

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 14. No. 16.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Beezelebub's Brethren Calling achieved the not inconsiderable feat of broadcasting items of news of the Canadian Federal Election without mentioning Social Credit (so far as our information serves us). Since, fundamentally, the election was between Social Credit and the rest, and the election was contested primarily by radio, it is not difficult to deduce the kind of d'markrazi made possible by the progress of science.

While our own direct information concludes its statement of the figures as they stand pending the receipt of the service vote (which may, for instance, unseat Mr. MacKenzie King who is only 250 votes in 13,000 ahead of his opponent) with the remark "taking the longer view, the overall result is not unsatisfactory," it would not have been difficult to present the rise of the Social Credit representation from ten to fifteen Members as insignificant. In fact, pending the receipt of fuller information, certain aspects of it are very curious indeed, and we notice a very subdued note in the formal acclamation of the "Liberal" Victory, which is not wholly accountable by the fact of the greatly reduced majority, or the large increase in the Progressive Conservative returns. We are inclined to ascribe it mainly to the wholly incommensurate result of the tremendous forces in money and organisation behind the C.C.F. which, in place of making it either the Government, or at "worst," the official opposition, as Mr. Coldwell, its headquarters liaison officer claimed it would be, has only given it a very temporary lien on twenty-five seats.

But, to Social Crediters, the most interesting and intriguing aspect of the Election is the Quebec result. It must be remembered that Quebec Province has the most powerful Social Credit organisation in the world, backed by a newspaper the circulation of which is now rising by nearly *one thousand copies per week*. It has accomplished all kinds of practical results by direct pressure, as, for instance, the defeat of the broadcasting monopoly. It has forced mention and discussion of its views into the Quebec Legislature. Mainly to meet the demand of a minority of its constituents, it nominated forty-three candidates, and put the whole weight of *Vers Demain*, and l'Union des Electeurs behind them. *Every single one was heavily defeated.*

The suggestion advanced by Sir Stafford Cripps, and, in a slightly different form, by Mr. Ernest Bevin, that we must have a Socialist Government to please Russia would be funny if it did not indicate the curious and dangerous dreamland in which Socialism does its thinking. If a Stalin-dominated Government came into power in this country (and the only way to "please Russia" is to take

her orders) it would take about three months to liquidate Sir Stafford, Mr. Bevin, and the rest of them.

These are the people who, with the able encouragement of Jewish publishers and "economists," yelled for war against Germany when they had ensured the disarmament of "Britain" and the armament of Hitler. We presume the "appeasement" of Russia, now that the war-like strength of Great Britain and the Empire is greater than it has ever been, and perhaps greater than it will ever be again, while Russia is temporarily at the weakest point which can be envisaged, is something else again.

D'markrazi registered a fresh triumph when Mr. Tom Johnston, the Socialist ex-Secretary of State for Scotland, very suitably cut the first sod of the Loch Sloy Hydro-electric Scheme with a bull-dozer, accompanied by a prayer. It may have been suspected that we do not love Socialists or the "B".B.C., but we could bear with them better if they didn't pray. Loch Sloy is the first of the "North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board" projects designed to benefit Scotland by damaging its natural beauty, drying up its rivers and exporting its comparatively insignificant water-power resources to the South of England.

Loch Sloy is about twenty miles from the outskirts of Glasgow, and incidentally is about as "North of Scotland" as Tunbridge Wells is Lancastrian.

The scheme has been torn to shreds technically; it has been opposed by the Dumbartonshire County Council; at the hearing of appeals against it, it transpired that the plans published were not correct. But it doesn't make any difference; d'markrazi wanted it.

That Mr. L. D. Byrne has been appointed Deputy Minister of Economic Development in the Alberta Government will interest our readers the world over, but to those who know the inner story of Social Credit, Mr. Byrne's eminence already stands so firmly that no title, or the absence of it, will affect their appreciation of him as an historic character. But his new appointment, while probably not greatly affecting his essential activities, puts him in a position to deal more directly with the stream of attack directed against him by the Socialists and others.

The National Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union has passed a Resolution "viewing with concern" mergers and cartels, and urging the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress to demand an enquiry. We are all for it. Order of priority: (1) The Chemical Cartel. (2) The Trades Unions affiliated to the Trades Union Congress, and through it to the German and Russian Trades Cartels, with special reference to the Mond-Turner Conference between (1) and (2).

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 14. No. 16.

Saturday, June 23, 1945.

The Canvass

Reports from the constituencies in which action has been taken on the lines recommended by the Secretariat enable us to form an opinion concerning its reception.

(1) Neither candidates nor electors contest the proposition that only one policy is being offered and not a choice of policies. There are appeals to party sentiment, but if they are set aside, the case against the parties is admitted in general terms. "But what can you do?"

(2) Underlying candidates' evident desire to formulate their own undertakings, presumed to be in line with that put before them, is apparently anxiety to avoid action which would bring them into conflict with the party machines. The willing spirit looks for meat in the form of effective sanctions—electoral support.

(3) It would not be remarkable if the Secretariat's advice to vote for the only political choice available—*i.e.*, to vote against all the official 'programmes'—were discouraged by editors confronted with letters for publication in their journals, but, in fact, published letters are by no means all on Hayek lines. Hayek seems to have been adopted as the text-book of the election, and not a bad choice, since it relieves us of the trouble of diverting energy to publicising what is already widely understood.

(4) Those who have had a 'dip' into the fray are pleasantly surprised at the ease with which agreement can be evoked. The elector "plucks up hope" when the position is put before him.

(5) A certain but relatively small amount of 'barracking' and 'knocking' (in the slang American sense) is in evidence, coming from 'Economic Reformist,' 'labourist' and masonic quarters. It might be useful to challenge systematically every partisan who displays awkward interest with the question: 'Are you a freemason?' Freemasonry (any sort of freemasonry) besides other features which it may present, inevitably acts as a *hotbed* for the growth of ideas. Great ideas do not need forcing; indeed they cannot be forced. The freemason is a highly 'moral' person, and one of his specialities at present is to give currency to the idea of the 'immorality' of the 'spoil' vote. We don't ask anyone to spoil his voting paper: we suggest that he might do the only thing which could possibly convert it to some use (unless he genuinely desires to live the political life of an infant from 'the cradle to the grave.') Canvassers who report 'discouragement' are, probably unconsciously in most cases, almost certainly supplying an out-of-date mixture

unpalatable to the public on account of its obviously theoretical ingredients. Canvassers who understand what they are doing do not need a large repertoire of pamphlets. The commonest, as well as the most pathetic, 'resistance' to what we have to say at this juncture is sheer incredulity that there can be any serviceable weapon left in the hands of the electorate, and that it can possibly be something of quite simple construction, intelligible and useful to all alike. How the party-followers long to be on our side!

Australia and Full Employment

(From Our Correspondent)

Canberra, June 2, 1945.

It is said here, and appears likely, that Evatt is hoping that international commitments, particularly economic, will give the Federal Government the powers, traversing those of the States which were denied to it in the referendum.

The day before yesterday, the Government tabled in the House of Representatives a White Paper dealing with its plans for providing full employment after the war. Of the White Paper, the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Dedman) says it is not an isolated policy, but part of the general social pattern in which reform of the banking system, steps for the re-establishment of Servicemen and the series of 'Social Security' measures already introduced were parts. Direction of labour is to cease with the end of the war; but in the immediate transition period control of prices, materials and investments will be continued. "If spending and employment tend to decline, Governments [*sic*] should stimulate spending, both by their own expenditure and through their monetary and commercial policies, to the extent necessary to avoid unemployment and the consequent waste of resources." Taxation should be "at such a level that the yield from incomes when the economy is fully employed covers at least all public expenditure on current items. It should also make some contribution to public capital expenditure."—The responsibility of the Commonwealth Bank will be to "ensure that the banking system does not initiate a general contraction of credit or contribute in any way to the growth of unemployment through a decline in expenditure." The Industrial Finance Department now being set up within the Bank will provide capital finance for small and growing businesses. Agreement with other nations will be sought for the maintenance of full employment.

This is, of course, all old stuff; but now the Government is committed to it a mile-stone is reached.

Informing the Public

If candidates for Parliament use their exceptional facilities for obtaining paper, they will have a publicity advantage of at least two thousand to one over the combined resources of their constituents. This is 'Freedom' to print. The compromise effected in the current issue of *The Social Crediter* between presenting what we have to say in a form suitable for public consumption and not doing so will, it is hoped, be understood. Reprints of the middle pages may be available for distribution during the last week of the campaign.

Warning 1946!

In 1934 Major C. H. Douglas made the following statement to the assembled Legislature of the Province of Alberta:

Just as I told you in Ottawa in 1923 exactly what was going to happen in 1928, so I tell you now in 1934 that before 1940, if you have not changed the financial system it will change and probably eliminate you.

In the summer of the following year a Social Credit Government was elected in Alberta with a majority so overwhelming that all the other parties were virtually eliminated. The Government has been twice returned to power, last time (1944) gaining 56 out of 63 seats.

A Hundred per cent. British experiment.

After some initial confusion engineered by the International Financiers (whose headquarters are in Wall Street, New York), acting through the 'Liberal' Federal Government of Ottawa, which is entirely subservient to them, the Social Credit Government set about legislating for those changes in the financial system which Major Douglas had told them were indispensable for the preservation of Peace. But what happened?

The Federal Government immediately vetoed every one of the important pieces of legislation which aimed at giving to the Albertans that economic freedom and security that the natural, and enormous riches of their province could easily have provided. In other words the people of Alberta were *forbidden* by their finance-controlled Federal Government to carry out the expressed will of the vast majority of their electors.

In spite of this sabotage of provincial democratic rights by the hidden forces working through the façade of 'Ottawa' the Alberta Government has achieved a series of unique successes in the realm of administration, and Alberta is now the model to which the other Canadian, and even American governments look for improvements in Education, Health, *etc.*

The most remarkable fact is, however, that all the improvements in social services have been achieved *without increase in public borrowing*. During the same period public indebtedness, rates and taxes have risen steeply in almost every other country in the world.

In view of the fact that the province of Alberta furthermore has contributed, materially, more to the war effort than any other territory of comparable size and population it is nothing less than astounding to find that in Great Britain both the Press and the B.B.C.—a state-monopoly—observe a conspiracy of silence with regard to this hundred per cent. British social experiment which is carried out in direct line with our best traditions of peaceful evolution, while every publicity agency in the land blares forth ceaselessly the virtues of that body of continental state-legislation which is known as 'Social Security' but better described as Compulsory Insurance, and which you are going to get whatever 'party' you vote into power.

Similarly, every official agency is at pains to hide the fact that circumstances have forced the 'Government' of Great Britain to adopt, with regard to several necessities of life, that price-compensating technique which Major Douglas has advocated in speech and writing since 1919.

If the British housewife to-day can buy bread, flour, *etc.*, at pre-war prices, it is owing to the fact that the Government creates certain sums which it pays to the producers of those necessities to enable them to sell their goods below cost, at prices the consumers can afford to pay. Although that is exactly what Major Douglas, *and no other economist*, has prescribed as one of the two essential remedies to cure our Economic and Political ills, no acknowledgement, no sign of appreciation, has yet been forthcoming from any official source. That was to be expected. In the first place this attitude is at variance with all scientific etiquette, and secondly, which is more important, in view of the unique result of the British experiment in Alberta it is a gross betrayal of the peoples of the British Empire, who have every right to demand to share in the results of the fruitful experiences gained by their cousins in Alberta.

By this sinister totalitarian attitude, the Press, and B.B.C. and the 'Parties' are assisting in the plot to deprive the British peoples of the services of a body of experts whose unique experiences could perhaps quicker than any other group of individuals render the transition from war to peace as smooth and painless as would be humanly possible.

The following article written by Major C. H. Douglas for the newspaper *Social Credit* in 1935, and recently republished in *The Social Creditor* (May 19, 1945), bears on this issue:—

THE WARNING OF 1935

During the past few years it has been suggested from various sources that the Social Credit Movement in general, and myself in particular, have not shown fanatical admiration for the Labour Party. It has been deduced from this, quite erroneously, that the Social Credit Movement has not sufficient sympathy for those who are the more obvious sufferers under the present economic, financial, and social systems.

This confusion, which is quite understandable, arises from the assumption that the Labour Party is representative of its constituents, an assumption which I should myself deny, and which an increasing number of its constituents would also deny.

At a time when there is impending a General Election, which is bound to have tremendous consequences, an understanding of it as a political manoeuvre, so far as it can be imparted in the time available, is of paramount importance.

The coming Election is between something which is called a National Government, and the titular Labour Party, since by common consent no other Party is likely to figure largely in the returns. I hope to show that there is no important difference between the true policy of the Labour Party and that of the National Government, and that they are both, in fact, correctly described as being Whig policies which are primarily dictated by the Bank of England, the "City" and International Finance.

To place beyond doubt what may at first sight appear to be an unjustifiable statement, I have tabulated, quite broadly, the policy of both parties in regard to the main divisions of politics: Foreign Policy, Industrial Policy, Financial Policy, and Real Property Policy. (See following tables).

BANK OF ENGLAND:

Adviser, Mr. Montagu Norman (Old Etonian)

FOREIGN POLICY

Internationalist.
Bank of International Settlements, Basle.

INDUSTRIAL POLICY

"Rationalisation," i.e., vertical trusts.
"Favourable Balance of Trade," i.e., more exports—
capture foreign markets.
Wage system (no work, no pay).

FINANCIAL POLICY

International Financial Monopoly, i.e., "Orthodox."

REAL PROPERTY POLICY

Punitive taxation, leading to acquisition by banks and
insurance companies.
(Liberal Wing: "The Land for the People," i.e., bought
on mortgage from financial institutions).

OVER-RIDING POLICY

The weakening of the individual and the centralisation
of power.

LABOUR PARTY:

Adviser, Dr. Hugh Dalton (Old Etonian)

FOREIGN POLICY

Internationalist.
League of Nations, Geneva.

INDUSTRIAL POLICY

"Nationalisation," i.e., vertical trusts. (Mr. Montagu
Norman: "Nationalisation? We welcome it!")
Employment for all, i.e., more exports—capture foreign
markets.
"No dividends to parasitic classes," i.e., wage system
(no work, no pay).

FINANCIAL POLICY

Orthodox, i.e., International Financial Monopoly.

REAL PROPERTY POLICY

Confiscation in favour of a "nation" controlled by the
Bank of International Settlements, via the League of
Nations.

OVER-RIDING POLICY

Collectivism, subordination of the individual to the
group.

There are, of course, minor variations in this very broad programme, and the vocabulary in which it is customarily described is, in many cases, so different that only a somewhat specialised knowledge of the subject will enable it to be seen that it is nothing but the vocabulary which varies and not the policy.

If, however, I am correct in my main contention that, as at present carried out, an Election will only be an Election of *personnel* and not an Election which will decide policy, how does this state of affairs come about?

There is really very little doubt about it. Party politics provides a career and a livelihood, and there is no career, and certainly no livelihood in politics outside Parties, at any rate at the present time. It is the business of Finance in particular, and "Big Business" in general to facilitate the advancement in a political career of those who can be relied upon to take advice in regard to policy. Or, to put the matter in the plainest possible way, Finance has its nominees in the key positions of every Party almost equally.

So far as the Labour Party is concerned, this is even easier than it is with the so-called Conservative or Liberal Parties, since the bribes which can be offered, not by any means necessarily or wholly of a monetary nature, form a greater contrast to what would otherwise be the normal life of the recipient.

I do not wish to be misunderstood, I do not think that it is primarily in the ranks of Labour Members, or their titular Leaders that this influence is so effectively exerted. Permanent Party officials, "packed" Committees, and those who appoint them, "Research" Committees and other agencies which present the Labour M.P. or Cabinet Minister with the material on which he is practically bound to act, are much more effective channels of influence.

I do not wish to draw invidious distinctions between the denizens of the political underworld, and I have no doubt that, to the extent that it is necessary, exactly the same thing will be found in the same places in the Liberal and Conservative Parties.

But the hardly-concealed smirk of the Conservative press,

both in this country and in Canada at the Canadian Federal Election results ought to be sufficient evidence that an overwhelming Liberal victory causes them no anxiety whatever. The Labour *Electorate*, however, is potentially much more dangerous than the Whig Electorate, and it is therefore in the headquarters of the Labour Party that we should logically expect to find the most astute and unscrupulous nominee of Finance, just as I feel sure that, if there were a Social Credit Party in this country, long before it became a formidable menace, its organisation would contain in most of its key-positions a set of rogues who would make the best exhibits of Smith Square, Abingdon Street, and Palace Chambers, look like respectable citizens. There is plenty of promising material about at the present time.

I believe, then, that the British people, in particular without delay, must assert their sovereignty, and, to put the matter in its most concrete form, I think that they have AT ALL COSTS TO BREAK THE IDEA AND THE FACT THAT THEY ARE ASKING TO BE RULED FOR FIVE YEARS IN THE WAY THAT THEY HAVE BEEN RULED IN THE PAST, AND ON THE CONTRARY, TO ASSERT THEIR DETERMINATION TO RULE THOSE INFLUENCES WHICH HAVE IN THE PAST, RULED THEM.

THIS MEANS THAT THEIR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT MUST BE ELECTED ON THE CLEAR UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY WILL DISREGARD THE PARTY WHIPS AT ANY TIME OR ALL THE TIME IN FAVOUR OF THE INSTRUCTIONS OF THEIR CONSTITUENTS.

I feel sure that it will be suggested that this point of view is the product of a diseased imagination, and that what is required is a little sweetness and light. *Honi soit qui mal y pense.*

Everyone is entitled to his own opinion. My own, put forward with, I trust, becoming and customary, diffidence, is that the world in general, and the Anglo-Saxon Race in particular, is faced with a fight to a finish against something which may be symbolically described as the "Devil Incarnate, The Father of Lies."

However you please to describe it, I believe that this

Force is implacably hostile to the best interests of the human race, and that there is no crooked and slimy trick too despicable, no crime too black for it to commit, to further its ends. I think that it has made an exhaustive study of human frailty and perverted ambition, and makes every possible use of them. To me it seems about as reasonable to expect a six-foot cobra to nurse the baby and wait at table, as to suppose that this Agency will listen to anything but the irresistible logic of force.

The Election of 1945

**LESS, not more, 'Government,' and
FEWER, not more bureaucrats.**

Whatever 'programmes' are advanced by the 'Labour' (f'state'-monopoly) or by the 'Conservative' ('private'-monopoly) Party, the real issue is going to be—do we have more or less government, by more or fewer bureaucrats? The Upper Bureaucrats are in no doubt. They are telling us what they will allow us to do, and what we shall be allowed to eat, and to whom they are going to give our property, for years ahead. Under these circumstances, what is the elector to do who objects:

1. To being subjected to "special behaviour conditions" by inspectors when he is sick or out of work? (Par. 67, Govt. Social Insurance White Paper)
2. To being transferred to a job away from home? (Par. 71. Same paper)
3. To being heavily penalised if self-employed? (Par. 78. Same paper)
4. To the price asked—his freedom—for the benefits offered by compulsory insurance?
5. As a doctor, to becoming a state official? (National Health Plan)
6. As a patient, to his life being dependent upon a state controlled doctor who has to think first of the regulations regarding certification *etc.*? (National Health Plan)
7. As a parent, to the interference of the state with his children, and wishes to decide himself what is best for them? (Education Act)
8. As a Christian, to interference of the state in the field relative to religion? (Education Act)
9. As a farmer, to "planning" of the land from Whitehall? (Uthwatt and Barlow Reports)
10. As a citizen and ratepayer, to his local council losing its traditional powers?
11. As a small trader, to the 'concentration' of his trade in the interests of big firms?
12. As an employer, to doing the work of the tax collector under P.A.Y.E.?
13. As a worker, to direction and transfer by officials?
14. As an individual, to being prevented from exercising his initiative in trade or business unless first licensed by an official?

A vote for a Party—any Party—is a vote for all these things and many more—*because*—all the Party leaders are agreed and pledged on the main principles and it is not

therefore intended that these highly controversial plans shall be made subject to the vote.

How, Then, Can I Vote?

How, then, can I vote effectively? By placing an "O" instead of an "X" against the names of all candidates who will not undertake to press the Government to put *first* on the Parliamentary agenda the reduction of the Civil Service to well below the figure to which it was cut in 1931, stating why your vote is withheld on the back of the ballot paper.

By so doing you attack the common basis of all restrictions and compulsions, the army of overseers necessary to enforce them against us, the bureaucracy paid with *our* money to control *our* lives. You will then be using *your* vote to express *your* will, instead of wasting it in yielding to theirs.

Lastly, you must make known your action and the reasons for it to as many as possible.

**LESS, not more, 'Government,' and
FEWER, not more, bureaucrats.**

ELECTORAL FREEDOM FORM

The following formal undertaking is suggested for use in all Parliamentary Constituencies:—

Electoral Freedom

.....Parliamentary Division. General Election, 1945.

To the Candidates:

WE, undersigned, electors in the Parliamentary Division of....., finding that, through agreement between those in control of ALL THE PARTY MACHINES, we are deprived of effective means of voting against the mass of RESTRICTIVE LEGISLATION planned by the Government while we have been preoccupied with winning the War, which legislation if passed will have the effect of extending permanently the power of officials over our lives, **REFUSE TO VOTE FOR ANY CANDIDATE WHO DOES NOT GIVE A CLEAR AND SUFFICIENT UNDERTAKING TO PRESS H.M. GOVERNMENT TO PUT FIRST ON THE PARLIAMENTARY AGENDA THE REDUCTION OF THE NUMBER OF CIVIL SERVANTS TO 20 per cent. BELOW THE FIGURE TO WHICH IT WAS CUT IN 1931, AND REPORT PROGRESS AT THREE MONTHLY INTERVALS TO PARLIAMENT.**

Signature

Address

Pay the displaced bureaucrats if you like; but don't pay them to put Great Britain in irons.

Issued by

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

7, VICTORIA STREET

LIVERPOOL 2

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.

It Can Be Done

The following are among letters which have appeared in the press:—

In the *Huddersfield Examiner* (? June 10):—

Sir,

For Whom Shall I Vote?

One of the drawbacks of the Party System is that the people are divided against themselves on many important issues. In actual fact, human desires are very similar in every walk of life. Yet the election has already deteriorated into a sordid slanging match, each party trying to fix the blame for causing an election to be necessary.

Meanwhile, ordinary people are anxious to obtain more coal, meat, potatoes, fats, sugar, eggs, fish, fruit and other foods. They require new clothes and furniture, and houses worthy of the British people. They expect a standard of living which reflects the progress made in science and engineering over a long period of expansion.

People expect to see, now that Germany is beaten, a gradual increase in the amount of rationed food available, instead of further cuts, for which official excuses are lamentably weak.

A reduction in paralysing Income Tax, in the ruthless taxation of tobacco and spirits, and the gradual abolition of Purchase Tax; a gradually increasing quantity of goods for sale, an increase in the amount of goods which can be obtained for a pound, better travelling facilities, all these are things for which people of every class are waiting.

They are tired of the dictatorial methods of Labour Exchanges, of the wearying activities of bureaucratic Ministries, swollen to double their necessary size and number, and of constant questioning, form-filling, permit-seeking, and bossing around.

They care not who owns the pits and the shops and the railways as long as these organisations produce satisfactory results of a quality that cannot be described as shoddy, and as long as they have sufficient money to avail themselves of these services.

They want leave facilities and amenities for relatives in the Forces comparable with those of Colonial and American troops; and they want those relatives home as soon as is humanly possible.

Which party is prepared to work unceasingly to achieve these results, instead of promising jam to-morrow and pie in the sky? Unless one of the candidates can answer this question to the satisfaction of the writer, he will feel justified, rightly or wrongly, in deliberately spoiling his voting paper by crossing off each candidate as having a policy not in accordance with his wishes.

BEWILDERED.

In the *Wood Green Herald* (June 8):—

Sir,

In your leader this week, you drew attention to the fact that at the last election an outstanding feature was the considerable number of people who did not vote.

There is, of course, a reason for this. It may be more pronounced than ever this time if a "way out" cannot be found.

At the moment, we can expect four candidates. It is possible there will be a fifth. This fifth candidate, if he stands, will prove that the other four have all the same

policy, and only differ in *method* of carrying it out.

The four support the policy of shackling us with a compulsory "social security" scheme; which merely means that we are to be compelled to hand over our money, and some of it will be returned to us under special conditions, fenced about with controls, restrictions and *penalties*. Unless this fifth candidate stands, any who do not agree to this scheme of national socialism can only vote against the four candidates by—well, voting *against* them, *i.e.*, putting a nought against each of their names. If they stay away from the poll, they will be accused of apathy, and you will again have to deplore the fact; also it would be reasonable to assume that they were apathetic.

This election is different from all others, in that the planners and plotters have taken advantage of our pre-occupation in winning the war, to prepare their shackles. We are now given a last opportunity to accept or refuse these shackles. Let us then realise the serious necessity that all should record their vote, whether for or against, realising that a vote is an expression of will.—Yours, *etc.*,

DONALD W. COX.

The Shortage-Makers

Figures showing how the production of food is being impaired in consequence of open-cast coal mining in Northumberland and Durham were given to a meeting of farmers and landowners over which Lord Ridley presided at Newcastle-on-Tyne on June 8. According to the *Newcastle Journal*, it was agreed to ask the headquarters of the National Farmers' Union and the Central Landowners' Association to receive a deputation, with a view to making the strongest possible approach to the Government.

With the end of hostilities in Europe, it was contended that there is no further reason or excuse to lay waste many acres of land that should be producing potatoes and cereals.

A statement issued at the close of the meeting said that reports presented by delegates showed there will be a considerable reduction in the production of essential foods in such proportions as to create a national problem.

The statement added:

"In Northumberland—one of the richest agricultural areas in the country—large tracts of good agricultural land have been seriously damaged by open-cast coal mining with large tracts taken for prospecting, and further areas requisitioned for future operations.

"It is estimated that the acreage disturbed and likely to be disturbed by workings, and consequently lost for the production of food, will be about 15,000 acres in Northumberland alone."

Apart from the open-cast workings, it was stated, large tracts of good land have been spoiled for immediate food production, standing crops damaged, drainage systems destroyed, and gates and fences demolished.

In the case of requisitioned land, in some instances, crops had been lost for two or three years, with no evidence that the land will be utilised.

After mining operations have been completed and the land handed back, it was contended, food production will be low for many years, and possibly a loss for several generations, owing to lack of humus on the top soil. In addition, there will be no drainage for a considerable time owing to the settlement of the replaced soil.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 1, 1945.

**PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION
(QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE)**

Commander Locker-Lampson: On a point of Order. There has appeared on the Order Paper a Motion in the name of the hon. and gallant Member for Peebles and Southern (Captain Ramsay).

[That this House realises that the protection afforded to His Majesty's liege subjects from arrest and punishment without trial and from Jewish extortion and exploitation by the provisions of Magna Carta signed at Runnymede in 1215, confirmed and elaborated by the Statute of Jewry passed in 1290 under Edward I, rightly acknowledged as one of the greatest law-givers of this realm, was mistakenly and harmfully impaired by the repeal of the Statute of Jewry in 1846, in the ninth year of Queen Victoria's reign; that the repeal of this Act released the very evils which Magna Carta and the Statute of Jewry recognised and against which they were specifically directed; that these evils have from that moment reappeared in ever-growing proportions; that they have now become a grievous menace to His Majesty's liege subjects throughout the realm and are in turn evoking a rising tide of public feeling against the Jewish nation; that the Statute of Jewry provided for protection from all violence for all Jews who obeyed its provisions; and this House therefore calls upon His Majesty's Government to reintroduce the Statute of Jewry and enforce its provisions.]

Am I entitled to ask whether that Motion is not a breach of Privilege; whether it might not also lead to every sort of serious legal consequence, and how did it get on to the Order Paper?

Mr. Speaker: The Motion in the name of the hon. and gallant Member for Peebles and Southern (Captain Ramsay) was carefully examined before it was put on the Order Paper, and is in Order, but whether one agrees with the views expressed or not is entirely another matter. My only duty is to see that the Motion is in Order, and if so, as protector of minority opinions, I am bound to accept it.

**GOVERNMENT OF BURMA
(TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) BILL**

Sir Stanley Reed (Aylesbury): ... On the economic side Burma has two great permanent assets, the land and the forests. The basis of Burma's economy must be the land. Therefore, I feel that early steps should be taken to deal boldly and resolutely with the land question; to restore the cultivating proprietors to their holdings; furnish them with the best means of cultivation; secure that they are not once again expropriated by the intruding moneylenders and turned into a landless, disappointed and disgruntled peasantry. That is of the first importance. The land is there, the fields are there. The Government have taken active steps to provide a great reserve of seed rice. The great drawback at the moment is lack of cattle...

The White Paper is admirably written and compiled, and broad and generous in its terms. At the same time, White Papers are not very good means of conveying to people in Asia the policies and declarations of the Govern-

ment. I feel we have missed a great and unequalled opportunity. During the last few weeks we have been the witnesses of one of the great events in Asiatic history. If anybody knowing Burma had been asked three months ago whether we could reconquer Burma from the North, through those dense jungles and in tropical conditions, he would have replied that anybody who said we could do it was a dangerous lunatic; it was an impossible feat. Once again in our Imperial history the impossible has been done, by the gallantry and endurance of our soldiers, by the skill of those who have directed them, and by a dramatic use of air power such as nobody had ever conceived would be possible. In those circumstances, we have crept unobtrusively and silently into Rangoon and sealed reconquest—with a White Paper of many pages. If we had adopted the dramatic methods of Napoleon, what should we have done? We should have given to the Burmese people a dramatic proclamation from His Majesty the King Emperor, announcing the great triumph and announcing the generous policy with which we were going to consummate it, and we should have left it to the White Paper to embody in a multitude of words the technical details by which we proposed to carry this policy out. I feel that if my right hon. Friend had remembered Queen Victoria and the wise words of Lord Derby, we might have sounded a note throughout Burma and Asia which would have helped us very materially on the difficult road we have to travel...

SUBSIDISED FOODS

Sir L. Lyle asked the Minister of Food if he will provide a table showing the present retail price of those foods which are assisted by Government subsidies, showing in each case what the retail price of each item would be but for the subsidy.

Colonel Llewellyn: The following table shows in Column 1 the present retail prices, as ascertained for the computation of the Cost-of-Living Index, of the principal subsidised foodstuffs, and in Column 2 the estimated retail price of each item if the amount of the subsidy were to be provided by an increase of price:

	Column 1.		Column 2.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.
Bread	9	per 4 lb.	1	1 per 4 lb.
Flour	1 3	per 6 lb.	1 9½	per 6 lb.
Oatmeal	3½	per lb.	5	per lb.
Meat (home killed)	1 0½	per lb.	1 4½	per lb.
Potatoes	7	per 7 lb.	10¾	per 7 lb.
Eggs	2 0	per doz. (large)	3 6½	per doz. (large)
Eggs	1 9	per doz. (small)	3 3½	per doz. (small)
Sugar (domestic)	4	per lb.	6	per lb.
Milk	9	per quart	10	per quart
Cheese	1 1	per lb.	1 4	per lb.
Bacon	1 10½	per lb.	1 11	per lb.
Tea	2 10	per lb.	3 0	per lb.

**PURCHASE TAX (SUSPENSION OF
REGISTRATION LIMIT)**

Mr. Linstead (Putney): I would support a Motion for the Adjournment...

One can only assume that, because the Order has been made at this very late stage in the war, it is really the intention of the Treasury, that the Purchase Tax should become a permanent feature of our taxation system. If that is to be so, it ought not to be dealt with in this way—

by a side wind as it were. It is a major decision of policy which ought to be taken, with proper notice, through the Finance Bill and properly discussed. It is worth while inviting the attention of the House to the way in which a simple phrase passed by this House, in order to impose some taxation, can be developed, by departmental action, into something probably very much greater than the House ever intended. The Purchase Tax, for example, which was applied to drugs and medicines, was applied in a charge occupying three lines. Those three lines were then interpreted by the Department in a pamphlet which runs to 10 pages, and, in fact, it is not the three lines that were passed by this House but these 10 pages of Departmental interpretation of what those three lines meant, which is, effectively, the law of the land to-day. That is why I am expressing the view that it is gravely unsatisfactory that a major taxation decision of this kind should be brought in by a side wind. The effect, without doubt, on the small manufacturer is that he is just going to give up hope, shrug his shoulders and buy the goods which he used to make with his own hands from the big manufacturer. I have very little doubt that it is the big manufacturer who has been putting pressure on the Treasury to cast the net completely round everybody and—I will not say primarily, but incidentally—squeeze out the small, and the intelligent and imaginative competitor of the big man. I would assure the House that in the section of the industry of the country with which I am familiar there is very grave concern about the application of this Tax...

House of Commons: June 4, 1945.

FINANCE (No. 2) BILL

Mr. Ernest Bevin: ... I will join with anyone in finding a rational basis for an international price level, properly organised, provided it does not reflect itself in depressing the standard of life on the home market. As yet, neither the Chancellor nor Lord Keynes has ever been able to persuade me that there are sufficient safeguards in the Bretton Woods proposals to achieve that object.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL

Mr. McIntyre (Motherwell): ... The suggestion that full agreement on such a Measure is of itself a great thing is surely a very extraordinary idea. The most classic example of full agreement in the biological world that I know of was the case of the Gadarene swine—there was not one exception to the rule.

I come now to the two matters on which I would like an assurance from whoever is to reply to this Debate. I am not satisfied with the assurance I have so far received on the subject of the size of classes. Will it be definite that teachers and materials will first be used in order to reduce the size of classes and not to put into operation the junior colleges? Because it is quite useless either to raise the school age or to establish junior colleges unless classes are of a reasonable size. I should also like to know the views of the Government on the question of early specialisation brought up on an Amendment to Clause 1. That Amendment was defeated, but I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to make early specialisation compulsory or whether they are going to leave it open to the children for some time after they enter secondary schools?

ELECTION LEAFLET

Don't Waste Your Vote!

Limited quantities, 2/6 per 100.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...	8d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...	4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate.....	3d.
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
The Issue: Electoral Canvass for an Anti-Bureaucratic Representation.....	1d. each; 3/6 a hundred.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.).....	1d.
The Representative's Job.....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.