

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 22. No. 5.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 2, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

THE BRITISH IN INDIA

"I would say this to India and Pakistan. The British forest officer has built up not only a great legacy which he now makes over to the owner, but he has also brought it to a pitch not, I believe, existent in any comparable area of forest in the world. If it is a proud legacy to leave behind, it is an equally proud one to take over."—Professor E. P. Stebbing, from *Nature*.

"I have been struck by the likenesses, the underlying similarity of attitude, shared by these monstrous nabobs and the . . . less spectacular British" as Mr. Humphrey House, broadcast by the "B".B.C. would say.

"One great peculiarity in the native Jews is, their being so totally unlike the western Jews; they are straight-nosed, and generally very fair—the men with transparent pink complexions—and they do not seem to be so money-loving. They say that the worst specimens of their race are in England and France. A great many of them here are very learned as well. The oldest and best families came from Spain at the time of Ferdinand and Isabella. They are rather superstitious and do not like being alone in a house at night."

While to those who take the interest in the Jewish question which its paramount importance demands, the foregoing quotation from the *Letters of Thomas Seddon* written in 1854 is familiar, we do not think enough attention is paid to it. Beyond any question most of the "Jews" referred to as "western" Jews, the moving spirit of Zionism and the scourge of Europe and Great Britain, are not Jews—they are hybrid Mongol-Tartar Khazars. Most of them are not even Jews by religion. To anyone who has noticed the almost incredible superstition amongst even highly-educated (*sic*) people ("After all, they are God's Chosen People, you know") the matter will be recognised as being of high political importance.

Whatever we may think of the past record of the Liberal Party since 1906 (and what we think of it would require the gift of tongues to express) it appears to have someone of elementary common sense connected with the drafting of its programme which is more than can be said for the "Conservatives." According to the *Daily Mail* of March 15, "women's interests will be high on the agenda for its Hastings conference . . . home helps, foreign and home domestic workers . . ."

Nothing could be more remarkable than the tolerance which has been extended to the policy of the current Administration and its would-be successors under Lord Woolton, in which every interest, black, white or brown, is to be catered for, *via* the factory-ghetto, while the British housewife sinks into a mire of overwork, dull, stale food and gadgets which she is exhorted not to use. If we were not semi-imbeciles, we should throw every Parliamentary can-

didate who did not disclaim both Cripps and Woolton into a well-greened duckpond.

We don't like Sir Oswald Mosley's so-called Fascists, but at any rate, they *do* something.

Amongst the more repellant forms of bilge with which the Socialist era is connected, is its claim to represent "Service, not Self." We neither forget nor overlook such men as Maurice, Kingsley, Ruskin, and with certain reservations, Keir Hardie. They were good and great men, and their fatal defect (much more fatal than culpable) was that they did not understand the problem with which they wished to deal.

But the vast majority (and we speak from varied personal contact) of the Socialists, who were the forerunners of the Communists, now trying to displace them, were pure careerists. They saw money and power in Socialism—"jobs for the boys"—And the other "Service not self"-ers, the Sanhedrin behind the Rotary Clubs, the International Peacers, Columbia University, the London School of Economics, *etc.*, have seen that they got them; in most cases, quite small jobs, but better than working for a living.

As for "Service," 95 per cent. of the population of this country obtained better service from the industrial system in the late nineteenth century than 50 per cent. receive to-day. The matter is far from being one of statistics; the question of what a man gets out of life is just as much bound up with what he wants to get out of life, as it is with the actual, material articles which his system allows him to appropriate. The Sanhedrin has devoted its most skilful propaganda to the fomentation of discontents, and to providing grounds for them.

At the risk of labouring the point, we consider it to be nothing short of Black Magic that the population of this country, most of whom can read and write, cannot see, or does not heed, the deception which is being practiced on it, or to where that deception is leading.

Looking at the material side, can anyone in his senses suppose that a man in the position of Sir John Boyd-Orr (Lord Orr, God save us!) can broadcast on September 23, 1936:

"Not only can we produce real wealth in abundance, but we are doing it with less and less labour. Thus, in the case of wheat, which is an outstanding example of easy production, it is estimated that with modern machinery and modern methods, half a days work of one man is equivalent to a month's work at the beginning of the (Twentieth) century."

And, ten years later, from the eminence (?) of a world organisation, warn us solemnly that we are in danger of starvation; and be right in both cases, *if he is telling us all the relevant facts?* There are twenty-one million people "employed" in this country to-day; nearly double the number employed last century; and they are producing worse results. But the Black Magic goes much deeper than material things.

It conceals the fact that Socialism is simply an incredibly (perhaps that is why) clever scheme of robbery-without-risk-to-the-robbers. In preparation for this scheme the whole moral code of civilisation has been undermined, such landmarks of Christian Law as Magna Carta and Habeas Corpus (*vide* 18b) have been overturned, a new theory of the Divine Right of Parliaments has been set up, property has been seized without compensation, the currency debauched, and the Public Services reduced to the level of those of a Balkan State fifty years ago.

Socialism, the misuse of the State to further sectional interests, is quite inevitably universal war—the war of the group on every individual. One section of the group is bribed by robbing another, only to be robbed in turn, just as the Russian peasants were bribed to attack their landlords, and were, within six months, deprived of the land they had coveted.

The elements—only the elements—of a stable and potentially satisfactory society are: Security for life and property; fluid (*not full*) employment; low and falling prices; negligible taxes *never* political or “moral”; simple laws, few in number and drastically limited Constitutionally. Imperfectly, but perfectly, we had these elements sixty years ago; to-day we have none of them. And there are people who call that Progress.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 6, 1949.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA BILL

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. BOWLES in the Chair]

(*The Debate continued*)

Sir A. Herbert: . . . Assuming that he [the Attorney General] is sound on his legal points—and he is a very fine lawyer—let me try to simplify the thing down to two matters of factual significance, to use his own phrase. First, the Newfoundlanders say—this is not my opinion but theirs—“Under the Act of 1933 the Commission of Government with its six or seven oligarchs”—I use that term in no offensive sense—“were given power to make laws for the ‘peace, welfare and good government’ of the Island for a temporary period. They had no power to make laws making away with the future and the sovereignty of Newfoundland.” That is one simple point.

The other point is: Suppose the Attorney-General to be quite right legally; what is the actual situation we have now? Here, in the House of Commons, we are discussing the affairs and the future of Newfoundland, and the terms of the Bill. Tomorrow in the House of Lords there will be more Parliamentary discussion of the Bill and the terms. For 16 days in the Parliament of Canada these terms of union were discussed. There is nothing to stop the Federal Parliament in Australia or the State Parliaments from discussing in an airy way tomorrow this great union between Canada and Newfoundland and saying: “These terms seem to be very favourable and fair.” In New Zealand and South Africa they can do the same, in the cold air of Hobart or the hot sun of Queensland. They all have Parliaments. There is only one place in the whole Commonwealth where there can be no Parliamentary discussion of these terms, and that is in the Dominion of Newfoundland. Let us sweep away all

the legal arguments and the quibbles; that does not seem to be a democratic thing which can be adjusted to our ideas of law or of fact in this Empire. Therefore, if I only have one man with me I am going to ask the House of Commons to divide with me in favour of this Amendment.

The Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations (Mr. Philip Noel-Baker): . . . I want to end by an appeal to the hon. Member. He has given wide publicity to a certain number of propositions, which as my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney-General has shown, have no foundation in law or in constitutional practice. He has helped to prolong the unhappy bitterness which has existed in Newfoundland. I hope he will now help us to secure the acceptance of this new thing which is going through so that in Newfoundland, as in Canada and elsewhere, this will be accepted as a splendid form of democratic self-government for the Newfoundland people as part of the great nation of Canada and as part of the great Commonwealth to which we all belong.

Question put, “That those words be there inserted.”

The Committee divided: Ayes, 12; Noes, 241.

AYES—Bowen, R.; Gage, C.; Gruffydd, Prof. W. J.; Hannon, Sir P. (Moseley); Morris, Hopkin (Carmarthen); Mullan, Lt. C. H.; Roberts, Emrys (Merioneth); Roberts, W. (Cumberland, N.); Ropner, Col. L.; Savory, Prof. D. L.; Smiles, Lt.-Col. Sir W.; Smith, E. P. (Ashford).

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alan Herbert and Lieut.-Col. Sir Thomas Moore.

Sir A. Herbert: I do not wish to delay the House long, but I do think the House will do me the justice of letting me say one or two words in reply to the attack made upon me by the Secretary of State. I am certainly not going to say that everything I have done in this business has been right. On the contrary, long ago in *The Times* and elsewhere I have confessed that like all of us in this affair, I may have made some mistakes. However, I would remind the right hon. Gentleman what I did recommend in the Report. I would first tell him that when I wrote my Report, on which was founded that speech of mine which he has quoted, I was not in a great office with the Statute of Westminster before me but in a small sailing boat off the coast of Labrador, and I was eating seagulls and salt cod, and was fogbound for nine days. A very uncomfortable time it was.

Mr. Scollan (Renfrew, Western): Not more uncomfortable than the time the hon. Gentleman has had tonight.

Sir A. Herbert: I had not got the Statute of Westminster with me or the British North America Act, 1867. Indeed, I do not think I had heard of the British North America Act, 1867, at that time. If I had, I should certainly have thought twice about making some of the recommendations I did—although I think they were practically pretty sensible all the same. The House must realise this, that at that time the political machinery was dead, and that it had been dead for 10 years, and one great thing was to get that machinery going again—to get a council of citizens together to discuss their future. That was the idea of the Convention. Another idea was the Referendum. That was also recommended by Lord Ammon. It was thought that they might well wish to allow a short time to go by after the war—a couple of years perhaps—to see how the Newfoundlanders stood, and to see how their future might shape: and for such a short period stay under Commission of Government, perhaps in a modified form. That was constitutionally the only

justifiable aim and purpose of the Referendum. I think it was useful and gave a general idea of the feelings of the people. But I did not think that anyone said that the Referendum ought to be allowed to exclude the proper constitutional operations.

Sir T. Moore: I will not detain the House for many minutes. When I spoke on Second Reading concerning this, as I honestly believe, shameful Bill, I said I thought that it was probably too late to alter the course of events. That thought has proved true. I admit that the voting tonight and on Second Reading was impressive; but I wonder just how much hon. Members who trooped into these Lobbies knew exactly what they were voting about and what they were voting for.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker (Mr. Bowles): The hon. Gentleman cannot reflect on hon. Members and how they vote. Secondly, that has nothing to do with what is in the Bill at the present moment.

Sir T. Moore: I was not reflecting on anyone. I was merely submitting a query. However, I will follow your guidance, and will only ask, once again—because neither the Secretary of State nor the Attorney-General answered the query before—why are we in such a hurry? Is it the fear that public opinion will be aroused in this country, as it was aroused in Canada and in Newfoundland? Is it the fear of an even greater force of nationalism arising in Newfoundland? Or do they fear that other parts of the Commonwealth may suddenly see their future in jeopardy? Whatever the reason, I believe the result will go down to posterity as something both unconstitutional and unethical on our part.

I feel very strongly about this. I do not know why. I have no justifiable reason to offer. I have never been to Newfoundland, although I have met a number of Newfoundlanders; but I feel in my conscience that I cannot support this Bill. I feel it to be wrong. Possibly other hon. Members have taken the same line on other Measures, because of their consciences and their judgments. Therefore, I must say what I am saying. [*Laughter.*] That may amuse some hon. Members, but that does not worry me. All I can say in conclusion is that it is possible, and no doubt probable, that when this Bill becomes an Act the future of Newfoundland will be more secure, more tranquil and more prosperous under the wing of Canada. But we are denying her the possibly dangerous but at any rate adventurous right of shaping her own destiny, of moulding her own future, and of deciding her own fate. Feeling that way, as I do, I can only hope—although not on the same lines as my hon. Friend the junior Burgess for Oxford University (Sir A. Herbert)—that when this Bill goes to another and wiser place, the mistake, the tragic mistake, that we are making tonight will be rectified.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time, and passed.

House of Lords: March 15, 1949.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA BILL

Viscount Simon: My Lords, we are grateful to the noble Lord, Lord Ammon, for giving us so clear an account of the Bill, and for putting before us the considerations which make the Government feel that it is right for us to give

it a Second Reading without a Division. Obviously, it is a measure of great importance. To all those of us who keep in mind the wonderful story of the growth of British institutions in the Commonwealth overseas, the whole topic of this Bill is a subject of the deepest interest. What is so regrettable is that in certain quarters an impression has arisen that what is being done is not being done in the best way—even, indeed, an impression that the Bill involves some departure from true constitutional doctrine.

As the noble Lord has observed, the view is held in some quarters even that we are not proceeding in a democratic manner, or (to put it at its highest) that something like a breach of faith is involved. If that were so, it would give all of us the greatest possible concern. I do not take that view. . . . It is said—and it is said truly—that there is an appeal now pending to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council which might affect this matter and, therefore, it is wrong (though perhaps not legally wrong, but morally and politically wrong) that we should take the step of carrying the present Bill until that matter had been finally disposed of judicially. . . .

. . . I have here the proceedings. Six gentlemen who are residents in Newfoundland started an action against the Governor of the Colony and his six advisers who form the Commission. They claimed that they ought to be entitled, by an appeal to the law courts, to get a decision which would result in establishing that the course proposed was what is called “unconstitutional”; and, further, that they should be able to get orders from the court restraining the Governor and his advisers from taking steps for confederation and indicating that they ought to do something different. Do not let us exaggerate the powers which can be exercised by courts of law. Courts of law exist for the purpose of applying the law of the land to the facts of the case. They do not exist for the purpose of dictating to those who conduct a Government how they should govern or to a Legislature how it should legislate, or what policy they should pursue. The whole idea that, by a legal process in a court, you can proceed to determine these questions is, as it seems to me, quite fantastic. It certainly seemed very fantastic to the courts in Newfoundland which had the matter before them. I should inform your Lordships that what has been before the courts of Newfoundland is not a formulated case on the one side or the other, but an application at the beginning of the proceedings to strike the whole claim out because it is, in lawyer’s language, “frivolous and vexatious.” . . .

. . . As a matter of fact, the Judges in Newfoundland examined each of the contentions with great care. I admire the way in which they have applied the constitutional law to the matter. They point out that there is nothing whatever in these allegations which any court of law could ever undertake to decide. Lest I should be thought to be speaking with undue freedom about contentions which, no doubt, are put forward with great earnestness, I would ask leave to read to the House one sentence from the Judgment of the learned Judge who first had the matter before him. I can assure the House that if you read the earlier part of the Judgment you will find that he discussed each question with the greatest care and precision. Having done that, he said:

“I have listened to counsel at some length, but this Statement of Claim is a dead horse, and flogging it will not bring it to life, or make any difference to their position. The action is based on fundamental errors of law and logic which are apparent on the

(Continued on page 6.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 22. No. 5.

Saturday, April 2, 1949.

Spring

It is a well-known fact of botany that not all seeds germinate in their first spring or equivalent period of their year; but lie slowly increasing their inner force while time destroys the resistant strength of their cases.

This is the second spring since the seed of *Realistic Constitutionalism* was sown, and, assuming that there is some organic association between human affairs and the powers of growth in nature (as we have every reason to assume), it is time that the idea began to sprout. The fruit will come later. What we are concerned about is to apply, judiciously, a little gentle heat, no more than the sagacity of a gardener might countenance ("sagacity is something which one may expect to find in one's gardener, if not in one's doctor"—the doctors have validated the criticism.).

Our followers seem to have found more difficulty with this particular husk than with any other, and it is in their minds that the germination we would encourage is sought. The phrase 'Constitutional issue' is difficult-sounding, and seems to have induced the conviction that its solution is a very highly parliamentary matter, far removed from the daily lives of most Social Crediters. It will, however, be recalled that Major Douglas, when addressing the Constitutional Research Association expressly disclaimed both a "spurious romanticism" and "abstract Scheme-building." But, he said, "conditions have developed in this century, beginning in their modern phase after the South African War and the Parliament Act, but taking more sinister form in 1931, which make it imperative that we put the framework of our house in order to enable us to rectify both our housekeeping and our external business. Our present situation is not adventitious—it is the outcome of a venomous hatred and envy of our indigenous qualities. If anyone is foolish enough to suppose that the prestige of this country and the Empire, and with them, the welfare of the population, can be restored by an appeal to an anonymous, irresponsible, and mis-instructed ballot-box democracy, I can assure them that, if their opinion should prevail and our destinies be submitted to decision by that process, the outcome is a mathematical certainty—our final eclipse."

It should be obvious to anyone who gives any thought to the question that the frame-work of our house, while it is quite certainly and objectively the frame-work within which the Administration acts, is also the frame-work of ideas of which that structure is a reflection. That framework is a tissue of propositions, accepted as axiomatic, which are far from being axiomatic. Persistent question of every pretence along these lines is one sound step towards the recognition, in responsible quarters, that they are dealing with an unsound

and unstable structure. It is in this that chiefly consists the germination of the idea. And this persistent question is within the range and competency of every Social Crediter. But it cannot occur swiftly, adroitly and spontaneously unless that Social Crediter has himself spotted the spurious axiom actuating the mind of his neighbour, and has confidence to expose it.

Social Crediters whether in general or in particular are not called upon to frame a Constitution; they are called upon to strip the effective Constitution of the moment of its pretensions; to unmask it, and to dislodge from the minds of those who would exploit an heretical opinion, the grounds from which their evil confidence grows. This is a thing better done far away from Councils and Committees with high-sounding names; it is best done in the myriad conversations of the working world. That this has been done to a degree, and with a success which would astonish those who fancy that monetary theory is the only skeleton of Social Credit, we know. We would have others know it too.

Raphael

"He [Raphael] died at thirty-seven. And in his twenty-fifth year, . . . he was sent for to Rome, to decorate the Vatican for Pope Julius II, and having until that time worked exclusively in the ancient and stern mediæval manner, he, in the first chamber which he decorated in that palace, wrote upon its walls the *Mene, Tekel, Upharsin* of the Arts of Christianity. And he wrote it thus: on one wall of that chamber he placed a picture of the World or Kingdom of *Theology*, presided over by Christ. And on the side wall of that same chamber he placed the World or Kingdom of *Poetry*, presided over by Apollo. And from that spot, and from that hour the intellect and the art of Italy date their degradation. Observe, however . . . Raphael had neither religion nor originality enough to trace the spirit of poetry and the spirit of philosophy to the inspiration of the true God, as well as that of theology; but that, on the contrary, *he elevated the creations of fancy on the one wall, to the same rank as the objects of faith upon the other; . . .* The doom of the arts of Europe went forth from that chamber, and it was brought about in great part by the very excellencies of the man who had thus marked the commencement of decline . . .

" . . . in mediæval art, truth is first, beauty second; in modern art, beauty is first, truth second . . ."—John Ruskin: *Lectures on Architecture and Painting*, 1853.

Forthcoming London Meeting

A meeting for subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been arranged by the Social Credit Secretariat to take place on the morning of Saturday, April 23, at the Cora Hotel, Upper Woburn Place, W.C.1. The chair will be taken at 10-15 a.m., by the Deputy Chairman of the Secretariat, Dr. Tudor Jones. Subscribers who desire to be present are requested to apply for tickets *as early as possible* to The Social Credit Secretariat, 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2, marking the envelope "London Meeting." It is desired that the number of those attending the meeting who wish to lunch at the hotel afterwards be ascertained.

"Military" Medicine

The abstractionism which sets aside all the objective evidences of the momentum now generated towards war and the implementation of "the plan" of the world's future (with or without Man) seems to be still in the ascendancy, and is itself a major weapon on the side of evil. There could scarcely be a better example than the article by Dr. Jules Voncken, of Liège, contributed to the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (Vol. 139. No. 8) on "The Future of Medicine in Times of War."

The Mindszenty "Trial" and the "research" behind the methods employed, and all other evidences of the complete repudiation of any conception of Law but that of Might and Power apparently make no difference to the mental operations of the world's talkers, and so the forthcoming diplomatic meeting which will be held at Geneva this spring is held up as a "great opportunity" for the banishment of inhumanity from a necessary concomitant of military warfare.

"During armed conflicts," says Dr. Voncken, "physicians find themselves with a mission to fulfil which is unique in its extent and complex in its moral grandeur. In all epochs of civilisation it has been an axiom of the most elementary international law that 'hostes dum vulnerati fratres' (enemies when wounded become brothers). Since the nineteenth century, which saw the first international codification of duties involved in the organisation of aid to the wounded, in the form of the Red Cross Convention, this concept has continued to advance, and it is consoling to observe that in spite of all the setbacks of political rapprochement, whether in the League of Nations or in the United Nations Organisations, the only structure which has been maintained is the Red Cross, probably because it places emphasis on respect for the suffering. Suffering being the same throughout the world and thus becoming a superior imperative before which nations must bow as before all physical scourges or epidemics, it is in common misfortune that even enemies dream of uniting in order to combat the scourge effectively.

"It is the same with the scourge of war: In order to improve with a little hope the suffering of the wounded and sick, nations are willing to accept, for the common interest, respect for the humanitarian conventions."

The writer goes on to argue that since "the plenipotentiaries of all nations of the world" will be together in conference, they should not be permitted to depart without establishing an international code of medicine." If indeed there is strictly speaking a single "plenipotentiary" present, it would be for the good of the world if those about him rose up and throttled him. There may, of course, be only one "plenipotentiary," though we do not know who he is; but if there are more, even the removal of one might make a difference. These left-overs from a vanished political order do not make sense in the modern world.

Nor are we impressed by the "lessons" which we may learn from the Nuremberg trials:

"What are these lessons? First, the medical conscience cannot be subjugated to a government or to a state; it must derive its discipline from a moral sanction superior to the concept of the state; there should not be an obligation to obey orders which deprive the physician of his healing mission." Numerous medical assemblies are stated to have considered this great question, "and in the texts which they have published they have affirmed this necessity." So the Congress of Microbiology at Copenhagen has:

"proposed to support and adopt by acclamation that the Fourth International Congress of Microbiology together with the International Society of Cytology condemns as energetically as possible all forms of biologic warfare. The Congress believes that these absolutely barbaric methods are incompatible with any civilised community and hopes much that microbiologists of the entire world will make all efforts to prevent their own exploitation for this purpose."

The article goes on:—"The World Medical Association demands that every physician take an oath which regulates his professional conduct:

"The International Committee of Military Medicine demands that there be added to the text of this oath the following paragraph:

"My duty, superior to all others, written or not written, will be to care to the best of my ability for him who has been placed in my care or who has entrusted himself to me, to respect his moral liberty and to be opposed to all cruelty which is attempted against him and to refuse my co-operation to any authority which request me to act contrary to this demand. Whether the patient be friend or enemy, even in time of war or civil disturbances, whatever be his opinion, his race, his party, his social class, his country, his connection, my care and my aid to his human dignity will be the same."

"Thus, it is the international medical code which has to be reformulated. With this aim the Medico-Legal Committee of the International Committee of Military Medicine has proposed to prepare a codification of these regulations.

"This is based on the following points:

1. The physician must render the same aid to his friend or to his enemy.

2. In no case should the physician be disturbed at having given aid to a wounded person whatever the nationality, race, religion or opinion of the injured, and whatever may be the circumstances in which the wounded is found.

3. The physician can never in any manner co-operate in works of general or individual destruction.

4. As a result, this set of duties confers on the physician a legal status, according to which he cannot be made a prisoner and according to which he must be granted in all times, and in all places, the right of his complete professional freedom.

"This is the proposal set forth by the International Committee of Military Medicine. The World Health Organisation and the World Medical Organisation, in our opinion, should take a stand as soon as possible on this problem which affects the future of all medicine."

What is the use of laws, if governments and Parliaments over-ride Law?

Church and State

The Archbishop of York, Dr. Garbett, states in his diocesan letter for April that it is widely felt that some change in the present relationship of Church and State is urgently required.

The individual churchman had probably greater freedom than that possessed by the members of any other church, but the Church as a visible society was without full spiritual freedom. There were a few who would wish for disestablishment.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

face of the papers, and which are fatal to it no matter what counsel may say. Legally, logically and practically, it seems to me to be nonsense."

Thereupon, the six residents of Newfoundland—who have no more right to make this sort of claim than any other resident of Newfoundland and which, on the most elementary principles of law, therefore, they should not make themselves but should get the spokesman for the public, the Attorney-General, to make—then appealed to the Court of Appeal in Newfoundland. I have read all the Judgments of the Court of Appeal, and they are quite unanimous. These gentlemen appealed against the decision that their proceedings were frivolous and vexatious. They were listened to with great attention, and the Judgments are well worth reading because they deal with each point with great care and soberness. But at the end of it all the Court of Appeal unanimously said: "The judge below is quite right," and they never even called upon the defendants to say anything at all. They confirmed the dismissal of the whole proceedings as frivolous and vexatious.

Your Lordships therefore see that if, indeed, the appeal ever came to the Privy Council—and up to the present I am told that no case has been deposited there, though notice has been given—the Privy Council would not be deciding the merits of this matter at all; they would merely have the question before them of whether it was not manifestly a "frivolous and vexatious" proceeding. It is not for me, speaking here quite apart from any judicial function, to say what would happen. I am not pronouncing judgment. Being a fairly cautious lawyer, I say only that I cannot conceive any court taking any other view. Even if they did, the only result would be that the matter would have to begin all over again, in order that both sides might formulate this argument and that. . . .

Lord Sempill: . . . In the debate on Newfoundland which I was privileged to initiate in your Lordships' House on February 9, my noble friend Lord Rennell stressed the advantages, as he saw them, that would accrue to Newfoundland when confederation with Canada was brought about. I propose to say little or nothing about that side of the case, since I am not fully informed on the many complex ins and outs of the matter. With respect, I suggest that it is not for your Lordships' House to settle this question of confederation which, in my view, concerns only the Parliament of Canada and the Parliament of Newfoundland, when that has been set up again. My noble friend Lord Rennell, with his considerable business knowledge, had much to say on February 9 on the advantages that would accrue, but I think he would not seek to justify the repudiation of a guarantee of a debenture issue if 43 per cent. (or even 53 per cent., putting it at its maximum), of the debenture holders had been "squared" to take something different from what they had been promised. I think Lord Rennell will be speaking later in this debate, and I shall be interested to hear his views in respect of that matter.

I did not move from my seat in the Gallery in another place, not long ago, during the Second Reading of the Bill now before your Lordships' House. I have read with considerable care the interesting debates that took place on the Committee stage and Third Reading. At that time, or at least in the first debate, the acting Leader of the Opposition in another place, had a great deal to say. He remarked that, "We to-day are in rather an unusual position." I venture

to think, and it has been well stressed by the noble and learned Viscount who has just sat down, that the same may be said of your Lordship's House. The right honourable gentleman, in finishing his interesting remarks in another place from which I have quoted, begged the Government to postpone "the operative date for federation"—I quote his actual words. This showed, clearly, that the anxiety in another place of the Junior Burgess for Oxford University, and those who supported him in a Motion declining to approve the Bill, was not confined to him and the five other honourable Members who supported that Motion.

The Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, and others who have spoken for His Majesty's Government in another place, have laid great stress upon those two words, "on request," about which the noble and learned Viscount had a lot to say, appearing in paragraph (G) of the extract from the Royal Commission's Report, which is in the Schedule to the Act of 1933. The right honourable gentleman the Secretary of State stated that, had the words not appeared,

"there would be a strong case for saying that, when the Island was self-supporting, the form of government which had existed in 1933 must be restored, and that no other alternative was open."

As your Lordships will recall, the setting up of the National Convention, a body elected by Newfoundlanders in 1946, gave them their first opportunity of making known their views and of voicing, should they so wish, this much discussed "request." That they did so wish is very clear from the proceedings of the National Convention. It decided, by a substantial majority, that only two issues should appear on the referendum ballot paper—the continuation of the Commission of Government, or the restoration of responsible government. Yet, despite this, the Commission of Government was instructed by Whitehall, as was made clear in another place during the debate on this Bill, to solicit a vote for confederation with Canada. The Government of Newfoundland, as your Lordships are well aware, consists of seven Commissioners, of whom only three are Newfoundlanders.

Viscount Simon: Surely it consists of six Commissioners and the Governor. The Governor is not a Commissioner.

Lord Sempill: I accept the noble and learned Viscount's correction of those figures. I thank him very much.

On the first referendum in June, 1948, a relative majority of votes was obtained for the restoration of responsible government. A similar result seems to have satisfied His Majesty's Government in elections in Britain! Why, therefore should Newfoundland be differently treated? On the second referendum, in July, 1948, 52 per cent. of the total votes cast were for confederation with Canada. This was 43 per cent. of the total number of registered voters. The first figure constitutes a 4.6 per cent. vote in favour of the surrender of sovereignty. Surely this does not convince your Lordships that here was a sufficient majority for so tremendous a change? The views so clearly expressed by Mr. Mackenzie King, when that right honourable gentleman was Prime Minister of Canada, are not met either. He said in the Parliament of Canada that

"the people of Newfoundland should indicate clearly and beyond all possibility of misunderstanding their will that Newfoundland should become a part of Canada."

I cannot see in these figures an expression that is "beyond all possibility of misunderstanding," and I submit that this slender majority of 4.6 per cent. does not warrant a change of the nature contemplated.

In the last few weeks I have been fortunate in rediscovering several friends with whom in years gone by I was proud to work in Newfoundland. As a result, I have refreshed my memory on one or two points. One of the first Commissioners was Mr. Thomas Lodge, appointed because of his wide experience of finance and administration. I worked with him in Newfoundland, and I discovered his whereabouts a week or two ago from a letter in *The Times* of March 3. In this letter Mr. Lodge pointed out that he and his colleagues on the Commission of Government—I quote from his letter:

"have declared times out of number, in public speeches and in private conversations, that once the Island was self-supporting its political independence would be restored."

My Lords, I can well recollect several such occasions when statements of that nature were made, not only by Mr. Lodge but by other Members of the Commission of that time.

I take this opportunity, most gladly and from first hand experience, of paying a sincere tribute to the splendid work done by the Commissioners, in particular the first appointed under Sir John Hope Simpson, of whom Mr. Lodge was one. As your Lordships are well aware, they were set the extremely difficult task of developing a new method in the administration of government. I am sure your Lordships will allow me to quote from an important letter just received from Mr. Lodge which has a bearing on this matter. He says:

"If ever there was a plain straightforward obligation, it was to restore the Island's political independence once it became self-supporting. The Government's case is that a 48 per cent. vote did not constitute a 'request' within the meaning of their original pledge. They seem to forget that their own tenure of office is based on a 48 per cent. vote of the electorate in 1945. The attitude of the Dominions Office to the whole problem of Newfoundland has been lamentable from the start. It is an open secret that the first reaction of the Government of the day to the Amulree Report was one of definite rejection. It was only the pressure of the Bank of England which made them accept responsibility for the Island's debt and for setting up the Commission of Government. The Commission worked well enough for its first two years, under the chairmanship of that distinguished naval officer and administrator, that prince of diplomats, the Governor, the late Admiral Sir David Murray Anderson. He kept us as a reasonably united body and he supported us through thick and thin . . . The Dominions Office bitterly resented my efforts to rub their official noses against the refractory facts of Newfoundland life. They heaved a sigh of relief when they got rid of me, and thereafter they saw to it that only safe, docile, civil or ex-civil servants should be Commissioners."

Your Lordships will not be surprised that when arrangements were made for the Commission of Government to be set up, to help Newfoundland, prostrate by the world depression of 1931, as has already been pointed out, the honourable Mr. Alderdice, Prime Minister of Newfoundland in 1934, said:

"We thank His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom . . . We trust implicitly in their honourable intentions, feeling confident that a full measure of responsible government will be restored to the Island when we have again been placed upon a self-supporting basis."

He obviously spoke not only for his colleagues in the Cabinet but also for the people of Newfoundland. The intention of His Majesty's Government was clear to them, as the honourable gentleman's words show, and His Majesty's representatives at that time on the Island, the Commissioners (of whom I have quoted from one), were constantly reminding them of the truth of the Prime Minister's words.

If we consider this situation for a moment from the aspect of the public view in regard to this matter, as expressed in the organs of the Press, some of your Lordships

will have noticed a leading article in *Truth* of February 18, headed "Betrayal of Newfoundland" which reads:

"Few more shocking breaches of faith have stained the honour of any British Government than the way in which our present rulers have gone back on the promise to restore responsible government to Newfoundland. Had that promise been kept, and had the elected government 'opted' for union with Canada, no objection to the proceedings could now be raised."

The Attorney-General during the Committee stage on March 9 did not take the same view as that which the Secretary of State took on the Second Reading on March 2. The right honourable gentleman stated on the Second Reading:

"If the Privy Council do take a different view, and do so advise His Majesty, the position would not really be much worse than if we were to delay the present legislation. If the Privy Council did take that view we should at once accept it and we here, and Canada and Newfoundland, would have to start all over again."

That was the Attorney-General, speaking on the Committee stage. I plead with your Lordships very earnestly to restore self-government for Newfoundland and—her freedom gained—to let her plan her own future by herself, or if she so wishes it, with Canada. I submit that that should be done. Several of us who sit in your Lordships' House as elected Scots representatives, are descendants of pioneers concerned with the founding of Scotland's great Colony, Nova Scotia, over three centuries ago, in the reign of James VI. That was a great venture, and it might be thought, that as one of those descendants, and therefore a Nova Scotian (and more recently a Canadian), I would be anxious to force this issue. I say most certainly that we Nova Scotians would welcome closer ties with Newfoundland, but only if such ties were conceived in a free way and provided that Newfoundland was not dragooned into it. If I were privileged to be one of the representatives of Nova Scotia sitting in the Parliament of Canada, though a cross-Bencher, I should certainly have followed the Leader of the Conservative Opposition when he led 74 people into the Lobby against the final Resolution when this matter was being debated in Canada.

In conclusion, My Lords, I would like to say just a word on the human side, which is so little considered to-day. At the time of the setting up of the first Commission of Government, one of the Newfoundlanders chosen was the late Mr. Howley; he served on the Commission of Government with Sir John Hope Simpson; Mr. Thomas Lodge and one or two others. He leaves one descendant, a daughter, a Mrs. Kathleen Fletcher, who is bringing up her three small daughters in St. John's. She wrote to me a few days ago a letter which shows the feeling in Newfoundland. The letter reads:

"What everybody seems to overlook is the moral effect that this affair is having on the minds and hearts of so many in this country. 'England has done this to us,' they say. It is just as if some person whom you've loved and looked up to all your life, suddenly destroyed every ideal and illusion most dear to you. I know that this may sound far-fetched, not to you but to some; but it's as if

By

C. H. DOUGLAS:

**THE REALISTIC POSITION OF
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND**

PRICE EIGHTPENCE. (Postage 1d.)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, LIVERPOOL.

I suddenly turned my three children—your god-daughter one of them—out on the street for some stranger to pick up and look after.”

My Lords, to the Motion that the Bill be now read a second time, I beg to move the Amendment in my name.

Amendment moved—

To leave out all the words after (“that”) and to insert—
 (“this House, without prejudice to the merits of the proposed union of the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland, declines to give a second reading to a Bill for which the electors of Newfoundland have not expressed such a democratic demand as would warrant an irrevocable change in their constitutional status, which arises from the unilateral action of His Majesty’s Government in including in referenda held in Newfoundland in 1948 the question of union with Canada after its decisive rejection by the elected representatives of the people of the island sitting in National Convention, which is based on terms of union which have not been discussed and agreed by the people of Newfoundland or their democratic representatives, which violates the solemn pledge of His Majesty’s Government that self-government should be restored to Newfoundland as soon as it was economically self-supporting, and the constitutional legality of which is at present the subject of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.”)—(*Lord Sempill*.)

Viscount Addison: My Lords, in view of the character of this discussion it is not necessary for me to say very much in conclusion. . . . The noble Lord, Lord Sempill, talked about Newfoundlanders’ being deprived of their independence. He put it very strongly. But I should like to hear, for instance, what the free people of Ontario would have to say to anybody who suggested that by being a Province of Canada they have been deprived of their independence. He would find their answer was more forceful than Parliamentary. No, my Lords, it is just plain nonsense. The people of Newfoundland will enjoy a greater and a wider freedom. They will be able to get their needs dealt with by a great Federation, which will be more able to meet their social necessities than by themselves they are now able to do as a small part of the North American Continent. Seeing how the world is moving, and seeing how things are developing, they will be able, by joining up with Canada as a Province of that confederation, to share more of the benefits which come from large-scale co-operation and from association with greater wealth. But apart from that, I would like to say this: that as the world is moving to-day, we can see that people are everywhere joining together in greater associations, and we must take a longer view. There can be no question that Newfoundland as a part of the great Confederation of Canada, as it is and as it will be, will be immensely stronger and much better able to reap the benefits and the rights of freedom than she would be if her people remained as a small isolated community. I am glad that all sections in your Lordships’ House support this Bill.

Lord Sempill: My Lords, your Lordships have been good enough to accord me two hearings on the Newfoundland discussions, on February 9 and to-day; and for this I am most grateful. I feel that there is no more to-day that I can do but pray—as I shall—that when this matter comes before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council they will decide in favour of the result for which I have unsuccessfully striven. Before withdrawing my Amendment, I would ask leave to put one question to the noble Viscount the Leader of the House. He will no doubt have observed that in the House of Commons in Canada, Colonel Drew, in winding up the debate (after which he went into the Division Lobby with seventy-four others), said that the affair had “the taste of an unholy deal.” I should like to ask whether an arrangement was ever come to, as between Britain and Canada, when the question of naval and air bases was under discussion during the war, which has resulted in Newfoundland’s

sovereignty over her own territory being given away without her consent.

Viscount Addison: My Lords, I have had no notice of that question, and I think the noble Viscount, Lord Swinton, should know better than I do, because he was in the Cabinet at the time. But I am quite sure that Newfoundland’s territorial integrity and freedom have always been respected. The point was that we had to make the best use of all our resources for continuing the war.

Viscount Swinton: My Lords, I was not directly concerned with this, but it is an absolute certainty that nothing which was done with regard to the provision of the bases, or the common use of bases, did anything at all which prevented us from giving to the people of Newfoundland the absolute and unfettered right to decide what their own future should be. Indeed, had it not been so, we should not have offered to the people of Newfoundland, as His Majesty’s Government have done, the absolutely free choice as to what their future should be.

Lord Sempill: I thank the noble Viscount the Leader of the House, and also the noble Viscount the acting Leader of the Opposition, and I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(<i>reprinting</i>)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The “Land for the (Chosen) People” Racket.....	2/-
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart..	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
Sous le Signe de l’Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....(<i>Cloth Edition</i>)	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage	7/-
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Odlum v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Protocols of Zion	2/-

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.