

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 9.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

It is beyond dispute that census statistics relating to Jewry are wholly misleading, but no one has ever suggested that they are inflated. "The Jewish Year Book" states that the total number of Jews in Great Britain is 385,000. If this is correct, we can only comment that Jews have some of the characteristics of a stage army—they look much more numerous than they are.

But accepting these figures for the moment, they form only 0.84 per cent. of the total population. The Jewish population of Manchester, however, is 3.4 per cent., and of Leeds, 5.1 per cent. No other city in Great Britain approaches these figures, Greater London, with 2.7 per cent. and Brighton, with 1.7 per cent., coming a bad third and fourth.

According to the *News Review*, April 18, 1946, "Man behind the drive to prevent the Government from opening the larder door by way of celebration" (of Victory Day) "is publisher Victor Gollancz founder of the Left Book Club" (and maker of a large fortune by the publication of books and pamphlets attacking the Conservatives while they were prohibited from reply by the Party Truce).

Well, Clarence, you see what you fought the war for. Or don't you?

"A curious incident took place at a protest meeting against Hitler's treatment of the Jews, at the Pavilion Theatre, Whitechapel Road, on December 10, 1934. An excited Jew speaker, M. Oman, claimed Bismarck as a Jew."

It will be recalled that Bismarck, who never concealed his intention to eliminate Great Britain as a World Power, said of the German Socialists, "We march separately, but we fight together."

Our shortcomings do not include an hysterical adulation of Mr. Winston Churchill, but he has at least two qualities wholly admirable—courage, and a certain essential honesty, both of them not unlike those exhibited by Mr. Ernest Bevin, although perhaps more sophisticated. These qualities reached a high water-mark in his speech at the Guildhall on November 10, 1942, a speech which merits recall, because its implication is a good deal more extensive than perhaps anyone but Mr. Churchill himself realised at the time. He said: "Let me, however, make this clear, *in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter.* [Our emphasis] . . . I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. For that task, *if-ever it were prescribed, someone else would have to be found,* and under democracy, I suppose the nation would have to be consulted . . ." [Our emphasis]. Notice the

distinction between the source of the prescription, and the "Nation".

It is obvious that the liquidation of the British Empire has been prescribed, and as a result of "consulting" the "nation" someone else has been found. If Mr. Churchill would say to whom he was speaking, and from where the prescription for the liquidation of the British Empire has been written, he would render a service which would be worthy of his qualities. We know; the liquidators know; but the "nation" doesn't know.

In this connection, Lord Acton's comment on a similar and related situation is significant:

"The appalling thing in the French Revolution is not the tumult, but the design. Through all the fire and smoke, we perceive the evidence of calculating organisation. The managers remain studiously concealed and masked; but there is no doubt about their presence from the first. They had been active in the riots of Paris, and they were again active in the provincial risings."

It should be remembered that prior to the Revolution, France was not only the dominant Continental Power, but was the unchallenged leader of civilisation. Since then, her history is one of steady degradation and corruption, until it is probably true to say that to-day France's only claim to consideration is that inseparable from her geographical position.

The late Lord Keynes was one of the most implacable and dangerous enemies of the Social Credit Movement, because he understood both its technique and its implications. But we should never have wished that he should be the object of an obituary notice by Dr. Hugh Dalton.

We notice that when Lord Vansittart makes his repeated and rather curious attacks on the Germans as a race—curious, not because there may not be sound grounds for such an attack, but because they seem to be accompanied by a vehement assertion that such an attack is only justifiable if it is made on Germans—he always claims to have special information not available to the general public. So far as we are aware, Lord Vansittart holds no official position. How does he come to be so well informed?

The people of these islands are being subjected to a torrent of Black Magic which must sooner or later, and soon rather than later, eventuate in a catastrophe either for the country or the Black Magicians. The food situation is being steadily "plugged" by the "B."B.C., and other agencies, all of them Left Hand, with the object of generating mass hysteria. A speaker at the Independent Labour Party Conference announced that he was prepared to commit every member of his Party (with what authority is not disclosed)

to prison rations in order that starving somewhere-or-other might have their food.

The indigenous natives of these islands are kindly people, and are prepared to lend a hand in situations which clearly demand it. But what is going on at the moment is not kindness, or Christianity, and it is not inspired either by kind people or by Christians. It is a devilish device to blur the lines of property and abolish Common Law, so that Mr. La Guardia (for the moment) can say that, even when our Australian kinsmen have consigned a shipload of food to us, it is not ours, unless he says so. That will enable Mr. La Guardia or his successor, to starve us into submission in a month if at some later date our desire for self-determination should reassert itself.

The facts of the situation are nearly unascertainable, except in one particular. Never in the known history of the world has there been such colossal, continuous and widespread waste in practically every quarter of the world as at present, and never has there been such conscious and calculated lying on the subject. Every eye-witness can and does (in private) testify to it; every organ of public misinformation, led by Beelzebubs Brethren, suppresses all mention of it. And it is easy now for anyone who will keep clear of this manufactured mass hysteria to see that the full power of it is directed against the British Empire. The Fifth Column is feverishly active everywhere, and nowhere more evidently than in these "Save the poor, Hottentot—shsh, its good for trade" campaigns.

There is hardly a country in the world which could not manage its own affairs if Wall Street and Moscow could only, haply, be engulfed in a tidal wave, and P.E.P., the Fabian Society and some of the more successful publishers be induced to colonise Madagascar.

• • •

The late Lord Keynes is said to have described the Socialist Party as "sectaries of an outworn creed, mumbling, moss-grown demi-semi-Fabian Marxism."

Nice work, if you can get plenty of it.

• • •

It is now plain to see how indispensable was the period of depression and semi-starvation from 1928 to 1933 in preparing a suitable background for "reconstruction" after the war which was already contemplated in Wall Street. Had purchasing power been decentralised and distributed by methods which the Socialists with their hidden backers were chiefly concerned to ridicule, but which they are using for their own purposes, not ours, the Great Britain of the thirties would have been so prosperous and powerful that in all probability there would have been no war, and there certainly would have been no conquest of these islands by Jewish Commu-Socialism. But we seem to be possessed of devils.

There is not a single factor in the causes of the war just finished (if it is finished) which we are not reproducing on a larger scale. The drive for exports is not a drive for imports of consumer goods—it is a drive for international currency without any principle of real values visible anywhere. The really blatant gifts to UNRRA; the complete disappearance or sabotage of hundreds of millions of pounds' worth of war stores which have been paid for in taxes; the steady degradation to a slum level of the buildings of the country, in imitation of Russia, are all of a piece. We saved others; we cannot save ourselves.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons, April 11, 1946.

FASCIST ACTIVITY

Dr. Haden Guest asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he now has any further statement to make on the control and restraint of Fascist and anti-Semitic political activities.

Mr. Ede: Fascist and potentially Fascist bodies in this country are small, disunited, and ineffective. They will be watched with the utmost vigilance, and the potential danger of such bodies will always be kept in mind. The Government have examined in consultation with the Law Officers the scope of the existing law and are satisfied that in present circumstances the law is fully adequate to enable action to be taken against all really dangerous activities. If believers in Fascist doctrines engage either singly or in conspiracy in subversive activities, or disturb the peace, they can be, and will be, dealt with firmly as law breakers.

Dr. Guest: Will my right hon. Friend say whether he regards anti-Semitic propaganda, carried out at a meeting for political purposes, as subversive within the scope of the definition.

Mr. Ede: It all depends on the strength and virulence of the statements that are made.

Mr. Driberg: Did my right hon. Friend observe that a recent meeting intended to promote anti-Semitism could not be held because the Westminster City Council, very properly, refused the use of the hall? Will he commend that example to other authorities?

Mr. Ede: No, Sir, I was very anxious to hear what the man who was advertised to address that meeting would say. Unless statements are made I cannot prosecute the people who would like to make them.

Mr. Driberg: But has not this man made hundreds of statements before?

Mr. Ede: Most of the statements hitherto made by that gentleman have been made in Scotland, where the law is not quite as powerful as it is in England. This was the first opportunity for getting him to make a statement in England.

Mr. Godfrey Nicholson: The right hon. Gentleman used the term, "Fascist doctrine." I am sure all Members of the House condemn Fascist doctrine—[*Hon. Members*: "Not all."]—but does he include all totalitarian philosophy?

Mr. Speaker: We are getting very wide of the original Question.

WAYS AND MEANS—BUDGET PROPOSALS

Mr. Assheton (City of London): . . . We must not get into the habit of thinking that we get results merely by voting money for this and for that. What we have to ask ourselves is: are the goods and services available to make that money good? The pace of Government expenditure is alarming. In January this year there were 937,000 men and women in national Government service—more than there were in the whole building and civil engineering industries. On the same date, there were 854,000 employed in local government service, which is more than those engaged in the whole of agriculture.

According to a table in *Hansard* of 15th March, 35 per cent. of the occupied population is still employed in the Armed Forces, as non-industrial civil servants, as employees of local authorities and in the manufacture and equipment of supplies for the Forces. That is a figure at which the Chancellor should look. It is shocking that at this time more than 1,500,000 are still employed on orders for the Supply Departments. These figures can be seen in this excellent Monthly Digest of statistics with which the Government are good enough to provide us, and the latest figure given is 1,562,000 of insurable age, and there is another unstated figure for those over insurable age. I cannot state what the total figure is, but it must be above 1,562,000. I suggest that constitutes an incredible waste of labour and materials, and it is something about which I would like the Chancellor to tell us this evening.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Dalton): . . . We carried Income Tax down to the low levels. I am not complaining that what was done in the war was wrong as war finance, but the tax was, in fact, carried down to lower income levels than ever before, and brought in millions of people who had never paid before, who had very little taxable capacity, and who felt the burden acutely. There was a great agitation which resulted in the P.A.Y.E. scheme. There is still an agitation, but it is not, in my view, to P.A.Y.E. that they object, but to P-A-Y-I-N-G. It will be the same under any system of collection . . .

April 15, 1946.

The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison): . . . In the statement which he made to the House on the 6th December with regard to the United States Proposals for Consideration by an International Conference on Trade and Employment (Cmd. 6709), the Prime Minister said that both the United States and the United Kingdom intended, well in advance of the international conference, to carry on between themselves and other countries, including British Commonwealth countries, preliminary negotiations upon the subjects dealt with in the American document. These preliminary negotiations would be designed to prepare the ground thoroughly for the full international conference, which is to be called by the United Nations.

The United States Government have accordingly invited the Government of the United Kingdom to nominate representatives to attend a preliminary meeting . . .

Although, as I have said, no dates have yet been fixed, either for the preliminary meeting or the Commonwealth discussions which will precede it, it will be vital for the success of the negotiations that the United Kingdom Delegation should enter them with a full understanding of the considered views of trade, of industry and of labour in this country. I am therefore getting in touch with the Association of British Chambers of Commerce, the Federation of British Industries, the National Union of Manufacturers and the Trades Union Congress. My right hon. Friends the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, the Secretary of State for Scotland and the Secretary of State for the Home Department will similarly arrange to obtain the views of the various organisations representing the farming, fishing and ancillary industries in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and my right hon. Friend the Minister of Food will similarly obtain the views of the food industries of the country. Organised labour will have an opportunity of expressing its views through the Trades Union Congress . . .

April 16, 1946.

KNOWES COLLIERY, FAULDHOUSE

Mr. Matthers asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether he will withdraw the notice to close Knowes Colliery, Fauldhouse, in view of the firm pledge to prevent another stoppage given by 97 per cent. of the men employed, who have greatly increased production during recent months and who will be affected should the colliery be closed, because a few youths and the management had a dispute over a recent grievance affecting part of the pit.

Mr. Shinwell: With permission of Mr. Speaker and the House, I propose to make a statement in answer to this Question at the end of Question Time today.

Later—

Mr. Shinwell: During the past six months the number of unofficial stoppages in Lanarkshire and the adjacent area in West Lothian was 285—compared with 194 in the rest of Scotland and 288 in the whole of England and Wales. Stoppages in this small area are thus proportionately far in excess of those in any other section of the British coalfield although in this, as in other areas, there exist joint agreements entered into voluntarily on the workers' behalf by their trade union representatives providing comprehensive machinery of collective bargaining, conciliation and arbitration for the settlement of any dispute on wages and conditions without recourse to direct action of this kind. Following discussions which I had with their Executive, the Scottish Area of the National Union of Mineworkers, recognising the dangers inherent in the situation, issued at my request in January of this year a general warning to a number of collieries that the continuance of unofficial stoppages was likely to involve the risk of the collieries concerned having to be closed.

There have been nine stoppages at Fauldhouse during the past six months, involving numbers of men ranging from six to 180, of which four have occurred since the beginning of this year. Following one which took place on 25th and 26th February, I authorised my Regional Controller to cause a notice to be posted at the colliery to the effect that if any further stoppage of the colliery or any section of it took place after 1st March the colliery would be closed without further warning being given. This notice was posted on 27th February, but notwithstanding its unequivocal terms, a further stoppage involving 18 men took place of 3rd April. Although I carefully considered the facts I was unable to discern any extenuating circumstances in connection with this stoppage which would have justified me in intervening to prevent closure, and all the men employed were accordingly given notice terminating their contracts of service with effect from 13th April.

Every effort is being made to find alternative coalmining employment for the men displaced, and there is every prospect that the great majority will be engaged at other collieries in the vicinity with outputs of 25 cwts. per manshift and over, as against an output at Fauldhouse varying from 12 to 17 cwts. This level of output at Fauldhouse had resulted in heavy losses being incurred, and since 1942 the maintenance of the colliery in production has cost the Coal Charges Fund £190,000. The position in Lanarkshire and the adjacent area in West Lothian is that the value of the joint machinery of conciliation and arbitration is gravely endangered by the recent course of events, which has also resulted in the loss in that area of over 100,000 tons of coal during the past six

(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. 9.

Saturday, May 4, 1946.

"Only That Which Resists Endures"

In varying degrees, Canada, Australia and even South Africa (the Continent of Europe not to be omitted from consideration) occupy a more prominent part of the Social Credit field of vision at the present moment than its British homeland, where, nevertheless, the discomfiture of the reformist-minded must surely be nearer to completion if they have seen the subject of the 'public debate' staged by the Economic Reform Club and Institute (May 3), "That the National Control of Finance will render the Public Ownership of Industry Unnecessary."

Here in England the brave and able speech of our friend, Mr. Jaques, to the Canadian House of Commons should be read in conjunction with the wise words of Mr. James Guthrie engendering a more robust attitude towards their unique responsibility of less distinguished members of our order.

An early reason for the popularity of Social Credit ideas was the hope that it might be the embodiment of an assault upon the citadel of entrenched Power entailing no discomfort and only the most peaceful persuasion to the highly intelligent but timorous reformer. Buxton was the scene of the first discouragement to this facile view. There have been others. Truth does not enter by back doors. It would not be true if it did. The durability of Social Credit is of the same nature as the durability of institutions. The cleverest of Napoleon's politicians, when he asked them for an opinion concerning the durability of his institutions, answered by saying: "Ask yourself what it would cost you to destroy them. If the destruction would cost you no effort, you have created nothing; for, politically as well as physically, only that which resists endures."

Only that which resists endures. So, with Mr. Guthrie, we hope that, as the great crisis approaches, the actions of Social Crediters may become more personal and less aloof, and that they may recognise their unique position in society.

"Youth" in Tasmania

The Labour Party here stinks, especially in the nostrils of Labour 'followers'. Labour is only in power because of the incompetence or treachery of the Liberal Party. Some of the discontented will vote Liberal to get rid of Labour, but many will not vote Liberal at any price. The 'democracy' of the towns is class conscious, and this extends into the monetary reform movement.

The Legislative Council franchise is interesting. It extends only to owners of houses (£10 a year), those who pay rates (12/- a week), returned soldiers and university graduates. As the Government figure for computing the

basic wage is a rental of £1 0s. 11d., a week, the franchise includes the head of practically every family. Yet Labour, which has a large majority in the House of Assembly, can get only three direct representatives in the Upper House, one of whom is a rebel. Further, the voting in the Lower House goes according to direction, right down the list of candidates; whereas in the Upper House the voting is discriminative. Assuming wives vote for the same candidates as their husbands, the explanation of the difference in the results must be put down to the youth vote—the same thing as Hitler and Stalin relied on, the 'Youth' movement. Labour evidently realises this, for they have constantly demanded a reduction of the voting age to 18.

This is how the House which compelled the Federal Government to hold a Referendum was constituted. It was vilified from all quarters as reactionary; but, strangely enough, its verdict was upheld by the majority of Australians. Tremendous pressure was brought to bear. Individuals and the State were threatened with dire consequences and cajoled with promises and bribes; but the Members held firm. We must raise our hats to the leader in this fight, Mr. Lilloco, M.L.C.

The number of larrikins [Aus., *rowdies*] who are being pushed into key positions is astonishing, and the result may be disastrous to the administration. J. T. Lang thinks the revolt against the left is stronger among the lower wage group than in the higher. The Teachers' Federation, which has always been ultra 'modern' had a long article in its magazine debunking modernism in all its phases. This is significant.

I believe that if a few Social Crediters could appreciate the tremendous speed of the revolution they are witnessing, and use the powerful weapons placed in their hands, the result would be decisive. As the great crisis approaches, their actions may become more personal and less aloof, and they may recognise their unique position in society.

—JAMES GUTHRIE.

Hobart, April 12.

Canadian National Convention

Dated Edmonton, Alberta, April 8, the following has been sent to Major Douglas:—

SOCIAL CREDIT ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL CONVENTION, Regina

Dear Major Douglas:

I have been instructed to convey to you the feelings of the delegates as expressed at the Second Annual National Social Credit Convention of Canada held in Regina, Saskatchewan, April 4, 5, 6, by the following resolution which was heartily and unanimously adopted:

This Second National Convention of the advocates of Social Credit assembled in Regina, April 4, 5, 6, 1946, express to you their gratitude and admiration for your great contribution to the cause of freedom and to assure you that the principles and tenets enunciated by you will continue to receive their endorsement.

With hearty and sincere good wishes.

Yours truly,

H. E. NICHOLS, Joint Secretary.

Communism in Canada

The noteworthy and valuable speech of Mr. Norman Jaques, M.P., in the Canadian House of Commons, the opening paragraphs of which were published by *The Social Crediter* last week, continued as follows:

And then, to those who think that the Prime Minister took a liberty or a risk when action was started in this espionage case, there is quite a pertinent editorial in the *Saturday Evening Post*. It is headed, "Is it immoral to trip up a spy?"

When the Canadians could no longer keep the well-known secret that Soviet agents had long been operating on this hemisphere, former ambassador Joe Davies rushed up to declare that Stalin had a "moral right" to spy upon America because America has the atom-bomb secret and Russia, so far as is known, hasn't . . . One could point out that Joe Davies, who endorsed Stalin's murders of thousands of Russians without trial, is an odd man to mention morals in this connection, particularly as it seems not to have occurred to him that, if Russia has a moral right to steal our secrets, we have a moral right to prevent her from stealing them. Furthermore, officials in this or the Canadian government have a moral duty to protect the interests and security of their country, and not use government time to think up excuses for other nations' spies.

The mention of Mr. Davies and the Moscow trials reminds me of a statement which I put on *Hansard* a few years ago. In July, 1943, I called attention to a letter which had been recently published in the *New York Times* dealing with a motion picture called "Mission to Moscow." I quoted a letter which was signed by Mr. John Dewey and Suzanne LaFollette, who were the chairman and secretary of an international commission that went to examine into the Moscow trials. In the light of what has happened since, this letter is certainly prophetic. I will read only the first and last paragraphs:

The film "Mission to Moscow" is the first instance in our country of totalitarian propaganda for mass consumption—propaganda which falsifies history through distortion, omission or pure invention of facts, and whose effect can only be to confuse the public in its thought and its loyalty . . . The film is anti-British, anti-congress, anti-democratic and anti-truth. It deepens that crisis in morals which is the fundamental issue in the modern world. . . . "Mission to Moscow" is a major defeat for the democratic cause. In putting out this picture the producers, far from rendering the patriotic service on which Mr. Davies compliments them, have assailed the very foundations of freedom. For truth and freedom are indivisible, as Hitler knew when he expounded his method of confusing public opinion through propaganda. The picture "Mission to Moscow" makes skilful use of the Hitler technique. To quote Matthew Low of the *New Leader*, "This kind of 'truth' is on the march, and God help us if nothing can stop it."

Mention has been made, I believe by the Prime Minister, quoting the judges who are investigating the activities of these alleged spies, that the accused excuse themselves for their spying on the ground that their loyalties are not inside this country, their loyalties are outside; and I say that the reason for that is very largely the propaganda which has been put over by every possible means for the past many years to confuse the people in their loyalties. I have repeatedly in this house protested against it. I can only say that I got very little support either inside or outside the house; in fact I might say that there has been great deal more sympathy shown to the spies than to those who have tried to enlighten public opinion on this dangerous situation. Three years ago this next week I called attention to a statement which was made by a well-known editor in this country, Mr. Sandwell. He said—at least he is reported to

have said—at a meeting of the League of Nations Society in this very building, though not in this chamber:

A supranational authority with power to settle questions of immigration, natural resources, treatment of minorities, repudiation of debts, finance, etc. To bring about Canada's acceptance of the new "authority" it would be necessary to bring all the people to a diminution of their loyalty to the crown by substituting a new loyalty to an authority wider than Canada, than the British commonwealth of nations, or all the democracies together.

When I called attention to this in this chamber and asked if that were not treason, I was greeted with either ridicule or jeers from one end of Canada to the other. I say that these few spies who have been caught in the net are not the danger; it is not these few men, misguided as they are, who constitute our danger; the danger is that these opinions are shared by, I should not like to say how many, but altogether too many Canadians in this country. Their loyalty is no longer to Canada but to something outside the country, something outside the British empire, outside democracy. It is the direct result of a lying propaganda which has been used in every possible way to confuse the loyalties and the thoughts of the Canadian people.

Now a few words about the idea of a world government, of which we have heard so much in the past few years. Both Lenin and Stalin have declared that "the prolonged existence of the Soviet republic side by side with the imperialist states is unthinkable and in the end either one or the other will be victorious, and until this happens a series of terrible conflicts between the Soviet republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable." What is the result? What has been the big idea, these past many years, if it is not the dissolution of the British Empire—because there are three great powers in the world to-day. There is the British Empire; there is the United States of America, and there is the U.S.S.R. How, then, is it possible or conceivable that a world government can be made up of these two contrasting ideologies? Has anyone ever read a statement by Premier Stalin or any other Russian indicating that they have any intention of surrendering one atom of their sovereignty to any world government? No. All the surrendering has been done by the others. There has been appeasement, and the idea has been to drive a wedge between different members of the British empire, destroy their strength, and then drive a wedge between them and the United States. Thus there would be only two to decide the issue.

That cuts both ways. Can one wonder that Premier Stalin and the Russians are suspicious of the rest of the world, the bourgeois states, as he calls them, or the imperialist states? Imperialism is of course another word for anti-communism. Can one wonder that they are suspicious when we are doing all we can to spread the idea of one world government? They know very well that government will never be theirs; that is, if we can prevent it. It will never be from Moscow, and is it not only natural therefore that they should think that before there can be a world government the power of Moscow will have to be eliminated? Do we not think exactly the same thing? Is not that what it has come to? What else was the reason for Churchill's speech at Fulton? I heard the speech; Mr. Churchill was speaking beyond the shadow of a doubt, if not with the approval of the government of Great Britain, with that of the majority of the people in the old country; and beyond question he spoke with the full approval of the President of the United States.

If you sum that all up in one sentence you can say that Churchill made this statement: If we do not hang together we shall hang separately. That is where the idea of a one world government has brought us, to the verge of a third world war. That is the position we are in to-day. Had we kept to the Atlantic charter and guaranteed all countries their sovereign freedom, then no country would be afraid of any other. But that was where the tragic mistake was made. What happened when the President of the United States and Mr. Churchill stepped off their battleship? Why was that charter torn up? Who tore it up? That is something we have never been told.

One thing is certain, that no people in the world to-day wants war. The British people do not want it; the American people do not want it; the Russian people do not want it and never did want it. We have had two wars. Why are we faced with a third? Because there are people who are determined upon world power, and in order to get it there will be another war and another after that until there is only one power left on earth. That is what we face.

I would not for a moment accuse anyone—I would not name anyone—of deliberately helping that along. I am quite willing to believe that the majority of the world's people have been frightened into the conviction, by these horrible stories of atomic bombs and so forth, that they have been put into a frame of mind where they are willing to surrender everything they have, including their liberties, in order to prevent another war. But that will not prevent it. There are people, whose names perhaps will come to light, who are and have been for a long time deliberately plotting and planning just that thing.

I said that the big idea has been to eliminate the British Empire, using as an excuse Greece or Palestine or India or some other place. Always the socialist is against British action and British control. I remember a year ago last Christmas when Britain was having trouble to keep order in Greece. I was, I believe, the only member of this house who publicly made a statement endorsing the British action. For that I was abused more than these spies have been abused. I was the subject of an abusive editorial in the *Citizen*, for instance, because I said that very thing.

The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation at their national convention a year ago last Christmas or thereabouts issued a statement, which was published in the press, that they condemned British action in Greece, saying that Canadians were not dying to restore discredited governments or reactionary monarchs. When the representative of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation was over in London at the united nations organization conference he had the great pleasure of hearing Mr. Bevin call Mr. Vishinsky "a damn liar" for using those very words.

Mr. Coldwell: Oh no.

Mr. Jaques: Yes, he did.

Mr. Coldwell: Quite different.

Mr. Jaques: Exactly the same.

Mr. Coldwell: Mr. Bevin did not say he would restore discredited monarchs or discredited governments; quite a different thing.

Mr. Jaques: I shall not mention Palestine because I intend to make some further remarks on that country later on. Then we have the Argentine. At the peace conference in San Francisco the admission of the Argentine was opposed

by I do not know how many people, but I know it was opposed by the leader of the C.C.F. party.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jaques: I will tell you why, because the Argentine is not a communist government. That is the real reason.

An hon. Member: Fascists.

Mr. Jaques: We now have the proof of what I say. They have had a perfectly democratic election without bloodshed. It was in perfect order and they have elected the government they wanted. That is their business, not ours, may I say, unless we want to bring about another war. So it is with Spain. I hold no brief for Spain but I believe that the Spanish people are perfectly capable of running their own affairs. Whatever one may say about Spain or the Spanish people, they never interfered with us during the late war. I know I have heard them accused—

Mr. Coldwell: They tried to.

Mr. Jaques: I have heard them accused of certain things, but when you consider the position in which the Spanish government found themselves when only the British Empire stood against the might of Germany and all Europe was overrun by Hitler, do you think it was any great sin, for the Spanish government to play along with Hitler to the extent that they did in order to preserve their own people?

An hon. Member: Certainly.

Mr. Jaques: They did not do anything to us.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Jaques: Where was the C.C.F. when Britain stood alone against the might of Germany? What did the C.C.F. say? "Not a man overseas."

Mr. Probe: At that time members of the C.C.F. were in the armed forces.

Mr. Bentley: Our boys were over there.

Mr. Jaques: "Not a man overseas"; not before Russia came into it.

Mr. Coldwell: That is a lie.

Mr. Jaques: It is true.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must call the attention of hon. members to standing order 34, which reads as follows:

Every member desiring to speak is to rise in his place, uncovered, and address himself to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jaques: I heard the B.B.C. broadcast last night. I hope what they said is not true, and coming from the B.B.C. it may very well not be true. When I was over in England two years ago I heard that the B.B.C. was a sort of code name for Beelzebub's Brethren Calling.

Mr. Coldwell: That is what Hitler said.

Mr. Jaques: Well, he was not far out. However, I was going to say a word on behalf of General Mihailovich, who, I am sorry to say, has been captured. I know the stories that have been told; I know the other side, too. Let me quote a statement of the British ambassador to Yugoslavia, which is good enough for me. What did he say?

All the accusations of the partisans that Mihailovich is a fascist, collaborating with the occupational forces, are completely unfounded, and spring entirely from the efforts of the partisans to blacken Mihailovich among the Serbian population, and frustrate him when the moment comes to seize power in the country. General Mihailovich from the beginning of the struggle has loyally collaborated with the allies and no one can doubt his loyalty as an ally or as the representative in the country of the Yugoslav government.

That is the statement of the British ambassador with regard to General Mihailovich. If he has been captured I suppose he has not long to live and I should like to pay that tribute to a gallant and honourable man.

Before I resume my seat I should like to make an appeal if I may. An appeal has been made on behalf of Canadian unity. I should like to appeal to French and English, Catholic and Protestant, to unite in their loyalty to the truth. Let us be true to ourselves and we can be false to no man. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3)

months. The maintenance of this machinery is of the highest importance not only in the national interest but also in the interest of the general body of workers in this basic industry. I cannot stand aside and see it weakened or destroyed as must ultimately happen unless there is an end to unofficial stoppages on this scale.

DEBT (GOVERNMENT SECURITIES)

Mr. Spearman asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the nearest million pounds, the amount of debt held by the issue department of the Bank of England and the Exchange Equalisation Account; and how these are distributed between funded and floating debt.

Mr. Dalton: As shown in the published Bank return for 10th April, 1946, the Issue Department then held £1,399 million of Government securities and £1 million of other securities. Details of these holdings have never been published, and I think they should continue to be regarded as confidential, as also should particulars of the assets of the Exchange Equalisation Account.

April 17, 1946.

NORWEGIAN OIL

Sir D. Robertson asked the Minister of Food the tonnage of Norwegian herring oil hardened and available for margarine; and what amount he intends to purchase for British use.

Sir B. Smith: Norwegian herring oil is not available for purchase by the United Kingdom under the Combined Food Board arrangements, and I do not know the amount that is being produced.

Sir D. Robertson: Are not the Combined Food Board responsible for feeding our people?

Sir B. Smith: The Combined Food Board are responsible for allocating but, on the other hand, I understand that the Norwegian authorities have prohibited the export of this oil.

April 18, 1946.

ARMED FORCES AND CIVIL SERVICE (PENSION)

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby): It is now 22 minutes to five on the last day of a long Parliamentary sitting which has extended from 22nd January until today. Today, twenty minutes before we adjourn for the Easter Recess, we have, for the first time, found an opportunity of dealing with about 750,000 retired State pensioners. When we come to deal with them, we are allocated half an hour. We have had time

enough this Session to cast the steel industry into confusion, we have had time to listen to Ministers talking on subjects which they do not understand, but it is only in the last 22 minutes of a long sitting that we have any time to deal with 750,000 retired servants of the State who have had an exceedingly raw deal at the hands of the State.

I am not going to attempt, in the seven minutes which is the maximum I can have, if I am to allow the Government to reply, to add to the case which has been stated. But I will do one thing today. I will make my protest against the way these men have been treated, and against the conduct of successive Governments in this connection. I will be precise. I protest at the meanness shown by Governments up to 1935 on this subject and at their giving the least they could by way of compensation for the increased cost of living to the retired State pensioners. I protest against their meanness in consolidating the increase in pensions at a time when the cost of living had fallen to its lowest point. I protest against their conduct from 1935 until 1944, when the cost of living was rising, in denying a single penny of relief to these 750,000 people. I protest that in 1944, when, after two years of agitation in this House I obliged them to do something they did the meanest, miserablist least they could in the circumstances of that time. I swore that I would compel them to do something when I came back to this House. I protest that in 1945, when they were asked to produce a new and better Bill, they "diddled" us with the use of the Expiring Laws (Continuance) Act to carry on the existing inadequate pensions. I protest against the fact that they dishonoured the pledge they made when the Expiring Laws (Continuance) Act was brought before this House. When that Act was before the House, I raised this very point and I received from the hon. Gentleman opposite, whose word is worthless—it is time we had some plain speaking in this House, and I do not care what he replies today because I shall not believe a word of it until it is implemented—

Mr. House (St. Pancras, North): Is it in order Mr. Deputy-Speaker, for an hon. Member to allege that a statement by the Parliamentary Secretary is worthless?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker (Mr. Hubert Beaumont): The hon. Gentleman is not out of Order, but whether such expressions are advisable is another matter. It is a question of taste.

Mr. Brown: I make no apology. I say that the promise the hon. Gentleman made last November has been proved to be worthless. He promised the House of Commons that he would not wait for the Expiring Laws (Continuance) Act of last November to expire next November before this matter was reviewed. He promised that it would be gone into as soon as possible. He recognised that there were anomalies in the 1944 Pensions (Increases) Act, and promised that he would consider them as soon as possible. Yet when I asked the Government, as I did a few weeks ago, what they intend to do, I got the reply that there was no prospect of any legislation on this subject this Session. What does that mean but that the assurance which the hon. Gentleman gave last November was utterly worthless from the point of view of these 750,000 people?

I do not want to attempt to add to the case which has been put by my hon. and gallant Friend, but I want to denounce the Government for their mean, callous, cruel, indifferent, treatment of 750,000 old servants of the State. I tell the Government that the effect of their ill-treatment is that the word of the Government counts for nothing in the

world of the public service today. I say that one of the Achilles heels of this Government, this contemptuous Government—contemptuous of Parliament, and of its obligations to its servants—will prove to be the public service of this country. I warn them that we are tired of them, that we do not believe a word they say to us. We regard them as very much in the category of cardsharps. That is strong language, but it is about time the House of Commons heard some plain language when we are dealing with people who do not understand anything but plain language.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's language is in bad taste, though not out of Order. In my opinion the words used are undesirable.

Mr. Brown: I am merely telling the Financial Secretary what people are saying outside this place. There was a time when Governments would have been sacked for less unworthy conduct than they have exhibited towards the poor people for whom I am pleading today. One of the things I will do, by the grace of God, if this kind of conduct continues, is to denounce the Government in appropriate terms, and leave them to do what they like. Something a little stronger than myself is what is needed to deal with this kind of set up. There is a fellow whose statue appears outside, whom we might invoke in this connection! . . .

. . . Apparently we have reached the stage when this Labour Government, from whom labour will have to be protected before this Parliament is through, in its dealing with the weakest section of the community can do nothing except "diddle" them in the way in which these old folk have been "diddled." All it does is to give the Civil Service fair words plus the Control of Employment Order, which forbids them to walk out. This is a strange set up. At any rate, I have made my protest today. I do not think it matters two hoots what the Financial Secretary says. He is not even a Minister. In the Treasury they regard him as the weakest and most complacent Financial Secretary they have ever had in my lifetime. This is blunt talk, but it ought to be said. Few Ministers have counted very much in the Departments of which they have served. The present Financial Secretary is regarded in the Treasury as the weakest, most pliable and most complacent instrument they have had to deal with yet. We want Ministers there who can deal with officials, who are strong enough to recognise a just claim when it is made, and to be able to insist that something is done about it. I have not the slightest confidence that the Hon. Gentleman will do anything, and I do not think it matters, therefore, what he says.

I have made my protest today, and at every opportunity I will continue to make that protest on behalf of these hundreds of thousands of retired people, badly treated during their service, and defrauded in their retirement. I denounce it in the name of everything I hold to be decent, reasonable and just in the relationship between the State and its servants.

EMPLOYMENT MINERS (PROSECUTIONS)

Squadron-Leader Donner asked the Minister of Labour how many of the 2,100 men who left their employment in the coalmining industry during 1945, without the permission of a National Service officer, contrary to the Essential Work (Coalmining Industry) Order, 1943, have been prosecuted; how many have been convicted; and what was the nature of the penalty in each case.

Mr. Ness Edwards: During the year 1945 proceedings in England, Scotland and Wales were taken under the Essential Work (Coalmining Industry) Order, 1943, against 756 persons for leaving their employment in the coalmining industry without the permission of a National Service officer with the following results:

Fined	479
Imprisoned	88
Bound over, dismissed under Probation of Offenders Act or admonished	69
Dismissed or withdrawn	120
						<hr/> 756

BROADCASTING (SPONSORED PROGRAMMES)

Mr. Kingsmill asked the Prime Minister whether he will consider the immediate appointment of a commission to investigate the future of broadcasting in this country, with especial reference to the possible introduction of commercially sponsored programmes.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Attlee): No, Sir. As stated in answer to a Question by my hon. Friend the Member for West Leicester (Mr. Janner) on 19th February, the Government has given the fullest consideration to the appointment of a commission to consider the future of broadcasting in this country, and has decided that no independent investigation is necessary. The question of permitting commercially sponsored programmes was fully considered when this decision was made.

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.