

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 10.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 8, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

## The Great Betrayal

By C. H. DOUGLAS

(II)

Mr. Winston Churchill is by ancestry half Hanoverian Whig and half American, and by political upbringing and association a Lloyd Georgian Liberal with powerful Jewish support. None of this would suggest a tendency to produce a starry eyed political idealist with a trusting temperament of a Babe in the Woods, and it is therefore doubly significant that Mr. Churchill (it is stated on good authority) has refused to accept his salary as leader of the Opposition in the present Administration. It suggests that the trend of events is not such as he had anticipated, or at any rate, he has no wish to be paid for even passive complicity in it.

With no desire or competence to find excuses for him, I find it difficult to believe that he has not been double-crossed. And the nature of the double-crossing is not far to seek. Mr. Roosevelt, it would seem, took his measure accurately, recognised his overwhelming passion to be a second Marlborough, and gave him a fairly free hand to win the war so long as not many Americans fought seriously, making, however, complete and effective arrangements to win the peace. Clearly, as Mr. Roosevelt's friends would assure him, no better plan could be imagined than that outlined by Mr. Jaques. How it was arranged that the "Labour" Party should be returned is difficult to know, but that it was arranged is nearly certain. Never in the chequered history of the secret ballot conjuring trick, has such a bare-faced imposture been staged as in the election of 1945, with its hundreds of thousands of U.S. soldiers all canvassing against "the feudal system" ("why don't ya have a d'markrazi like Amurrica?") and its three months' interval between the ballot and the vote counting.

At this point, it is useful to obtain some idea of the nature of the Parliament which was "palmed", to use the appropriate conjuring term, on the British Isles under the name of a "Labour" Government. Of the 398 members accepting the Government Whips, 124 are Trades' Union officials, 48 publishers, journalists and authors, 45 Municipal politicians, 41 barristers and solicitors, 41 business men, 34 schoolmasters, 12 Co-operative employees, 12 doctors and dentists, 10 university teachers, 10 farmers, five Army, Navy and Air Force officers, three civil servants, three Free Church ministers, one policeman, and five unclassified.

Whatever may be said of this collection, and a good many things may be said of it, it is not "Labour" in any reasonable or distinctive meaning of the word. Anyone with the slightest acquaintance with the subject would recognise its character. It is a Parliament of Fabian Socialists and P.E.P. nominees hand-picked for Mond-Turnerism, united by a common preference for white collar jobs over "workers" employment, and an equal determination to tell other people how to work rather than to work themselves. That is to say,

it is almost identical with the New Deal background which had propagandised Franklin Delano Roosevelt and blanketed its failure by precipitating the Second World War. While many of its constituent members did not know it, it was an international, not a British, body, committed in advance to wreck its native country.

It is almost certain that the genesis of the Parliamentary victory of the so-called "Labour" Party can be found in the conditions imposed on Mr. Churchill in 1940 after Dunkirk as a condition of "Labour" support, and the situation at this time can be synthesised by observing that *every party outside Mr. Chamberlain's group was being advised by the same international body*, and that the present interests of that body are geographically centred in New York. In consequence the complete elimination of Great Britain as a Power is essential to the role so engagingly recalled by Mrs. Roosevelt, that "Britain" is the first line of defence of the United States. "That," added Mrs. Roosevelt recently, "is true to-day." That is a proud thought for the survivors of the British Empire.

Obviously, every piece of advice, now practically amounting to an order, which was tendered by Mr. Roosevelt's entourage has been good advice—as viewed from Wall Street and Washington. And, in the main, Mr. Churchill took that advice, which probably included a suggestion to hand over the post-war baby to the trained arms of Mr. Attlee and the London School of Economics. To provide Mr. Attlee with a loyal background on the American model, Lord Citrine (T.U.C.) is now Chairman British Electrical Authority at £8,500 *per annum*, Sir Frederick Burrows (ex-railway clerk) was made Governor of Bengal (!) at £9,000 *per annum*, Sir Ben Smith, a most admirable ex-able-seaman is paid £3,500 *per annum* for running the West Midland Coal Mines, Mr. Jack Benstead, a Trades' Union official, £5,500 as a member of the Transport Commission, *etc., etc.* There are dozens of others. These are "out in the country." But, if my addition is correct there are between sixty and seventy Ministers or near-Ministers on the higher pay-roll, all of whom, together with the ordinary Members of Parliament, were immediately rewarded for their allegiance by a large rise in salary. Many of the Opposition Members feel also that it would be a pity to be too censorious of an Administration with such sound principles, more especially as their leaders appear curiously willing, or even anxious, to be more Socialist than the Socialists.

Briefly, then, the public at large may have lost the peace once again, Great Britain may now be "Britain"; but with the aid of significant sections of all political parties, we have achieved the proud position of the First Line of Defence of the U.S.A., are in process of becoming a Work State on a standard of living arranged from Washington, America will be free to treat the world as her oyster while we fight for her mistakes, will take what she wants from us, and give us what she can't use herself, and it will, and has, become clear

that as in Hitlerite Germany and Russia, only fools will work either manually or technically—all the knowing ones will be good Party politicians.

It has been the fashion in Bloomsbury, and in those places where the Fabians sing, to jeer at the British Empire ("pure Kipling, old boy, ha! ha!") and in general, the ways of the Victorians. While many valid criticisms can be made both of the organism and the period, most of them traceable to that financial system the Fabians are so careful not to attack, it would be a cardinal error not to assess the significance of this attitude. Passing over the fact that the Socialist is not naturally a traveller or an adventurer, except in the less desirable sense of the word (the very roots of Socialism are antipathetic to individual initiative) he is a worshipper of logic—of pure reason, which he mistakes for intelligence. The Fabian Society itself is the descendant of the Encyclopaedists who ushered in the Age of Reason. That this is not a British trait—in fact, the typical Englishman distrusts logic to a degree which denies it its legitimate use—is only one of many indications of the alien philosophy sapping our native vigour. The *premises* for arguments in favour of the Empire are in the main hidden, and the deductive method does not apply. But the *proofs* are clear, even if to the man in the street, the reasons are not, that the British Empire was a far more admirable growth than any mechanistic League or Union of Nations, precisely because it was not reasonable—it was organic.

(To be continued).

## Car Exports to Portugal

### "Propaganda of Competitors"

From *The Scotsman* of April 30:—

"To the Editor of *The Scotsman*.

"148, Piccadilly, London, April 28, 1948.

"SIR,—I was naturally alarmed to read Mr. M'Nab's letter in your issue of April 23 about 200 British cars rusting on the quay at Lisbon. Without having yet investigated the matter, let me hasten to put it in its proper perspective.

"Since the end of the war we have shipped 6841 cars to Portugal, and in accordance with the usual practice these cars would be paid for in foreign currency before they left Britain. Thus cars arriving in Lisbon are then the property of local agents, and whatever happens to them then, this country is not financially any worse off.

"With regard to Mr. M'Nab's impression of the number of post-war American cars as compared with our own, he is perhaps confused by the number of pre-war American cars, some of which look similar to postwar models. It must not be forgotten that America continued to manufacture and export cars in 1940 and 1941 up to 1942. In these three years we made no cars at all. The actual number of post-war American cars shipped to Portugal is 4885, leaving Britain in the lead by about 2000 cars.

"On the subject of price, I have a list in front of me giving the current prices in Portugal. This shows that nine British models are cheaper than the least expensive American car. For instance, a Morris 8 sells at 38,500 escudos, as compared with a Chevrolet at 68,700 escudos. The nine models below American prices included Vauxhall 14, Morris

10, Hillman, etc.

"It is disappointing that British travellers abroad often fall a victim to the propaganda of competitors and do not appreciate the great export efforts of British industry, including the motor industry.—I am etc.

"R. GRESHAM COOKE, Director,  
"Society of Motor Manufacturers and  
Traders, Ltd."

Waal, waal, wa-a-al, fur cryin' out loud. It ain't the bleat, its the stupidity. Just think of them pore Portuguese payin' for a lot of British cars an' leavin' 'em to rot. And just fancy them British boastin' they can't sell cars even when the price is two-thirds the Amurrican. And supposing a Morris 8 is an alternative to a "Chevrolet."

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: April 20, 1948.*

### Representation of the People Bill

(In Committee)

CLAUSE 40.—(Prohibition of expenses not authorised by election agent.)

*Mr. Gallacher:* I beg to move, in page 39, line 4, at the end, to insert:

"Provided that nothing in this section shall render it unlawful for a political party to incur expense in the presentation to the electorate of the views of that political party in the election, where no member of that political party has been nominated as candidate in the election concerned."

I want to make clear the position of political parties that exist in a constituency who are not running their own candidate, apart altogether from participating in support of one or other of the candidates who may be standing. In the case of my own Party, it is not a very pressing matter from one point of view. For instance, I spoke at a public meeting in North Croydon during a recent by-election and we made something like £30. It could easily have been spent in posters and we would have come out without having incurred any expenses at all. But there are always political groupings or parties that may not be in a position to put up candidates of their own but still have a policy they want to place before the electorate. I would like to know if an Amendment of this kind can be accepted. I leave it at that, because I do not like this Clause and want to say two or three hard things about it on the Motion that the Clause stand part of the Bill.

*The Attorney-General:* I am afraid we must resist this Amendment. It would open the door wide to evasions of the whole principle of this Bill, and evasions, I venture to think, of the most grievous kind. Suppose—if one might suppose such a case—a person is standing who describes himself as an Independent Socialist but whom the party represented by the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Fife (Mr. Gallacher) regard as being a fellow-traveller of the Communist Party. The Communist Party, if this Amendment were accepted, could go into that constituency and spend unlimited amounts in support—

*Mr. Gallacher:* It is not a question of the Communist Party going into a constituency, but of the electors of that constituency who belong to a particular party who have not a candidate. Have they no right to put their point of view

during the election campaign in any way they like?

*The Attorney-General:* Certainly, they may put their point of view, but they must not incur expenditure in regard to the matter. If they are allowed to incur expenditure which would not rank as election expenditure, clearly they can spend a large amount in influencing the course of that election and far exceed the amounts permitted by law. . . . If political parties, whatever their political complexion, want to take part in a campaign, although they put no candidate into the field, they must be intending to influence the result of that campaign in favour of one candidate and against another candidate. And if, as my hon. Friend very well put the case, the election agents of the candidates concerned are not prepared to invite, or to accept, their assistance in this way, then they must not be allowed to spend money uninvited in an endeavour to influence the course of an election. The proper course of a political party in that position, unable to put their own candidate into the field, or to get an election agent for any other candidate to authorise expenditure or to adopt their candidate, is to keep out of the field, out of the ring, to express their views, if they wish to do so, without incurring expenditure, but otherwise to leave the election to be fought by those parties which have the courage to put forward candidates to fight it. The whole object of this Clause is to require the authority of an election agent for any expenditure intended to influence the result of an election, and to accept this Amendment would be to drive a horse and cart through this intention.

*Mr. Gallacher:* This Clause makes it clear that money cannot be spent in support, or disparagement, of a candidate; but the Amendment wants to make it clear that a political party can engage, as the Labour Party has done in years gone by, in elections, because when feeling is aroused, as it is during an election, it is an opportunity for a party or group, whatever that party or group may be, to put forward its point of view. Surely it is permissible for a party in a constituency to expend money in putting its point of view without in any way interfering with other candidates—either for or against. That is the important fact. Under this Clause, it would be prohibited from putting its point of view to the constituents. . . .

*Mr. Nicholson:* Suppose there is a vegetarian political party, and they take advantage of the large crowds attending the market in a town, and set up a platform to run some sort of a pretence candidate, who says, "I am the vegetarian candidate," what then? Is not the position becoming ridiculous?

*The Attorney-General:* If he is merely propagating the general principles and doctrines of vegetarianism without reference to any particular candidate—

*Mr. Nicholson:* He might be supporting the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

*The Attorney-General:*—he is doing something which is perfectly legal under the existing law, as is the case quoted by my hon. Friend, the Member for Peterborough (Mr. Tiffany). If the political party are merely giving expression to the political principles to which they adhere without supporting one candidate or the other, the expense of that is perfectly legal. If, however, in the course of propagating the principles of vegetarianism a man in a meeting says, "The hon. Member for Farnham (Mr. Nicholson) is a vegetarian and you ought to vote for him at the next election," that

would be an offence under this Bill. What is not illegal is any kind of political or ethical propaganda which is not intended to support one candidate and disparage another. That is illegal unless authorised by the agent of the candidate whom it is intended to support.

*Mr. Nicholson:* If this vegetarian political party recommends its followers to vote for me am I to be charged with the expenses of that under this Subsection, or are they to be proceeded against and, if so, under what Section?

*The Attorney-General:* Under Subsection (9) of the succeeding Section.

*Mr. Gallacher:* Would the right hon. and learned Gentleman tell us whether I would be acting in a legal manner if I recommended the people at an election meeting to support the very clear and acceptable policy of the Communist Party, and then I went on to say, "You will understand that it would be illegal if I advised you to vote for such and such a candidate, and it would be also illegal if I told you that the Tory candidate was a damned liar and should not be supported"?

*Lieut.-Commander Braithwaite:* That is not a purely hypothetical case coming from the hon. Member for West Fife (Mr. Gallacher), for recently he did intervene in a by-election and succeeded both in supporting and disparaging the Socialist candidate in one speech when he said of Harold Nicholson, "He is a bit of a sop, but you had better vote for him."

*Mr. Ede:* This point which we are now discussing is one which has been part of the election law since 1918, and it arises from the activities of parties, such as the Tariff Reform League, and other organisations, in the early years of this century, which used to go to by-elections and general elections to support Liberal or Conservative candidates, as the case might be, carrying on an intensive campaign for those candidates. But, they said they were not members of either the Liberal or the Conservative Party and, therefore, their expenses could not be charged against the candidate. That is the mischief aimed at by the Clause we have now under discussion and if, in fact, a person goes down to advocate the views of some other political party, he does not incur liability unless he recommends his hearers to vote for or against one of the candidates at an election.

Hon. Members will agree that it is very necessary that the intervention of outside bodies which purport not to be supporters of candidates but which are, in fact, supporting candidates, should be prohibited from carrying on propaganda during an election. That is the commonsense kind of thing which happens and if a candidate is found out as having some apparently independent organisation in the constituency carrying on a campaign intended to give him votes, he will have, rightly, to include the expenses of these people in his election returns or he will be guilty of an offence. . . . This is a practical proposition which has worked well during the last 30 years, and I hope that the Committee will continue it.

Amendment negatived.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. Gallacher:* I hope very much that the Home Secretary and others responsible will reconsider this Clause.

(continued on page 7.)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*  
*One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.*  
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 20. No. 10.

Saturday, May 8, 1948.

### From Week to Week

It must be obvious that our system of education, whether by intention or not, blinds the intelligence of the average sufferer from it so that events do not produce a normal reaction. In no plane of activity is this more startling than in that which is supposed to be the primary interest of the population—goods and services.

So far as we are aware, there has been no general reaction to the virtual disappearance of immense war surpluses, far exceeding those which were available to the domestic consumer for at least ten years after the First Armistice. We have made reference to this matter on at least five occasions; no one is interested.

A correspondence has been proceeding in *The Scotsman* from actual eye-witnesses who report that, e.g., at Lisbon and at East African ports hundreds of new and unused British cars are lying in the open to rust and rot. Presumably these are "paid for" by Export Credits, since they are clearly not paid for by the countries on which they are dumped. Nobody cares, and almost nobody takes the trouble to understand the results.

The fact that wages are generally more than eighty per cent of the cost of production and are rising, and that profits are generally less than five per cent. of the cost of production and are falling, does not prevent the T.U.C. from pretending that the "worker" is being defrauded of higher wages by such profits as are distributed, and that lower prices can be combined with higher wages without higher unit production.

We have never agreed that the "democratic" parliamentary system was even a sane method of selecting individuals to control business; but even we never believed that it could be so startlingly disastrous.

While the courageous denunciation of Communism by the Archbishop of Canterbury was mentioned by the "B".B.C., perhaps because he is an *ex-officio* Governor, it was played down by the Press in general to an extent which suggests the exercise of immensely strong influence. Dr. Fisher, if he would realise it, and we have no means of knowing that he does not, has an opportunity such as occurs only in the most critical periods of human history, and only then to men placed in strategic positions. His responsibility is great, not so much for the exercise of caution as for the employment of courage.

We have previously drawn attention to the special relation of "Dutch" Finance and politics to the history of Great Britain during the past three hundred years, and it is therefore a matter for close attention that the Masonic United States of Europe should crystallise round the "Benelux"

countries.

While all these world policies derive support from half-baked dupes to whom they are commended as the salvation of mankind, as for instance the League of Nations which ensured the Second World War, only ordinary powers of observation are required to see that, always and without exception, they are devices to ensure the enslavement of those they pretend to save. Why anyone should suppose that the steady drain of initiative and power from the individual to the institution should be for the benefit of humanity made up of individuals, we have never been able to understand. Every atom of evidence goes to prove the opposite; we have more institutionalism, less safety, less satisfaction and less future than at any time in recorded history.

Social Crediters at least ought to know the answer. The slogan of "All Power to the Soviets" in whatever disguise it may be propounded, and whatever name may be given to the Parliament, Cabinet, or State being propagandised is, and always has been, a trick, a trap, and a delusion. The whole objective of civilisation is that a man shall be able to choose or refuse one thing at a time. Until he can do that, he is a determinist, and ought to resign himself to the idea that he cannot have atomic energy to free him from "full-employment" without having atomic bombs to render his further employment unnecessary.

There are dozens of instances in which the fundamental principles which ought to limit organisation have been embodied, such as the cricket or golf club. In every case, their essential character depends on the freedom to contract out. The Trades' Unions, which began by being a tyranny on the craftsman, have now become a tyranny on the general population; because they have made it nearly impossible to contract-out of their monopoly, Labour.

### "If Leisure is Time to Think"

"Then again there is the baneful effect of Hollywood in lowering the taste of the masses, and in fact, in lowering the whole standard of thought throughout the world. Crowds flock to the picture theatres, and producers revel in producing the kind of film that tickles the taste of the masses. Crowds also flock to the museums to see exhibitions of outlandish paintings, and some people argue from this that the masses are becoming art conscious. This is not true—the masses are now merely what they always have been, namely stunt conscious. I am not a great believer of art for the masses—even to appreciate art and to understand art much prayer and fasting is required, and the habit of deep and prolonged thought is only acquired by those who are supposed to belong to a leisured class. If leisure means having the time to think, then there *must* be a leisured class, for without thought no human progress is possible."—Lord Lytton in *The National Review*.

### "Democracy"

"You cannot drive the British, but you can often kid them to do things they don't like and get them to like them later. That is what is happening now."—Mr. George Isaacs, Minister of Labour, addressing a 'vocational service forum' organised by No. 5 district of the Rotary International, British Isles, reported by the *Manchester Guardian* of April 26.

**The Secret Ballot: A Look into the Past**

NOTE: Time and timing are of the essence of the immediately present situation, and we therefore print the following notes by Mrs. Geoffrey Dobbs of the Debates on the First Reading and Second Reading of the Ballot Bill, 1872, in the House of Commons, before the material has been collated with what may be obtainable from the Official Reports of other Debates, of Lords and Commons, not immediately available. The Bill was passed, becoming the Ballot Act, 1872. There had been an earlier Bill (1871), passed by the House of Commons but rejected by the House of Lords, an action which led to threats against that body after the now familiar manner. To gauge the degree of understanding of the Constitution operative in earlier phases of the campaign for its destruction, it is desirable that reference should be made to the speeches of Members of Parliament before their thoughts have been 'developed' (to use a word from the Canadian Espionage Report). In the meantime the Notes which follow are of sufficient interest:—

(Passages in Italic type are summary or comment: Speakers' reported words are in Roman characters.)

**Parliamentary and Municipal Elections Bill  
February 8, 1872**

*column 172 Leave. First Reading.*

Mr. W. E. Forster, in rising to move for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Procedure at Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, said, . . .

. . . The Bill which he (Mr. W. E. Forster) now brought forward was confined strictly to the mode of nomination and the mode of voting. It would abolish public nomination and establish voting by Ballot . . .

*There has evidently been a Bill the previous year which has been turned down by the Lords; for he concludes . . .* The Bill now came before the House reinforced by the fact that its provisions had been carried by great majorities through the House, and that the country at large, as both sides would admit, endorsed the decision of that House. That could hardly be disputed, seeing, by the perfectly legitimate action of the House of Lords, that the country had had the opportunity during the last six months to show any feeling against this measure, but it was perfectly clear that it considered it a *fait accompli*. As a proof of that fact he might mention the recent election in the West Riding—*won by a Conservative at a reformed constituency who Mr. F. thought wouldn't have been returned had he not been a known advocate of the Secret Ballot.* . . . This agreement between the two parties in this important constituency was a good omen for the success of the present measure and he hoped that, however much some hon. Members might entertain a traditional prejudice against and dislike of the Ballot, they would, after entering their protest on the occasion of the second reading, assist the Government in rendering the measure as perfect as possible; . . .

Mr. Gregory . . .

Mr. Newdegate thought there was not universal consent for secret voting. When House of Lords rejected the Ballot Bill last session an attempt was made to assail them by agitation. Attempt failed. . . The House of Lords had been repeatedly assured that the House of Lords would imperil their existence, if they strove to evade their destiny in the

shape of the will of the Government on this subject. The House rejected the Bill and the attempt to assail them failed . . . *By voting for the Ballot, members were favouring a reduction of the franchise to manhood suffrage.*

Mr. Brady.

Motion agreed to . . . Bill presented, and read the first time [Bill 2]

**Parliamentary and Municipal Elections Bill  
Second Reading**

February 15, 1872. Col. 470.

Mr. LIDDELL, rose to move the Bill be read a second time in six months. *Ballot had been recommended from one community in Australia where secret vote is said to work well. But the example of America (deemed not to recommend the measure) is ignored.*

Col.

475 Colonel Barttelot, in seconding the Amendment, said . . . The real question upon this subject had never been fairly put before the constituencies—that was whether they, as Englishmen, preferred the present system of open voting to the vote by Ballot, a secret system now proposed. No doubt there were many honorable members who, influenced by political prejudice, were prepared to say that the Ballot would be a great boon to many classes of the community; but not a man would come forward to say that he personally was afraid to record his vote unless he was protected by the Ballot. Under these circumstances, he was justified in asking upon what grounds this measure had been introduced last year? Was it because by extending the franchise they had gone backwards politically, that the Ballot had been rendered necessary? Were the classes who had obtained the franchise under the recent Reform Bill less independent than the class immediately above them? The Bill indirectly casts a great slur upon the working classes of the community by insinuating that they were unable to protect themselves in giving their votes; but he was prepared to contend that the working classes were as independent and able to protect themselves as any class of people in the country. The small shopkeepers were not nearly so able to protect themselves; but the Government during the time that this class had power never introduced any Ballot Bill. Had anything arisen in modern times to call for the Ballot? Had the elections that had taken place in England produced any necessity for the Ballot? It was perfectly true that the candidates that the Government wished to be returned had not been returned; but was that in consequence of open voting, or because of the unpopularity of the Ministry? . . . *examples given, showing it was unpopularity of measures of taxation. "The 2d. income tax!", and because of scandals. It's effect in Ireland.*

477 . . . He regretted to be obliged to say that the elections in Ireland were a disgrace to our representative system, because men were not able, under the state of things that existed in that country, to go to the poll and record their votes freely according to their consciences . . . *because of inflammatory politics. Ballot would not prevent bribery. Had intimidation increased recently? He thought not—Ballot not necessary on that account. But it would make personation easier.*

478 In his opinion, each man ought to honestly record his

political conviction and to give his vote openly. Doubtless the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President of the Council, and perhaps one or two more of the Ministry, had been in favour of the Ballot ever since their first entrance into Parliament; but what had become of the opinions of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, and of several others who sat near him? . . . Was it improbable that certain hon. Members opposite, sitting below the gangway, had said to the Government—"We must have the Ballot, or else you cannot have our support?" *He developed this theme and then He, however, trusted that . . . even if they temporarily supported their Ballot Bill, they . . . would—in the course of a Session or two—bring in a bill to repeal the Ballot Act on the ground that it had not had the effect they anticipated it would have had, and that they were prepared to revert to the old Constitutional custom of open voting.*

CAPTAIN NOLAN *spoke of the tyranny of Irish Landlords, and how the Ballot would eliminate it, but didn't seem to think the Catholic priests used their influence wrongly.*

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (*Mr. Dowse*) was glad that the question had been discussed without any reference to first principles and without any allusion to 'the social contract,' or 'the rights of man,' and then *descanted on the details of the first two speeches.*

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE . . . thought that at this period of these long controversies the opponents of the Ballot might claim at least to have time on their side. *Their arguments had gathered strength, while the abuses which had led to the demand for the Ballot 25 years ago, could scarcely be said to exist. He ended* No such thing as a secret vote was possible, save to a man who could resent and repel pressure and defy hostilities. To such a man he need hardly say the Ballot was entirely useless, and its protection would be scorned . . .

Mr. WALTER: *Franchise a species of trust—secret Ballot meant extending suffrage much further.*

Mr. GOLDNEY: *Another speech on the technique of nomination.*

Colonel Sykes *had not spoken in previous debates as he was anxious not to delay the passage of the measure. As far back as 1847 he had advocated the secret vote to protect working men from the coercion of their employers. Nowadays, He maintained that there was now a greater necessity of protecting the working man against the trades union committees than there ever was of protecting him before. The influence of his employer was nothing to what that of the trades union committee would be. They knew how the men of the unions were governed and dictated to by a small committee of active persons, and it was because those persons had political ideas, political views and political objects, and because the unionist members were subject to the dictation of those who ruled them that he had been induced to . . . address the House . . . He wanted the working men to be free to vote as they desired. They must look also to the fact that these committees if actuated by political views, might be dictating to their fellow-tradesmen in the union, and ultimately become a serious power in this country by controlling to a certain extent its representation. What, then,*

would become of our system of election? If, therefore, there were reasons why the working men should have had the Ballot for their protection in times past, the reasons were tenfold stronger now why they should be in possession of that protection. . . .

499 Mr. FIELDEN *outlined American methods for bribery with the secret vote. The only real check upon the unscrupulous use of wealth by the rich was publicity; but by the introduction of secret voting they shut the door to all chances of discovery and intimidation. The thing which alone could control the exercise of this power was publicity. But he thought this Ballot milk and water beside the proposed abolition of Public nomination.*

501 Mr. CADOGAN.

502 Mr. HUTTON.

Mr. Beresford Hope said, he did not agree . . . that the Ballot would put an end to coercion— . . . The real restraining power upon their intimidation was public opinion. At present, the man who desired to coerce was in a measure restrained by the publicity of the poll-book, which gave the clue to his sinister machinations, but with the Ballot in force he could do his worst. At present, the great safe-guard of political purity against coercion or intimidation was the patent discrepancy between the vote which the poll-book bore on the face of it, and the views which the voter may have been known to proclaim in public; but destroy the identity of each vote, as you would do by the secret Ballot, and there would remain no means of bringing home coercion to those who practiced it. The machinery by which coercion and intimidation would in future be worked would be that a system of *espionage* would be established, under which dependent voters would be brought to the poll in gangs, watched up to the booths and away from it again, and put under the strongest moral pressure to vote in the sense of their escorts. *It would lead to the payment of M.P.'s changing them into paid delegates.*

506 Mr. DENISON.

509 Mr. A. EGERTON.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL.

510 Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH . . . All the Ballot would do would be to make bribery safer, and, very possibly, to extend it from the electors to the returning officers. With regard to intimidation, nothing in the present day

## AN EDITOR ON TRIAL.

### REX v. CAUNT.

#### *Alleged Seditious Libel.*

(Official shorthand transcript of the Trial at the Liverpool Assizes of James Caunt, Editor of *The Morecambe and Heysham Visitor*, for alleged seditious libel against the Jewish People.)

2/- NETT (Postage 1½d.)

*Obtainable from:*

K.R.P. Publications Limited, 7, Victoria St., Liverpool, 2.

was so much the subject of exaggeration as intimidation. He was convinced that labourers were rather ruling their employers now than employers ruling their labourers. Tenants were often far more powerful than landlords, and he did not believe there was a man in the United Kingdom who would be so foolish as to evict a tenant for having given a vote against him at an election. The Ballot would be no protection whatever to individual members of the International Society, or a trades union, or the Fenian Society, against their fellow members; for no men were less capable than the working classes of that constant and vigilant reserve which would be necessary to conceal their real opinions . . . suppose open violence were out of the question, threatening letters and other machinery would be used to keep away those voters who were suspected of wishing to vote against the popular candidate. But it was now hardly pretended that the Ballot could, in practice, be really secret. He thought it was pretty generally admitted that the secrecy which the Ballot would bring about would be, at the most, optional, . . . It appeared to him to be an unheard of proposal that for the sake of enabling a miserable minority of cowardly electors to live a life of hypocrisy the vast majority of Englishmen should be deprived of their privilege of being able to satisfy themselves that their votes, when given, had been actually reckoned in favour of the candidate of their choice, and that the real power of deciding elections should be taken from them and placed in the hands of the returning officer. *Technical passages on bribery and polling places, etc.* . . . but was there any real feeling in the country on the subject? There had been times that evening when the House might with the greatest facility have been counted out, though it was upon the first night of the discussion of a measure which the Government affected to consider as one of the greatest importance. Nothing could exceed the indifference of the country upon this matter.

Mr. STACPOOLE.

Mr. D. DALRYMPLE: *The country was indifferent because it thought the result a foregone conclusion.*

515 Mr. HERMON.

Question put: House divided on the amendment:

A109 N51. Main Question put and agreed to. Bill read a second time.

---

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

Before dealing with the point I have particularly in mind I should like to make reference to a suggestion which is often made, that somehow or another organised disturbances are made at election meetings nowadays; and the impression given is that that is something new in the experience of this country. It is further suggested that some parties pay hecklers to go to meetings for the purpose of creating disturbances. From my long experience I am absolutely positive that the Communist Party, any more than the Labour Party, has never, under any circumstances, expended money for the purpose of creating disturbances at election meetings. But nobody could say that about the Tory Party. Before there ever was a Labour Party or Communist Party the Tories were tearing Liberal Party meetings to pieces in this country. One of the

worst demonstrations that ever happened—as I have pointed out before—was against the late Lloyd George, when he had to be slipped out of the back door of the Birmingham Town Hall—otherwise a Tory mob would have torn him to pieces; they would have killed him. That was a Tory mob.

I have the feeling that this Clause is an extreme and a somewhat disgusting example of kicking away the ladder on which the Government climbed to fame. There would never have been a Labour Party or a Labour Government had it not been for the auxiliary forces which assisted at elections. Before ever the Labour Party had substantial affiliations—even from the trades union movement, which they have now—not one Labour candidate stood at an election but he was supported by money from housing committees. Many hon. Members will remember that in the old days housing committees expended large sums of money on assisting Labour candidates. They were not Labour Party committees but housing committees—in the early days of the movement. And not only was there support from housing committees; but how many Labour candidates in the early days received support from, and got into parliament here through money spent by the Co-operative movement, independently of the election expenses of the candidate and money spent by the trades union movement and trades union branch and district committees? That was money spent quite independently of the candidate's expenses; money given to build up Labour Party support and to assist Labour candidates. Is that not true? Will anyone on the Labour Party Front Bench deny it?

In the early days of the movement the Labour Party was built up with the powerful support of the auxiliaries. In this country a feature of Parliamentary activity has been the work within constituencies of all kinds of groups, who verbally express their support and spend money. In my early youthful days, before I got led into the Socialist movement and set out on a political path, I was in a temperance movement. In election campaigns that temperance movement spent a lot of money, supporting candidates who would give pledges to further the movement's aims. That was a common practice. All kinds of groups and organisations acted within constituencies. Now all that is to be stopped. Why? The Government have got into a position of power, and maybe they are afraid that if these auxiliary movements are encouraged other parties may make progress and develop. Is that the idea? I cannot understand why, from the Labour point of view, such legislation should be necessary regarding meetings. In a constituency where there is an election it is easy enough to run public meetings without incurring expenses by a party like ours. . . .

. . . At the last Election, as in previous elections, the Catholic Bishops in Scotland sent out a letter—I do not know how much it cost to send out the letter; it would cost so much for paper, and so much for stamps—which was read from every pulpit in my constituency, as in some others. The letter said that Catholics could vote for the Tory or vote for the Labour candidate but they would go plumb down to Hell if they voted for the Communists. I would like to be told if that is going to be included in the expenses of the Tory and Labour candidates or if it is going to be treated as a corrupt practice. I am not against it. I consider that they or any other organisation have the right to express their views at an election however unpalatable they may be to me or anybody else. Electors in this country have always had that right. If

there are auxiliary bodies or groups of any kind within a constituency they should be allowed as groups to express their views. . . .

*Mrs. Middleton* (Plymouth, Sutton): I would like to put one question to the Attorney-General. It is concerning the matter of election questionnaires. One of the phenomena of modern elections is the circularisation of candidates with election questionnaires. Afterwards the replies to these questionnaires are often published in the Press, and sometimes advice is given publicly to the members of the organisation submitting the questionnaire that votes should be given to certain candidates. Can my right hon. and learned Friend say whether that comes within the ruling of this Clause?

*Mr. Ede*: If, as a result of answers to a questionnaire, expenses are incurred in circularising the result of the questionnaire with a recommendation that certain candidates shall be voted for, or that steps shall be taken to prevent the election of one of the candidates whose answers might be deemed to be unsatisfactory, that is an expense which clearly comes within the statute. May I say with regard to the points raised by the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Fife (*Mr. Gallacher*)— . . . what we are doing here is to re-enact the law as it has existed since 1918, and which was aimed at preventing what had occurred during the first 18 years of this century. Then there were bodies attached to the great political parties who went down to constituencies and spent considerable sums of money on the grounds that they were not supporting the candidates as they were not party organisations. It was, therefore, felt necessary to take steps to prevent this, and the experience we have had since 1918 has amply vindicated the alterations made in the law. I do not think any of the criticisms made by the hon. Member for West Fife are valid, or ought to persuade the Committee not to add the Clause to the Bill.

Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.  
CLAUSE 75.—(*Short title, and citation.*)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. Hogg*: I am sorry that the two Amendments which stood in my name have not commended themselves to the Chair, but I feel that some part of what I wished to say on those Amendments would be in Order on the Question, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill." The Clause provides that this Bill may be cited as the Representation of the People Act, 1948. It further provides that it

"shall be included among the Acts which may be cited as the Representation of the People Acts,"

—a long series of honourable Acts of Parliament.

So much has happened since this Bill was first introduced that I fear this title the "Representation of the People Act" is no longer appropriate or happy in the circumstances, and it would be a mockery to include it, as the second part of this Clause does, in that long line of Representation of the People Acts which great Liberal and Conservative Governments in the past carried into law. A more appropriate title to this Bill would be the "Representation of the Labour Party Bill," and I was prepared to advance numerous arguments to support this title as being the more appropriate of the two. I fear, however, as we are simply upon the Motion, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill" that I am bound to criticise the title which is in the Clause without offering any arguments in support of an alternative title. If I do so I

hope I shall not be criticised by hon. Members opposite as one who has no constructive alternative to offer.

. . . a Measure is only entitled to be described as the "Representation of the People Act" if it proceeds upon the principle which provides for the better representation of the people. It is precisely at this point that this Bill falls short, and that one is compelled to feel that another title the "Representation of Something Other than the People Act," would be a slightly more appropriate designation. The original number—

*The Chairman*: I am sure the hon. Gentleman will appreciate that he is not entitled to indulge in a Second Reading speech. He must keep himself precisely to the contents of the Clause and, if he will forgive me for saying so, there is not a great deal that can be said about it which would be in Order.

*Mr. Hogg*: . . . I was solely addressing myself to the cold, technical question whether this Bill can properly be called the Representation of the People Act, and I was seeking to compare this Bill, to which this name is sought to be given—

*The Chairman*: The hon. Member will, I am sure, appreciate that so soon as he begins to do that he begins to discuss the merits of the various Acts which are included and that is out of Order.

*Mr. Hogg*: May I not, with due submission, put this to the Chair on the purely technical question of what is appropriate—supposing that the first 74 Clauses of this Bill contained nothing whatever except a series of provisions regarding the artificial insemination of cattle, and Clause 75 then went on to say:

"This Act may be cited as the Representation of the People Act, 1948, and . . . shall be included among the Acts which may be cited as the Representation of the People Acts."

*The Chairman*: I cannot admit that argument. The hon. Gentleman must resume his seat unless he has some other point to raise.

*Mr. Hogg*: If the illustration did not meet with your approval, Major Milner, I will gladly withdraw it and substitute any other. The point, and the sole point, which I was trying to put to you was that, supposing it to be true as a matter of principle that the other 74 Clauses have nothing whatever to do with the title proposed in the 75th Clause, which is what I submit to be the case here—

[*In the next twenty minutes the Chairman of the Committee ruled out of order arguments on these lines by Mr. Hogg, Mr. Byers (who suggested the Act be called the Redistribution of Miscellaneous Electoral Provisions Bill) and Mr. C. Williams (Representation of the Socialist Party Bill) before the question that the Clause stand part of the Bill was put to the vote and carried by 242 votes to 78*].

## ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL CREDIT

*An introductory Course of Lectures published with the authority of the Social Credit Secretariat,*

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

6/- net.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.