

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 1.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 6, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

Political Representation

EDITOR'S NOTE: THERE HAVE COME UPON US AT THE SAME TIME, DEMANDING OUR SPECIAL CONSIDERATION, TWO RECENT SPEECHES BY MEMBERS OF THE CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS, MR. JAQUES AND MR. ASHBY, AND THE DEBATE IN THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT ON THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL. THERE SEEMS TO BE REASON, BOTH OF TIME AND CIRCUMSTANCES FOR PRINTING MR. JAQUES'S SPEECH, DELIVERED DURING THE DEBATE ON THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, AND WE INTENDED TO PRINT MR. ASHBY'S SPEECH WITH IT. THE LATTER INTENTION IS POSTPONED. THE DEBATE AT WESTMINSTER IS IMPORTANT TO US BECAUSE OF ITS ACTUAL CONTENT, BUT ALSO FOR THE SUGGESTION IT CARRIES OF DETERMINATION DEVELOPING SINCE LAST OCTOBER TO MEDDLE WITH THE CONSTITUTION. EXTRACTS WHICH WE DEEM WORTHY OF REPRODUCTION, AS A MINIMUM, TOTAL OVER THIRTEEN PAGES OF *THE SOCIAL CREDITER*, AND WE HAVE DECIDED NOT TO CURTAIL THIS ACCOUNT. EVEN TEMPORARY ENLARGEMENT OF *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* TO ACCOMMODATE THIS LARGE AMOUNT OF MATTER IS IMPRACTICABLE, BUT IT WILL BE PUBLISHED IN AS FEW ISSUES AS POSSIBLE TO MAKE REFERENCE EASIER. THE LIST OF REFERENCES IN *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE, PUBLICATION OF WHICH WAS PROMISED RECENTLY, WILL ACCOMPANY THE PUBLICATION:—

House of Commons: February 16, 1948.

Representation of the People Bill

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede): . . . This Bill completes the progress of the British people towards a full and complete democracy begun by the great Reform Bill of 1832. From now on, every citizen of full age will have a vote, and only one vote. This Bill wipes out the last of the privileges that have been retained by special classes in the franchise of this country . . .

. . . In the past few years, there has been a series of committees and conferences which have been considering the future of the franchise in this country: There was the Conference over which you, Mr. Speaker, presided in the last Parliament; there was the work of the Boundary Commissioners, for which you again placed the House in your debt by acting as chairman of each of the four bodies; there was the Committee presided over by my hon. Friend the Member for Ilkeston (Mr. Oliver) when he was Under-Secretary, and there was another Committee presided over by Sir Cecil Carr, Mr. Speaker's Counsel. . . .

. . . Clause I of this Bill embodies the work of the Boundary Commissioners, which is set out in the First Schedule. There is one slight change and one change of

substance. The slight change is that the constituencies are now described as county constituencies and borough constituencies, and are set out as such in their respective geographical counties in the First Schedule . . . The change of substance is that we have given consideration to the position of the City of London, and we have decided, in view of the figures of the electorate, to ask the House to include it in the constituency which the Boundary Commissioners marked out as the boroughs of Shoreditch and Finsbury. The electorate of the City of London, under the present law, in 1946—and all the figures which I give of electorates will relate to 1946, since that is the year upon which the work of the Boundary Commissioners is based—was 12,500, which is less than a quarter of the average for the whole country. But that includes the business premises vote. The residential vote in the City of London is 4,600, and that, of course, is approximately one-eleventh of the average size of a constituency in the country.

There can be no grounds for suggesting that there should be one Member allocated to so small a constituency as that. I heard the Petition read at the Table today, but I cannot think that it advanced any reason which makes it inappropriate that the City of London should be merged with some other borough so as to provide a constituency of appropriate size. We have decided, however, in view of the historical connection between this House and the City of London, that the name City of London shall be preserved. I cannot think that, in 1948, it is possible to plead that 4,600 electors should be given separate representation in this House . . . The electors in the future will have one qualification only—that of residence in the constituency. That alteration leads to the abolition of the business premises vote and the university vote, to both of which I will allude later. Clause I also provides for two registers. . . . Clauses 8 and 9 provide for voting by post for all now entitled, and, in addition, for all Parliamentary candidates, their wives or husbands, policemen, polling officers and others prevented by official duties in connection with the election. In a future general election there will be no postal vote for members of the Armed Forces serving overseas. The only way in which it could be done with efficiency would be to have, as there was on the last occasion, a considerable period between the date of the poll and the date of the declaration of the poll. . . . In Part I of the Third Schedule the most important change is that in future the nomination papers may be handed in over a period of days with a final closing hour and not limited to a few hours on the final day as at present . . .

. . . Part II of the Third Schedule makes a few alterations which need comment. There is a prohibition against the candidate describing his political activities on the nomination paper. That arose over certain incidents at an election. Where the description of the candidate is unduly long on the nomination paper the returning officer is given power to reduce it to reasonable length. The deposit in future may

be made by a banker's draft. Again, that is a matter which I am certain will be for the convenience of candidates in a good many cases. Probably the largest alteration, and one that arises out of a recommendation of Mr. Speaker's Conference, is that in future the poll card shall be issued by the returning officer . . . Part III prescribes two important alterations with regard to the conduct of the poll. The ballot paper in the future is to have no margins and no unnecessary wording . . . Another important alteration—it appears important, but I suggest that it is less important than it appears to be—is that persons will not in future be put on oath when questions are asked them in the polling station. I am informed that penalty for the false statement is the same whether the person is put on oath or not, and it therefore appears to be unnecessary to delay the proceedings, especially towards the end of the poll, by putting on oath any voter who presents himself. If he makes a false statement, he will be liable to just the same penalty as if the law remained as it is. . .

. . . Part III of the Bill deals with Parliamentary elections and corrupt and illegal practises, and certain other incidents of an election campaign. The most important thing here is the revision of the cost of election. A substantial reduction will be made, in accepting the recommendations of Mr. Speaker's Conference, that in future the cost of election shall be limited to £450 plus 1½d. per elector in county constituencies or 1d. per elector in boroughs. Perhaps I can best show how drastic this alteration is by giving the figures for typical constituencies. An electorate of 50,000 in a county now entitles the candidate to spend £1,325; in future the maximum will be £762 10s. In a borough, the similar figures are £1,091 13s. 4d. at present. £658 6s. 8d. in future. An electorate of 70,000 in a county constituency now entitles the candidate to spend £1,825; in future, the maximum limit will be £887 10s. In a borough of 70,000, £1,508 6s. 8d. can now be spent; in future the maximum limit will be £741 13s. 4d. . . and I hope this will enable some of the difficulties of the past to be avoided.

. . . Clause 35 prohibits election broadcasts from abroad, with the exception that an election broadcast from abroad may be made in pursuance of arrangements with the British Broadcasting Corporation for it to be received and transmitted by that Corporation. It might be that some prominent politician was abroad at a conference, or on other public business, at the time of an election, and it might be desired by his party that a message from him should be included in the election broadcasts that had been arranged. He would, under this, be able to participate. The broadcast would have to be received by the British Broadcasting Corporation and retransmitted. . .

Mr. Churchill: If a broadcast is made from abroad, what punishments will be inflicted on British people who listen in?

Mr. Ede: I do not think the offence is listening; I think the offence is speaking.

Mr. Churchill: This is a new law imposing pains and penalties; what punishment is to be inflicted on any person who makes a speech which is reported on the ether and is listened into by people in this country?

Mr. Ede: That is among the difficulties which presented itself to both the Committees which considered the matter. I am advised that the probability is that it would void the election which it was designed—

Mr. Churchill: I really must interrupt the right hon. Gentleman. If it were a general election, would the whole

general election be voided because people in all parts of the country listened?

Mr. Ede: The offence is not listening, the offence is speaking. It may be that the House may have to give further consideration to the appropriate penalty that should be inflicted. After all, this House has the power of dealing with offences committed at election time. . . . We also provide that at parish council elections in future the procedure followed in other elections shall be ordered. That will abolish the show of hands, which is objectionable, first, on the ground that it is a form of open voting, and secondly, that with the wide extension of the electorate since 1894, it is now almost impossible to get the electorate for a parish council election into any building in the parish in which the parish meeting is held. . . .

. . . I come now to the question of the abolition of the university franchise. . . . This is no new issue to be debated in this House. It is no new issue to be put before the country. In the early years of this century, the present Viscount Samuel, in his account of the abuses which called for reform, said:

“A second of these reforms”—

the first was the abolition of plural voting—

“is the abolition of the nine university seats; very anomalous features in the Constitution, which are condemned by the argument, amply confirmed in this case by experience, that a high education is no guarantee of political wisdom, and that government by literary men is among the worst of constitutional devices.”

In recent days there have appeared in various newspapers accounts of Parliamentary representation of the universities which proceed almost to suggest that this is justified by the fact that the Members returned by the Universities are a specially select body of men, incapable of undergoing the ordeals of the hustings, and to be welcomed for certain outstanding qualities. We have in this House at the present time three Members who in the last House were Members for territorial constituencies. In that Parliament they represented Norwich, Kelvingrove and Kilmarnock respectively. Does any one suggest that the hon. Member for the Combined English Universities (Mr. H. Strauss), who represented Norwich in the last Parliament, has become less partisan because he represents a university, or that the right hon. and gallant Member for the Scottish Universities (Lieut-Colonel Elliot) has shown any alteration?

Mr. Henry Strauss (Combined English Universities): Does the right hon. Gentleman not consider that the point is not whether or not I am more partisan or less, but whether I properly represent my electors?

Mr. Ede: Yes, but the argument advanced is that the university elector is above partisan feelings and that he brings to the House a dispassionate treatment of the affairs of the House which those who represent territorial constituencies cannot do.

The hon. Member, the junior Burgess for Cambridge University (Mr. Wilson Harris), in last week's "Spectator," gave a list of the people who, he alleged, and I agree with him, had been ornaments to the House as representatives of university constituencies. . . . Peel is another name mentioned. Peel was secure at Oxford until he backed Roman Catholic emancipation, and when he resigned his seat to test the electorate at Oxford on that issue, he was rejected. Dr. Whately, writing to him after the poll, said:

“Of 19 professors who voted we had 13, and of 40 Members of Parliament, 38.”

That was Oxford University. Lord Palmerston, who was, I should have thought, the mildest reformer who ever escaped being described as a Tory democrat, sat for Cambridge from 1812 until 1831. Then he backed the great Reform Bill, and Cambridge threw him out. Mr. Gladstone sat from 1848 to 1865, and then he advocated an extension of the franchise. He was thrown out, although again the resident voters supported him, and it was the non-resident vote which threw him out.

Captain Marsden (Chertsey): How does the right hon. Gentleman know that?

Mr. Ede: There was no secret ballot in 1865. If the hon. and gallant Member for Chertsey (Captain Marsden) wishes to have more particulars—

Captain Marsden: I am asking for information. I am not aware of when the secret ballot started.

Mr. Ede: The Secret Ballot Act was passed in 1872, seven years after the incident to which I am alluding. Gladstone had a majority among the resident members of the University. The "Dictionary of National Biography" rather curiously adds that this was so even among the heads of houses. Of the professors 24 voted for him and only 10 against him. Bishop Wilberforce used all his influence, and Gladstone received the suffrages not only of Jowett and Patterson, but of Keeble and Pusey.

There is no ground for suggesting that the electors of universities are animated by different passions from the rest of us. They are ordinary citizens who have had great educational advantages, such advantages as this party, during the lifetime of this Parliament, has made it possible for a wider section of the community to enjoy.

Mr. H. Macmillan: It was done during the last Parliament.

Mr. Ede: We have done it since the last Parliament. The right hon. Member for Bromley (Mr. H. Macmillan) should try to keep up to date. The Education Act, 1944, was passed in the last Parliament, and was an agreed Measure between both sides of the House; but since this Parliament was elected, my right hon. Friend the Minister of Education has very largely increased the number of State scholarship and the amount of maintenance that may be given in respect of any one of them.

This House exists to deal with the business of the ordinary citizens of the country. We hold that the franchise should be based on ordinary citizenship; of people meeting with their neighbours to determine who should represent them in Parliament. I understand that there are some people who would say: "We will accept the principle of 'one man, one vote', but let he who has a university degree choose whether he will exercise it in his university or in his territorial constituency." That seems to me to be a proposal that would involve us in very great confusion.

I draw the attention of the House to the numerical side of this subject. There are at the moment 228,769 university electors, and they return 12 Members. Each Member, therefore, represents an average constituency of 19,000, one-third of the average territorial constituencies in the country. On the basis on which this redistribution is being carried through they would not be entitled, therefore, to more than four Members, even if every university voter exercised his vote in respect of his university franchise.

... This issue which we submit to the House today has

been debated for far longer than the period of Parliamentary reform. When the Council of the Army met at Putney in 1647 to draw up their proposals for a new Constitution, Colonel Rainborough advanced the proposal that there should be universal suffrage without any property qualification on this ground. He said:

"The poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as much as the greatest he."

We believe that that claim made 301 years ago is still valid as the basis for the suffrage for this country. We hope through this Measure to be able to complete the democratisation of this House, which was first commenced in 1832, and in that spirit the Government commend this Bill to the House.

Mr. Churchill (Woodford): . . . In discussing constitutional questions of this character, it is desirable to emphasise at the outset the points upon which we are in general agreement. We all value and cherish our broad free Parliamentary system, and it is our duty to submit ourselves with all the grace we can to whatever may be the will of the people from time to time, subject to the procedure of Parliament and to the inalienable rights of the minority. . . .

... It would not be possible for us on this side of the House to oppose a Measure which, whatever its blemishes, conforms to the wide and well-established convictions and foundations of our British Parliamentary life. Everyone agrees that the redistribution of constituencies at frequent intervals should conform to the movements of the population, and that the Parliaments resulting from a general election should be a fair representation of the wish of the people throughout the land. We, therefore, support the main principles of this Bill on grounds which are agreeable to the true representation of the people and to our Parliamentary and democratic system to which we all adhere. However, there is another custom which has come into being in the last 60 years, and which has been accepted by all parties as a valuable and wholesome method of procedure in our public and political life. It has become a well-established custom that matters affecting the interests of rival parties should not be settled by the imposition of the will of one side over the other, but by an agreement reached either between the leaders of the main parties or by conferences under the impartial guidance of Mr. Speaker. . . .

This was also the procedure which the National Coalition Government adopted when we began to see daylight, or what we thought was daylight, in our troubles in 1944. Of course, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in such conferences under the Speaker of the House of Commons, as in so many reasonable affairs, there is a great deal of give and take. Neither party gets all that it seeks. Concessions are made on both sides. Accordingly, I received from the Speaker in May, 1944, the Report of the Conference over which he had presided. This embodied the agreement reached between the main parties in the State after prolonged discussion. Although the Conservatives at that time had a majority of 150 over all parties in this House, the representation which we agreed to on the Speaker's Conference was in a very different proportion. There were 15 Conservatives and 11 Socialists out of a total of 32, and when the Liberals and the few Independents were added, the Conservatives did not even have a majority on the Conference, although they had a majority in the House of 150 over all parties. It was not dealt with entirely on the basis of House of Commons majorities.

Of course, in dealing with the conflicting interests and natural divergent desires a considerable measure of compromise

Continued on page 8.

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. 20. No. 1.

Saturday, March 6, 1948.

From Week to Week

We think that it is high time that some Member of the House of Commons of, say, the character and type of Mr. W. J. Brown, the Independent Representative for Rugby, should take up seriously, and push through to an exposure, the nature of the book-keeping which appears to accompany the liquidation of the British Empire.

To take the Indian sub-continent as an example, *Great Britain* has developed over 43,000 miles of railways with stations, bridges, administrative offices, and auxiliary works; provided irrigation works for 27 million acres of otherwise nearly useless land; developed first-class harbours at Karachi, Bombay, Madras and Calcutta; built some of the world's greatest bridges and trunk roads; developed modern power systems, hydro-electric and otherwise; transformed the great Presidency cities from slums into sanitary, attractive, well built settlements, traversed by wide tree-shaded boulevards, built public and business administrative offices unexcelled anywhere; rescued the forests from almost complete destruction and so checked soil erosion—to put the matter shortly, transformed a sub-continent.

Not merely has this been to the immense advantage of the indigenous inhabitants, but (until it was discovered that we were so imbecile that we would allow any amount of mud to be thrown at us, and believe we deserved it) the performance was the envy of the whole world, and has never been approached by any other country, European, Asiatic or American.

We now evacuate the scene of 150 years' intensive and successful effort, not merely under a stream of abuse from the sob-sisters of the Middle West and the aliens of Leeds, Bradford, the London School of Economics, and Chicago, but we appear to owe "India" £1,500,000,000. In other words, we have to work for *nothing* on three years' total exports of the United Kingdom at 1936 levels, for the benefit of "India" alone, without paying for a single pound of imports from India or anywhere else, before we have liquidated the balance of money cost to us of 150 years of Indian development.

The same tale meets us at every turn—Burma, the Argentine, China. Alone amongst "victorious nations" we stagger under impossible tasks; and we work without pay, subject to contempt and in two years bereft of even prestige. Either our negotiators are traitors or they are so incompetent that they are not fitted to manage the traditional welk stall.

We need clear information of every international transaction from the agreement made by Isaacs in Washington in

1917 (probably the basic agreement) accompanied by balance sheets of the assets transferred, together with the replacement values at present price levels. Unless we are very much mistaken, the British public is being subjected to a "steal" which leaves any previous steal in history on the level of petty larceny. All the tentative experiments in procedure can probably be identified in the oil and railway rackets of the Rockefeller-Vanderbilt era.

The *Canadian Social Crediter*, now under the control of the so-called Alberta Social Credit League, publishes in its issue of February 5 a reprint of an article, in the form of an "Open Letter to Members of Congress," which apparently appeared in *The Woman's Voice* of Chicago, U.S.A. The new Editor of the *C.S.C.*, describes this as "the following informative article." Technically it is perhaps the most unrelieved farrago of nonsense on the subject of gold finance we have seen for some time. Politically its intent may be gathered from the statements: "You can protect American citizens by depriving the British Gold Bankers of their power to create inflations and depressions here whenever they desire." . . . "This Gold Control system . . . is operated by a group variously known as the British, or Gold Bankers . . . This group will be referred to hereafter as the Gold Bankers."

This is of course the Communist technique in full operation—to describe what you are doing or intend to do, and then to accuse your enemy of doing it first.

The article ends by ridiculing anti-Communists and enquiring "Is there any answer except that they really represent British interests stirring up a smoke screen to scare us of communism [*sic*], and to hide the fact that the British Imperialists really control us?"

On its merits, we might be inclined to smile at this kind of stuff. But we are satisfied that something more effective is necessary, and we agree with a correspondent of the *World's Press News* that "Our abject silence in the face of years of calumny and wilful misrepresentation has created the impression that Britain [*sic*] is a spent force."

We commend the matter to our Canadian friends, who are many.

"Idols of the Market Place"

"But the Idols of the Market-place are the most troublesome of all; idols which have crept into the understanding through the alliances of words and names. For men believe that their reason governs words; but it is also true that words react on the understanding; and this it is that has rendered philosophy and the sciences sophistical and inactive. Now words, being commonly framed and applied according to the capacity of the vulgar, follow those lines of division which are most obvious to the vulgar understanding. And whenever an understanding of greater acuteness or a more diligent observation would alter those lines to suit the true divisions of nature, words stand in the way and resist the change. Whence it comes to pass that the high and formal discussions of learned men end oftentimes in disputes about words and names; with which (according to the use and wisdom of the mathematicians) it would be more prudent to begin, and so by means of definitions reduce them to order."—*Francis Bacon*.

Mr. Norman Jaques on Political Zionism

Following is one of the two speeches in the Canadian House of Commons referred to in the Editorial Note on page 1. Mr. Jaques is speaking on February 19, on the speech from the Throne.

Mr. Norman Jaques (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, during the time at my disposal this afternoon I intend to discuss external affairs, first, because I happen to be a member of the committee on external affairs; second, because the house seldom, if ever, has the opportunity of discussing external affairs; third, because of certain developments which are taking place in the world today, and last, because of a statement that was made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) just before this house met after the Christmas adjournment. According to the press report on January 20, the Prime Minister is reported as follows:

The world was in an "appallingly dangerous condition" today. "Let us not speak of having entered upon an era of peace," Mr. King warned, "where all about us are evidences of strife."

Then the day before yesterday the leader of the C.C.F. party directed a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) in these words, as reported at page 1282 of *Hansard*:

In view of the grave warning by the Palestine commission to the security council yesterday that "tragic and dangerous precedent" will be established if force or the threat of force is allowed to thwart the decision of the united nations, is the government prepared to accept its share of responsibility in such action as may be taken by the security council with the view to averting further bloodshed in Palestine and implementing the assembly decision?

I do not intend to read the answer made by the minister; neither shall I attempt to interpret it. But apparently it has caused speculation in the press. If, as some people seem to think, it means that Canada is to be committed to armed intervention in Palestine, I wish to put on record at this time the fact that I am absolutely opposed to it. May I refer to a speech that I made in this house two years ago last December. On December 17, 1945, speaking on external affairs, I said, as reported at page 3706 of *Hansard*:

I have no brief for either Arabs or Jews—

I should have said "Zionists" there.

—but it seems to me that the public hears only the Zionist arguments, never the Arab side of the question. As I have said, I have no brief for either side; my sole concern is to establish the truth, for just as truth and freedom are indivisible, so mutual faith in the given word is the basis of friendship individual and international. Once that faith is destroyed or even impaired, trust and friendship turn to suspicion and hatred. But instead of historic fact, the Zionists base their case on racial, cultural and commercial superiority. These claims on behalf of a favoured nation and a chosen people are upheld especially by leftists and internationalists, by the very people who denounce racism and nationalism. They also are the people who claim especially to be the world's peacemakers but who, in the face of continued and fatal rioting in Palestine, are going out of their way to embarrass Great Britain in her efforts to maintain peace by encouraging tolerance by both Arab and Jew.

Then a little later on in my speech I said:

Quite recently it was reported that the national leader of the C.C.F. at a public meeting in Washington, "urged, the immediate opening of Palestine for Jewish immigration to the fullest possible extent so as to provide a refuge from the terror of their persecutors." In the light of the present critical conditions in Palestine, I would ask the leader of the C.C.F.:

Can he assure us in making those demands that he is promoting the interests of world peace? Does he realize that such demands are calculated to embarrass Great Britain and if insisted on may lead to a clash of interests between the British empire, the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.? In the event of war in Palestine and the near east, is he prepared to commit Canadians to active service in such a war? If not, whom would he expect to fight it?

Those are the words I spoke here two years ago last December, I think subsequent events have justified what I then said. The question of partition is the one question which has come before the U.N.O. upon which Russia is in agreement.

Mr. Harris (Grey-Bruce): That is not so.

Mr. Jaques: I think that is a significant fact. On the other hand the British government—and I am not going to quote the exact words—made it plain enough that they are against partition. They are against the use of force and they are not in agreement with any settlement which involves the use of force. I cannot help wondering why it was that this government should have taken sides against the British government.

Mr. Hartt: Thirty-three other nations did so.

Mr. Jaques: Well, I may come to that later on. I am making the statement that the British government—who have in all probability forgotten more about Palestine and the near east than all the rest of the nations put together—have refused to be a party to this partition.

Mr. Hartt: Certainly. They wanted Arab oil. It is oil, not Arabs. That is what it means. It is not the principle; it is the oil.

Mr. Brooks: The United States wants votes.

Mr. Jaques: I do not want to be personal, and I am not making a political speech. I do not even know that I have the agreement of everyone in this corner of the house. I was going to say that it does strike me as odd that the leaders of the C.C.F. were prompt enough to hail the labour victory in Great Britain as a victory for the C.C.F., but why is it that after two years or so of labour government in Great Britain the C.C.F. now are backing the policies of capitalist United States and are opposed to the foreign policies of the labour government of Great Britain? I think that is a good question.

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Jaques: Well, I have quite a lot to get through; but all right.

Mr. Knowles: It is a very short question. Is the hon. member aware of the fact that there is now before the world a decision taken by the united nations, and that it was in support of this decision that the leader of this group asked his question the other day?

Mr. Jaques: Yes, but my point is that before the decision was taken the British had no support, as far as I know, from either the government of this country or the C.C.F. party; and as far as Canadians themselves are concerned, according to a recent Gallup poll, while some fifty per cent of the people expressed no opinion, only nineteen per cent expressed sympathy with the Zionist cause. It was stated in the press that when the minister gave his answer yesterday there was applause from all corners of the house. Well, I wish it to be understood that I did not add to the applause; and I must say it was about the loudest silence I have heard for a long time. It must have been in a corner because I heard very

little of it. I do not wish to pose as an expert on this question, but I intend to put on record opinions which have been published by eminent Jews in the United States. I have been accused of anti-semitism and racial extremism because of my stand on this Palestine question. So I am going to put on record the statements of two American Zionists one of whom, Albert Kahn, visited this country a year ago and addressed a series of meetings. I take this short quotation from the press of that time. He said "the British in Palestine were worse than the Nazis and should be driven into the sea." "Anti-semitism and fascism were raging in North America", and "the Jews must look to the Soviet Union for protection through the labour unions." I should say that is a libel on the majority of Jews.

I have here a copy of *PM* which I bought when I was in New York a year ago, containing an advertisement written by Ben Hecht, who is certainly a nationally known Zionist. I am not going to read it all, but it contains these words:

Every time you blow up a British arsenal, or wreck a British jail, or send a British railroad train sky high, or rob a British bank or let go with your guns and bombs at the British betrayers and invaders of your homeland, the Jews of America make a little holiday in their hearts.

I say that is another libel on the majority of Jews; but certainly Mr. Hecht is a Zionist and a very strong one. That, I should say, is an example of racial extremism. Now I have a page out of *National Affairs*; I have not the date, but it was some time last summer. It bears a photograph, under which there is the title "U.S. Zionist in action." This Zionist is busy writing on the wall of the British consulate in New York the words "British following the Nazis" and then painting the swastika on the building and this occurred in other cities as well. That is another example, I would say, of racial extremism.

Let me now quote the words of one who was highly respected and eminent among the Jews in the United States, though he is dead now. I refer to the late Henry Morgenthau, senior. In his autobiography, *All in a Lifetime*, Mr. Morgenthau devoted a chapter to this question of political Zionism. He said:

Zionism is the most stupendous fallacy in Jewish history. I assert that it is wrong in principle and impossible of realization; that it is unsound in its economics, fantastical in its politics, and sterile in its spiritual ideals. . . . The very fervour of my feeling for the oppressed of every race and every land, especially for the Jews, those of my own blood and faith, to whom I am bound by every tender tie, impels me to fight with all the greater force against this scheme, which my intelligence tells me can only lead them deeper into the mire of the past, while it professes to be leading them to the heights. Zionism is a surrender, not a solution. It is a retrogression into the blackest error, and not progress toward the light. I will go further, and say that it is a betrayal; it is an eastern European proposal, fathered in this country by American Jews, which, if it were to succeed, would cost the Jews of America most that they have gained in liberty, equality and fraternity.

Mr. Blackmore: Would the hon. member say what he is quoting from?

Mr. Jaques: I thought I had done so. It was from Mr. Morgenthau's autobiography, *All in a Lifetime*. I tried to get it in the library but apparently they do not have it, though they promised to get a copy.

Now I come to the opinion of Mr. Benjamin Freedman, who is still living, of course, and who is an eminent Jew in the United States. He wrote an article which was published by the national economic council, incorporated, 350 Fifth

Avenue, New York; and this letter is dated October 15, 1947. This is what Mr. Freedman says on this question:

The threat of political Zionism to the welfare and security of America is little realized. It is a dangerous mistake to think of it as a localized, Arab-Jewish struggle. There may soon take place in Palestine an explosion that will set off another world war. Every American citizen, every head of a family, all members of Christian churches, every non-Zionist Jew, should be brought to understand that the consequences can be fatally disastrous.

The influence of the Zionist organisation reaches into the inner policy-making groups of nearly every government in the world—particularly into the Christian west. This influence causes these groups to adopt pro-Zionist policies which are often in conflict with the real interests of the peoples they govern.

And further:

This utterly immoral and unjust policy is producing an unanticipated result. An explosion is brewing and, as it approaches, Christian supporters of Zionism in our government—

That was the United States government, of course—

—are almost panic-stricken. Yet they fear to reverse their position lest the democratic party be stigmatised by Zionists as "anti-semitic."

Then he adds that the next election is only a year away.

Mr. Freedman then goes on to say:

The ability of Zionists to have things their way stems from the organised pressure they can bring upon people who do not agree with them. By holding the threat of being called "anti-semitic" over men engaged in public or business life, they have been able to stifle opposition—even among American Jews such as the writer, who have no interest in forming a Jewish state and wish only to live and die as good Americans. It will take courage for Americans of whatever origin to think these facts through and take public positions upon them. They will be smeared. They will be slandered. Already, Zionists have been able to bring about the economic ruin of many Christians and Jews who have dared challenge their right to claim Palestine for a national Jewish state. But America and American Christianity stand at a crossroad. The majority must decide whether it will longer submit to being the tool of a small but ruthless and unscrupulous minority of a minority people. The great majority of American Jews also must choose. Will we all acquiesce in the program of political Zionism? Will we follow it out to its inescapable consequences?

If we do, we shall be walking the road to ruin.

I could speak with sympathy and from personal experience as to the truth of what Mr. Freedman says about the smear of anti-semitism raised against those who are opposed to the policy of political Zionism. One reason I am speaking here this afternoon is that I have been refused space in the press. Only last week I wrote a broadcast which consisted chiefly of the quotations I have just placed on record. That broadcast was to have been given last Sunday in Edmonton. However I received a letter yesterday to say that the station refused to broadcast it.

Mr. Sinclair: Is that from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?

Mr. Jaques: I do not know the inner workings of radio. This was station CJCA in Edmonton, a private station. However I should think the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would be even less tolerant.

Mr. Sinclair: Oh, no.

Mr. Jaques: That is my opinion of the C.B.C.

Mr. Hartt: They have a little bit of sanity; they are not all insane.

Mr. Blackmore: Maybe that is why they will not let it go over the air.

Mr. Hartt: Because they are sane.

Mr. Blackmore: Because they know that their bread is buttered on the right side.

Mr. Jaques: I am sorry I have to refer to quotations this afternoon, but certain things have already been said or published. The statement to which I shall now refer concerns me personally, so I have no option but to call it to the attention of the house. This was published in an Ottawa paper on December 16, 1947, and states:

Norman Jaques, Social Credit member of parliament for Wetaskiwin, informed that his writings have been banned temporarily from the *Canadian Social Crediter*, a party newspaper published weekly in Edmonton, said today: "It is exactly what the communists say."

He declined to comment further.

Gordon Taylor, managing editor of the newspaper, official organ of the National Social Credit Association of Canada, said Saturday the ban on Mr. Jaques' writings will remain in effect as long as Mr. Jaques persists in what Mr. Taylor called an "anti-isms" attitude. He referred particularly to what he said was Mr. Jaques' "anti-semitic attitude."

I can only suppose there is a misunderstanding there. As I have said before in the house and outside it, my attitude is not one of antisemitism; it is one of anti-political Zionism, because for many years I have seen where it was leading. And the situation today in Palestine and the near east is surely a justification for the stand I have taken in the past.

There are two statements that I should like to quote, which were published in the *Canadian Jewish Chronicle*, which a Jewish acquaintance sends to me. One is dated Ottawa, January 9, 1948, and reads:

Leaders of the Social Credit party have finally announced a ban on the publication of anti-semitic articles in the organization's official organ, following conferences with Joseph H. Fine, chairman of the public relations committee of the Canadian Jewish congress.

In addition to the ban, party leaders forced the resignation of the editor and assistant editor of the publication *Social Crediter*. Chiefly affected by the new policy will be Norman Jaques, Social Credit member of parliament, who has been using the magazine as one of his platforms for anti-semitic propaganda.

I want to say here that is the statement of the editors of the *Canadian Jewish Chronicle*. It is part of the smear campaign. My other quotation from the *Canadian Jewish Chronicle* concerns a distinguished man, the Right Hon. Ernest Bevin, minister of foreign affairs in the British Labour government. This quotation is dated Jerusalem and is from the issue of February 13, 1948. It reads:

The name of Britain's foreign secretary Ernest Bevin has been vigorously cheered of late at meetings of the Mosleyite fascist fringe although the mention of any of his colleagues in the labour cabinet draws equally vigorous boos, Arich Gelblum, correspondent of the Hebrew daily *Haaretz* reports from London. Mr. Gelblum, one of Palestine's most reliable reporters with excellent contacts in Britain, says that intellectuals of the Labour party believe that in the event of a personal defeat in the Labour party, it is possible that the present foreign secretary will bolt his party and become the "fuehrer" of a new British fascist party in uneducated, discontented labour ranks for whom he holds a strong appeal.

According to these circles Bevin possesses some of the prime requisites for becoming the leader of a "nationalist" mass movement. He hates Jews, mocks Labourite intellectuals, some of whom are Jews, and enjoys an ever-growing popularity among those sections of the British labour who share his dislike of the intellectuals. Mr. Gelblum, who has spoken with top leaders of the British Labour party, says that in private conversation Bevin says frankly that he believes in the protocols

of Zion, the notorious forgery used by anti-semitic fanatics all over the world as proof of a "Jewish world conspiracy," that Hitler was right as far as the Jews were concerned and that Jewish aspirations for statehood must be destroyed.

I am in good company. That is a fair sample of political Zionist smearing of those who dare to take a stand against their plans. Of course Mr. Bevin does not need me to defend him, but if that is not libel I do not know what is. Is that not calculated to stir up hatred among people?

Mr. Low: It is anti-English.

Mr. Jaques: It is designed to stir up ill-feeling among the people of Canada, the United States and Great Britain. I repeat what Freedman said:

The ability of Zionists to have things their way stems from the organised pressure they can bring upon people who do not agree with them. By holding the threat of being called "anti-semitic" over men engaged in public or business life, they have been able to stifle opposition—even among American Jews such as the writer, who have no interest in forming a Jewish state.

Then I should like to quote from the official report of a communist convention which was held in Edmonton a year ago last November, as follows:

Social Credit government and movement cannot be called fascist (anti-communist). But strong pro-fascist (anti-communist) wing of Jaques, Bourcier and some others, who control C.S.C. which carries most vicious type anti-communist, anti-socialist, anti-soviet, and anti-Jewish propaganda. "We" should find some means to bring us to Social Credit rank and file as friends . . . We must single out the reactionary pro-fascist group for unrelenting attack, must expose failure of Social Credit government to meet needs of people.

That agrees with the statements of the political Zionists.

And again:

The mayor of Edmonton, H. P. Ainley, appeared at our opening session, and welcomed delegates to city. Ainley nominee Civic Dem. Alliance, leftist inclined, or courting L.P.P. for votes, rather surprising he should officially give public blessing to our small party.

It is not surprising at all when you understand that Mr. Ainley refused to be present at a dinner held by the Canadian Arab league. I quote the words of Mr. Freedman:

Soviet communism will succeed in its attempt to conquer the world in direct proportion to the support which America gives Zionism. This may sound startling, but it is grimly true.

That is part of a letter to the economic council from which I quoted before. The statement that political Zionists have the support of communists in this country and in the United States is endorsed by the fact that the partition is supported by Russia, the first and only proposal that Russia has supported. The reason for that is obvious. If a united nations force is sent to Palestine it will include a Red army. Once the Red army is in Palestine I should like to know by whom and how it will be sent back whence it came. What is the good of trying to hold the line in Greece when it is opened wide in Palestine? I would think Palestine is much more important than Greece because it forms a bridge between Europe, Asia and Africa. I do not wish to say more at this time because I hope the house will have an opportunity to discuss this question before a Canadian army goes there and before we are committed to war. An eminent United States columnist who has had considerable experience, who has a good reputation to maintain, said the other day that Armageddon will start the instant the British leave Palestine. I want to register my complete opposition to this policy to which apparently this country has been committed, and hope

that something will be done so that we may avoid the terrible consequences of it.

Mr. Harris (Grey-Bruce): Will the hon. member permit a question before he concludes? I ask for the information and not for any wisecracking purposes. He made a statement that our policy was undoubtedly different from British policy. I think he went so far as to say that British policy was in opposition to the decision on Palestine. The reason given by the hon. member was that they said they would have nothing to do with it. My question is: what authority has the hon. member for saying that that is British policy?

Mr. Jaques: "Well, I have no official authority, of course, only what I have read in the press and in statements made by British ministers in the British house. As I understand it, the British are opposed to partition. They oppose any solution which is not acceptable to both Arab and Zionist, and they would be opposed to any solution which would need the use of force to implement it. That is what I understand.

Mr. Harris (Grey-Bruce): I wish the hon. member would quote me one declaration of British policy opposing partition, other than the statement he has just made.

Mr. Jaques: I have not the statement with me but I shall be glad to oblige the hon. member at the first opportunity.

Mr. Hartt: May I ask this question: is it not true that it was the British government which submitted the Palestinian question voluntarily to the united nations?

Mr. Jaques: I understand that is the fact. I did not deny that. All I said was that they are not willing to take part in the partition of Palestine, or in any other solution which will need the use of force.

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

ise and goodwill and, may I add, good faith were necessary.

... I must however, admit that ... I was astonished to find that the Conservative representatives had agreed to the extraordinary step of assimilating the Parliamentary and local government franchise, so that both elections were to be polled on the same register. This step involved the addition of no fewer than seven million non-ratepaying electors to the municipal franchise. This would evidently be of enormous advantage, or so it appeared to be, to the Socialist Party, who always fought these local elections on party lines, and who might expect to receive from this mass of non-ratepaying electors a very considerable accession of strength.

I asked some of my Friends who had served on the Speaker's Conference about this. Some of them were very high-and-dry Tories, like the former Chief Whip, Lord Margesson. I was told that the kind of answer I received was that after all it was a bargain and an agreement, that they knew very well that this would be deeply detrimental to what are called the Centre and Right-wing interests, but that the Report of the Conference must be taken as a whole. It was further pointed out to me that the university representation and the representation of the City of London, with one or two Members—that was not entirely settled—were accepted by the Socialist leaders, and, of course, the process of redistribution in accordance with the movements of the population was a necessary step in the normal political progress of the country.

I and my Conservative colleagues, therefore, accepted the Report, which Mr. Speaker sent to me in May, 1944. We accepted this agreement between all parties as a whole. We subjected ourselves to the very great disadvantages, as it

seemed to us at that time and as it proved at the first municipal elections which were held, of the addition of seven million non-ratepaying electors upon the municipal register. ... It is a sort of British idea that when you reach an agreement you take the rough with the smooth. A decent, honourable agreement between both parties about the basis of their elections is the foundation, and has been for many years the foundation, of our Parliamentary government, which amid all its stresses is the model for, as it was the cradle of, democratic institutions throughout the world.

It would have been possible for us in 1944 to have resisted our Labour colleagues in this matter of the local franchise, and ask for its reconsideration, but we accepted the recommendations of this Conference as a whole and took every step punctually and in good time to make them effective. A Bill was introduced at the end of 1944 for the resumption of municipal elections, and established the new basis which added seven million non-ratepaying electors to the register.

... We had accepted the Speaker's Conference settlement, and we were quite ready that it should be carried into effect, for better or for worse, for richer or for poorer, in the most convenient manner. However, by introducing this Measure, for which the Lord President obtained the sanction of the Cabinet, the right hon. Gentleman got the one great outstanding gain for his party in the bargain or settlement. Time alone, he said, prevented the carrying out of the other provisions.

We were, of course, defeated in the July elections. Everybody here and in the country can feel their own way about that. We were also most heavily defeated in the municipal elections by the arrival of the additional seven million non-ratepaying voters. However, there was the settlement reached by the Speaker's Conference; there was the agreement to which both sides were parties. The Labour Party had taken their full advantage of their side of the bargain, and it was left to them, with indisputable power to carry it out in its entirety, and in its integrity. This, we were assured, would be done. The Boundary Commission was sent upon its work, and we now have its report before us.

As late as October 21, 1947—that is only a few months ago—the Lord Chancellor, speaking in another place—I must not quote his actual words, and I was not intending to do so—told Lord Samuel—it is a narration, and not a quotation—that the Redistribution and Electoral Reform Bill which would be introduced would contain provision for electoral reform arising out of the recommendations of the Speaker's Conference. He added that, if Lord Samuel would acquaint himself with these proceedings he would know precisely what the Bill was going to do. So there, as late as October last, was reaffirmation of the resolve of the Government to act in a straightforward and honourable manner, and to complete the carrying out of the recommendations and agreement of the Speaker's Conference, in which they had solemnly concurred, and from their part of which they had already gained a concession, a Clause which was, to them, of the very greatest benefit.

(To be continued).

The Problem of the Medical Profession
by B.W.M. 1/- from K.R.P. Publications Ltd.