

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 18. No. 19.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

"Coal, the Key" (P.E.P. Slogan)

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

II

Where the selling-price to the ultimate home consumer of an article is little above the direct *cost* of production as, for instance, in the pre-war price of coal, the items which go to make production-cost are the dominant consideration. Most coal exports were a loss. One of the difficulties in assessing the real effect of export trade lies in the absence of true cost figures, and it is therefore most helpful to be provided with a case, that of Scotch whisky, in which true cost is so small a percentage of selling price *to the consumer* that no great error is introduced by taking the F.O.B. price (4/9d.) as the cost, although in fact the true cost is probably not one quarter of that figure. The price to the consumer of somewhat weaker whisky than that shipped F.O.B. at 4/9d. is nominally 25/9 but more nearly averages £2 10s. 0d. (There is more whisky sold in the Black Market at £3 10s. 0d. per bottle than at the controlled price. Why not? *Vive les rackets!*) But we will take the controlled price as a basis. Imagine for a moment that the amorphous bulk figures of exports given by the "B".B.C. did reflect something amorphous—that all "production" is whisky or can be accounted for as whisky; that the country to which we export the whisky lives solely on whisky, as above defined, imported from us, paid for in dollars, which are used by us to buy the raw material for more whisky. Then, on the premises we are using, *the standard of living of the country to which we export is to ours as the inverse of the bulk prices—i.e., 25.75 to 4.75*, and that standard is brought up to its high level by free subsidies from us. The extent to which this example corresponds with fact simply depends on the ratio of capital and export goods to home-produced consumable and imported *consumable* goods on sale, measured in a common unit of account.

This somewhat tricky process is clearly a matter, not of absolutes, but of ratios. For a given amount of "production", you can maintain any standard of living by exchanging a portion of it for an excess value—a profit. *And conversely, you can have a falling standard of living quite irrespective of how much you produce, if you export more and more for the raw material of further exports.* And since your "production" is not production at all, but is simply changing one thing into another by the application of energy, you can use more and more coal, labour and material for less and less satisfaction. This is, of course, what we are doing, and have been doing in this country for a century at least. It may, of course be asked, *quis benefic?* Who is the criminal? That is another story.

The situation disclosed by the A + B Theorem, which required money from capital and export goods to be provided for the home purchase of a diminishing percentage of consumable production, enabled this process to be carried on more or less un-noticed by anyone but the International Bill-brokers, so long as the greater part of the earth was unindustrialised. Any intelligent child ought to have been able to see that, if the coal-operated, power-driven machine age was really so efficient in comparison with the England of the sixteenth century, there was something very queer going on when fifteen millions of employes, working nine hours per day, could not maintain a decent standard of living, without robbing, by taxation, a diminishing number who had attained a fair standard. But the attention of the intelligent children was diverted, and the grown-ups were treated by the London School of Economics, so that any fact which was less obvious than a lump of coal escaped them.

That the present Finance-Socialist Administration is Satanic in intention is demonstrated by the extension of the process just indicated. More and more coal, more and more employment, including that of women, more and more export for less and less return, £800,000,000 free to U.N.R.R.A., are not now left to the working of the A + B Theorem. They are ensured by Order-in-Council.

From all, all they can do; to all, as little as they can live on, or less.

At the moment, Dr. Dalton and his gang appear to be getting away with it. I think, not for long. It is going to dawn on an increasing number of people that this "need for more labour," "the export drive," "austerity," the unique importance of organised labour, "no room for parasites," "the rest don't matter a tinker's cuss"—and so on—is a pretty scheme to create a Soviet "aristocracy" such as exists in Russia—an "aristocracy" which for vulgar corruption and callous indifference to the "proletariat," together with a complete absence of cultural grace or value, appears to parallel the gangster élite of Chicago and New York. That is the kind of "aristocracy" the world-rulers like. The aristocracy which grew out of mediaeval chivalry may not have been flawless; but a perusal of Magna Carta is sufficient to demonstrate that it was an effective barrier to the kind of racketeer we know elevated to power.

What to do? Quite easy: Arrest one dozen men *and one woman* in this country, and about twice that number in New York and Chicago. Put them on the island of Runnymede with a guard of Coldstreams, commanded by Officers who were arrested without notice under 18B.

Give them three weeks to find a solution—or else.

But perhaps another world war is more agreeable, or death by slow starvation.

Finally: IF the future of this country depends on "the workers," it has no future. The Trades Unions have done their work well, and not one man in twenty understands the meaning of an honest day's work. Many would be glad to work; but most of these emigrate. The rest imitate the Hitler Youth, and play politics.

(Conclusion)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 19, 1947.

Naturalisation

Mr. L. Hutchinson asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will give the number of applications by aliens now resident in this country for naturalisation; the number of such aliens who have made claim for prior consideration on the grounds of war service; and the number of the latter applications that has already been granted and the number still pending.

Mr. Ede: The answer is as follows:

APPLICATIONS FOR NATURALISATION.

Statement of position since resumption of naturalisation on 1st January, 1946.

Applications outstanding on 1st January, 1946	...	16,000
Applications received from 1st January, 1946, to 31st May, 1947		
Civilian cases	...	15,048
Service cases	...	8,172
	Total	39,220
Certificates granted - from 1st January, 1946 to 31st May, 1947		
Civilian cases	...	9,323
Service cases	...	3,653
	Total	12,976
Balance outstanding on 1st January, 1947		
Civilian cases	...	20,443
Service cases	...	3,849
	Total	24,292

House of Commons: June 23, 1947

Government Hospitality (Receptions, London)

Mr. Arthur Lewis asked the Minister of Works the amount of money spent on Government hospitality at receptions held in London hotels and restaurants; and the amount spent in each establishment for the past year.

Mr. Key: The total expenditure on Government hospitality at receptions held in London hotels and restaurants

SCIENCE, LIBERTY AND PEACE

By ALDOUS HUXLEY.

PRICE 3/6. POSTAGE 2d.

Obtainable from:

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

during the 12 months ended 31st May, 1947, was £4,754 10s. 5d. I will, with my hon. Friend's permission, circulate the details of this sum in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Following are the details:

The amount spent in each establishment was as follows:

	£	s.	d.
Claridges Hotel	1,311	7	9
The Dorchester	727	9	2
Grosvenor House	49	6	1
Gunters Restaurant	201	11	0
The Hylle Park Hotel	157	4	1
The Savoy Hotel	2,307	12	4
Total	£4,754	10	5

Shooting Incident, Itchen Stoke

Sir E. Graham-Little asked the Minister of Agriculture under what process of law George Raymond Walden, Borough Farm, Itchen Stoke, Hants, was shot dead while defending his home; whether the police who shot him were acting under the authority of a legal warrant or under what other authority; and what action he is taking in the matter.

Mr. T. Williams: In 1940 on account of the poor state of Mr. Walden's farm and his failure to comply with Cultivation Orders, it became necessary for the Hampshire War Agricultural Executive Committee to take possession of the holding. Mr. Walden refused to leave and shot at, seriously injuring, an unarmed policeman sent to see that there was no breach of the peace when the Committee took possession. He then shut himself in the house and shot at anyone approaching. Altogether he injured with gun shots four policemen before he was killed—it is thought—by a gun discharged by one of the policemen trying to arrest him for attempted murder. A coroner's jury returned the verdict that the man died from gunshot wounds inflicted by a police officer in the proper execution of his duty, and that it was, therefore, justifiable homicide. No warrant is necessary in law for the arrest of a man who has committed the felony of attempted murder. If an officer of justice is resisted in the legal execution of his duty, he may use force, and should he kill the person resisting him it is justifiable homicide. This very regrettable incident was fully investigated at the time. In view of the verdict at the inquest and the passage of seven years, I see no reason why I should take any action in the matter, or that I could usefully do so.

House of Commons: June 27, 1947

Northern Ireland Bill

Considered in Committee.

[Major MILNER in the Chair]

NEW CLAUSE.—[Validation of the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Acts (Northern Ireland), 1922 to 1943].

The limitations and restrictions imposed by the principal Act on the power of the Parliament of Northern Ireland to make laws shall be deemed never to have extended to prevent that Parliament from enacting the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Acts (Northern Ireland), 1922 to 1943, or to prevent the carrying out of section one of the Civil Authorities [Special Civil Authority (as defined in subsection (2) Powers] Act (Northern Ireland), 1922, amended by section one of the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act (Northern Ireland), 1933) from making or varying or revoking any regulation thereunder; and, the provisions of the principal Act notwithstanding, the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Acts (Northern Ireland), 1922 to 1943, and each and every regulation

made thereunder shall continue in full force and effect until the first day of October nineteen hundred and forty-seven and no longer, unless Parliament otherwise determines.—[Mr. Bing.]

Brought up, and read the First time.

Sir Hugh O'Neill (Antrim): Before the hon. Member for Hornchurch (Mr. Bing) moves, "That the Clause be read a Second time," may I raise a point of Order in regard to it, Major Milner? So far as I read it, the Clause seeks to repeal provisions of an Act of Parliament passed by another legislature within the Empire. I cannot speak on the legal aspect, but it seems to me that if that were done it would be opening a new and doubtful chapter in the constitutional history of the British Empire, and quite apart from that point, which seems to be a very substantial point indeed, this Clause suggests also that the Special Powers Act of Northern Ireland is *ultra vires* the Government of Ireland Act, 1920. If that is so, surely the proper procedure is for that point to be tested in the courts? There is provision in the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, for testing any constitutional matter of that kind in the Privy Council. Surely, that is the proper place to do that, and I suggest to you, Major Milner, in view of both the points I have made, that this Clause is not properly in Order.

The Chairman: I have given serious consideration to the point as to whether or not I should call this new Clause, and have also had regard to the fact that it was put in very late—it appeared for the first time on the Order Paper today. I am sure the right hon. Baronet appreciates that the question of importance or merit does not affect the question of Order. I have taken advice and I have come to the conclusion that the new Clause is in Order and that I have no alternative, on the grounds of Order, but to call it. I would point out to the right hon. Baronet that this Bill is promoted largely to remove doubts regarding the validity of certain laws made by the Parliament of Northern Ireland, and there are quite a number of additions under the Clauses of the Bill which directly remove doubts. In the circumstances, I can only say that in my judgment this new Clause is in Order.

Mr. Bing (Hornchurch): I beg to move, "That the Clause be read a Second time."

... This Clause deals with Section 5, which, as the Home Secretary has so rightly said, is the sheet anchor of the constitution of Northern Ireland. My submission to the Committee is that the Special Powers Act infringed on the provisions of Section 5 (1) of the Government of Ireland Act. In those circumstances, I thought that the Committee might agree with me that the proper course would not be to put some individual litigant to the expense of going to the House of Lords, but to validate for a period the actions of the Northern Ireland Government and thus give them the opportunity, after 1st October, 1947, to reconsider the position—either by coming to the House to ask for further authority to enable them to carry their Special Powers Act, or else to repeal those portions of the Special Powers Act which they may come to the conclusion infringe the constitution of Northern Ireland. That, shortly, is the object of this Clause.

To deal as shortly as I may with the point of substance involved, in the first place Section 5 (1) of the Government of Ireland Act provides clearly and distinctly that the Parliament of Northern Ireland shall make no law which tends, either directly or indirectly, to take any property without compensation. That is a principle which I should have

thought would have commended itself to hon. Gentlemen opposite. It does seem to me a little odd that they should be so anxious where the property of the wealthy people is concerned while disregarding cases which concern poor and humble folk. One of the first things the Northern Ireland Government did under the Special Powers Act was to make Regulations by which any person authorised by the Home Secretary could seize, under Regulation 18C, any property which he himself considered might be in any way involved in any offence. Let me just give the Committee one or two examples of how that power has been used in dealing, for example, with members of the Labour Party of Northern Ireland...

[*He gave two examples concerned with the seizure of books in pre-election raids.*]... It seems to me to be rather a long way round to have to go all the way to the House of Lords to get one's books returned.

I put it to the Home Secretary that it might be desirable that we should consider whether or not these provisions of the Special Powers Act infringe Section 5 (1) of the Government of Ireland Act. If they do, we have offered hon. Gentlemen opposite a Clause which will rectify that, and it is up to them to accept it or not. If they are not willing to accept it, then I think there may be an argument for our not pressing it from this side of the House because the whole validity of the Special Powers Act might be tested. If they think they can stand on a regulation which provides for forfeit when there is a provision in the constitution saying that no property may be taken without compensation, that perhaps is a matter which might be tested, and I will have a word to say to the Home Secretary about this in a moment.

There is just one other aspect of the question which does arise as to whether the whole Special Powers Act from beginning to end is not just void. That is a much more difficult and technical point but, shortly speaking, what happened was that in 1920 this Parliament delegated to the Parliament of Northern Ireland powers to make laws for the order and good government of Northern Ireland. Those powers were delegated by the Northern Ireland Government, first to the Home Secretary, then, by a subsequent Amendment, to the Parliamentary Secretary, who is entitled to make laws which have the right to repeal Acts of this Parliament in certain circumstances. These powers have since been further delegated to any police officer or police constable—which means even part-time constables, some of whom are not quite as impartial as one would like them to be. It seems to me that to delegate powers of legislation to police officers is wrong. The right hon. Gentleman opposite knows of this because a by-election is proceeding in his constituency at the moment and the meetings of his party are actually held in the barracks of one of the police organisations.

Sir Ronald Ross (Londonderry): On the other hand, the hon. Member's meetings are held without displaying the Union Jack—which he dare not—and without playing the National Anthem.

Mr. Bing: The Clause at present under discussion does not deal with the propriety or otherwise of using patriotism as a party technique, but I should have thought that one of the first duties of a Northern Ireland patriot would be to obey scrupulously the constitution laid down for Northern Ireland by this Parliament...

(continued on page 6.)

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. 18. No. 19.

Saturday, July 12, 1947.

From Week to Week

The history of these islands for two hundred years is a history (and by far the most significant history) of the interaction of Roundhead-Whig-Liberalism with Jewish intrigue, and it is no accident that a meeting of thinly-disguised Jewish interests, including Communism, which was recently held in a flat in London, included Sir Andrew MacFadyean, an ex-Treasury official, a member of the fatal 1917 mission to Washington, Secretary of the Dawes Commission and Joint Hon. Treasurer of the Liberal Party Organisation. Sir Andrew is also a City magnate.

Liberal-Whiggism (we are not of course, referring to the must-vote-for-somebody variety) forms one of the most subtle aberrations of human nature. To suppose that all Liberals are hypocrites is merely infantile—the malady goes far deeper. Its roots are (in spite of its frequently ostentatious piety) in a denial of religion. Not only in a denial of Christianity, because it generally goes with a variety of sectarianism commonly by courtesy dubbed Christian, but of the essential meaning of religion, which is “to bind back.” The essence of Liberalism is the essence of Professor Laski’s idea of the British Constitution, as something which makes its own rules quite regardless of anything but its own transcendent sovereignty. Between 1906, and 1922, when the Jewish influence having as usual overplayed its hand, Lloyd George and his Ministry of “hard-faced men who looked as though they had done well out of the war” revolted even the British political digestion, and Sir Alfred Mond and his fellow industrialists for the most part became “Conservatives” with a view to carrying on, from the Carlton Club, policies for which the Reform had become an undesirable address, this sweeping away of every obstacle to “the will of the people” as formulated for them by the Treasury and the Bank of England went on practically without interference, partly, no doubt, because the mass of the electorate was abysmally ignorant (it is only less so now) of the trend of the policy. With the short Bonar-Law interregnum, the Armistice period was devoted to consolidating the gains made, the Conservative Parliamentary majority being completely dominated by its Whig Fifth Column, Baldwin at its head.

With the return of war, the Labour sanction became irresistible, and the Jewish influence was transferred to Socialism and Communism. But the Jew is nothing if not prehensile; and a reconversion to Liberalism is clearly in the offing.

The practical importance of this is that, thoroughly unsatisfactory as is the Conservative Party in its present dress and with its contemporary Whig leadership, any considerable Liberal Parliamentary success, even if far from achieving Office, would be absolutely disastrous. It would merely indicate that we have learnt nothing, and can therefore expect a final and permanent defeat.

The story which will undoubtedly be told is that a Liberal candidate will have a better chance of defeating a Socialist. The answer is that every Liberal returned is a *de facto* Communist victory. We do not believe the present situation can be greatly assisted by any probable electoral result; but we have no doubt whatever that it can be made much worse.

We cannot too strongly recommend to serious students of these present discontents a booklet published by the Aquinas Society and written by Mr. Richard O’Sullivan, K.C., entitled “Christian Philosophy in the Common Law.”

Readers of this review will not require to be told of our conviction that our present clipped and emasculated Constitution is potentially fatal to ourselves, and a menace to the World. It seems extraordinary that a generation which believes itself to be “scientific,” and pretends to recognise law in everything, should suppose that the only Law in human affairs is that which Mr. Shinwell, assisted by Messrs. Piratin and Platt-Mills, propose to import from Moscow. Whether Common Law can be supported against the House of Commons and the Cabinet by the Judges alone, without the background of religious belief, seems doubtful; but that the principle of the supremacy of Natural Justice must be re-enthroned or we perish is certain.

A nation-wide large-display advertisement of the Dominion Bank (of Canada) which appeared in the Alberta newspapers on May 21, ought to be of considerable assistance to us in bringing the mechanisms of “democracy” into the limelight which they deserve.

Describing the Secret Ballot as “a priceless [*sic*] freedom,” the bank advertisement says “When a nation votes in secret, the people live in open freedom.” (You follow that don’t you? If not, you belong to the people who don’t matter a tinker’s cuss.)

In a recent Federal Election, the price was about five dollars.

It proceeds, with a song in its heart, just like Dr. Dalton, “With the Secret Ballot, men became their own masters... it has helped make Canada great.”

This is very interesting. Some time ago, we noticed that the new Leader of the Liberal Party in Alberta, Mr. Harper Prowse, was perturbed about the doubt thrown on the Secret Ballot by the Social Credit Board’s Report, and the Liberal Party, wherever found, is the Bankers’ favourite Party. We strongly advise the Social Credit Movements in the other Provinces of Canada to explore the militant possibilities of an open ballot. It would be odd if, for instance, a nice compact, circulating electorate was disclosed, wouldn’t it? Does anyone seriously believe that the “Labour” victory in 1945, in which most of the ballots disappeared for three months, was not planned?

We never expected to find ourselves in agreement with Mr. Strachey about anything, but, even if by accident, his defence of his policy contained one sound observation. In remarking that "it would be a mistake to think that removal of controls is always a popular policy with the traders," he indicates one of the worst features of controls. His observation could with advantage be expanded into a lecture, but amongst other aspects of it might be noted that controls of the type favoured by the London School of Economics and the Planners eliminate all competition, reverse the situation of buyer and seller, and enthrone inter-trader deals at the expense of the public. Except for those diminishing numbers of traders who took a pride in their business as beginning far back from their customers in skilful, competitive buying, the contemporary trader loves controls. He just collects easy money and ties something (anything will do) in a parcel and calls it rations.

• • •

We notice that a reply to the letter of Sir Ernest Graham-Little, M.P., on the Postal Services, which was reproduced in our issue of June 28, has been answered, if that is the right term, by the Secretary of the Post Office Trades Union.

Sir Ernest's letter was, of course, a criticism (long overdue) of some of the aspects of Post Office higher policy in its relations to the public it is supposed to serve.

It is significant that an official of an employes' association, which does not even pretend allegiance to the Secretary of The Post Office, still less to the Postmaster-General, the official channel of communication between Parliament and the public, and the postal service, takes upon himself to answer criticism of the undertaking as a whole. In more robust days, he would have been told to mind his own business; but it is significant that as the postal services get worse, the number of people who appear to represent the Post Office grows larger.

• • •

Dr. Dalton's proposed import tax on films, if it ever materialises, will be the first hint of economic sanity with which he can be credited; and it is unfortunate that he rates his constituents so low that it has to be excused by one more slogan, "Food Before Flicks." We dislike intensely the curious agitation against, e.g. luxury fruit from countries which have nothing else to send us (not, be it noticed, against the exports which preceded them) but most American films are not a luxury, they are a moral and social poison—a fact which is widely recognised in their country of origin.

• • •

Isn't it wondrous? "Britain" and France are facing up to Russia, and the States are preparing to be the Arsenal of D'Markrazi.

• • •

"The Socialist Party, which is infested with Fabians and infected with planners, plays Box to Cox with the Conservative Party, which is infested with planners and infected by Fabians."—R. F. B. Gaudin, B.Sc., A.C.G.I., in the *City Press*, June 27.

Anyone know of a good insecticide?

Industrial Organisation Bill an Instrument of Oppression*

By R. F. B. GAUDIN, B.Sc., A.C.G.I.

The Industrial Organisation Bill has now been passed by the House of Commons and is in the Lords. It is my view that if it comes into operation it will prove to be a devastating instrument of oppression. The ostensible object of the Bill is to "increase the efficiency and productivity of industries and to enable them to render better and more economical service to the community."

No one will take exception to these sentiments.

They are most laudable. The vitally important point, however, is whether the proposed legislation helps to that end or does it really further the basic policy which you would expect the Socialist Government to pursue, if not openly, certainly by using a suitable pretext? I am certain it is to further the basic policy.

State monopoly, which is even more objectionable than private monopoly (because the latter is less secure, rarely, if ever, absolute, and subject to the usual rules of accountancy), must result inevitably from the passing of this Bill.

To call the result nationalisation, while true, does not worry some people, but to call it "State Monopoly," which is another name for the same thing, does convey, I think, a stronger note of warning.

If this Bill becomes law a development council may, under Clause 14 of the First Schedule, be authorised to establish a co-operative organisation for marketing the products of an industry, thus cutting out your sales organisation.

Another co-operative organisation, or the same one with wider powers, will co-ordinate production.

To put it another way, it will hand out orders for standard products at standard prices based on standard costs to favoured firms.

The only thing left for you to do will be making the standardised goods, and conceivably all you will own eventually will be the shell of your factory or you may be closed down, for an amending order "may also assign a council—functions not listed in the First Schedule."

There is nothing to show that you will be free to contract out of these proposals, so that to all intents and purposes your private enterprise will be liquidated and you or your manager, unless they are chosen as key men to run the co-operative organisations and become members of the development council will be little more than foremen.

Of course, you may be compensated in paper money at 2½ per cent. interest, but you will just become a State slave.

That is the prospect, not immediately, perhaps, for the screw may be applied gradually. The point is that this Bill gives these powers, and we should oppose them.

To suggest that such a Bill will improve the efficiency of industry is quite untrue, but the promoters would like you to think so.

The real object is to suppress private enterprise and set up State monopoly, so as to place certain people in power over you.

The Statistics of Trade Bill is largely complimentary to the Industrial Organisation Bill, and my objection to it is

*From the *City Press* of June 27.

that it will be an instrument by which a large number of time-taking and largely useless returns can be called for.

It contains severe penalties for breaches of the law, and it will generally make your life more miserable.

Some of my readers may doubt that such powers as I suggest will be given to development councils, but as "an amending order may also assign to a council . . . functions not listed in the First Schedule," it seems that powers could be given to a council to liquidate any firm on a convenient pretext.

It may be objected that all this is conjecture and could not happen here.

But these things are happening all the time here and abroad, and it would be criminal to be complacent.

It is suggested that these industrial proposals are based largely on recommendations of the Fabian Society and of P.E.P.

The Fabian Society works for "the transfer to the community by constitutional methods of all such industries as can be conducted socially."

The founders of P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning), but before it was known as such, issued, in 1931, under the title of "Freedom and Planning," a semi-confidential document which said of the manufacturer: "He will be less free to make arbitrary decisions as to his own business . . . and in resisting them (the plans) because he regards them as encroachments on what he calls his freedom, he will make things much worse for himself and the community."

The Freedom and Planning group allowed writers and others to quote from this document provided, curiously enough, they did not quote the document itself as the source of information.

This was clever, for doubtless it was a means of making people think they were listening to or reading spontaneous thought from diverse sources, arising from the consideration of current problems. In that way prejudice was less likely to be aroused. Bernard Shaw, talking of the Fabians, said:—

"Our propaganda is chiefly one of permeating—we urged our members to join the Liberal and Radical Associations of their districts or, if they preferred, the Conservative Associations."

In 1921 the London School of Economics was founded. Sir Ernest Cassel settled large sums on it by his will, so that it would be a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State.

It is therefore not surprising to find men like the Prime Minister, Dr. Dalton, Professor Laski, Lord Beveridge—to mention only a few—were associated with, or trained at, this school and saturated with its dogmas.

Now, the Socialist Party, which is infested with Fabians and infected with planners, plays Box to Cox with the Conservative Party, which is infested with planners and infected by Fabians. The Liberal Party, being a kind of half-way house, is likewise perverted from its professed aims.

Just as red superimposed on blue makes black, so a Coalition Government which is a blend of both parties or all, may produce a political blackout and prevent people seeing the danger of the emergence of the single party with overwhelming power.

Bearing the foregoing warning in mind, do not be hyp-

notised into believing in the "inevitability" of planning. The large-scale industrial planning is envisaged by P.E.P. If you can be persuaded to think that this must be so you will be helping forward their mistaken and evil policy.

The planners themselves, realising that planning is incompatible with freedom, anticipated the natural reaction of the public, for in "Planning," No. 200, they ask those "who are genuinely concerned over the outlook of liberty to see how planning can be made the vehicle instead of the enemy of liberty, 'for planning is inevitable.'"

What is inevitable is the contradiction between Planning and Freedom.

If people have to obey plans not of their own making, they can never be free.

Now a word more about P.E.P. That organisation is controlled by a council of 13, whose chairman is Mr. Leonard Elmhirst, trustee of Dartington Hall School.

It claims that it has the co-operation in their private capacity of a large number of Civil Servants. Is it not time we had a public inquiry into P.E.P.? What right have Civil Servants to give knowledge acquired in the service of the State to this organisation? Finally, if you are on the side of freedom the time for action is now.

The Bill is not yet law, and the House of Lords may yet prove the saviour of the nation. I propose that a petition to the House of Lords against the Bill should be prepared.

All business concerns should use their sales staff for the purpose of securing signatures—for the planning of industry means the end of the sales organisation—and this is your affair.

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3)

Mr. Ede: It seems to me that my hon. Friend the Member for Hornchurch (Mr. Bing) has invited us to do what is an impossible task for a legislative and deliberative assembly; that is, to assess the validity of Acts of Parliament for another Parliament. Very few of us are qualified to do that. My hon. Friend is a barrister, and my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Kettering (Mr. Mitchison) is one of His Majesty's counsel, learned in the law; but I am a layman, and my experience with lawyers has been very much the same as the experience of the hon. Member for Rugby (Mr. W. J. Brown) with doctors.

Mr. Bing: The Home Secretary will recollect moving Clause 11, which validated another Act of the Northern Ireland Parliament exactly in the same way as this would do.

Mr. Ede: I did so because the advice on which I have to rely, and for which the House pays was that that was advisable. My view on this matter was expressed by a colleague attending quarter sessions for the first time. He had listened very carefully to the speech made for the prosecution, and then, when defending counsel rose he said, after counsel had been speaking for a couple of minutes, "What is this fellow doing? I understood this case until he started." This House is not a competent body to determine the validity of Acts of this Parliament or other Parliaments. It is frequently said in the course of our Debates that it does not matter what the Minister says in explaining a Bill, but what will happen will be what the courts say when the matter is before them. On the advice I have received, I do not believe that the Acts of which complaint is made are

invalid; but I do not regard that as the final issue, for the persons who advise me are not the persons appointed in the final issue to determine whether an Act is constitutional or not. If there is a feeling in Northern Ireland that some of these actions are not merely ludicrous but illegal, the courts are open, and Sections 49 and 50 of the Government of Ireland Act provide for appeal to the House of Lords from any court in Northern Ireland, *via* the Court of Appeal, in any case involving a decision on any question as to the validity of any Act of Northern Ireland. In addition to that, and this is very important, Section 51 of that Act has a general saving in the power of His Majesty in Council to refer any question to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and for the right of any person to petition His Majesty for such a reference. What that really means is that, in the case of Northern Ireland, if a subject feels he has a grievance he petitions His Majesty through the Home Secretary of this country, who will submit the petition to His Majesty in Council with such advice as he thinks proper.

Mr. Beattie: Does my right hon. Friend mean that the petition comes through him, or through the Home Secretary in Northern Ireland?

Mr. Ede: I am the Secretary of State whose duty it is to present petitions to His Majesty on matters of this kind arising within the Realm. In my time I do not recall that I have received such an application. I do not know whether prior to my time any petition has in fact been submitted, but if the allegations made today came to me in the form of a petition, it would be my duty to consider them and to make such recommendation in regard to the hearing by the Committee of the Privy Council as the circumstances of the case appear to warrant. This House cannot possibly decide whether an Act of Parliament is valid or not. One of the commonplaces of an Opposition, no matter to what party they belong, is to denounce what the Government propose to do as being unconstitutional. In this country that is a pretty safe charge to make because we have no written constitution, except for the Parliament Act, and the constitution is very much what one thinks it is, but in regard to Northern Ireland, the constitution in this matter is laid down in Section 5 of the principal Act. There it is quite clearly and definitely stated, and if there is any feeling that it has been violated, I should have thought the proper thing to do would be to challenge the issue in the courts.

I have no doubt that even if they were not satisfied with the courts of Northern Ireland the appeal still lies in courts in this country, and, ultimately, under Section 51, to His Majesty in Council. I suggest that the Committee would be embarking on a very dangerous principle indeed if it said we were to consider the validity of an Act passed by another Parliament. As the right hon. Member for Antrim (Sir. H. O'Neill) suggested in his point of Order, we would not make this claim in regard to an Act of Parliament of the Union of South Africa, or any of the other great Dominions. There, too, the first appeal, as I understand it, is to the courts of the country in which self-government is being practised and, ultimately, in most of these cases there is an appeal to His Majesty in Council. Quite recently there was a very important constitutional case brought over from the Dominion of Canada to be argued before the Privy Council.

Mr. Scollan: Is it not the case that there is a very distinct difference here, because Northern Ireland Govern-

ment have direct representation in this House?

Mr. Ede: No, we are dealing with these matters which are within the competence of the Northern Ireland Parliament, which this House has said belongs to the Parliament of Northern Ireland. Do not let us forget that the great self-governing Dominions owe their constitutions to Acts of this House. There we have parted with all control of government. Here we have parted with the control of certain matters to a parliament which is capable of legislating within its own rights within its own territories. The first challenge to the validity of its actions should come in the courts of its own country. If the decision given there does not satisfy the person who has the grievance, he has the right first to come to the courts in this country and, if he so desires, to petition His Majesty in Council. I believe that the Measures complained of are constitutional, but I am not a lawyer. If they are challenged the machinery is open for use by those who have a grievance, and I suggest to this Committee that it will be a very dangerous thing for this House, without the capability of hearing the evidence in a judicial spirit, to attempt to judge the validity of Acts of another Parliament. For that reason I hope my hon. Friend will not press this new Clause.

Mr. Paget (Northampton): I entirely agree with what my right hon. Friend has said when he says that this House is no place in which to judge the validity of an Act of another Parliament. Indeed, I was rather afraid that in his opening remarks he was falling to some extent into the very fault about which he has expressed an opinion now as to the validity of this Act. This Amendment does not assert that the Act is invalid, but it asserts something quite different—that its validity is doubtful—and if there is any question as to that I would submit, as has already been said, that if this House shows that the validity of this Act is at least in doubt, the right hon. Gentleman can act. He knows that a high judicial opinion in Northern Ireland, when high judicial opinion was still at the Bar, expressed the view on a number of occasions very emphatically that the whole of this Act was invalid. In those circumstances, surely it is clear that the validity of all or part of this Act is doubtful, and what this Amendment suggests is that we do exactly as this House is doing with regard to the Fire Services Emergency Act, not deciding whether it is valid or invalid, but acting upon the basis that it is doubtful and putting those doubts at rest. That is what we ask for here.

Mr. Morgan (Rochdale): May I interrupt the hon. and learned Gentleman?

Mr. Paget: No, I am sorry I cannot give way. If the Home Secretary takes the view that this is undesirable here and it should be decided in a court, I would remind him of two things, first, that testing anything in a court is for a private individual a very expensive matter; and secondly, Section 51 empowers him not merely to act upon a petition, but to take the initiative in that matter. If the Home Secretary will tell us that he will take the initiative which he is expressly empowered by Section 51 to take, which Section anticipates that he will do it, and bring this Special Powers Act before the Privy Council to consider its validity, or the validity of the orders made under it, then I think, speaking for my friends on this side of the Committee, we shall be fully satisfied and we will not press this new Clause.

Mr. Hector Hughes (Aberdeen, North): I want very

briefly to put one further point against this Clause. The whole argument of the hon. Member for Hornchurch (Mr. Bing) was directed to show that the Special Powers Act is illegal, *ultra vires*, and unjust. If that is so, why should it be validated? It may well be that actions have been taken by citizens of Northern Ireland who have been unjustly treated under the Special Powers Act, but if that Act be now validated their actions may be brought to an end prematurely. It seems to me to be quite inconsistent to attempt to validate an Act which is called unjust, *ultra vires* and illegal.

Question, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill," put and negatived.

... Bill reported, with Amendments; as amended, considered.

... Bill accordingly read the Third time, and passed.

DR. TUDOR JONES asks correspondents if they will kindly address all letters intended for his attention other than those of a purely personal nature, during the rest of July and the first week of August, to Mrs. Geoffrey Dobbs, c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2.

"Daemon est Deus..."

"It is well to be prepared for the avalanche of nonsense that is bound to descend upon us as a result of the narrowing issue with Russia—nonsense, not from Russian, but from British, pens. It has already started..."

"In the present instance the enterprise has already been launched ostensibly for the purpose of allaying Russian suspicion, of seeing the Russian point of view, and of preparing the ground for impartial and majestic co-operation and friendship both with Russia and the United States. The ideal sounds fine. The execution, if one may judge by a particular specimen just published, is not only foolish beyond expectation, but is likely to defeat its object and cause not only merriment but mischief in Moscow.

"The National Peace Council in London, which has done good work for the cause of peace, has by way of a change just published a pamphlet called *A Crisis of Culture: the U.S.S.R. and the West*, of which the author is John Mac-Murray, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. His thesis amounts to this, that if we are to understand and befriend Russia, we must face the fact that 'the civilisation of the Roman tradition is at an end'...

"In that tradition he includes the Christian civilisation deriving from the teaching of the Catholic Church. The initiative, he says, has gone to Russia and to the United States. Moreover, he argues, we have to recognise that the Russian conception of 'democracy' is as sincerely held as our own, though the two conceptions be mutually incompatible, and we further have to recognise that the religious difference is essentially that between eastern and western 'Christianity.'

"If Stalin reads this pamphlet in a moment of relaxation

from his aggressive conquests he will laugh as he never laughed before. The challenge thrown down by Russia is to Christianity itself, and must be energetically accepted. There can be no compromise. That is why those who by contrast try to compromise merely land themselves in a bog of the most utter nonsense."—*The Catholic Times*, July 4.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket	2/-
Money and the Price System	7d.
The Use of Money	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.

ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart...21/-	
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
The French Revolution by Nesta H. Webster	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster	7/6
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster	5/-

Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754	2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
Protocols of Zion	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.	1/-
Aberhart: Manning	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards ...	8d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick	6d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	4d.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson	4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson ...	6d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson	4d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne	3d.
This Freedom	9d.
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson 'Debate	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus	3d.
Social Credit: An Explanation for New Readers 1½d. each, or 50 copies for 5/-.	

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.