

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 13.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 1, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

"Near-millionaire Victor Gollancz, speaking on the Jewish Problem to the Left Book Club, London, said he believed there could be no permanent solution to the Jewish Problem without International Socialism." —*Australian Jewish Herald*, January 11, 1946.

Why don't you give the little dear what he wants, Clarence, without making so much fuss about it? After all, he's God's Chosen Child, and quite naturally he only wants the Earth.

There is a well-known technique, especially popular in what passes for statesmanship in these days, which consists in raising a question which it is not desired to solve, suggesting a solution which can be confidently expected to fail, and if pressed, applying this "remedy" so that the problem may be declared insoluble.

We are solidly convinced that both in 1914 and 1939, the German people were the catspaws of the Jews, and notably of the Jews who carried to New York their German interests.

The anti-Jew part of Hitler's policy, which merely consisted of an irreducible minimum, stands out as an instance, and even the merest infant in politics can see that, strong as the Jews were during the Armistice years, the war has made them tenfold stronger, and the downfall of the British is their fixed, clearcut and immediate aim. A solution has to be found. There is no more probability of settling this problem by appeasement than of dealing with exactly the same problem, promoted by exactly the same people, as it became "anthropomorphosed" in "the Kaiser," "that man Hitler" and now "Stalin." There is not room on this earth for the Diaspora, the world-wide Fifth Column, and the rest of us.

Palestine is not the solution and does not pretend to be—it is merely an exacerbation. Madagascar might be, with a world-wide code of Nuremberg Law.

The Jews are unassimilable; and every attempt has led straight to disaster.

"As a result, the years 1920-40 in England saw political power transferred from what had been the rather *large* upper, and upper-middle class which had English culture ingrained in it, and worked through Parliament and through pressure on public opinion, to a much *smaller* ruling caste which at the same time held the key positions in industry, finance and politics—a class to whose members, most of them very recently ennobled, the name "Pluto-Democrats" can well be applied." (Italics in original). —T. R. Fyvel: *The Malady and the Vision*, p. 161.

The book from which the preceding, penetrating quotation is taken, is written by a German-born Jew schooled in England. In consequence, it is hardly fair to expect in it an advertisement of the fact that the whole structure of the pluto-democracy to which reference is made is Jewish in conception and control and that a Zionist Jew, Mond, was its architect in "Britain." But perhaps the most interesting aspect of an interesting book is the obvious nostalgia for the dying English culture combined with venomous hatred for its individual exponents. Mixed with this, is that genuine inability to assess British qualities exemplified in such comment as "a number of brilliant new political figures, Ramsay MacDonald, Snowden, Henderson, Maxton, had been thrown to the top." "Thrown" is *le mot juste*. With the exception of the last named, we have had considerable conversation with all of them, and we have no hesitation in saying that a stonemason's chisel is the only argument which might have inserted an idea into their heads. That is the explanation of their rise, and is the complementary aspect of pluto-democracy.

A national culture is the soul of a people, and the idea that a people can lose its soul and retain its identity is of a piece with the rest of dialectical materialism. That the English can adopt negro cacophony, Hollywood ideals of manners and morals, Jewish economics and monopolistic politics and Masonic "theology" and still remain "English" is a naive conception which, in an elementary fashion, any motor-car manufacturer would deride. Mr. Henry Ford tried to make Ford cars and the equivalent of the Rolls-Royce under one control. The Ford didn't approximate to the Rolls-Royce; but Mr. Ford's attempt at the Rolls-Royce closely approximated to the Ford. This country has no genius for "mass" conceptions—even its industrial ability is individualistic; and of course, we are told from every quarter that the brave new world has no use for that kind of thing. Maybe so; and with it, good-bye to England.

We have a reinforced conviction that if the general principles of Social Credit finance had been adopted when they were first suggested, the cartelisation of Great Britain would have been defeated. But the malady is much graver now, and probably only the surgeon offers an effective solution.

"The American Military Observer sent to Russia was shown through Russia's foremost 'plane factory. His guide, a Russian General, highly extolling Soviet production records, showed . . . the assembly line filled with planes . . . The American observed a peculiarity common to all planes in sight . . . He asked; "Where are the propellers?" Whereupon the Russian General drew himself up with a frown, and replied, "Yes, and what about your negro

problem?" —Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, in *The New Leader*, N.Y.

Nothing is more remarkable than the arrogation by Labour Socialists—not by the average craftsman, who is normally tolerant—of a monopoly of civic virtue, associated with the proposition that anyone who is, or was, fairly successful in the orthodox activities of the past hundred years, unless that success was achieved as a Trades Union official or a Socialist politician, is reprehensible. We think that we have made our condemnation of certain aspects of "capitalism" fairly clear; but it has never seemed reasonable to suggest that given certain canons of society, those who fail to live under them were, *for that reason*, more admirable than those who succeeded. Almost the only remark ever made by Dr. Buchman which attracted us was his retort to a gibe that he and his followers confined their activities to the well-to-do: "Well, God is a millionaire, isn't he?"

There is no dubiety as to the origin of this arrogance—it is in the doctrines behind the French Revolution, and in particular the conception of "equality", which has the curious effect of nourishing the most profound hatred of quality as well as a claim to be a judge of it. The French Revolution was a bourgeois upheaval, and its psychology was that of the Fabian Society. In consequence, while it would be infantile to lay the blame for the present chaos to the debit of any one specific class, a disproportionate number of its fallacies have been propagated by such persons as Mr. H. G. Wells.

There is, of course, a very real sense in which "to whom much is given, much will be required," and it is a matter which may well give food for thought to a number of successful industrialists, *not because they have become rich, but because they know, or ought to know, why nearly everyone could become rich in the economic sense.* The distinction is vital. Nearly every step in the progress of the world has come from the "privileged" classes; and the equalitarian doctrine is expressly and consciously designed to frustrate disinterested effort—the only effort which can save mankind.

There is some conscious plan, in which numbers of highly-placed people in this country are conniving, to destroy British credit prestige. Whether it is merely part of The Big Idea, as enunciated by Mr. B. K. Sandwell, of the "Canadian" Broadcasting Company—"it will be necessary to bring all the people to a diminution of their loyalty to the Crown"—we do not know. But it is there for anyone to see. One topical instance of it is in connection with the release of energy by nuclear fission, popularly and erroneously termed atomic energy. There is a very large mass of literature of a popular and semi-popular character on this subject, largely transatlantic in origin. In not one single instance which has come to our notice has the name of Professor Soddy been mentioned, and the references to Lord Rutherford, where they occur, are generally smothered in those to Dr. Niels-Bohr. Professor Chadwick does get attention; but fades into obscurity behind that scion of ancient British stock, Dr. Leo Szilard. It is unnecessary to indicate the racial origin of most of the decorated. Perhaps, as the result of their combined researches, it doesn't matter. The subsequent proceedings may interest us no more and the remainder of our tenure of this planet may be short and nasty. With the kind of world our Planners are determined to give us, perhaps it's all for the best.

"One of the oddest hypocrisies in the air to-day—and one which too many writers seem to have swallowed whole—is the attitude that in the world, right now, there are what they like to call 'Three Great Powers'. If you look at the thing practically (especially thinking about the common use of the term, which is 'The' Three Great Powers) it won't take long to see that this way of putting it is meaningless. The third great power, the one always meant by those who speak of 'Three', is supposed to be Great Britain. But, however pleasant it may be to indulge our feeling that we want Britain on our side and all the rest of it, the fact remains that in any proper definition of the word 'great', there are just two great powers—ourselves and Russia." *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 29, 1946.

That seems to make it unanimous. We're not even third now. Anyone like to throw some more mud at Mr. Chamberlain? Don't all theak at once, genth.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons, May 8, 1946.*

### New Towns Bill

*Viscount Hinchinbrooke* (Dorset, Southern): . . . I now come to the Bill. My approach to it, as hon. Members can see, is one of alarm and despondency. It must be admitted that the Bill, despite the character of the right hon. Gentleman who introduced it, is frankly totalitarian in form. What a profound pity it is that this Ministry of Town and Country Planning, which until a few weeks ago was a spacious and gracious Ministry dealing with the essential social and economic problems of relations between town and country, should suddenly take on the character of the Ministry of Works and resort to monstrous powers and a very great degree of ruthless direction. In Clause 1 we find the terrible phrase:

"Expedient in the national interest. . . ."

What is the national interest; can any hon. or right hon. Gentleman tell me what the national interest is in peacetime?

. . . It is clear that under National Socialism the national interest is what is expedient to the Minister. After a phrase of that kind in Clause 1, it is a mere bagatelle to find the Minister designating an area as the site of a town—poor wretched Stevenage which has never done any harm to anyone and through whose spacious streets many thousands of people have passed to their great delight. In Clause 2 we come immediately to the rotund phrase, every word of which reeks of arrogance and pomposity:

"The Minister shall by order establish a corporation . . ."

Who are the corporation? They are an oligarchy of nine men who are going to rule the roost at Stevenage and in other towns. They are the creatures of the Minister. They are appointed by the Minister. They are responsible to no one but the Minister, and are given enormous powers. It scarcely needs the acquisition of pistols to turn these gentlemen into the bosses of Wild West towns of gold rush times.

In Clause 4 the oligarchy proceeds to acquire compulsorily any land, inside or outside the designated area, for any purpose whatsoever without the obligation to hold a local inquiry. That is where 78 year old Mrs. Ellen Gray, of

Stevenage, who has lived in her house for 45 years, comes in, or rather goes out. I was very glad that the Minister's tyres were deflated. I hope they will be deflated again when he goes to Ongar and all the other places. One day the spirit of independence of the Englishmen will rouse itself to a fever pitch and will wake the planners out of their dreams. Clause 8 ensures that no one—no one at all—in new towns shall own his own house or plot of land. What is the intention there? Clearly it is to proliferate the creatures of the Minister and assure him of a goodly supply of Socialist tenants in the national interest. There follows power after power, and provision after provision, all centralised in the Minister. Clause 22 is a poignant Clause and deals with the application of the Bill to Scotland. Alas, poor Scotland. Another deadly blow; another mighty Empire overthrown!

In conclusion, may I say a word about the financial provisions. When the Minister was in Stevenage the other day he said "Stevenage will, in a short time, become world famous. People will come from all over the world to see how we in this country are building for the new way of life." Yet only £19 million is to be provided for each of these new towns. If we take four persons to a house, that gives 12,000 houses. Divide that into £19 million, and we get a figure of just over £1,500 per house, which has to include land. What quality of house is that to provide? A good second class quality house. Where is the money in that sum of £19 million for the open spaces, the larger houses, public buildings and churches. There is not a penny. Is that the quality of town that the Minister is going to build? The Minister spoke about private enterprise providing its own factories. What about public buildings and the creation of open spaces to give the towns life and vigour? Either the sum must be considerably stepped up, or else the Minister's claim to pride and beauty for the new town is absolutely groundless.

On all those grounds, therefore, I think the case is not proven either for the new towns or for this Bill. I believe that unsightliness and sprawl can be stopped by negative control, and that the bad location of industry can be remedied by the same process. In their whole policy of strategic planning the Government make the altogether intolerable presumption that the people shall bow to the planners. They arrogate to themselves dictatorial powers. They propose to use an electoral vote given for social progress as authority for popular constraint. In the name of the minority of electors they intend compulsion for the majority. That, I believe, is a programme which, as many a nation has found to its cost, destroys in time the Government which sponsored it. Fortunately in a democracy the speed of destruction is great and the harm done is diminished. The right hon. Gentleman's policy will be on the scrap heap before very long. He spoke of Sir Thomas Moore having lost his head. Let us hope the Minister, in a few years time, will lose his office.

### Wheat (U.S. Shipments)

*Captain Crowder* asked the Minister of Food the quantity of grain which was due to have been exported from the U.S.A. during March and April; and what quantity was actually exported.

*Sir B. Smith*: At the time of my visit to Washington in February the target set by the U.S.A. for shipments of wheat and flour during the first half of 1946 was at the rate of one

million tons (wheat equivalent) per month. I understand that shipments during March totalled about 896,000 tons and that the April figure may be about 720,000 tons.

### Pamphlet (Legality)

*Mr. Driberg* asked the Attorney-General if he has considered a pamphlet, a copy of which has been sent to him, issued illegally without an imprint by Lieut.-Colonel L. Sheridan, public relations adviser in the United Kingdom to a Dutch political association; and what steps he is taking in this matter.

*The Attorney-General*: Inquiries are being made in regard to this matter. When they are complete I will communicate with my hon. Friend.

May 13, 1946.

### U.S.A. and Philippine Islands (Trade Arrangements)

*Mr. Lennox-Boyd* asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the agreement for preferential treatment concluded between the Governments of the U.S.A. and the Philippine Islands has been officially communicated to His Majesty's Government; and how this arrangement fits into the Bretton Woods Agreement.

*Captain Sir Peter Macdonald* asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, at the time the United Kingdom Government was pledged to support the proposals for the elimination of Imperial Preference laid down in the programme for the International Conference on Trade and Employment, he was aware that the preferential arrangements now entered into between the U.S.A. and the Philippine Isles were in contemplation.

*Mr. McNeil*: the new Philippine Trade Act provides under certain conditions for the continuation for eight years of the existing free trade arrangements between the Philippine Republic (which is to be set upon 4th July, 1946) and the United States, followed by preferences gradually diminishing over a subsequent period of 20 years, at the end of which the preferences are to be extinguished. As the Philippine Republic has not yet been established, no agreement has yet in fact been concluded. Various projects for legislation on this subject have been before the United States Congress for some time past. The United Kingdom Government were fully aware of this fact when they declared themselves in agreement with the American "Proposals for consideration by an International Conference on Trade and Employment," though it was not then known in what form the American legislation would finally be enacted. As the Prime Minister explained to the House on 6th December, reductions of preferences, whether they be Imperial Preferences or preferences between other countries, will depend upon whether adequate compensation is forthcoming and upon whether a mutually advantageous settlement is reached.

*Mr. Lennox-Boyd*: May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether there is any practical difference between the preferences mutually granted by the United States to the Philippine Islands, and the preferences now existing and continuing to exist within the British Empire?

*Mr. McNeil*: I must point out that they have not yet been mutually agreed upon.

(Continued on page 7)

## 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. 16. No. 13.

Saturday, June 1, 1946.

### False Commentaries

To anyone with a mental digestion robust enough to read through the tidal wave of "literature" let loose upon the hapless British public from such centres as the Left Book Club and certain Jewish publishers (not alone those proclaiming Left opinions), the anatomy of the present chaos, and its probable extension, can hardly offer a problem. The first feature common to all the books intended to appeal to the more responsible type of reader (as distinct from those primarily abusive) is their general accuracy in regard to contemporary phenomena, and their false derivation. To a reader entirely ignorant of economics, politics and history—we are not referring to the "1066 and all that" variety—the statement that the Public School system is or was an outstanding feature of Edwardian England, is in itself so obviously true that the comment "This system was unique, because the *product* [our emphasis] of a phase of history which was unique. It had started as the usual aristocratic training for rule through command and domination, dating from the time when an unbridgeable gulf divided aristocracy and the masses" passes as reliable. The quotation is from the book by the German Jew, T. R. Fyvel (schooled, we believe, at St. Paul's, London) to which reference is made elsewhere in these columns. We instance it, not because of any special urge to defend the so-called Public School system, but because of the mixture of the concrete fact with false and fallacious commentary typical of Jewish Socialism.

There never was an unbridgeable gulf in England between "the masses" and the aristocracy, and the very quickest mechanism of *transition* was the Public School. The most powerful Peers of the Middle Ages were the Spiritual Peers. At the heyday of his power, no Duke dare cross the will of Cardinal Wolsey, the butcher's son. What turned the public school into the Public School was not aristocracy but *money*—the special province of the Jew. And the whole blast of Jewish Social propaganda has been directed against the dividend system—"profits"—because that system was the only avenue ever so far devised which promised release from the domination and rule of the Jewish financier and universal release from privilege founded on fallacious accountancy.

### The Spellbinders

Together with many others, we date the Beginning of Tribulations by the sinking of the "Titanic"; but it would make little chronological difference, and might correspond more nearly with reality, if we substituted the rise of the Political Professor.

President Wilson, almost a classic exhibit of the American Don who mirrors Big Business, can be awarded

much of the credit for having "delivered the British Empire into our hands," as Walter Hines Page is said to have cabled him; for having hamstrung the Treaty of Versailles with a League of Nations which committed everyone but himself and his Wall-and-Pine-Street backers; and for having initiated that high moral tone, accompanied by detachment from practical example, which has marked the dealings of the United States with foreign, and particularly European, affairs, and which always seems to result in "Britain" losing her small change.

The latest entry from the professorial stable to tread the spellbinding path appears to be Sir John Boyd Orr, clearly destined to add "an air of verisimilitude to a bald and unconvincing narrative." We do not doubt that Sir John is a nutritional expert, a profession the lack of which did not appear to trouble the world fifty years ago; neither do we doubt his naive honesty; we are merely convinced that he is talking pernicious nonsense.

Anyone with the most casual acquaintance with Government Departments knows that (a) They always indent for twice the amount of anything they may require "because it's safer"; (b) They have a squirrel-like capacity for hiding; (c) their one overriding passion is power-control.

If, instead of talking at large about four famine years, *etc.*, Sir John Boyd Orr would insist on an investigation of the ratio of potential food produced or producible to the amount actually consumed, it would not take him long to arrive at the true remedy—a human vermin exterminator.

### Tooley Street

"Dear Dr. Tudor Jones, On behalf of the above Committee I enclose a short MEMORANDUM on the CANCELLATION OF CONSUMER CREDITS. From this you will see that the Committee feel it necessary to discuss the possible need to cancel surplus purchasing-power; and, if this is agreed, to discuss methods of so doing in order that Social Credit may be presented as practical politics rather than, as hitherto, a somewhat theoretical scheme...."

Our memory may be at fault; but we believe the arrangements for a meeting under the same auspices last year were cancelled, thus depriving the Secretariat of the unadulterated joy of meeting the descendants of what must have been the most humorous society on earth, that of "We, the People of England," *alias* "The Three Tailors of Tooley Street" of Canning's pleasant little story. In keeping with our abstractionist times, tailoring has given way to the modern pastime of 'co-ordinating'. The 'co-ordinators' are Helen Corke, Edward Field, J. B. Griffin, C. Marshall Hattersley and T. Womack. Miss Muriel Stewart is their Secretary. The circulation of *The Social Crediter* assures them at least this degree of publicity.

Their distaste for the theoretical will not, we trust, detach them too completely from interest in the question whether the utter extinction of consumer purchasing power may not occur in time to prevent the rise of a Canning able and willing adequately to commemorate their distinctive contribution to the gaiety of unco-ordinated Social Crediters like ourselves.

For the benefit of those not specially interested in Messrs. Field, Griffin, Hattersley and Womack (and this is

(continued on page 8)

### An Address at Regina

*A feature of the Regina Convention of the Social Credit Association of Canada was the following address by the Association's Vice-President, Professor J. E. Grégoire, which was received with enthusiasm:—*

I feel sure that everyone present here will agree with me when I say that this gathering is a feast for both the spirit and the heart.

We hail from the East or from the West, speaking French or speaking English, worshipping as Catholics or as Protestants of various denominations. But each and everyone of us is illuminated by the same brilliant light and pursues the same humanitarian and Christian goal. We all see clearly and we all seek right.

Each one of us is out after a better life, not for himself alone, but for everyone else as well. The vision of a Social Crediter does not end at his doorstep, nor at the frontier of his own province, it is not even confined between the two majestic oceans which border the far distant coasts of our great Dominion. We know very well that our Social Credit philosophy is a universal philosophy. We have no doubt that if, tomorrow, instead of a National Convention, we were to have an international Social Credit Convention, the same flame would burn in the heart and shine in the eyes of every delegate, and they would all understand one another, whatever the language or country.

But we all know very well, also, that there will never be a Social Credit world unless there first be a Social Credit nation somewhere in the world; and we all feel that the first Social Credit nation in the world can and must be Canada.

We further know as well that a Social Credit Canada can only be built up by the Social Crediters whom we represent at this Convention. And it is the great duty of everyone of us, as it is of every provincial group which delegated us here, to tackle this big job of building up a Social Credit Canada.

It will forever remain the glory of Alberta, that it was the first country in the world to elect a government with a Social Credit mandate. And it is a credit to the intelligence of the electors of Alberta, that this government has been returned to power for a second and a third term, in spite of the fact that external forces, backed by a federal government which blocks where it should help, have frustrated Albertans from obtaining what they had expressly voted for; in spite also, of the fact that six years of war have created scarcity, an unfavourable climate for a doctrine which came into prominence by preaching the distribution of plenty.

All eyes turned on Alberta in 1935. Many eyes were kept on Alberta ever since. If such eyes did not yet discover in Alberta the distribution of the much-propagandized dividend, they were able, at least, to note the remarkable development of public and social services concurrent with a steady decrease of the province's public debt. This in itself is an accomplishment which spells something different from any other government.

And to what can that "something different" be attributed? Honorable Premier Manning, his colleagues in the Cabinet, the men who support the government in the Parliament of Edmonton, are of no special make. They are no angels. They are men in the flesh, just like the rest of us and just like those who govern in Regina, in Ottawa, or

anywhere else. Where is, then, the "something different" that makes of their administration such an outstanding success? Where do they find the secret of improving their province without begging for one cent permission of the unvoted power which saddles every government of the civilized world?

Where is the difference?

Just this: They are Social Crediters, they get their orders from a Social Credit electorate. A Social Credit government, not only knows how to recognize the people's policy, but knows also how to give the people what they want.

The war is over. If plenty has not returned to Canada, the means for producing plenty are there. Our quarter million unemployed and our resting machinery are ample proof that plenty is immediately possible.

In face of such potentialities, the Social Credit government of Alberta cannot bear to see the citizens of Alberta with a curtailed purchasing power. And hence, its famous Bill 76 of the 1946 session.

All eyes are on Alberta again.

But we, Social Crediters of the other provinces, cannot just sit down and watch the fight, for a fight it is against the crucifiers of humanity.

Social Crediters of all the provinces of Canada are in duty bound to raise a dominion-wide opinion in support of that new and important step of the Alberta Government towards the inauguration of New Economics in a sector of our planet.

We, of Quebec, are, I think, more particularly interested in any action that may hasten the advent of Social Credit. I would say that Quebec has even more to gain from Social Credit than Alberta herself, because, if Alberta is a rich province to be rescued from the grip of financial despoilers, the Province of Quebec is an even richer province tightly held in the grip of the same gangsters. The loot is only bigger in Quebec than in Alberta.

Our friends of Alberta will agree that Quebec has a larger area, a bigger agricultural and industrial production, and of a more diversified nature, than Alberta. So much more to be plundered, and being plundered.

Every Social Crediter will also admit that, the population of Quebec being nearly five times the population of Alberta, there are nearly five times as many victims of the system in Quebec than in Alberta.

The fact that the gangsters have their Canadian headquarters in Montreal or in Toronto changes nothing in the situation. The presence of gangsters does not enrich their neighbourhood.

It has long been a boosted game to play the East against the West and the West against the East; doubtless because the people of both East and West finding their situation unbearable, a scapegoat must be produced to distract their attention from the real looters.

People in the East are being told now and again that they pay for risky ventures in the West, that they supply the money and the West has the railways, that they finance grants and subsidies to the wheat growers, and what else?

People in the West are being impressed that they are paying high rates to banks, insurance companies and railway concerns with headquarters in Eastern cities; they are charged

inflated prices for articles manufactured in the East, and that day in and day out the East is pumping the West of its hard-earned money.

Everyone is thus made to think that his pocket is being emptied for the benefit of the other fellow, at the other end of the country. The fact is that the pockets of both fellows are assailed by the same gang. Social Crediters know it. And that is why Social Crediters, both from East and West, join hands against their common foe.

The rapid expansion of the Social Credit philosophy in the Province of Quebec, within the last few years, may have come as a surprise to many. How can a Catholic province, too often publicized as a priest-ridden province, turn an open ear to a doctrine emanating from a Scot engineer? How can people who crowd their church every Sunday, where they are reminded of the transient aspect of their pilgrimage on earth, be so intent on improving the general economic conditions of their province and country? How can people brought up in the respect of established authority be so enthused to look for a functioning democracy in which the citizens themselves would dictate the policy?

Such questions denote a misunderstanding, either of Catholic philosophy, or of Social Credit philosophy, or perhaps of both.

The people of Quebec are surely a religious-minded population. They surely place upon eternal life an infinitely higher value than upon temporal life. But, they know very well, as was clearly expressed by Pope Pius XI, that the controllers of money and credit have rendered life "hard, horrible, and cruel," and that such economic conditions "make it difficult for an increasing number of men to operate the capital work of their eternal salvation."

The people of Quebec, with St. Thomas Aquinas, assert that a minimum of earthly goods, enough to lead a decent life, is quite appropriate to help in the practice of virtue.

The people of Quebec are surely brought up in the respect of authority. But they also know how to make distinctions, and how to define the mandates outside of which alleged authority is nothing but usurpation. We set no limits to the Pope's authority in spiritual matters, because we see in him the Vicar of Christ himself, responsible only to Christ. But not so with the heads of civil governments; they are only the vicars of the multitude—as does again remark Thomas of Aquinas. As such, they are mandated by the people only to serve the people—nothing else. They must take their policy from the people, just as managers of a co-operative take their policy from the co-operators.

The Social Credit philosophy in no way contradicts our Christian philosophy. Every Social Crediter—whether Catholic or Protestant—senses the parenthood between the Christian and Social Credit concepts of what should be the relations of man with man, and of men with the State.

Our heavenly Father bestows His gratuities lavishly on every human being, making no discrimination between the deserving and the non-deserving. And so does Social Credit. The Social Credit dividend will go to all and each, exactly as does God's rain and sunshine.

The Kingdom is within you, said Christ. Within you, not with the State. So do also think Social Crediters.

We hold that wherever there is one human soul, there is more than all the governments in the world. The poorest

citizen, the tiniest child, is more than the State. Our Lord would have descended from His Heaven and suffered all His dreary Passion even for the sake of a single soul. He would not do it for the sake of the biggest Liberal, or Conservative, or C.C.F. government.

Governments, as any human institutions, exist for men, and not men for governments.

These principles are quite in conformity with the Social Credit doctrine, as they are quite in conformity with the soundest Christian teaching.

Whatever goes to enhance the person individually, and to facilitate the person's free development towards its full life, is according to the Christian concept of man. Whatever goes to override the person and to make of it the domestic animal of the State is anti-Christian.

Social Crediters think so and proclaim it loudly, Social Credit has ways and means to enthroned the person and make of the State the servant of the person. Social Credit is in the right line.

Social Credit looks for the assurance of the daily bread to each and everyone.

Other political groups may also assert that goal, even if their road is more crooked and less clear. But Social Credit alone refuses to sacrifice the freedom of the individual for that assurance of his daily bread.

Social Credit alone proclaims that liberty and security are compatible, that the one needs not decrease to admit the presence of the other, and that both must be guaranteed to each and every citizen, whatever his age, sex or creed.

And because Canada is a land of plenty, peopled by men and women who appreciate the value of liberty, Canada is surely ripe for the flourishing of Social Credit, of economic democracy coupled with political democracy.

Our poor, harassed and haggard world of 1946, still panting from the bloodshed of six terrible years and already threatened with a third part of this crazy drama, is in dire need of new and saner leadership.

Ladies and Gentlemen assembled here from all parts of Canada, it is both our unmeasurable task and our lovely mission to make of this Canada the leader of humanity towards better shores.

We possess the torch of truth, of truth that can set man free. Let us bear it high and carry it wide, for all to see. And if, at times, we are tempted to let down under the weight of difficulties inherent in our pioneering mission, let us find strength in the thought that, through Social Credit, we are heralding the world into a new and resplendent civilization.

### Moving?

A public house near Manchester last week displayed the notice:—

NO BEER, NO STOUT.  
YOU PUT 'EM IN:  
YOU GET 'EM OUT!

With no intention of intervening in a fair fight, we suggest that the exhortation might be strengthened by the suggestion that as much assistance will be made available to the present losers as was given to the winners at the last election.

## PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3)

*Sir P. Macdonald:* Is the hon. Gentleman aware that, in addition to the Philippines, America has for many years granted substantial preferences to Cuba, and will the whole question be reconsidered before our country is committed to the elimination of Imperial Preference between our own Dominions and the Colonies?

*Sir Patrick Harmon:* Can the hon. Gentleman say whether the intention of the United States, in taking this action with regard to the Philippines, was revealed during the course of the Conference at Bretton Woods?

*Mr. McNeil:* There have been previous intentions by the United States administration which have been known to His Majesty's Government, but I repeat that no enactment is yet completed.

**Dr. Jose Giral (London Visit)**

*Mr. Henry Strauss* asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Dr. Jose Giral recently visited London on official business; and whether he can state its nature.

*Mr. McNeil:* Senor Giral came to this country in transit to the United States of America for which purpose he had been granted a transit visa.

*Mr. Strauss:* Is the Minister aware that a gentleman, describing himself as the Public Relations Officer of the Spanish Republican Government in the United Kingdom, issued an invitation to Dr. Giral's Press reception in London on 6th May?

May 14, 1946.

**National Finance****Income Tax (Health Service Cost)**

*Sir W. Smithers* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the cost of the new health and hospital proposals in terms of Income Tax.

*Mr. Dalton:* Ninepence in the £.

**Central Electricity Board (Supplies)**

*Mr. Palmer* asked the Minister of Fuel and Power the total number of units sold by the Central Electricity Board for the year 1944; and how many of these units were sold to owners of selected stations at the grid tariff.

*Mr. Shinwell:* The total number of units sold by the Board in the year 1944 was 34,439 millions, of which 1,784 millions were sold to the owners of selected stations at the grid tariff.

May 15, 1946.

**Nigeria (American Scholarships)**

*Mr. Erroll* asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that a Mr. Mwafor Orizu, styled President of the American Council of African Education, visited Nigeria in November to arrange the award of 100 scholarships tenable in American universities to African students and what has resulted from his visit; how many scholarships have been awarded and under what conditions.

*Mr. George Hall:* I am aware that Mr. Orizu, a native

of Nigeria, returned there towards the end of last year from the United States and that some local publicity has been given to a statement that he was arranging a scheme for the award of 100 scholarships to enable Nigerians to study in America. I understand that the conditions proposed for these scholarships have not yet been published and that no scholarships have yet been awarded.

*Mr. Erroll:* Does the right hon. Gentleman realise that this man sponsors the notorious Zik organisation, and that it is highly undesirable for him to influence African education?

*Mr. Hall:* I do not know whether what the hon. Member says is correct, but I do know that this man has obtained a promise of support from reputable institutions and persons in America to further the scheme with which he is dealing now.

**Cyprus (Jews)**

*Mr. Turton* asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies how many Jews are at present resident in Cyprus; and what steps he is taking to encourage the immigration of Jews into this Colony.

*Mr. George Hall:* The number of Jews now residing in Cyprus is 107. The conditions of Cyprus offer no opportunity for large scale immigration of any kind.

*Mr. Turton:* Is the Minister aware that there is a project to settle 13,000 Jews on holdings in Cyprus, and will he go into this matter, in view of the Palestine Report, as Cyprus might take some of the 100,000?

*Mr. Hall:* I have no knowledge of the scheme to which the hon. Member refers.

*Mr. Sydney Silverman:* Can my right hon. Friend say how many refugee Jews were deported by His Majesty's Government from Cyprus during the war to East Africa, and whether they may now return?

*Mr. Hall:* That is another Question, of which I should like to have notice.

**Oil Pipe-line Convention**

*Mr. Keeling* asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies why the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Company, of Delaware, has received a concession to carry oil in a pipe-line through Palestine and erect refineries there free of all taxes and duties and without any provision for a payment to the Government of Palestine; and whether there is any precedent for a one-sided agreement of this sort.

*Mr. George Hall:* The Oil Pipe-line Convention between the Trans-Arabian Pipeline Company and the Government of Palestine is practically identical with that between the latter and the Iraq Petroleum Company signed in 1931. The Convention of 3rd December, 1924, between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States precludes discrimination against United States nationals or companies in connection with the grant of concessions in Palestine.

*Mr. Keeling:* Was there not production in Iraq as well as a pipe-line and will the Secretary of State say whether any *quid pro quo* for this very unusual concession was received from America in some other part of the world?

*Mr. Hall:* I do not think so—

*Mr. Keeling:* Which part of my supplementary question is the Minister answering?

*Mr. Hall:* That with regard to a *quid pro quo*—

*Mr. Keeling:* What about oil in Irak?

*Mr. Hall:* There has been none in any case. This matter is a very complicated question since it concerns the League of Nations conventions and other things, and if the hon. Member cares he may see me to discuss the matter or, if he prefers, I will write to him fully.

*Mr. Stokes:* Can the Minister give the House some indication as to who constitutes this mysterious body which seems to control affairs in Palestine?

### Political Parties (Newsprint)

*Miss Bacon:* Is the Minister aware that on our recent visit to the British zone in Germany, it was repeatedly alleged and, indeed admitted by the Communists there, that in addition to the normal supplies of newsprint allocated by the British authorities to all political parties, the Communists were receiving an extra supply from Berlin?

*Mr. Hynd:* The Question, of course, has reference to my responsibilities in the British zone and the British section of Berlin, and that certainly is not the case in that area.

*Mr. Stokes:* Is my hon. Friend aware of the violent Communist propaganda from the East? Is he also aware of the responsibility of His Majesty's Government for supplying an adequate amount of newsprint to prevent another totalitarian regime being installed in Germany?

*Mr. Churchill:* And, when engaged in this benevolent task, will the hon. Gentleman also be careful to make sure that the crypto-Communists are also the subjects of the attention of His Majesty's Government?

*Mr. Hynd:* The party mentioned is not one of the licensed parties and it would be difficult to identify it in Germany at the moment but, as I stated in my reply, our policy is to ensure so far as is possible that the available newsprint in the British zone and under our control is allocated fairly between political parties.

### Egg Packing Station (Suspected Offences)

*Mr. Spence* asked the Minister of Food whether it was by his authority that the Bristol area egg officer issued letter JCP/MT dated 26th February, 1946, asking egg packers to report any suspected offenders amongst registered or unregistered egg producers against the regulations for the disposal of eggs; how many replies were received by the area egg officer; and what action was taken by him in regard to these reports.

*Sir B. Smith:* This letter invited licensed egg packers to state whether any producers in their collection zones were not sending in eggs, or a quantity apparently out of keeping with the size of their poultry flocks. The purpose in view, with which I am in complete agreement, was to increase the supply of eggs for the general public. The letter was sent to 52 packers. Twenty-six replies were received relating to 233 producers who have been visited by officers of my Department with reference to the requirements of the Eggs (Control and Prices) Order. In some cases, proceedings for infringing this Order are under consideration. I am glad to say that additional supplies of eggs have reached packing stations following these visits.

*Mr. Spence:* In view of that reply, might I ask if it is to become the policy of the Government to encourage private individuals who are in business to spy on their customers and act as informers?

*Sir B. Smith:* There is no intention of spying on people or of people acting as informers. My duty is to see that the Orders which I issue are obeyed. I have a means of checking in this matter, because the number of rations that go out ought to bring in a certain number of eggs. They did not arrive and the letter went out. It may interest the hon. Gentleman to know that in the Bristol area alone 15 producers who were approached delivered over 200 dozen extra eggs at the packing station in one week.

*Mr. Lennox-Boyd:* Are these egg packers officers of the right hon. Gentleman's Department or not? If not, can the right hon. Gentleman give an assurance that such spying as has to be done is done by officers of his Department, and not by private citizens?

*Sir B. Smith:* I will do anything I can to avoid the charge—[AN HON. MEMBER: "Answer."]—I am trying to answer. I say at once to the House that my job is to get the eggs for the people, and, whether by "snooping," as some people call it, or other means, not to allow private people to divert eggs from the public.

*Mr. Gallacher:* Have we not always been instructed that it is the duty of the citizen to advise the authorities when anyone else has committed an offence of which he knows?

*Mr. Churchill:* Could we not have an answer to the Question which was put by my hon. Friend the Member for Mid-Bedford (Mr. Lennox-Boyd)?

*Sir B. Smith:* Yes, if the hon. Member will repeat the Question. I thought I had answered it.

*Mr. Lennox-Boyd:* With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I thought was my clear Question. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Why?"] I was asked by the Minister to repeat it. I asked whether these egg packers are officers of his Department or not, and if not, whether the right hon. Gentleman will give an assurance that such spying as has to be done is done by officers of his Department, and not by private citizens on each other.

*Sir B. Smith:* I cannot say for certain whether the packers are servants of my Department, but certainly in the sense of the work they do they are employed by me, and, therefore, at all times I should use that machinery to see that eggs get to the public.

*Mr. Churchill:* And only that machinery?

"Tooley Street"—continued from page 4.

specially meant to appeal to you, Clarence), what problems there *are* in 'the need to cancel surplus purchasing-power'—you may have noticed that there isn't any—are easily intelligible to anyone who understands the principles which should govern the control and distribution of credit-power if the satisfaction of human needs is the criterion of successful working. They are *not* understood by others, and thus exercise, particularly over the more child-minded of those others, the fatal fascination of the star for the moth. The fascination is fatal because very "practically political" people can exploit it.