

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 15. No. 16.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

We like neither the politics nor the personality of Mr. Herbert Morrison, but we freely accord him a "possible" in respect of his retort to Mr. Churchill on the Vote of Censure, that the complaint appeared to be that the Conservatives were not allowed to bring in all the Socialist Legislation, and they put down a Vote of Censure when a Socialist Government claimed a right to do a little Socialist legislating itself. We have more and more doubt whether there is any essential difference between the Parties who carry on a sham fight in Parliament: but we are in no doubt whatever that the Conservatives will never return to power on the camouflaged Socialism which has distinguished them since 1931.

An excellent advertisement of the armistice period portrayed a protesting infant with the caption, "If I must be washed, wash me with Bux." Whatever the outcome, no body of responsible opinion will again tolerate *ersatz* Socialism of the Anthony Eden-*cum*-Progressive "Tory" brand.

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby, Independent) again confirmed our good opinion of him by voting against the Motion of Censure, which, as he was careful to explain, did not mean supporting the Government. His position was that "its object was not to censure the Government, but to rehabilitate the Opposition, which is in a bad way." He said the motion was not motivated right, it was not timed right, it did not come from the right quarter, and it did not deal with the right issues.

If Mr. Churchill wished to go down to history as a great statesman, and not merely a great war minister, he would approach Squadron-Leader Hollis, Mr. R. J. G. Boothby, and Mr. W. J. Brown, and with their co-operation issue a call to the honest men on both sides of the House (and there are honest men on both sides, but not many both honest and disinterested). But it is no derogation from his valuable qualities to say that he has not got it in him. And nothing that its worst enemies can say can encompass the abysmal treachery of the Whigs who make up the effective majority both of the Government and the Opposition.

How this fatal strain in British politics is to be eliminated, we do not know; but if there is indeed no way then it will eliminate us.

By the time these words appear in print, Parliament will have discussed the Bretton Woods racket. It is a measure of the accomplishments of the Social Credit movement that there is in the country and in the House of Commons a not inconsiderable minority of more or less

informed opinion on the elements of finance. Twenty five years ago, "Bretton Woods" could have been put through unexposed; we are fairly confident that Mr. Hugh Dalton, the People's Advocate, will have to tread very delicately indeed to keep the peculiar position of a "Labour" Chancellor supporting a Gold Standard Bank proposal from looking just a trifle odd. But doubtless he will do it, with the aid of a few well tried stalwarts such as "World Peace," "International Trade" and "Full employment." For our own part, we are so assured that sanctions and not technics are involved (and we have no immediate sanctions) that we propose to leave the matter to the play of forces until exposure seems to have languished at the hands of those who are concerned with it.

There is one aspect of the matter to which more attention must be drawn, however. It is stated that (a) We must sign a chit for about 125 millions sterling, value received in lease-lend, immediately. (b) In five years, we are to begin to pay back eleven hundred million pounds we have never received, just like 1920.

Just exactly how does it come about, if it does come about, that any and every transaction between this country and the United States involves (1) Loss of prestige. (2) Loss of money. (3) Disproportionately high taxation allegedly to pay for disproportionately small services to a common cause. (4) The progress towards power of agencies such as P.E.P., the Fabian Society, and other promoters of monopoly masquerading as "Peoples Movements"? It should be observed that each and every one of these effects, repeated almost without variation from 1920, tends directly to the elimination of Great Britain as a World Power.

Only ordinary intelligence combined with a willingness to undertake a not very arduous examination of the mass of evidence available, is necessary to assure anyone that the most gigantic, conscious, and successful robbery in all history has been progressively taking place on the natives of these islands, more notably since the access to power of the Liberal Government in 1906. Its earlier stages were carried out more through the Stock Exchange and Real Property Markets; the later stages have been Governmental and Fiscal, together with currency manipulation. The penultimate stage is the "nationalisation" of such private property as remains, when at the final stage, the title deeds to once-great Britain will be neatly tied with red tape and handed over to the World State run from Wall Street—or Jerusalem.

England was merry England, when
Old Christmas brought his sports again.
'Twas Christmas broached the mightiest ale;
'Twas Christmas told the merriest tale;
A Christmas gambol oft could cheer
The poor man's heart through half the year.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 27, 1945.

FINANCE BILL

Considered in Committee.

Sir Waldron Smithers (Orpington): I beg to move, "That the Chairman do now Progress, and ask leave to sit again."

I take this action as the strongest protest I can make against the action of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his evasion, and his unwillingness to give the information required for an appropriate discussion, in the Committee stage of the Finance Bill. Since September, 1944, on three occasions I have raised the question of increasing expenditure in connection with the service of the war. I propose to read the terms of the Question, which I have put and the only reason I know for not answering it, is the argument that it is not in the public interest. I contend that my Question was in the public interest, though it may not have been in the interest of the Government. After repeated demands to have these figures I put down a Question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in these terms:

"if he will give in tabular form the cost of the social services or the services in connection with the progress of the war at the latest available date and an estimate of the cost of the new social insurance proposals—the pensions for this war, the long-term and short-term housing policy, health, education and analogous services."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, Wednesday, 21 November, 1945; Vol. 416, c. 547.]

The Chairman (*Major Milner*): I cannot accept the hon. Member's Motion. As I understand his complaint, he wants some particulars of expenditure actual or estimated. This, of course, is a matter that might be raised on the Budget Resolution, or on the Report stage, or on the Second Reading of the Finance Bill. In my view, the Committee is now met to discuss Clauses which relate not to expenditure but to taxation and revenue, and, therefore, I am quite unable to accept the Motion or to permit the matter to be further discussed.

Sir W. Smithers: How can we logically or seriously consider taxation, if we do not know what the expenditure already passed, or envisaged in the proposals of the Government is? It makes the Debate this afternoon complete nonsense.

The Chairman: That may or may not be so, but the hon. Member has other opportunities of raising this question and cannot expect to do so now.

November 28, 1945.

STAFFS (STATISTICS)

Major Conant asked the Minister of War Transport the numbers employed in November, 1938, and at the present

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N. 6.

time by each of the four main line railway companies in the following categories: clerical staff, outdoor staff and temporary or casual staff.

Mr. Barnes: The information is not readily available in the form the hon. and gallant Member desires. The following figures may, however, be of service to him:

| | March, 1938. | March, 1945. |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| Salaried Staff (including office clerks, station-masters, supervisors, controllers, etc.) ... | 95,731 | 97,398 |
| Conciliation Staff (wages staff concerned with the movement of traffic) ... | 333,222 | 355,466 |
| Workshop Staff ... | 121,730 | 113,816 |
| Miscellaneous ... | 30,718 | 30,762 |
| | <u>581,401</u> | <u>597,442</u> |

In interpreting these figures it should be borne in mind—that in March, 1944, a substantial proportion of the staff were women and unskilled men who were taking the place of regular railwaymen serving in the Forces, and that traffic has increased greatly over that before the war.

December 3, 1945.

PALESTINE (INCIDENT HOGLA)

Mr. Malkhieu asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will make a statement on the recent shooting incident at Hogla, in Palestine.

Mr. George Hall: ... It is necessary to take this opportunity to state categorically that the allegation to which some currency has been given that British troops opened fire without provocation on unarmed persons is completely without foundation. I am satisfied that the forces in Palestine have been displaying exemplary restraint in the face of great provocation.

December 4, 1945.

MINISTERS AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS (MOTOR CARS)

Wing-Commander Hulbert asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury if he will circulate in the OFFICIAL REPORT a list of Ministers and officials to whom motor-cars are now allocated for their sole use; and upon what basis this allocation is made.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: This matter is at present under review.

December 6, 1945.

ANGLO-AMERICAN ECONOMICS AND FINANCIAL AGREEMENT

Mr. Norman Smith (Nottingham, South): The House has had from the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister a statement of policy which must have a tremendous effect upon the future history, not merely of this country, but of the world. The Prime Minister was followed by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, who told the House that it was necessary not only to focus opinion quickly but also to take action speedily. Following the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Woodford (Mr. Churchill) we have had the right hon. Gentleman the Lord President of the Council, who has announced the Business for next week involving among other things legislation to implement this agreement, legislation to be rushed through the House by Friday next. I have a very vivid recollection, Mr. Speaker,

that when you were installed in your Chair at the beginning of this Session you told the House that you were the champion of the back-benchers. It looks to me as though there is here collusion between, on the one hand the Leader of the Opposition, and, on the other hand, His Majesty's Government; and I am asking that this House shall not be required to pass legislation at this very rapid rate. I am asking that my right hon. Friend on the Front Bench shall not require this House to honour the date 31 December for ratifying the Bretton Woods Agreement. This House is being asked to take far too rapid action on a tremendously important matter. I beg, Sir, that a decision on Bretton Woods shall not be taken in this hurried fashion.

Mr. Boothby (Aberdeen and Kincardine, Eastern): I would like to ask one question of the Prime Minister, and that is how he reconciles the statement he has just made with the repeated pledges given by successive Governments to this House that no decision would be taken on the Bretton Woods Agreement, unless this House had had an opportunity of discussing that agreement. Some of us have been pressing for a discussion on this for the last ten months. We have never been allowed to have a discussion. Now we have a pistol pointed at our heads, and are told that we have to pass the whole thing in three days. I think, with all due respect, that the Prime Minister is not honouring the undertaking repeatedly given by this Government and by both the preceding Governments, to this House. I would like to

(Continued on page 6)

Social Credit Secretariat ASSOCIATE EXAMINATION FOR OVERSEAS CANDIDATES, JUNE, 1945.

PASS LIST

Australia. Robert Leas Kilpatrick
Neil Gordon McDonald
James Guthrie (Tasmania)

Canada James Vans Macdonald

The questions set were as follows. (All questions in each paper to be attempted):—

(OCEANIA)

Question One.

- (a) A leader writer on the staff of a leading Australian newspaper,
- (b) An inland revenue officer, and
- (c) A neighbour who is neither of the above, asks you:—
"What's the Compensated Price got to do with Social Credit?"

Write down the answer you would give to each of these individuals. (N.B. *Don't* give the answers someone else might give, but your own.)

Question Two.

Give your reasons for assenting to (if you assent to it) or dissenting from (if you dissent from it) the proposition that "The will of the majority should prevail."

Question Three.

Write short notes on *four only* of the following:—

- (a) Trade
- (b) Tradition
- (c) Innovation

- (d) Culture
- (e) Policy
- (f) Politics

Question Four.

An Australian Referendum

... The idea of party warfare has not been abandoned. . .
The Times, August 19, 1944.

Australians and War Control

... An analysis of the voting shows how completely it cut across party lines. . . .
The Times, August 22, 1944.

What do you understand by "party politics?" Assuming the influence of 'parties' to have been reduced during the 1944 Referendum in Australia, what steps would be open to collectivists to turn the situation to their advantage?

(CANADA)

Question One.

Provide brief definitions of the following:—

(a) Evolution, (b) Culture, (c) Policy, (d) Politics. What adjustment, if any, has it been necessary for you to make in your conceptions concerning these ideas (as defined), in consequence of your reading of Social Credit—i.e., the body of doctrine so described?

Question Two.

Distinguish between (a) the strategical and (b) the ideological differences between Monetary Reform and Social Credit.

Question Three.

Compare and contrast the role of the Jews and the role of the Japanese in Canadian politics.

Question Four.

Write short notes on the following:

- (a) Trade
- (b) Tradition
- (c) Majority Rule, and
- (d) 'The compensated price.'

Examiners:—Dr. Tudor Jones, Mr. Hewlett Edwards and Mr. H. R. Purchase.

THE NEXT ASSOCIATE EXAMINATION FOR THE BRITISH ISLES WILL BE HELD IN APRIL, 1946.

Though primarily intended for students of the Study Course, this examination is open to all subscribers to *The Social Crediter* or to members of Associated Groups who agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy for every five members. The questions set will cover the general field of Social Credit, and will correspond with the 'matriculation' examination in the degree system of universities, where that is still held as an initial test before entry upon a more advanced course of study. At the 1946 Examination, one question will bear directly upon *The Brief for the Prosecution* by C. H. Douglas.

Entries should be received not later than February 1, 1946, and should each be accompanied by the candidate's full name and address, the date he took the Study Course (if any), the name of his Associated Group (if any), and an examination fee of 10/-. (Candidates are advised to see the Lectures and Studies Booklet (3d.) obtainable from K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.)

—B. M. PALMER, Director of Studies.

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. 15. No. 16. Saturday, December 22, 1945.

Christmas.

The very word sparkles.

The Smithfield workers have decided to postpone their strike until December 29, as they are averse from inconveniencing the public during the first peace-time Christmas for six years.

There is no doubt that this item of news has been heard in certain quarters with exasperation and astonishment. I suppose that nowhere outside the British Empire would such a statement be made by any body of strikers, and nowhere else would it be understood. In Great Britain it is generally accepted as perfectly natural, partly because of the ineradicable tendency of the English to regard politics as a game, albeit somewhat dirty at the moment. We do not play games every day, there are other things to do. This state of mind has been one of the greatest difficulties in the path of the professional continental politicians who have wished to mould us to their will. Karl Marx (Mordecai), in his Message to the First International in 1870, observed "The English are incapable of making a Socialist Revolution, therefore foreigners must make it for them."

I do not think that one in a million of the native English has any real conception of the deeply pessimistic and relentless atheism of professional continental intellectualists, the great majority of whom are Socialists. Cold, dark and humourless, masochistic to themselves and sadistic to their fellows, to them Christmas is nothing but a weak superstition to be got rid of as a serious obstacle to the brotherhood of man. So far as I am aware, Karl Marx never gave a comprehensive definition of what was to be understood by the term "brotherhood"; but in practice it appears to be minding everyone else's business rather than your own, because you know better than he does what is good for your brother. "The people are sunk in such dreadful superstition. . . ." and so on through the long myths and labyrinths of Communism.

The native English cannot conceive of this state of mind. Even those who modestly describe themselves as agnostics do not try to question the significance of the Festival of the Incarnation. Between them and the foreign revolutionaries whom Marx addressed is a great gulf fixed.

There have been some very comforting words of late in *The Social Crediter*. "The final conquest of politics is the realisation that all politics is bad; that mankind has no business with politics—that man's business is with himself." This harmonises so perfectly with what one had always felt to be true; one had always had an eye to one's own business. And so have the Smithfield strikers. And they are simply proclaiming the fact that Christmas is more important than

striking, in the opinions of the vast majority in this country.

And then *The Social Crediter* has shown that the Incarnation must be accepted as an axiom, not merely as a fact. The significance of Christmas to any social creditor must therefore be great; for it is the one day in the year when the importance of the individual above all systems is fearlessly maintained. We are far from supporting the Calvinistic idea of the Sabbath; yet at one time there were certain things that simply were not done on Sundays, and any attempt to make certain individuals do them was fiercely resisted. Sunday is now like any other day; with a small amount of evil, much good has been lost. Christmas day, a mere 24 hours, is now the only Holy Day, throughout the year, a year of 51 working weeks, and one week of "holidays with pay."

So far as in us lies, we should do everything in our power to retain the significance of the only day when it seems possible for large numbers of people to enjoy for a few hours part of the spiritual meaning which lies in the words "Social Credit." All of us have our own rituals, which to ourselves are part of reality, though an infinitely small portion. Let us rejoice; rejoice that even at this eleventh hour we have discovered that the love of God is the policy of the individual, and the love of our neighbour is the technique by which it can be attained.

B. M. PALMER.

Socialism on Trial

It is already becoming clear, as we have been suggesting for some years past, that what is being tried for its life in this country is not socialism but democracy. This is well brought out by Mr. Demaree Bess, the political reporter-editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*, who quotes Mr. Crossman, described as "this editor on the Socialist Weekly, *The New Statesman and Nation*," as saying: "the British Labour Party happens to be the foremost representative of real democracy to-day, not merely in Britain [*sic*] but in all Europe." If Mr. Crossman is right, and we have little doubt that his constituents are under the delusion that he is right, what he calls real democracy—the card vote, labour-monopoly control of party politics framed by the London School of Economics and financed by millionaires—is on the spot. Great Britain is a totalitarian state as she has never been in all the thousands of years of her marvellous history; and Mr. Crossman's democracy is demonstrated as a system by which all the attributes of a man are taken from him and vested in a Frankenstein masquerading as Mr. Pink-Geranium.

The way in which the Government runs true to form and breed is nothing less than remarkable. We suppose it calls itself a Government of the Left; and every measure which it sponsors either reinforces the power of international finance or takes something from individuals to give it to a cartel. There is little doubt that, had it been possible to keep Russia hermetically sealed from the outside world while propagating the myth of "the common good" and the wickedness of private property, it would have had almost a free run and, to use its own metaphor, it would have scrambled the economic and political eggs so effectively that no one would have been able to unscramble them. The metaphor seems to us to be particularly apt and descriptive of the ideals it has in mind. But a note of doubt creeps into the shrill screams of Professor Laski. We are engaged in the attempt; but he does not care to prophesy the outcome.

When all Men shall be Brothers

By J. ERNEST GREGOIRE

Vice-President, S.C. Association of Canada.

There is one feature of Social Credit which always strikes me whenever I have the opportunity of living a few days, or even a few hours, with people of another province, or of talking at some length with people from another country, even from as far as Australia.

And this feature is the unifying spirit that we find in Social Credit. This, by itself, would be a sufficient proof that Social Credit is more than a simple monetary technique, it is more than a simple political group, it is a philosophy, and the right philosophy.

The right philosophy, because it answers the aspirations of man, as rooted in his nature by his creator, and as purified and elevated by Christianity.

You find in man, in any man not stultified by sordid interests nor crushed down to animality by communism or any other form of totalitarianism, you find the two natural tendencies: individuality and the urge for association.

To the superficial mind, these might seem to be conflicting. They are not.

Man lives in association, but in an association of men, not of bees, ants, or any other kind of animal.

If a doctrine tends to sever man from his natural associations, such doctrine is subversive. And if a doctrine tends to drown the individuality of man and mould all men into a pre-fabricated robot, such also is subversive. The first sets up man against man; the second changes man into a domestic animal.

Social Credit at the same time strengthens the individuality and enhances the common aspirations of all individuals.

Social Credit makes a man more himself, and Social Credit makes a man meet his fellow men as a brother.

Social Credit blasts off the obstacles of the full life of each individual, and Social Credit blasts down the walls between the individuals.

With Social Credit, men meet and love one another, but those are bigger men, in the cultural and spiritual meaning of the word, who meet and love one another.

A communist or a socialist will take two men, put them side by side, cut off both heads, and set a single monkey head to top the four shoulders; and he will call that unity. It is a monstrous accomplishment, and cannot be styled Christian, not even human.

On the other hand, the political parties and the tyrannical money power will take men and throw them at one another's throats. They call that the struggle for life. That struggle for life flourishes among the wild beasts of the forest. It kills the Christian and debases the man.

Social Credit takes men, women, young men and young ladies, enlightens them individually, develops their mind and fills their hearts with love that urges them to carry the light and the flame to their brothers, near, far and wide. Social Crediters meet and understand one another at the outset.

They come from Quebec or from Ontario, from the East

or from the West, from Canada or from Australia; they worship as Catholics or they worship as Protestants; they speak English or they speak French; they are endowed with an anglo-saxon culture, or they are endowed with a latin culture; they are rich or they are poor in things of this world; they have gone through university or they had no other book instruction than what they got at the rural school of the most remote settlements—it does not matter; the same light shines on their faces, the same fire kindles their hearts, the same hope illuminates their eyes, the same confidence in one another transpires in their hand-shakes and in the sincere, even if awkward, manner in which each one is trying to express his feelings in the other's mother tongue.

Social Credit is truly Christianity transferred to social, economical and political relations.

Of the first Christians, of the Christians who had not yet been set one against the other by partisan ambitions or by money interests, it was said: See how they love one another. Paganism was in wonder and could not explain.

Of the Social Crediters, who have purified their minds from the lust for political power, and, who want for every one the power to organise his own life according to his intimate call, it may also be said truly: See how they love one another. And the paganised and mammonised politicians cannot explain. They shrug their shoulders and say: "Those Social Crediters are fanatical."

Fanatical, the first Christians, but the cross came to dominate the throne of the Roman emperors. Fanatical, the Social Crediters, but Social Credit will one day dominate politics for the good of all and every citizen; the Social Credit philosophy will one day inspire the laws of Canada, of the whole British Empire and, we hope, of all the civilised world.

Meeting here in Toronto, and tasting the experience of what the Social Credit spirit, even without Social Credit legislation, brings to men of various races, creeds and languages, is surely an advance image of what Social Credit, in its fulfilment, will do to make the world fit for human beings, redeemed by Christ and called to the vocation of children of God. Social Credit is applied Christianity on the temporal plane. We surely have God's blessing with us, and we can surely look forward to the final triumph of Social Credit on the forces inspired by egotism and all the passions which people the devil's kingdom.

Palestine

In the House of Commons on December 10, Mr. Bevin announced that the composition of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry (Palestine) will be as follows:—

Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson of the Fifth Circuit Court at Houston, Texas, (American Chairman); Mr. Justice Singleton (British Chairman); Dr. Frank Aydelotte, Director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, and American Secretary of the Rhodes Trust; Mr. Frank W. Buxton, Editor of the *Boston Herald*; Mr. W. P. Crick, Economic Adviser to the Midland Bank; Mr. Crossman, M.P.; Mr. O. Max Gardner, former Governor of North Carolina; Sir F. W. Leggett, until recently Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of Labour; Dr. James G. McDonald, former High Commissioner for Refugees; and Mr. Manningham-Buller, M.P.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

ask how he reconciles this statement with those undertakings.

The Prime Minister: My statement was that before a decision on Bretton Woods is taken, the House will have an opportunity for full discussion and debate. And it is proposed that there should be a two-days' debate on this matter. I think that is fully honouring the pledge.

Mr. Stokes: As it is evident that the terms of this loan are dependent on the Bretton Woods proposals being accepted, I support the plea made by my hon. Friend the Member for South Nottingham (Mr. N. Smith) and the hon. Member for East Aberdeen (Mr. Boothby) that more time should be given to this matter. May I ask the Prime Minister, in view of the fact that the whole of this arrangement depends on the acceptance of the Bretton Woods proposals and the whole intention of America is to get us back on to the gold standard, will he make it abundantly clear to the country, that acceptance of this policy means a return to the gold standard—

Several Members: No.

Mr. Stokes: And if the Debate must take place next week, will the right hon. Gentleman see that Whips are taken off so that Members can be free to vote according to their opinions?

The Prime Minister: My hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Stokes) will be able to make that point, but I do not accept his premises.

Mr. Beverley Baxter (Wood Green): The Prime Minister, in his very important announcement, mentioned the scaling down of Imperial preferences in return for compensations and advantages which will have to balance what already exists. I would very much like to know whether we are to be presented with legislation to be carried through by the Government with their majority, or whether we are first to have a chance to debate this very important issue before we are presented with Government legislation with, in the end, the imposition of the Government majority.

The Prime Minister: I am afraid the hon. Member for Wood Green (Mr. Baxter) has not got it right. There is no question of legislation on the commercial agreement. The commercial agreement is a point which is going to be discussed at an international conference, and the matter is intimately bound up with other matters. All that is suggested is, not a unilateral abandonment of preferences, but discussions for a general reduction of trade barriers in which the reduction of preferences might form a part. No legislation is required on that.

Mr. Stanley Evans (Wednesbury): In view of the fact that many hon. Members, and many people throughout the country, regard Bretton Woods as economic strangulation for the British Commonwealth of Nations, will the Government consider taking the Whips off on the occasion of this Debate?

The Prime Minister: No, Sir. The fact that certain people hold certain opinions does not necessarily mean that, therefore, we should take the Whips off.

Mr. N. Smith: What is the Prime Minister afraid of?

Mr. Churchill: I would like to ask the Leader of the House whether we may take it that, in regard to the outline of Business for next week, in connection with the statement made by the Prime Minister—a suggested outline but one which will, of course, be interpreted in accordance

with the general wishes and desires of the House—if more time is required, we shall not be held to be agreeing at this moment to the allocation that has been proposed.

Mr. Morrison: I understand the right hon. Gentleman's position, which is not unreasonable, and, of course, if discussions are desired through the usual channels, they shall take place, but I am bound to say that I am in a very real difficulty. I am up against the clock and the calendar. The Bretton Woods agreement, if it is to be effective, must be implemented by 31 December by legislation, and, in order to get it into another place at the proper time, I am advised—and, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Warwick and Leamington (Mr. Eden) knows, we have had discussions and have put it off a bit to give more time for consideration—but I must get it into another place, I am advised, by two o'clock on Friday of next week. That is the difficulty I am in, and having pointed out this very real difficulty that really ties me up, certainly I would not wish to prevent any real discussion.

Mr. Stokes: On business, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. N. Smith: May I ask if it is on your authority, Mr. Speaker, that this House is required either to implement or reject the Bretton Woods agreement by 31 December?

Mr. Speaker: That is a most improper suggestion. I had nothing to do with the Bretton Woods Agreement or with the arrangements. If the hon. Member wishes to object to any arrangements made, when the Bill comes before the House he will be able to vote against it and show his protest.

Mr. Stokes: May I ask the Lord President of the Council, in view of the very serious statement he has just made as to the effect of this on Business next week, whether it is the Government's intention to ask this House to put this country back, as the result of acceptance of the Bretton Woods agreement, on the gold standard next week, when some of us have spent about 25 years fighting against it?

Mr. Morrison: I am not, myself, a conclusive authority on the gold standard—

Mr. Stokes: The right hon. Gentleman ought to know what he is asking for.

Mr. Morrison: In this matter, I am concerned with the business of the House, not the gold standard. It does seem to me that, if the Bill is published and the White Paper is available tomorrow, with the Prime Minister's statement, it is not unreasonable to ask that the House should begin the discussion on Wednesday and conclude it, over all, by 2 o'clock on Friday. I really do not think we are treating the House badly. Naturally, the House will have opportunity for all points of view being heard, and, in the meantime, there will be considerable discussion in the Press and otherwise. I do not think we are treating the House in a way which can be described as thrusting this down the throats of the House, without reasonable opportunity for discussion.

Mr. Janner (Leicester, West): May I ask a question of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House on Business? We have been promised for some time a Debate on Palestine. I would like to know whether there is a prospect of that taking place before the Recess.

Mr. Morrison: As I said last week, I have no objection to that, but I think that, in the new order of things, whereby we have had two days on the Motion of Censure,

and there will be the two and a half days on financial and economic matters next week, I am bound to say; whilst I will still do my best, the prospect dims and dims, and whether we can get the Debate this side of Christmas I do not know.

Mr. Bracken (Bournemouth): May I ask a question not based on party bias?

Mr. N. Smith: In view of what Mr. Speaker said to us last August, when we first took our seats, I want to ask who it is that governs the Business of this House? Who said this legislation must be passed by 31 December?

Mr. Speaker: I have already informed the hon. Member that I do not govern the Business of this House. The Government governs the Business of the House.

Captain Gammans (Hornsey): A point arises which I think is of the utmost importance from the statement that the Prime Minister has made. Before the Debate comes off next week will he say at what rate between the dollar and the pound—the parity of the pound in relation to the dollar—these sums have been fixed, both in regard to the repayment of capital and of interest?

Mr. Pargter (Spelthorne): Is the financial settlement with America completely dependent upon the Bretton Woods Agreement?

The Prime Minister: Yes, Sir, the Bretton Woods Agreement is part of the whole Agreement.

Mr. N. Smith: Shame.

The Prime Minister: I think hon. Members had better read the whole thing. I know that certain hon. Members have an almost religious fervour on this point.

Mr. N. Smith: Why not?

The Prime Minister: I quite agree, and I do not grudge it to the hon. Member, but I think it would be better if hon. Members would look at this thing as a whole, and study this document. There will be plenty of opportunities for my hon. Friends below the Gangway to vent all their wrath when they really know what they are talking about.

Mr. Stokes: May I ask whether, in his consideration of the Business for next week and what may follow it he will bear in mind the repeated promises that have been made to this House to allow us full time to consider this matter before the decision is taken? We have months in which to discuss this matter, and if the right hon. Gentleman rushes this thing through the verdict of this country will be that he has sold us out to the moneylenders.

Mr. Harold Macmillan (Bromley) rose—

Mr. Stokes: May I have an answer?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member cannot make another speech.

Mr. Stokes: On a point of Order. Has not the Motion for the Adjournment been moved again, and therefore can I not speak again? I crave your fairness in this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is correct. I overlooked the second Motion. He may therefore then ask the Lord President of the Council to answer.

Mr. H. Morrison: If I get the permission of the House. [HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] I think it is unreasonable for the hon. Member to assume that nobody has

heard of Bretton Woods before this statement was made.

Mr. Stokes: There has been no discussion here.

Mr. Morrison: I know, but a knowledge of documents and proposals has been knocking about for months. I have read the Agreement, but not with that fullness that I ought to have, I admit; but I have heard of the Bretton Woods Agreement for some time, and therefore the subject has been known. The question is whether we are giving reasonable notice of Debate. I suggest that we are. Whether there should be any question of suspension of Rule on the Wednesday, to give a bit more time, we would be willing to discuss through the usual channels, to meet in any way we can hon. Gentlemen who are concerned in that respect.

Mr. Harold Macmillan (Bromley): Before the right hon. Gentleman sits down may I put this to him. This is a very grave matter. I fully realise the difficulties in which, from the point of view of time, the Government and the House find themselves. Perhaps we might ask that, as a result of the interchanges, the Leader of the House would regard the time-table as fluid, as a matter for discussion through the usual channels, so that we can reach the best possible arrangement for the discussion of a matter of such great importance. I am quite sure that the House would place itself at the disposal of the Government and if there was any inconvenience with regard to the holiday the House would be very willing to make the necessary arrangements. We have been very fairly met by the Leader of the House and we might come to some arrangement as to the discussion, so that even he might find an opportunity to read the Bretton Woods Agreement in the interval.

Mr. H. Morrison: I did not say that I had not read it at all. I only said that, in those earlier days, when I used to hear of Bretton Woods so frequently, I had not thoroughly read the agreement then. Of course, I have read all about it during these recent days. . . .

Mr. N. Smith: My right hon. Friend, the Lord President of the Council, has told the House that all of us have had ample time in which to consider this thing. I would submit that that is obviously inaccurate, for the simple reason that my right hon. Friend, the Prime Minister, has said to-night explicitly that the Bretton Woods ratification is part of the whole affair. This has only been announced less than an hour ago. That being so, I want to ask the Government if they would not put this matter off until after the Christmas Recess. The Prime Minister said, I think, most improperly, that some of us are treating this subject with religious fervour. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with a man being sincere? Many of us are sincere about this thing, and I beg of you, Mr. Speaker, as the protector of the back-benchers to see that we are not let down and that there is no collusion between the two Front Benches. All I ask of the Government is to put this off until after the Christmas Recess.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid I cannot order the Government how to deal with Business.

Flight-Lieutenant Beswick (Uxbridge): May I ask the Prime Minister what is sacrosanct about the date, 31 December? What principle would be involved in setting it back?

The Prime Minister: I am afraid I have exhausted my right to speak.

Mr. Stokes: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. May

I ask you, in order to get it on record whether in view of the fact that this statement involves legislation, the whole of this discussion is not out of Order on the Adjournment?

Mr. Speaker: It may eventually require legislation, but the statement had to be made. I say quite frankly I was concerned with the point, and it does not break the rule.

Mr. Stokes: For the sake of the record, Sir, and not with any intention to dispute your verdict, may I point out that the Leader of the House stated that legislation would be introduced next week. We then proceeded to discuss his statement and the statement of the Prime Minister, which clearly involve legislation. Clearly, therefore, it was out of Order.

Mr. Speaker: That is why I have been trying to keep to Business questions only.

Flight-Lieutenant Beswick: As the Prime Minister has not spoken since a quarter past eleven, when the new Motion for the adjournment was put, is he not in Order in answering my question about the date?

The Prime Minister: On that point of Order, I regret to say I have spoken since the Adjournment was moved again. I can speak again only by leave of the House. The short answer to the question which has been put is that under the terms of the Bretton Woods agreement, becoming an original member of the Bretton Woods undertaking is dependent on the matter being passed by legislation before 31 December.

Friday, December 7, 1945.

BILLS PRESENTED

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS BILL,

“to enable effect to be given to certain international agreements for the establishment and operation of an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid,” presented by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer; supported by Mr. Ernest Bevin, Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Glenvil Hall; to be read a Second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 46.]

Multitude

“... If there be any among those common objects of hatred I do contemn and laugh at, it is that great enemy of Reason, Virtue and Religion, the Multitude: that numerous piece of monstrosity, which, taken asunder, seem men, and the reasonable creatures of God; but, confused together, make but one great beast, and a monstrosity more prodigious than Hydra. It is no breach of charity to call these *Fools*; it is the style all holy Writers have afforded them, set down by Solomon in Canonical Scripture, and a point of our Faith to believe so. Neither in the name of *Multitude* do I only include the base and minor sort of people; there is a rabble even amongst the Gentry, a sort of Plebeian heads, whose fancy moves with the same wheel as these; men in the same Level with Mechanics, though their fortunes do somewhat guild their infirmities, and their purses compound for their follies. But as, in casting account, three or four men together come short in account of one man placed by himself below them; so neither are a troop of these ignorant *Dorados* of that true esteem and value, as many a forlorn person, whose condition doth place him

below their feet. Let us speak like Politicians: there is a Nobility without Heraldry, a natural dignity, whereby one man is ranked with another, another filed before him, according to the quality of his Desert, and pre-eminence of his good parts... It is a happiness to be born and framed unto virtue, and to grow up from the seeds of nature, rather than the inoculation and forced grafts of education; yet if we are directed only by our particular Natures, and regulate our inclinations by no higher rule than that of our reasons, we are but Moralists; Divinity will still call us Heathens... .

“It is the common wonder of all men, how among so many millions of faces, there should be none alike: now contrary, I wonder as much how there should be any. He that shall consider how many thousand several words have been carelessly and without study composed out of twenty four Letters; withal, how many hundred lines there are to be drawn in the Fabrick of one Man, shall easily find that this variety is necessary; and it will be very hard that they shall so concur as to make one portrait like another. Let a Painter carelessly limb out a million faces, and you shall find them all different; yea, let him have his Copy before him, yet after all his art there will remain a sensible distinction... . Nor doth the similitude of Creatures disparage the variety of Nature, nor any way confound the Works of God. For even in things alike there is diversity; and those that do seem to accord do manifestly disagree... .”

— Sir Thomas Browne (1605 to 1682). *Religio Medici*.

THE BRIEF for the PROSECUTION

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

8/6 net.

“... Major Douglas possesses one of the most penetrating intellects of our time; he has a profound knowledge of the ‘set-up’ behind governments—and he is fearless—a combination of gifts most rare in a time-serving world.”

“Major Douglas at his best.”

— *Truth*.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, Victoria Street, LIVERPOOL, 2.