to outnumber the boys.

"The greatest piece of mythology is that Communism is called a working class movement. Marx, who was the founder, was not a workingman.

"Sir Winston Churchill gave the answer when he said that power in a few hands also gave the power over finance. The Common Market is just part of an idea to drive mankind into one world—one set of hands to create a world state. The Common Market is the last act in a drama to knock Britain out of the Commonwealth.

"With the disintegration of the Commonwealth, Australia and New Zealand will be forced to go into a South-East Asia Common Market. Australia and New Zealand are the most isolated groups of Europeans in the whole world.

"Australia will be wide open to Japanese investors, but why can't we develop our own resources without the capital inflow from overseas, and do our own book-keeping?

"The worker is blamed for all the industrial trouble, but every wage rise is eroded by inflation. When the 6% rise in wages was given this meant an increase of \$900,000,000, but the wage earner received \$600,000,000 and the taxing monopoly got the other \$300,000,000.

"America is in the same position as us because they obtain the same sort of advice from the same experts who belong to the same power groups.

"Rhodesia is an example that people can do something with their own resources. They depended on tobacco as we depend on wool and they are not starving. We have many more resources than Rhodesia. In fact we have the greatest untapped resources in the whole world."

Speaking on the Federal Budget, Mr. Butler said let it go on record as him saying that it is only a preliminary to a restrictive policy against which the past few years are not bad in comparison.

"The Budget will stimulate inflation and produce a new crisis in this country. We are on the eve of even greater convulsions in every part of the non-Communist world than in the past."

Mr. Butler urged all to read the facts for themselves in two books called *None Dare Call it Conspiracy*, and *The Naked Capitalist*.

Mr. Butler said Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, said this about the former book: "I wish that every citizen of every country in the free world and every slave behind the iron curtain might read this book."

The meeting was chaired by Mr. R. M. Mackinnon and a vote of thanks was ably given by Mrs. M. Reynolds.

## TO THE POINT

**A distinguished American patriot, General Lane (retired), has observed that the first principle of modern politics is dishonesty and hypocrisy. The Australian Coalition Government has clearly mastered this principle. In the second of a series of policy brochures the Liberal Party set out to make immigration a major election issue. The brochure states "The policy developed by the Government provides for the entry of non-Europeans in reasonable numbers compatible with our national interest."**

The Government is well aware that its policy of allowing increasing numbers of non-Europeans to enter Australia is resulting in increasing public concern. Government spokesmen are therefore attempting to harness this concern against the Labor Party, some of whose spokesmen have indicated that they favour the entry of even larger numbers of non-Europeans. It is true that Mr. Whitlam is now trying to back away from any suggestion that a Labor Government would permit a greater flow of non-European migrants. But the danger from a Labor Government must not be allowed to obscure the fact that it is the present Government, which in recent years has progressively increased the number of non-Europeans. It is the same Government, which has suddenly discovered that increasing numbers of Australians are worried about the sale of Australia's natural resources to obtain foreign capital, much of it coming from Japan. There has been increasing Japanese pressure to weaken Australia's immigration policy to enable Japanese to live in Australia.

Government candidates must be told during the coming Federal Elections that they should not attempt to engage in political dishonesty and double-talk concerning immigration. They should be asked to sign a contract stating that the present number of non-European migrants will be drastically reduced.

\* \* \* \*

During the recent oil dispute Prime Minister McMahon said he was in favour of wider constitutional powers so that the Commonwealth can legislate to handle national industrial disputes. Socialist Dr. Evatt unsuccessfully attempted in 1944 and 1946 to get Australian electors to grant the wider powers sought by Mr. McMahon. But Mr. McMahon is so "very, very anti-Communist"! He and his colleagues will argue, of course, that in the modern highly centralised economy it is "inevitable" that the central governments should have more power. And so eventually as the economies of the nations of the world become more interlocked, with industrial trouble in one nation affecting other nations, it will become "inevitable" that World Government have the power to legislate. Should Prime Minister McMahon ever have a referendum on greater industrial powers for Canberra, it will be quite a spectacle to see him campaigning with the support of the Communists. And the National Socialists!

\* \* \* \*

We are often asked if Mr. B. A. Santamaria of the National Civic Council is as innocent of the realities of

the source of basic power in international politics as often appears. We cannot recall Mr. Santamaria dealing publicly with the decisive role of International Finance, but we are interested in comments made at an N.C.C. Information Evening, Festival Hall, Melbourne, in March of this year. The May issue of *Facts* quotes Mr. Santamaria as referring to "the real government of the United States for the last century—the East Coast 'Establishment', which in terms of history was an extension of the British 'Establishment'. It was founded on the great international banking houses. It was dominated by a small number of immensely wealthy families. Its links were with Britain and Europe. Its ideology was that of the Liberal Left. It controlled the New York and Washington Press. It had the power of appointment to the Ivy League universities, and the key positions in every American administration." Mr. Santamaria then goes on to say that "the real government" of the U.S.A. is passing, that its "authority no longer exists". This is where we part company with Mr. Santamaria. As shown by Gary Allen in *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* and Cleon Skousen in *The Naked Capitalist*, the overall strategy of the international power groups is being advanced at an accelerating rate. There is plenty of confusion and disintegration, but as Lord Acton observed about the French Revolution, behind the smoke and smother was the design.

\* \* \* \*

In spite of the Nixon Administration's "corrective measures", the United States continues to experience what the economists term an "unfavourable balance of trade". The total deficit for the first six months of this year stood at \$3,342,800,000. Washington officials predict that the deficit will top the \$4000 million mark for the whole year. This would more than double last year's deficit. The currency realignment of last December has not produced the predicted results. The next international monetary crisis cannot be far away. While present finance-economic policies are pursued, continuing conflict between nations is inevitable as they seek to solve internal problems by exporting them abroad. One of the dominating issues of the recent Honolulu talks between President Nixon and Prime Minister Tanaka of Japan was the subject of trade. The Americans desperately want the Japanese to increase their American imports.

\* \* \* \*

There has been keen speculation in political circles concerning the real purpose of Mr. Ian Sinclair's recent attack on The League of Rights, attempting to link it

Continued on page 8

## LEAGUE OF RIGHTS DIRECTOR ON T.V.

As expected, there has been considerable discussion concerning the appearance by the League of Rights' National Director, Mr. Eric Butler, on the ABC national TV programme "Monday Conference", and later on the Mike Willesee Current Affair programme. The only real test of public reaction is results. The League has never had such an avalanche of new support. In a recent meeting with a group of Melbourne Apexians, Mr. Horton Davies, Chairman of The Christian Institute of Individual Freedom, found that the overwhelming majority of those present were deeply suspicious of the obvious campaign to smear the League of Rights, through the press and on T.V.

Those critics who claim that Mr. Butler did not answer many of the questions put to him during the "Monday Conference", overlook the fact that he was not really permitted to do so. The following comment by F. C. Kennedy in "TV Times" of July 22, provides a realistic comment by a critic who makes it clear that he has no time for Mr. Eric Butler or The Australian League of Rights:

These days, when a person wishes to declare his personal piety, it is not necessary to mortify the flesh, keep the 10 Commandments or make joyful noises before the Lord on the Sabbath.

All he need do is make frequent public avowals of liberalism.

If you accept (as I do) the proposition that liberalism is the new morality, you must wonder (as I do) why our current affairs programmes have fallen exclusively into the hands of pious men and women, when everybody knows that villains and non-conformists are far more interesting than Holy Joes.

Pious liberals all, our current affairs practitioners would admit to holding even a moderately square opinion on racism, censorship, war, abortion or homosexuality about as readily as a Rechabite would admit to having a flask of rum on the hip.

Like the Puritans of yesteryear who hurled such words as "Drunkard" and "Fornicator" at the heads of the ungodly, new wave liberals use words like "Racist" and "Authoritarian" as smugly as street-corner revivalists quoting Holy Writ.

Evidence that our current affairs practitioners have accepted the doctrine of liberalism hammered out by undergraduates, flower people and protesters over a flagon of rough red can be found in This Day Tonight, Four Corners and A Current Affair. But Robert Moore's Monday Conference is perhaps the most consistent showcase for the new morality.

This was demonstrated with more than ordinary clarity in a recent edition in which Mr. Eric Butler, national director of The Australian League of Rights, was inter-

viewed by Sydney radio-journalist Brian White and Max Teichmann, senior lecturer in politics at Monash University.

While Mr. Butler is not a man who could lead me, personally, into a bar with a 20-dollar bill and an engraved invitation to share a bottle of Veuve Clicquot, and his organisation appeals to me less than the Morticians' Union, he did have some opinions. And seeing that they were the reason for his appearance on Monday Conference, they deserved a different handling.

From the outset Mr. Butler, whose views on ethnic groups seem to differ from those of avowed liberals, faced a barrage of loaded questions.

Mr. Butler, it seems, is the author of a book called *The International Jew*. I have not read the book and I would have enjoyed hearing it dissected by Brian White, Max Teichmann, Robert Moore and the author.

This was not to be. What I heard was a couple of quotes from the book followed by the question: "Wasn't that anti-Semitic?"

The tone of the question and the way in which all three panelists leaned forward with a "Gotcha mate!" expression made it clear that if the question had been answered with a simple "yes" virtue would have triumphed, Mr. Butler would have been considered to have been demolished and the debate over.

Nasty as anti-Semitism may be, it is not an unarguable question. If it is, several million Egyptians, Arabs and Lebanese should be cast into outer darkness.

Mr. Butler's views on South African apartheid were treated similarly and it seemed to me that the panelist probed them merely with a view to seeing whether they could label him "Racist".

There are, of course, subjects, which our current affairs men and women can handle without bias. But when popular issues (those for which protesters carry banners) arise, they seem to be in such haste to declare their virtuous liberalism that such programmes take on the nature of Holy Inquisitions.

### "A TEXT-BOOK FOR VICTORY"

"Social Dynamics", by Eric D. Butler, has recently been described as "a text-book for victory, a work which is clearly based upon a life-time of experience, which gives the student of these notes a coherent picture covering philosophy, economics, finance, constitutionalism and realistic political action". For those who wish to equip themselves effectively as Social Engineers, this work is indeed most essential. Order from The Australian League of Rights, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001. Price \$1.00.

Available from the "Institute of Economic Democracy"  
P.O., Kingstown, N.S.W., 2350.

## MATERIALISM'S GIFT IS DEATH

"I have never been able to believe in a life after death . . ." wrote a "Sydney Morning Herald" journalist, reviewing Dr. Arnold Toynbee's "Surviving the Future." That, most likely, is because he began his intellectual life not believing in it. He goes on to say, ". . . though one may not wish for another life I, at least, am filled with curiosity about the future of this one."

The writer is too intelligent a man to think that his not wishing for another life makes it certain that he will not have one, but his personal negating certainty might be an influence in determining whether or not he would question his own disbelief or bother to examine any evidence that might suggest that it could be wrong.

A description of his attitude towards the possible existence of vital realities beyond the physical one is a description of the attitude of very many educated people today. Their conclusion is of practical importance because it is drawn from materialistic assumptions upon which social and political theories and practices of our time have been built. Instead of providing the confidently expected solutions of human problems, Materialism has played havoc with individual and organisational behaviour. People, dwelling amid the marvels of material and physical inventions, find, to their dismay, that high material standards of living do not solve psychological problems, so do not bring the mental and emotional satisfactions that Materialists once thought they would. Thinkers have lost much of their faith in Materialism and are left with a vacuum in their conception of reality. They are offered nothing that they can accept with which to fill it. Consequently those who normally follow their lead are lost, bewildered, rushing this way and that in the hope of coming upon something with which to assuage their emptiness, grasping at Communism, Existentialism, Permissiveness and ephemeral cults that wither away because they are founded upon desperate hope rather than logical deductions drawn from some understanding of universal fundamentals.

### BELIEF IN IMMORTALITY IMPORTANT

A reasonably well-founded belief in immortality is of much more social and political importance than materialists will allow. If some individual, in his mind, segregates life within an ever perishing physical form and can imagine only nothingness when the physical presence passes away, it is his own problem or comfort, whichever way he looks at it; but when almost all the mentally influential think that way, the creed becomes a social problem. In our day it has led to an urgent desire for Heaven on Earth as expressed in the communist recipe for political perfection and in a frantic clutching at present physical and emotional satisfactions which involve casting aside the morality that safeguards social integrity and ensures that the social organisation performs its useful functions.

When trying to persuade people to consider forms of social and political and economic organisations more

broadly based than those based upon inadequate materialist theories, it is absolutely necessary for some thinkers to describe that broader base. To depend entirely upon the presentation of material facts and data is to accept unmodified a materialist dogma. Besides affirming that life has meaning because it is eternal, and that therefore practical action must be adjusted, not only to material phenomena, but also to ultra-material realities, there must be given some reason to believe that a Universal Reality includes and also transcends the physical reality. I suggest one idea that, perhaps, some of the younger people may care to analyse and pursue in order to discover if there be evidence to support it. This suggestion is that the earthly Present, unless related to the Eternal Present, is no more than a series of passing events and dissolving situations. The Existentialists recognised that and, living entirely in the earthly Present, logically found life absurd.

Leaving that now, I go on to say some forthright things. One is that writers and preachers, offering their spiritual and religious doctrines, rarely trouble themselves to discover why their converts among the skeptics are so few. It is not that those whom they wish to convert **will** not accept what they offer, but that they **cannot** accept it. It is not alone that the teachings offered, too, often lack a rational element, but that there is as well a psychological blockage. Perhaps I may be forgiven for introducing here my own experience in an effort to explain that last. What was my difficulty may be a fairly common one.

### A SEARCH FOR TRUTH

I was, of course, brought up to accept Christianity; but when in my teens I began to think about what I was taught, the inconsistencies, the improbabilities, the human littleness and pettiness of the God described to me by my good but rather stupid Sunday School teachers troubled me greatly. Preachers offered splendid ideas and ideals but, in spite of my questioning, I never came across one who could give me an interpretation of Christianity that satisfied reason and at the same time magnified the Christian creed until it was at least as great as the beautifully ordered physical universe. I don't suppose many Christians understand that mental predicament; but it behoves the few who wish to convert skeptics to try to do so. Anyway, it was with relief that I came upon rational materialism and found in it the logic and demonstrable realism that none of the Christian Churches thought it necessary to afford.

Although, from the first, it seemed to me that there

were too many gaps in the materialistic explanations, it was rational materialism that played the largest part in shaping my thought and, as I came to know, my mind as well. I like to think about what I believe, so during the years I accumulated a number of doubts about the total validity of materialism, and from time to time I came upon astounding pieces of evidence that there is a non-material reality existing with the material reality until, after many years, I had enough to convince me of the existence of divine forces and eternal spiritual principles. Yet—and here was the devastating difficulty — **though I knew this was true, I could not make it seem real.** That is often the skeptics' obstacle to mental expansion and one seldom recognised by either themselves or by those with a positive religious or metaphysical system to offer. I knew that I must either make a tremendous mental effort to compel the truth I had discovered to be real to me or else to leave a split between my knowledge of truth and my sense of reality; and I made what seemed to me the more sensible choice.

To persuade the skeptic to be sceptical about his own certainties, he must be presented with what is rationally acceptable and, at the same time, be persuaded to undertake the very difficult task of breaking free from the bonds that hold his convictions within the limits of materialist conclusions. Anyone trying to contribute some small thing towards that end will be more than ordinarily lucky if he receives any assistance whatever from the Churches or Universities or publicists or publishers or the truth-seeking skeptics, themselves. Yet the state of our present society shows us plainly enough that something is needed to fill the void left by disillusionment with Materialism; and the skeptics who have nothing to give but doubt stand guarding the void.

### **A CHALLENGE TO THOUGHTFUL CHRISTIANS**

What is being offered a spiritually hungry society? I hear at once and have heard from various sources the answer, "Christianity". Some more forthright observations are called for here. How many of those who believe in God and a life after death do so simply because it is what they have always believed? Does their wish to believe hinder them from trying to find out why others do not, or from bothering to discover what evidence there is to support their belief? If I may say it, such people have nothing acceptable for thinkers disappointed in the results of the practical application of Materialist theories. That is not to say that people in such a state of belief have a bounden duty to change their psychological pattern, since it amply suffices them in their spiritual need, and only a few hear a call to convert the infidels in our midst; but those who feel themselves to have a God-given mission to carry the Christian religion to men who have rejected it really must make a worthwhile attempt to understand why what is so convincing to themselves does not convince the skeptics—the scientific materialists, the atheists and the agnostics. Perhaps they

would be well advised to explore the reality of which they are a part in order to find there evidence of the validity of their dogmas. This investigation should have been begun by thoughtful Christians back in the seventeenth century. The more enlightened should have been ready by now, before occurs the black disaster which seems to be the only certain thing that halts the possessed in their maddened stampede towards self-destruction, to be able to give a saner direction to human beings journeying through worldly experience. As a matter of fact, there have been theologians and philosophers, though too few, trying for the last three centuries to show the validity of systems that are both logical and spiritual; but the Church leaders have disdained their help and the bulk of Christians have not felt that they needed it.

### **MANY CHRISTIANS GROSS MATERIALISTS**

To come to another thing usually left tactfully unsaid; a surprising number of devout Christians are gross materialists. The trouble is not that they pursue purely materialistic aims, but that their religious ideas are materialistic. They seem to think that if they say that they believe in God and life everlasting and the teachings of Christ, this proves that they are not materialists; but when they come to deal with practical affairs—with political policies and social problems and questions of life and death—they offer the same formulae and remedies and conclusions as do the materialists. For instance, look at the behaviour of most members of World and National Councils of Churches and the explanation of their sometimes puzzling policies is seen to be that they are religious materialists. They may talk of love with soft and holy voices; but atheists and agnostics can, and often do, love and serve their fellow men. Christ taught that we should love our neighbours, but that is not all that He taught. He taught also of the reality of the Spirit —the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Man. That is some thing that materialists deny and something apparently overlooked by those clergymen who demand social and political advantages for people needing more a revelation of spiritual realities.

There is another thing to be considered. There are millions of people in the world who are not Christians. Those with realistic socio-political theories which are based upon Christian teachings must give serious thought to the possibility that many non-Christians who might like the suggested policies would be averse to accepting what seems to be a package deal—a political system wrapped up in a religion, with the inference that if a person takes one he must take both. There is wisdom, not religious humbug, in showing Christians the Christian foundations and values of the best of Western civilisation; but it is not the Christian world alone that is wanting, and one must needs fit the new thought on to the old thought that shapes a mind.

Truth is universal, but truths are not. What is true

today may not be true tomorrow. Seek first the universals and the particulars will accommodate themselves to the spiritual scheme. I think that if there were made an analysis of the greater religions of the world it would be found that they are all based upon Christian Truth. The particular teachings gathered around this universal Truth—the Reality of God, or Spirit, and of a relation to, perhaps the oneness between all things and creatures and Truth—may or may not be truths; but it should be that men of all religions could be brought to recognise that the existence of a Material universe is a truth only within the limits of its own reality, but is not universal Truth. Beyond the material truths are other truths, which we need in formulating any social or political theory. The advantage of using them is that through them theory and practice are soundly related to universal Truth. That is something, which cannot be done by using material truths as though they were universal.

If a man cannot believe that life continues after physical death, he is taking it that Matter is the ultimate reality and that therefore he exists, not temporarily in a physical body, but that he is actually that body. That is the present materialistic economo-political thesis—that the material body of a human organisation is the whole organisation. Policies are adapted to that conception. Consequently the acquiring of more and more material things is believed to be progress, even though the acquiring be accompanied by the moral retrogression of politicians and subjects. Indeed, if increasingly lax moral standards contribute to the production of larger quantities of material wealth, by today's philosophy, it is a good development. The doctrine that the life of individuals and nations is a physical thing is a philosophy of death. It is no marvel that people accepting the doctrine take literally the advice: eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die. Perhaps we won't die tomorrow or on any day. If hedonism be our only comfort now, perhaps tomorrow, in this or another world, we'll live on in some dyspeptic hereafter in which we can neither eat nor be merry.

### **A NEW PATH TO NEW KNOWLEDGE**

How are those pioneering the exploration of the ultra-material reality to set about the task of breaking down the blockage caused by materialist thought and showing the immensities that lie beyond? It would never do to assume that there is only one way leading to new knowledge. Those men who first advocated and embarked upon a scientific investigation of the physical world never imagined the marvels which scientific research would reveal nor the aids to research that knowledge would make available. Nor could anyone predict the results of scientific research into the metaphysical. One thing is pretty certain however, and that is that such an investigation could lead to either good or evil, just as has investigation into physical phenomena. The seekers after

knowledge of the physical universe disregarded that possibility. The new kind of scientists should be more wary.

The path to the new kind of knowledge at present seems to be by way of a detached analysis of recorded mystical experiences and psychical phenomena. There are quantities of fraud and illusion and wishful thinking to be pruned away, but there will be much left that is physically inexplicable. In a similar way, all that parasitic growth above described has fed upon Christianity, but there is still in the teaching religious truth, interpret it as we may, that remains incorruptible. Materialists have rejected this truth as being part and parcel of the human errors and frauds and insanities that have, from time to time, attached themselves to Christianity. Materialists who have tried their hardest to discredit spiritual and psychical evidence have done so in the interests of Materialism rather than in the interests of knowledge.

### **MATERIALISM NO ANSWER TO CHURCHES' PROBLEMS**

All this is not irrelevant to the well being of secular and religious institutions. The Churches were beginning to lose ground at the turn of this century. That was not apparent to most churchmen, then, for the reason that when the new first challenges the old a great majority of the people remain loyal to the old, so that a false sense of security makes men blind to danger. Now, however, the drift away from the Churches is obvious to everyone. The Churches will not save themselves from the enemy, Materialism, by adopting materialistic solutions to problems—by coming out in support of the materialistic theories of physical, political and racial equality, of creating good material and physical conditions for the backward in the assumption that the physical good will automatically produce psychological and spiritual good. Churchmen, I think, might have a better chance of saving their religious organisations were they to come down from the throne of complacent belief and seek support for their teachings in the non-material realities.

As for the social and political and economic systems offered in place of the failing materialistic systems—these, even if adopted and though inspired by a vision of moral and spiritual realities, will be corrupted and in the end become no better than the bad that we have now, unless an infinite, everlasting Universe of ultra-material forces and Powers is accepted as being as real and as close to us as are the material realities. Immortality is implicit in the metaphysical realities. In the future of mankind on this earth, others will reap what we sow, and what they will reap, insofar as it is of our sowing, will be part of our own harvest in some future state of being. At least, the possibility of that is far too great to be waved away by happy scepticism.

increased. Sir William Gunn, best known as Chairman of the Australian Wool Board, is also a member of the Reserve Bank Board. Presumably he was merely echoing what he has learned from the central bankers when he made his famous statement a few years back, that even a change of politicians would not basically alter present financial policies. Sir William believes that inflation is "inevitable". A new set of politicians at Canberra would in reality be merely a new set of public relations men. Irrespective of which set of political yes-men Australians have at Canberra, the drive down the centralist road will continue at an accelerating rate—unless the basic policies causing inflation are challenged and reversed.

### A BASIC POLITICAL PROBLEM

The basic problem at this critical time in history is to bring it home to political candidates that all the measures taken to "control" inflation anywhere have failed disastrously. The record is clear for all with eyes to see. The Conservatives in the United Kingdom have created over one million unemployed in a desperate Keynesian effort to stop inflation, but inflation has continued to soar, leaving in its wake mounting industrial convulsions which bring the British ever-closer to complete industrial collapse. Mr. Heath has preached that if the British will only surrender their sovereignty and join the much-publicised European Economic Community, they will solve their problems in this "wider community". On the very eve of British entry the Common Market nations find themselves threatened with increasing inflation and industrial unrest! The Americans and the Japanese are striving to solve their internal problems by financing massive exports to Red China and the Soviet Union. Irrespective of which Party is in office at Canberra after the Federal Elections, it can be predicted that they will also be seeking the same "solution".

Halting inflation is a relatively simple matter, merely requiring the introduction of some realistic financial bookkeeping. Some of the economic "experts" are probably so brainwashed that they actually believe the gibberish they talk. But there are those who clearly understand the direction in which present policies of inflation are heading. These are the power-groups. And they must be exposed. The Federal Elections should be used for this purpose. Every candidate must be asked where he stands on the inflation issue. Mr. Snedden and his desperate colleagues should be asked if they are prepared to give a written assurance that they will end inflation without attempting to create more unemployment or by imposing more controls. They should be bluntly asked why should they expect electors to believe that they can halt inflation by continuing to do what they have been doing for twenty-three years, and in the process progressively increasing inflation. They should be asked do they wish to repent for their past mistakes.

Electors should make inflation a major election issue and ignore the politicians' red herrings.

with the Nazi Party. Canberra journalist Don Whittington has some interesting comments in his report, "Behind The Headlines", issued from Canberra on August 14. After repeating the stale rubbish about the League of Rights allegedly infiltrating the Country Party, Mr. Whittington comments that "The League of Rights could become an election issue if the Labor Party plays it up during this session . . . There are those in the Country Party who are deeply disturbed about the League of Rights. They won't achieve much by pious expressions of distaste." Has the Minister for Primary Industries allowed himself to be pressured?

We have long been of the opinion that the smearing of the League of Rights is directed also at the Coalition Parties. The smear campaign is being intensified by the progressive distribution of the Richards *Age* articles. We will be having some revealing comments to make about this campaign at the appropriate time.

\* \* \* \*

Brisbane economist H. W. Herbert made the following comments on the Budget in *The Sunday Mail* of August 20:

"The income tax cuts do not average a real cut of 10 percent as claimed; it is more like 5 percent. Mr. Snedden was a bit deceitful here, not taking into account the effects of inflation and progressive taxation. Take the \$5200-a-year man with wife and two children, who was paying \$866 tax a year ago. If his income went up 6 percent (to \$5512) just to keep pace with living costs (the same **real** income) he would now pay \$969 tax under the old scale. But if the Government took the same percentage of his income in taxation a year ago, the tax would be \$917 a year. His new tax is \$814 a year, a real reduction of 11 percent in his tax, not a reduction of 16 percent that the Treasurer claims . . .

"The Treasurer wiped off sales tax reductions by a facetious argument . . . that it would cause only a small reduction in prices. Yet no other item in the Budget will lower prices at all."

### WHY NOT THINK ABOUT THAT CHRISTMAS GIFT NOW?

Christmas presents always present a problem. So why not do something different and give a gift subscription to "The New Times" the journal dealing with the momentous issues now forcing themselves upon even the most unthinking. Here is a gift, which will arrive every month. And as many of our present readers know, this is how new, permanent readers are obtained.

Gift subscriptions are: \$2.50 for one; \$4.00 for two; and \$1.50 for each subscription in excess of two. Print names and addresses clearly. State whether card is to be sent with first Christmas issue.

# Enterprise

Organ of the  
INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY  
Post Office, Kingstown, N.S.W., 2350

No. 11

SEPTEMBER 1972

## MR. SNEDDEN'S BUDGET

**So much ballyhoo has accompanied the recently-announced budget, and the Government is so obviously pinning the remnants of its now-tattered hopes on the few sparse concessions made, that we might do well to place, as objectively as we can, the latest provisions in their right context.**

By the early part of 1971, it was clear that the traditional methods of "managing" the economy were failing dismally, and in July Professor Walters, a more honest man than many of his fellow economists, a London School of Economics training notwithstanding, made his now-famous Monash Lecture, in which he conceded that economists knew not which way to turn, and that the textbooks used in economic faculties for the last twenty years were completely useless. An interesting, but not surprising sidelight on the London School of Economics was contained in the reported remarks of Singapore's Lee Kuan Yew, who solved the problem of revolutionary students in his country by the simple yet ingenious ploy of dispersing them to Universities in Australia and other Western Countries. Colombo Plan and other aid programmes ensured that this cost Singapore little or nothing. However, Lee Kuan Yew ensured that none of his students went to the London School of Economics, "For" as he said, "They return even more convinced revolutionaries than they left."

Not one whit deterred by the implications of the Walters paper, the Government heralded in, with a fanfare of trumpets, an August Budget in 1971 containing the most savage reprisals on the Australian people to be implemented for ten years. As a start, taxation revenue was increased by \$1043 million. New and tighter restrictions on Bank lending induced immediate stagnation, and by the end of December, the unemployment queues had lengthened to 150,000. "A small price" the Government thought no doubt, "to settle the troublesome problem of inflation." For these figures were really not ordinary people, but merely statistics, and in terms of voting power, of little significance! There was, however, an increase in the inflation rate rather than otherwise, and in the final quarter, when the unemployment queues were longest, inflation was running at 7%. Furthermore, the statistics suddenly became people who were quite capable of protesting bitterly, and asking what the blankety-blank Government thought it was doing? Hardly an auspicious start to an election year. Australia had encountered the "stagflation" which had perplexed economists in Canada, England and the United States—a

perplexity which is the fate of all those who run harder and harder on the wrong road.

These artificially-induced problems in the high density population areas—a very different proposition to the by-now voiceless rural population—were fermenting other pressures, notably through the Trade Union movement, most clearly seen in the amalgamation of a number of Engineering unions, with the reins tightly in the hands of the Australian Communist Party, into the giant Amalgamated Metal Workers Union. In our December issue, written just before the amalgamation took place, we warned that Mr. Laurie Carmichael, assistant Federal Secretary of the new Union, and the real power behind the scenes, would be striking at key industries in an effort to create, in his own words, "nation-wide social friction". That warning has already been amply borne out by the oil strike, a small taste of what is yet to come.

### THE "MINI-BUDGET"

By March, the Government had to concede what they had just previously been hotly denying—the fact that the 1971 Budget "strategy" had been wrong. A mini-budget was introduced, again with a trumpet fanfare—which amounted to an almost negligible drop in the bond rate, and a slight easing of the drastic lending restrictions applied in August. It was hoped that there would be a rush of new borrowers, and that the loan moneys thus created would stimulate the economy. In other words it was an attempt to get people to borrow their way out of trouble. In the first quarter there was an increase in the volume of money of over \$1000 million.

The effect, however, was unnoticeable, the Government's election chances continued to evaporate, and we moved uncertainly towards the '72 Budget—perhaps more appropriately to be called "Snedden's Last Stand".

Just prior to the Budget, we had a number of curious claims from the Treasury, the first of which was that the Government had spent more than it had taken in, and would have a deficit of approximately \$187 million at the end of the financial year. One of Australia's soundest economists, Ronald Randerson, immediately condemned this report as "dishonest" and claimed that the alleged

deficit had only been arrived at by a shadowy manipulation of the figures. He pointed out that, while Government expenditure had been tabulated correctly, certain receipts had been "missed out", and he described these as: \$673 million net loans from at home and abroad; \$129 million net proceeds of Treasury notes issued to the public; \$53 million net Wheat Board refunds, and \$38 million from miscellaneous sources. Mr. Randerson insisted that the true figures should have shown a Surplus of \$706 million. Much weight was lent to Mr. Randerson's case by the fact that statements the previous August had claimed that the Government would be budgeting for a surplus of some \$600 million.

However, when Mr. Snedden announced the '72 Budget, no mention was made of the previously claimed \$187 million deficit, and we learnt that there had in actual fact been a surplus of between \$400 and \$500 million. No attempt was made to explain the difference between this report and the carefully detailed statement put out by Randerson. However, we were told that such was the munificence of the Government's new concessions that we would definitely be budgeting for a deficit in the coming financial year. Truly, the workings of the Treasury are a mystery which none but the initiated can understand!

#### **NEW CENTRAL BANK CREDIT**

However, sorting out the "bull" from the "dust", it is probable that Australia will be running a deficit budget this year. What does this mean? Quite simply it means that the Government will spend more than it takes in from traditional revenue sources. Very well, then. Where does the extra money come from? It is simply **CREATED BY THE RESERVE BANK AS COMPLETELY NEW FINANCE INJECTED INTO THE ECONOMY**. The amount created in this way is simply tacked on to the Public debt. Under present rules it can only be cancelled out of existence when the debt, and the interest it has incurred in the meantime, has been paid off from future taxes on the people. On June 30th of this year, Australia's National Debt stood at \$14,035 million, an increase of \$543 million over the previous year. To this exorbitant figure will be added all future Government borrowings, including Mr. Snedden's deficit. The only possible result will be to increase the present inflationary spiral.

Members of Parliament are decidedly sensitive about any mention of credit creation. They have managed so far to still their critics by claiming that credit creation would be "highly inflationary", "irresponsible" and would make Australia into "another Indonesia". So perhaps they could explain how they have justified this latest "creation of credit" from their own government. And perhaps they could also explain why this deficit, if it is considered necessary—and the Government obviously does consider it necessary—could not be introduced in a manner, which does not add to the nation's debt-bill.

The Government, and particularly the Country Party, is now running round in circles trying to bite their own tails. At the end of 1971, smarting from the growing

criticism in the rural areas, Mr. Bob Sparkes announced in the Press that the Country Party had asked Brisbane economist H. W. Herbert to act as advisor to the Party. This, it was hoped, would for a time forestall the deepening impact which the League of Rights is having among Country Party members.

Mr. Herbert may be the Rock on which the Party is finally forced to face the facts. Writing in the *Courier Mail*, Brisbane, on July 16th, 1972, Mr. Herbert wrote of the 'mini-budget': "The tax concessions represent only a 2½% cut because of inflation. We should, therefore, cut sales tax in half, and put a 5% **CONSUMER SUBSIDY** on, providing it is passed on to the consumer (our emphasis). These two measures would help lower prices and reduce the crazy spiral of prices forcing up wages, which then force up prices..."

On July 22nd, in reply to questions on his article, Mr. Herbert wrote: "The subsidy on sales is of much less importance than the cuts in sales tax, but the point you made, of being sure it is passed on to the consumer, is a sound one."

"On some 10% of consumer purchases, it would be easy to apply, as these are services sold by various authorities, namely fares, council rates, fuel and power.

"Another 8% of consumer purchases are goods usually sold at standardised prices, namely bread, milk, butter, eggs, sugar and tea.

"In most other items competition and price-cutting is keen, especially in household appliances, hardware, and furniture whose sales are particularly in need of stimulation because factory employment has fallen. Most of these lines are carrying 2½% sales tax, and some 27½%. The 2½% could come off, and the 27½% be reduced.

"Should a subsidy be paid as well, on items like radiators and tools? **With keen competition it would be likely to be passed on**, but some might object that 'tax revenue was going into manufacturers' and retailers' profits'. If price surveys showed that the subsidy was not being passed on to the consumer, I think it would have to be withdrawn. It is too cumbersome for the consumer to present his receipts at some government office and collect the subsidy." (Our emphasis).

One wonders what fate will be meted out to Mr. Herbert from Parliamentarians to whom the greatest sin is any suggestion that they are in error?

In answer to questions as to the source of finance for such consumer subsidies, Mr. Herbert replied on July 31st: "This year, when a large budget deficit is justified, **CONSUMER SUBSIDIES COULD BE PAID FOR BY NEW CREDITS** (our emphasis). But some people would still say it was tax money going into retailers' profits. A receipt system for subsidies would be workable, but laborious compared with paying the subsidy to the retailer without any extra paper work."

Mr. Herbert was even more explicit on this point when writing privately two years earlier, on July 24th, 1970: "The use of credit creation to subsidise prices downwards

(Continued on page 4.

## SO SAITH THE MINISTER

In our March issue of "Enterprise", we included the figures showing the growth of Debt between 1960 and 1970 in the public sectors. In that time the debt of the Commonwealth Government decreased by 36%, while the debt of State Governments increased by 160%, and that of Local Government by 221%. As Alfred Deakin prophesied in 1902, this has led to the growing centralisation of power. Symptomatic of this was a meeting between the leaders of ten "disaster" shires in Queensland, and the Premier, Mr. Bjelke Petersen, on August 2nd, 1972. After listening to the tale of woe, Mr. Bjelke Petersen's remarks were as follows: "We, as a State, cannot come in with grants or half rates, or any of these things whatsoever. When you think in terms of the magnitude of Queensland, and the amount of money involved, our State Government cannot afford to become further involved with Local Authorities." In reply, Councillor H. G. Behan, President of the Local Government Association in Queensland said: "I have spent 50 years in this game and every year has been getting worse."

One of our subscribers wrote to the Treasurer on the debt situation, and received this gem of a reply from the Minister Assisting the Treasurer, in a letter dated August 25th, 1972. We believe it speaks for itself:

"On the 3rd July 1972 you wrote to the Prime Minister asking a number of questions concerning government debt and interest payments. Your first and third questions, which are closely related, were: —

'Why is it that over a period of approximately 20 years the burden of interest rates has shifted heavily in the way of State Governments and Local Authorities?'

'How is it that the Commonwealth Government can operate at lower rates of interest today than it did 20 years ago?'

It is true that, over this period, the debt of the State Governments and their authorities has risen, while that of the Commonwealth has fallen: interest payments by the two levels of government have moved correspondingly.

Throughout the post-war period, government borrowings in Australia and overseas have fallen well short of the amounts required to finance the total loan programmes of the State Governments as determined by the Australian Loan Council. In this situation the Commonwealth recognised that if it took a significant proportion of governmental loan raisings (under the Financial Agreement, the Commonwealth is entitled to one-fifth of the borrowings approved by the Loan Council) the States would have to drastically reduce their planned capital expenditures. The Commonwealth therefore agreed that virtually all public loan raisings should go to the State sector, while the Commonwealth itself has financed its capital expenditures largely from taxation and other revenues. It further agreed to "underwrite" the State works and housing programmes approved by the Loan Council.

In all but two years since 1951-52, new money borrowings available in the capital market have been insufficient to finance the borrowings approved by the Loan Council for the works and housing programmes of the State Governments. The Commonwealth has made up the shortfall by means of special loans subscribed from its own resources (our tax monies—Ed.) on terms and conditions based on those offered in public loans raised during the year. In recent years the funds sub-

scribed in this way by the Commonwealth have been derived from general revenue sources.

I should add that the fact that the States have had to rely to a much greater extent than the Commonwealth on borrowings is, in itself, NEITHER GOOD OR BAD; (our emphasis) it must be considered in relation to the ability of the States to finance the interest and the repayments of the debts, given their various expenditure commitments and the total revenue resources available to them. It could be argued that a government that is in a position to borrow its capital funds is better placed than if it were obliged to finance its capital expenditures by increasing taxes above their present levels. (Yet the Government denied this when answering Mr. Butler's paper, "A Programme for Reversing Inflation".)

It must also be borne in mind that a very substantial proportion of State Loan raisings is used to finance the capital works of State business undertakings, which can be expected to recover their debt charges, or at least a large part of them, by way of the prices they charge for the goods and services they provide.

I should emphasise, however, that the Commonwealth, in giving consideration to the revenue assistance arrangements which should apply after the end of 1969-70, took account of State views that debt charges were placing an undue burden on their budgets and decided to provide increased revenue assistance to the States to offset these effects. This assistance is being given by way of two measures—first by means of the progressive take-over by the Commonwealth of the responsibility of meeting the servicing charges on \$1,000 million of existing State debt and, secondly, by the payment of annual capital grants (amounting to \$248.5 million this year) to the States in partial replacement of borrowings for their capital expenditure programmes. Details of these measures are given in Chapters II and III of the budget paper "Commonwealth Payments to or for the States 1972-73" (copy enclosed).

You also asked: 'Why is it that interest payments are rising in relationship to the GNP?' In fact, total interest payments by governments and their authorities have in recent years been falling as a percentage of gross national product, and this is shown in the attachment to this letter.

Finally you asked: 'do these figures as related by your-

self constitute an effect that the financial policies of the Liberal and Labor parties are one and the same?' While I am not at all clear what is meant by this question it seems to me that the only answer that can be given to it is "No".

Yours etc.

R. V. Garland.

FIGURES ATTACHED:

**Interest Payments by Public Authorities and G.N.P.**

	1949/50	1969/70
Interest Payments by Public Authorities (\$ million)	187	731
G.N.P. (\$ million)	5,127	30,070
Interest Payments as a percentage of G.N.P.	3.6	2.4

**Our Comment**

The figures given by Mr. Garland do not tell the story, and constitute an example parodied by George Orwell's pigs in "Animal Farm" who, whenever things got worse, had statistics available to show that they were really getting better and better. For example, what percentage of taxation revenue is spent on financing capital works in the years quoted? How much has taxation risen as a percentage of G.N.P. in the years mentioned? If the figures quoted are correct, then we have had an increase in G.N.P. of between 500 and 600 percent in 20 years, while in actual fact we have had a real annual growth rate of somewhere between 3% and 4%. But the growth has been measured in inflated money terms, rather than actual terms. As someone once said, there are lies, damned lies, and STATISTICS. But the real question is, who wrote the letter for Mr. Garland? Was it Sir Frederick Wheeler? Was it Mr. John Stone? And if it was one of the Treasury officials, will they not be working for the Labor Party if there is a change of government? Will not the centralisation continue? Mr. Garland's last sentence is nonsense!

Continued from Page 2

would, of course, only be a temporary and tactical matter, and it would not be worth doing unless there was a thorough-going attack on inflation from other deductions too. It would, of course, be much less harmful than the use of credit creation to increase wages. Ministers are in the habit of dodging the problem of inflation by saying that it could only be controlled by **rigid** price and wage control. I do not believe this is so. I think price control on leading items such as steel, motor vehicles, principal foodstuffs, petrol is all that would be required if an attack on other sources of inflation was being made, and if wage increases were restricted to the growth in productivity (2% to 3% per annum)."

Mr. Herbert's remarks are so refreshing after the rubbish propounded by the Treasury officials through their Public Relations men the politicians, that one is forced to wonder whether some Parliamentarian will belatedly "discover" that Mr. Herbert is really a subversive Nazi agent with Machiavellian designs?

In conclusion, we cannot escape the fact that the Snedden Budget is only going to increase the inflationary spiral still further, and that we are now running so fast down the wrong road that a complete crisis cannot be far off.

**CRUSHING TAXATION LIFTS COSTS**

**Under the above heading the item below appeared in "The Countryman", N.S.W., of July 1971. But the item is under the heading, "Looking Back—25 years"—and is a re-print from "The Countryman" of July 1945. "The Countryman" is the official newspaper for the N.S.W. Country Party!**

High taxation is forcing up costs and breaking down the whole moral structure of the community.

As a result, people are doing things that are not in accordance with law and order.

There is a tremendous amount of unassessed taxation in Australia today, but this is not being collected. But high rates are maintained on those who pay week by week.

The person who suffers is the wage earner. He is forced to carry the burden while other members of the community escape. —Mr. W. A. Chaffey, M.L.A., at Tamworth C.P. Electorate Council meeting.

The Country Party will treat the reduction of taxation, direct and indirect, as one of the most urgent problems with which it has to deal.

A substantial reduction of taxation is the most immediate need in this country, to encourage the incentive to maximum production of goods and services. Such maximum production is the only sound way of bridging the gap between vast accumulated purchasing power and the drastic shortage of supplies. —Mr. C. M. Williams endorsed C.P. candidate for Macquarie, in an address at Blayney.

Today there is a depression of production caused largely by a lack of incentive to work and this want of incentive is due mainly to the present crushing burden of taxation.

The workman finds today that it does not pay him to try to earn more money, and yet it is appalling to read of the colossal waste that it taking place and of the unwillingness of Government departments to reduce their emergency wartime activities and their wartime rate of expenditure.

If the country is to remain solvent and production stepped up to its maximum capacity, both the workman and the industry must be freed from the shackles of present exorbitant taxation. —Mr. E. G. Batchelor, one of the two endorsed C.P. candidates for Robertson, in an address at Rylstone.

IMMEDIATE and drastic cuts in taxation and elimination of a great mass of unnecessary expenditure are necessary. Present high taxation appears to be one of the main causes of industrial instability and dissatisfaction.