

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 21.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"There was a little city, and few men within it; and there came a great king against it, and besieged it, and built great bulwarks against it:

"Now there was found in it a poor wise man, and he by his wisdom delivered the city; yet no man remembered that same poor man.

"Then said I, Wisdom is better than strength: nevertheless the poor man's wisdom is despised, and his words are not heard.

"The words of wise men are heard in quiet more than the cry of him that ruleth among fools."

. . .

Yes, John, as you say it *was* a long time ago. But I wonder if you notice also that the city was a *little* city? The answer to centralisation is decentralisation. Take New Zealand, now—on recommending this course we have more than once been asked 'Why New Zealand?'—but never mind:—

The Avondale (Auckland, N.Z.) D.S.C. Group numbers twenty men, of whom we believe six are Associates of the Social Credit Secretariat. The Group held eight meetings in 1950—which does not seem to be a greatly excessive number. The twenty got a small printing press from England (output very creditable, as enclosures show us) and set to work to oppose the Local Government Commission, giving effect to the Local Government Commission Act, 1946, concerned with schemes of reorganisation for which there was no public request. Such reorganisation provided for remote control through finance in line with the well-known planners' formulae.

The Group claims that their action has resulted "in a flat refusal by the whole of the local bodies in the Auckland area to accept proposals and directions from the Commission."

The Chairman of the Commission is Justice I. Goldstine.

. . .

FROM DARKEST AFRICA:

"... Just heard on the wireless that they have cut your meat ration to 10d. again with 2d. of corned beef thrown in. Pretty dreadful isn't it. If you happen to be a West African native you can have all the meat you want. And sugar! There is so much out here they can't sell it. The Africans are so spoilt these days that they won't take granulated sugar in bags: they only buy cube sugar in packets! Even a small firm I know has about fifty tons of granulated sugar they can't sell, so imagine what the big firms must have. When I was with — a fortnight ago he showed me his warehouse stacked to the roof with sugar. It's a crime. If you have a black face, and your grandfather and grandmother

were cannibals a few years back you can have a nice limousine car to-day and if you smash it up you can have another one to-morrow. But if you are an Englishman and make the cars, you won't get one for ten years if then. . . ."

FROM DARKEST AFRICA (at college):

"... I was surprised to hear the laboratory assistant arrive under my window with a roar on his motor bike 'in top.' When the din subsided, I asked the dark beaming countenance why he did not come into the yard in second.

'Baas, is there more than one?'"

. . .

Noticing that only the *Daily Telegraph* among London newspapers recorded the failure of the Old Bailey case against Mr. Arnold Leese, we can well imagine the kind of publicity which would have followed a conviction. If we understand Mr. Leese's opinions on politics, national and international, we differ from him profoundly; but it cannot be uncertain whether or not he has reinforced the plea that the Jewish question should be laid bare for examination.

Leese was charged with publishing a defamatory libel concerning Sir Harold Scott, Commissioner of Metropolitan Police, in saying that "Police in the East End of London appear to be instructed by their Jewish Chief to knock off any street-corner orator who dares to mention the word Jew in any derogatory sense. I take a hard view of Police Officers who, to earn pay, carry out such vile orders."

The case was heard at the Central Criminal Court before Lord Justice Dodson, Recorder of London, on December 12. The jury returned a verdict of 'not guilty' after an absence of twenty minutes.

Ten Years Ago

"THE MEANING OF EXPORTS: Captain Oliver Lyttelton, President of the Board of Trade, explained that while the United States sent us munitions, to the value (?) of 300 million dollars a month, we hoped to pay for them by lowering the standard of living of the British people to that extent, and sending the equivalent to raise the standard of living of the Americans, while doing their fighting for them. This is called Statesmanship.

"In Washington it is called 'All help for Britain, Short of War.'"

. . .

"It is popularly supposed that the output of aeroplanes in this country is about 2,000 *per month*. The population is about 45 millions. During the first *year* of war, 743 aeroplanes were shipped from the U.S. to Great Britain. The population of the United States is about 120 millions. All of these were paid for in cash at high prices. This is called 'All Aid For Britain, short of War.'"—(*The Social Crediter*, January 18, 1941.)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 11, 1950.

Severn Barrage

Sir Ian Fraser asked the Lord President of the Council if, in view of the prospective shortage of electric power, His Majesty's Government will revive the Severn Barrage project.

The Minister of Fuel and Power (Mr. Philip Noel-Baker): I have been asked to reply. A Severn Barrage could make no contribution to the supply of electricity during the next few years, since the work of construction might take eight years to complete. But the Government regard the scheme as being of great interest, and arrangements were made some time ago to begin the preliminary work for the necessary model of the Severn Estuary.

Sir I. Fraser: In view of the expected shortage of coal and the expected demand for electricity over many years, will the Government have a fresh study made of this and of other means of getting electricity from natural sources?

Mr. Noel-Baker: I agree with the hon. Member in thinking that the long-term importance of tidal power may be very great, but the first requirement is a tidal model of the Severn Estuary. After we have that, we can see what to do next.

Mr. Ellis Smith: Is my right hon. Friend aware that a model was made at Manchester University in 1931, and that all the leading world authorities on hydro-electrification consider the Severn Barrage one of the world's best business propositions for development? . . .

Livestock Rearing Bill

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas Williams): I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

This is a very short Bill, but I think that the House will agree that the subject is both large and important. The purpose of the Bill is to give effect to the Government's long-term proposals, which I announced in this House last July, for increasing our meat supplies at home by making better use of so-called marginal land. Briefly these were, first, to provide £10 million for 50 per cent. grants for carrying out voluntary schemes for the improvement of livestock rearing land in upland areas; second, to provide a further £5 million for the continuation of the existing grants under the Hill Farming Act, 1946; and, third, to continue for another five years the subsidies on hill sheep and hill cattle.

As the House will be aware, attention has been focussed for a considerable time on the problem and possibilities of increasing supplies of meat from what is widely known as marginal land. There have been debates on the subject in this House and in another place. Papers have been read by prominent agricultural scientists, many memoranda have been submitted, and, more recently, a panel of the Welsh Council studied the problem and made some recommendations. The Government, as usual, gave their urgent consideration to the question but could not of course make to the House proposals involving very large sums of money without first making thorough investigation into the cost and the possible increase in the output of meat. Finally, therefore, the Government submitted the matter to a working party of officials of the Agricultural Departments and, two distinguished agricultural scientists, Professor Ellison of the University College of Wales

and Dr. Yates of the Rothamsted Experimental Station. . . .

. . . Many figures have been given about marginal land—some of them almost astronomical. We believe, however, that apart from the land covered by the Hill Farming Act, there may be in the United Kingdom about 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 acres of stock rearing land in the upland areas, whose productive capacity could be materially increased by suitable improvement. To support increased numbers of stock this land would have to be suitably improved not only by fertilisers, fencing, drainage and, in suitable cases, by reseeded, but by other more permanent improvements, such as the improvement of housing, farm buildings, roads, and water and electricity supply. . . .

. . . If the whole of the 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 acres were suitably improved—a rather tall job—they might eventually produce each year about 400,000 extra store cattle or the equivalent in store sheep. These when fattened on lowland farms would probably give us no fewer than 130,000 to 140,000 tons of high quality beef and mutton per annum. . . .

. . . The Government, bearing in mind the many demands for capital expenditure, decided to set apart £10 million for five years for grants for the improvement of land in upland areas, other than hill farming land, and in addition a further £5 million for grants for improvement schemes under the Hill Farming Act. In Clause 1 (3, a) of this Bill we have in effect run these two proposals into one. We have given a definition of "livestock rearing land" which includes all that land which under the Hill Farming Act of 1946 was defined as hill farming land. In addition this definition covers all the other upland stock rearing land to which I have referred.

We saw no really good reason for making a distinction between improvement schemes on hill farming land and schemes for the improvement of other stock rearing land further down the hill. That will avoid unnecessary book-keeping. Section 2 (4) of the Hill Farming Act, 1946, provided for maximum Exchequer grants of £4 million which could, with the approval of the House, be increased by a further £1 million. The number of schemes submitted is such that the extra £1 million would certainly be required but for this Bill. However, in Clause 3 we now propose to increase the limit from 4 million to £20 million.

Although we have decided to make no precise allocation between the different kinds of livestock rearing land, broadly we can regard the sum of £20 million as being made up of £10 million for hill farms and £10 million for other upland farms. I am afraid that £10 million will not be sufficient to complete the rehabilitation of the four million acres which I have mentioned. If we were to assume an average expenditure of £20 per acre, the £10 million would only be sufficient to provide for 50 per cent. grants on one million acres. However, we have to make a start and we shall exercise our discretion to see that the funds available are used to the best advantage. In approving schemes on a selective basis we shall be guided by the advice of the agricultural executive committees.

The fact that landlords and tenants will have to put up half the money is the best guarantee that full advantage will be taken of the improvements. We intend to rely on the voluntary principle as we have done under the Hill Farming Act, and the services of the county agricultural executive committees and the national agricultural advisory service will be freely available to owners and occupiers, both in the preparation of their improvement schemes and in making

the best use of them later. For the recalcitrant few who abuse the scheme in one way or another, we can use the efficiency provisions of the Agriculture Act.

I want to say a few words about the 1946 Act and the hill land to which it applies. The 16 million acres of hill land in the United Kingdom are unique in that they are the breeding ground of foundation flocks of hardy sheep numbering some 4,750,000 ewes. The purpose of that Act was to get comprehensive improvement schemes to restore farms and make them into sound economic units, where that was possible. We took the view at that time that, with sufficient help and encouragement, owners and tenants would do the job, and events have shown that that confidence was not misplaced. Full use is being made of the assistance offered, and, with still one year to go during which schemes can be submitted, schemes already approved or under consideration at the moment are estimated to cost no less than £8½ million, and it may be interesting to hon. Members to know that the schemes completed—and there are no fewer than 3,380 schemes approved—are estimated to cost no less than £7 million.

I am sure that hon. Members will readily understand that we are only paying the Government grant when the scheme is completed, unless it be a case where the owner or occupier finds himself in dire straits. Therefore, in making the calculations about the value of the Hill Farming Act, 1946, I hope hon. Members will not base their deductions upon the actual amount already approved.

... These schemes would absorb more than the £4 million which was made available under the 1946 Act. They may cover as many as 23 different kinds of improvements, which are all set out in the Schedule to the Bill. These schemes must be sufficiently comprehensive to ensure full rehabilitation for hill farming purposes, but I should like to say a word or two on this point, because I think there is some misunderstanding, and because the same conditions will apply to the livestock rearing land which we are bringing into the scheme.

It is sometimes said that the word "comprehensive" leads to over-elaborate schemes, when really all that is necessary is the application of lime and fertilisers. It has been suggested that some would-be promoters have been deterred from going on, and that may be a good debating point, but, in the light of our experience, it has no substance in fact. Instances where an owner or occupier has refused to agree to a comprehensive scheme have been negligible since the scheme actually started, and, in any case, it is a question of the right approach, and I think that I can justifiably claim that the county agricultural executive committees, mainly composed of landowners and farmers, with the addition of workers' representatives and the Department's technical officers, do know the way in which to make these conditions of real benefit to owner and tenant. Few or no complaints have been received, certainly in England and Wales.

As for those who, from lack of funds or for other reasons, cannot undertake a comprehensive scheme, they can still benefit from the lime and fertiliser subsidies, but we are dealing here in this Bill with farms that need more than fertilisers to make them fully productive, and if the State meets half the cost of providing, say, an access road or an agricultural worker's cottage, we must be sure that the full value is not lost because some other improvement, such as, say, fencing or a new cow byre, is left undone. . . .

Mr. Hugh Fraser (Stafford and Stone): . . . I should like to judge this Bill by two things; first of all, whether it will make the best use of the land available and the best use of the vegetable growth available on that land; and, secondly, whether it will put the finest quality and quantity of meat on to the dinner plates. It is a question of veg. and meat, because everyone knows the whole cycle of animal production is simply veg. into meat. It is on those two points I should like to discuss this Bill for a few moments.

... On the question of land, the Minister himself has dealt with this considerable and growing problem of the amount of acreage available per head of the population of this country. The total acreage available to the people in this country is just over one acre per head, and of that only three-eighths at the moment are used for agriculture purposes. When the Conservative Government are returned to power and build 300,000 houses a year, obviously the problem will become even more difficult. I am sure that my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Richmond (Sir. T. Dugdale), when he is Minister of Agriculture, will see that the density of houses to the acre is increased, because that has an important bearing on the whole question of the use of land.

On the whole question of land use, I am sure the Minister is enforcing on his colleague the maximum attention to Sir Dudley Stamp's Report on this matter. This question of production is of vital importance. There is a very wide margin to work on. The Minister has just defined it as something like 3½ million to 4 million acres lying between the hill land and the lower land. I should like to quote one figure as an example of the margin which exists, a figure which my brother in another place has often thrown at the right hon. Member for East Stirling (Mr. Woodburn). In 1850, 100 years ago, the Highlands used to send down to Falkirk 155,000 surplus store cattle; today the total population in the Highlands of hill cattle is under 55,000. There is a big margin for us to work on.

Therefore, one should give praise to this Bill for certain little things which it does. It brings cattle into the scheme as well as sheep, and it gives longer guarantees. This was an outstanding grievance amongst hill farmers—the guarantee lasted only a few years. Now that the guarantee has been extended the happier they will be. It gives more advantages by bringing more items into the Schedule. As many as 21 items are now listed. There is the question of the cattle pens, of silage installation, and of fencing. All these things are of great importance and a great step forward, but there are certain warnings which must be given about this Bill. This scheme is fine for the rich farmer and the big man. Unfortunately, the upland farmer on the whole is the poorest group in the whole community, and we have to see somehow, without disturbing the global sum, that some greater assistance is given to him.

I would make two suggestions, because as well as his land he has also to buy his stock, and his stock is a very big item. The two suggestions which I wish to make can be included inside the Bill. I know the right hon. Gentleman made a case against breaking down the comprehensive scheme, but what my hon. and gallant Friend said should at least be weighed most carefully by the right hon. Gentleman. If it is a question of developing these 4 million acres one can look at the similarities between the problems in this country and in colonial development, where the first thing is to get 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. 25. No. 21.

Saturday, January 20, 1951.

The United Soldiers

The following passages from an article in the *Daily Mail* by Mr. G. Ward Price deserve to be recorded. Editorial comment contrasts the "ballyhoo" associated with the Korean campaign with the "idealism" of a "great nation" of which Eisenhower is said to be a fit exponent. No newspaper with a national circulation could say otherwise without entering upon a determined campaign for the liberation of Great Britain from bondage to Wall Street. That would win inevitably, and the end would be peace—though possibly not at once. The over-riding policy of the world dictators is a war policy. Be that as it may, the sentences of Mr Price, which have received wide attention, are as follows:—

"This is the story of one of the costliest lessons in military history. It has been learned—one hopes—by the Security Council of the United Nations. The price has been paid mainly by the the United States—in a decline of prestige, great loss of material, and casualties counted by scores of thousands."

"How has it come about that the military forces of the most powerful nation in the world, under the direction of a general who in the opinion of international chiefs of staff was the ablest field commander of the second world war, should at this moment be in full retreat, compelled to abandon to the enemy almost the whole of the country it was their mission to save?"

"The causes can be summed up as follows:—

- "1. Lack of an efficient intelligence service;
- "2. The wrong kind of equipment;
- "3. Insufficient training;
- "4. Slack discipline;
- "5. An adversary accustomed to difficult conditions of terrain and climate and able to live off the country;
- "6. A local population providing cover for the enemy, by compulsion or consent.

This campaign can be divided into five phases. They have been:—

- First: Retreat;
- Second: Resistance;
- Third: Diversion;
- Fourth: Pursuit;
- Fifth: Recoil.

"The last of these is fast bringing us back to the stage at which we came in.

"What was begun as a 'police action' has developed into a virtual war with the largest nation in Asia under limi-

tations that favour the enemy and handicap us.

"Few more dramatic reversals of the fortunes of war have ever been recorded."

How does the correspondent defend—and, more significantly, enlarge upon—his list of defects enumerated above? Read on:—

"Whether the number of Chinese in Korea reach the astronomical figures supplied by General MacArthur's staff is open to doubt.

"The head of the Intelligence Department, however, is one of the general's old comrades in arms, and to such the commander-in-chief is ever faithful."

"The American forces are ill-suited to warfare in that stark, primitive North-West Frontier type of country.

"They are prisoners of their own mechanical equipment. The American infantry division takes with it on active service more than 1,000 jeeps, with 1,000 lorries and other heavy vehicles. It is accompanied by two mobile laundries and four field bath units.

"Its lavish provision of transport confines it to the roads, and a broken bridge will halt it for hours.

"The men are carried everywhere on wheels. They are unfamiliar with cross-country work, and leave the enemy to roam undisturbed over the confusion of steep and barren hills that cover most parts of Korea."

"The four infantry divisions that were the first to land in Korea had been softened by long experience of easy living as an army of occupation in Japan.

"The reinforcements they received from America were insufficiently trained. They arrived in the cheerful spirit of Boy Scouts on an exciting adventure.

"Almost every man had a camera dangling from his neck."

"The grim experience of the retreat into the Pusan perimeter soon taught them the war would be no walk-over, but it needed more than that to create the spirit of military discipline—which is foreign to the democratic habits of America.

"Officers were on easy-going 'buddy' terms with other ranks, who obviously had no high opinion of their superior technical skill."

"Much of the destruction done by bombs, rockets and Napalm incendiaries has served little practical purpose. It is due to the established American habit of calling for an 'air-strike' to overcome any resistance met by infantry."

"The superior fighting technique of the British 27th Brigade, which American troops themselves generously recognise, is largely due to the fact that it had had a year of intensive training on the mainland opposite Hongkong under ground conditions very like those of Korea."

With Mr. Price, we may say we "hope" the lesson has been learned. But what lesson?

Blackstone and Liberty

By H. SWABEY.

A clear example of unconstitutional law is the provision of the Education Act which vests the ownership of buildings formerly, and no longer, used as Church Schools in the central board of finance of the diocese concerned. For the common law, reinforced by the Statute of Limitations, ensured that possession for seventy years could not be shaken. In the case of Lindsell, the Council School has the date 1877 engraved on it, which shews that the Church School building has not been used as such for over 70 years, but has been owned by the Vicar and Churchwardens. It is notable that the Act was denounced by an Assistant Bishop as a "monstrous piece of legislation": but neither the common law nor this spiritual judgment have the slightest effect on restraining the legislation. Incidentally, the finance board has been generous and has allowed the local church to buy the hall for a nominal figure; but the people know well enough that the transaction is *wrong*. A lady of ninety-two put it very emphatically.

Blackstone has this to say about an "unlawful *taking*": "The right of property in all external things being solely acquired by occupancy . . . and preserved and transferred by grants, deeds, and wills, which are a continuation of that occupancy; it follows as a necessary consequence, that when I have once gained a rightful possession of any goods and chattels, either by a just occupancy or by a legal transfer, whoever either by fraud or force disposes me of them, is guilty of a transgression against the law of society, which is a kind of secondary law of nature. For there must be an end of all social commerce between man and man, unless private possessions be secured from unjust invasions: and, if an acquisition of goods by either force or fraud were allowed to be a sufficient title, all property would soon be confined to the most strong, or the most cunning; and the weak and simple-minded part of mankind (which is by far the most numerous division) could never be secure of their possessions." He goes on, later: "In absolute governments, the prince may promulgate a new code. . . . But who, that is acquainted with the difficulty of new-modelling any branch of our statute laws (though relating but to roads or parish settlements) will conceive it even feasible to alter any fundamental point of the common law and set up another rule in its stead?" The "conservatives" know better!

In a more intelligent age the inseparable relation between liberty and property was better understood, as well as the duties of the legislature: "The causes of the multiplicity of the English laws are . . . above all the liberty and property of the subject. It is essential to a free people that these determinations be published and adhered to; that their property may be as certain and as fixed as the very constitution of their state. . . . The judge with us is only to *declare* and *pronounce*, not to *make* or *new-model* the law. . . . The law will be loaded with decrees that may sometimes (though rarely) interfere with each other, because of the natural imbecility and imperfection that attends all human proceedings. But the legislature is ready and may intervene to remove the doubt, and determines by a declaratory statute how the law shall be held for the future."

Law-Latin was a lost cause when Blackstone wrote in its defence. But his reasons throw light on his idea of the law: "Law-Latin is in reality a mere technical language, calculated for eternal duration . . . and best suited to preserve those memorials which are intended for perpetual rules of

action. . . . This technical Latin continued in use until the subversion of our ancient constitution by Cromwell." It was restored with Charles II. "Thus it continued until about 1730." It was suppressed by an Act "that the common people might have knowledge and understanding of what was done for or against them. Which purpose has, I fear, not been answered; being apt to suspect that the people are now, after many years' experiment, altogether as ignorant in matters of law as before."

Our civilisation was based, at least, on Christianity, the Classics and the Law. The close connection of these three is shewn in Blackstone's comment on a defendant's right to an *imparlance* "to see if he can end the matter amicably without further suit. It is supposed to have arisen in obedience to the gospel precept, 'agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art *in the way* with him.' This gospel precept has a plain reference to the Roman law of the twelve tables, which directed the plaintiff and defendant to make up the matter, while they were *in the way* or going to the praetor,—*in via* . . ." We may, perhaps, see more clearly what is being done with that civilisation if we consider, briefly, what has already been done with our constitution.

William the Conqueror introduced the trial by *wager of battel* for certain cases, "till Henry II. by consent of Parliament introduced the *grand assise*, a peculiar species of trial by jury. . . . The establishment of this alternative, Glanvil, chief justice to Henry II., and probably the adviser herein, considers as a most noble improvement, as in fact it was, of the law." Glanvil described it as a royal benefit through the mercy of the ruler, advised by the nobles, granted to the people." (*clementia principis, de consilio procerum, populi indultum*.) It was an instance of constitutional government. We know that after the King had destroyed the Church, the (whig) Nobles destroyed the King, and the Commons destroyed the Lords.

The same process is rapidly disintegrating our civilisation. The Classics have been set against Christianity, and I have known Christians who have disparaged the law, notably by opposing "liberty" to "property." Besides this, each is attacked and ridiculed separately. Trial by Jury remains as a last barrier to the tyrant, although we must remember that no trials were granted under the notorious 18B, and that "tribunals" are becoming more popular. "It is a duty which every man owes to his country, his friends, his posterity and himself, to maintain to the utmost of his power this valuable constitution in all its rights . . . and, above all, to guard with the most jealous circumspection against the introduction of new and arbitrary methods of trial, which under a variety of plausible pretences, may in time imperceptibly undermine this best preservative of English liberty."

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of *annual* subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.

PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from page 3).

fencing erected and then afterwards make out the scheme. This is a frontier question. . . .

The second thing is to see that there is a variation of grant. In Ireland the Government gives 60 per cent. and the farmer 40 per cent. to reclamation schemes. I would not suggest that, but I believe that there could be variation of certain items which are of more importance to the small man than to others. The 21 items listed in the Schedule in certain instances could earn a 60 per cent. grant with a 40 per cent. contribution from the farmer. In Committee that may well be worked out. In such things as fencing, roads and buildings that could be a higher rate of grant which, whilst not affecting the global sum, could be dealt with in the interests of the small man by local licensing authorities.

But unfortunately the general problem of finance for the farmer cannot be met by the Bill itself. What is needed is more finance in a new form. The 1928 and 1932 Acts, which set up the Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, have done an immense amount of good for British farming, but at the moment something like £19 million are out in approved loans by the Minister. We have to find some other way in increasing the amount of credit this Corporation can give.

We already have a finance corporation for industry. There should be a finance corporation for agriculture which could expand the machinery which exists in the Agricultural Mortgage Corporation. The thing that holds this corporation up is that before they can issue more loans they must have backers to take up the loans. If the Government could give a further guarantee I believe that the great financial institutions would be prepared to come in and to back an extension of the Agricultural Mortgage Corporation. While on this question of finance I would like to say a word about the Land Commission and the Ministry. I believe that 450,000 acres belong to the Ministry in Scotland and that new schemes could be started if the Government were prepared to support the small man who is on his way up the farming ladder.

. . . One of the sad things in this country is that the quality of our commercial herds is definitely not high in meat production. For that reason those animals will tend to waste the grassland that we have available. I know that the grassland scheme of the right hon. Gentleman has been a considerable success, but it is important as a corollary to that scheme that the animals who use that grass should be good doers and efficient feeders. The Bill makes no attempt to deal with the quality question, and that is a very great lack. We do not expect that from the drop of the Minister's black hat there will suddenly spring up T.T. herds of Shorthorns, Galloways and all the rest of them, but we should see that there is a constant upgrading of commercial cattle. That is what is lacking at the moment.

There are various ways in which that could be done, and I would, in passing, make one comment and give a statistic to the House on this matter. In 1920, more than 4,000 pedigree shorthorn animals were disposed of at public auction. In 1948 only 900 were so disposed of. In 1950, the number was slightly more, but not much. What are the remedies? I suggest that there are some general remedies and two minor palliatives. The first palliative is that we should insist upon controlling bulls in the same way as controlling the rams which are used in these schemes. Artificial insemination cannot be effective for hill cattle unless we are to have vets running faster than deer up the

mountain sides. Some calf subsidies that are paid to milking breeds might be transferred to the beef breeds.

Something might be done there, but the more fundamental answer is to see that there is a better price for the finished product. Then we shall get quality. For this result, two things are needed. The first is greater freedom of choice for the butcher and the public, and the second is better slaughtering arrangements. There is no question that there is a waste of meat at the moment especially on the hoof. If the slaughtering trade were handed back to the butcher the public would get a much better service, and meat would not go up so much in price as it looks like doing.

Other things could be done. The calf subsidy could be removed from the milk calf to the beef or dual purpose calf and paid out at six months to the hill and upland cattles' progeny. I ought to have mentioned this point before. At six months £3 of the subsidy should be paid to the breeder and not to the feeder, and the remainder should go to the feeder in the scheme, that is, to the seller of the finished animal. We should get a transfer of payments from one part of the system to the final and finished animal. Further we might consider whether the price to be paid for old ewes and cows is not too high. We should see also that when the supplies of meat in this country become sufficient there should be established a free market in meat above the rationing scheme. All these ideas may be worthy of discussion in Committee.

We should welcome the Bill, and yet issue these words of warning. From the national point of view the vital thing is to see that the maximum use is made of hill land for grazing. I believe that could be done by reducing the size of the calf subsidy and seeing that it is paid to the breeder in the hills. The second vital thing is to see that the price of the finished product is sufficiently high to encourage quality production. . . .

Lord Macolm Douglas-Hamilton (Inverness): I represent an area to which the subject of this Bill is most important. The right hon. Member for East Stirling (Mr. Woodburn) has already pointed out that there are great areas of under-used land in the Highlands of Scotland. We know that. I think it has been variously estimated that these lands amount to something like 11 to 12 million acres. There there is a tremendous possibility. My hon. Friend the Member for Stafford and Stone (Mr. Hugh Fraser) again mentioned that figure which his brother, Lord Lovat, mentioned in another place that at the Falkirk Tryst 155,000 head of cattle, surplus to what was bred in the Highlands of Scotland, were sold. At Sligachan in the Isle of Skye 100 years ago there used to be a great cattle sale and at that sale alone 20,000 head of cattle, some of which were landed in sailing boats from the Outer Islands and driven right across Skye, used to change hands.

We used to be a great cattle country in the North of Scotland but now, for one reason and another, that has declined. We know the history—cheap imports of foreign meat in the 19th Century and then the decline of shelter through the felling of the forests, then bracken took the place of good grazing land, which reduced the sheep area and thus lowered the area of fertility and, finally, sheep gave way to sport. Now we have reached the stage when hon. Members have drawn attention to the fact that we have to produce as much food as we can in this country.

The right hon. Member for East Stirling and my hon.

Friend the Member for Stafford and Stone referred to my hon. Friend's brother, Lord Lovat, and the experiment he has made. It is really a remarkable experiment. On an area which before the war carried only 40 Galloway cows, he now has 700 to 800 head of cattle, though as the right hon. Gentleman said, in a way the circumstances are exceptional. The right hon. Gentleman also referred to Mr. Hobbs' scheme, which is also particularly interesting. He has used 5,000 acres of what was nothing but rough ground. It grew simply reeds and was mainly a bog with some heather upon it. He drained it and limed it and now has 600 cattle on that ground. The right hon. Gentleman gave certain information with regard to this and there are one or two points I would supplement. During the first year he used 250 tons of winter feed. In the second year he used 120 tons and this year he has used only 40 tons while, next year, he hopes to use only what he grows on the ground itself. That is a remarkable achievement, but Mr. Hobbs is certain that there are other areas, as many as 20, in a radius of 50 miles in which the same thing could be done. Mr. Hobbs' secret of winter feed is silage consisting of beans, peas and tares.

I would draw the attention of the House to the immense possibility there is for the big farm of this kind. I hope the Government will give every encouragement to it. I think the Bill does so, but it will be difficult to get capital in every instance. We should do all we can to interest big financial interests in the city, particularly those big concerns interested in cattle ranches in the Argentine, which might turn their attention to the Highlands. I suggest also that the Government should make the Bill as flexible as possible in order to take in the small man, because crofting agriculture is the basis of Highland agriculture. We must have provision for the small man who cannot take in every possible feature of the scheme. . . .

Mr. Baldwin (Leominster): . . . My hon. Friend referred to tied cottages, but I prefer to call them "service cottages." I hope that when we come to the Committee stage an Amendment will be tabled so that we can again discuss this controversial and rather bitter subject, which ought to be raised above controversy. I do not think any decent-minded farmer wants to have a man in his cottage who can be evicted forthwith. All he wants to be sure about is that if a man makes a contract with him to do a job and part of the contract is living in the cottage, when the man breaks the contract for work the contract should be broken also in regard to the cottage as well. The position can be safeguarded.

It would be an entire waste of the taxpayers' money to rehabilitate marginal and hill farms unless it is possible to get the labour necessary to carry on those farms and to turn out increased production, which is the only justification for the expenditure of taxpayers' money. Therefore, I hope that in Committee we shall make this an agreed Measure so that it is possible for a grant to be made for hill and marginal farm cottages.

Mr. Gooch: They have the opportunity now.

Mr. Baldwin: All I want is that they should have the option and be given the chance and if they are foolish enough to build a service cottage to which a man will not go, that is their responsibility. The Forestry Commission and the National Coal Board have tied cottages, and to say that they are better landlords than the farmer or the ordinary country landlord is nonsense, because they are the worst landlords, as has been proved time again.

Hill Farming (Improvement Schemes)

Mr. Nugent asked the Minister of Agriculture if he can give the average size of agricultural holdings on which improvement schemes have been approved under the Hill Farming Act, 1946, in England, Wales and Scotland respectively.

Mr. T. Williams: The average size of holdings for which schemes have been approved is: England, 390 acres; Wales, 270 acres; Scotland, 2,550 acres.

Parliament and Communist Policies

The House of Commons debate on the Livestock Rearing Bill from which extracts appear in this issue, like many another, should be read with the famous *Manifesto* of the Communist Party composed by Marx and Engels ever present in mind. Readers who do not enjoy easy access to the document itself may consult the article by "Spitfire" entitled *Some Communist Policies* in *The Social Crediter* for July 26, 1941. In the present connection we quote the following, pointing particularly to item 7:—

COMMUNIST POLICIES. But the most interesting feature about the *Manifesto* is the manner in which the Communist state is to be organised. This quotation is taken *verbatim* from the *Manifesto*:

"These measures will of course be different in different countries.

"Nevertheless, in the most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable.

"1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

"2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

"3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

"4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

"5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.

"6. Centralisation of means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.

"7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

"8. Equal obligation for all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

"9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.

"10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of child factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc."

Order the book you need from:—

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., LIVERPOOL.

Kahlil Gibran (1883-1931)

"Then a mason came forth and said, Speak to us of Houses.

And he answered and said:

Build of your imaginings a bower in the wilderness ere you build a house within the city walls.

For even as you have home-comings in your twilight, so has the wanderer in you, the ever-distant and alone.

Your house is your larger body.

It grows in the sun and sleeps in the stillness of the night; and it is not dreamless. Does not your house dream? and dreaming, leave the city for grove or hilltop?

Would that I could gather your houses into my hand, and like a sower scatter them in forest and meadow.

Would the valleys were your streets, and the green paths your alleys, that you might seek one another through vineyards, and come with the fragrance of the earth in your garments.

But these things are not yet to be.

In their fear your forefathers gathered you too near together. And that fear shall endure a little longer. A little longer shall your city walls separate your hearts from your fields.

And tell me, people of Orphalese, what have you in these houses? And what is it you guard with fastened doors?

Have you peace, the quiet urge that reveals your power?

Have you remembrances, the glimmering arches that span the summits of the mind?

Have you beauty, that leads the heart from things fashioned of wood and stone to the holy mountain?

Tell me, have you these in your houses?

Or have you only comfort, and the lust for comfort, that stealthy thing that enters the house a guest, and then becomes a host, and then a master?

Ay, and it becomes a tamer, and with hook and scourge makes puppets of your larger desires.

Though its hands are silken, its heart is of iron.

It lulls you to sleep only to stand by your bed and jeer at the dignity of the flesh.

It makes mock of your sound senses, and lays them in thistledown like fragile vessels.

Verily the lust for comfort murders the passion of the soul, and then walks grinning in the funeral.

But you, children of space, you restless in rest, you shall not be trapped nor tamed.

Your house shall be not an anchor but a mast.

It shall not be a glistening film that covers a wound, but an eyelid that guards the eye.

You shall not fold your wings that you may pass through doors, nor bend your heads that they strike not against a ceiling, nor fear to breathe lest walls should crack and fall down.

You shall not dwell in tombs made by the dead for the living.

And though of magnificence and splendour, your house shall not hold your secret nor shelter your longing.

For that which is boundless in you abides in the mansion of the sky, whose door is the morning mist, and whose windows are the songs and silences of night."

For correct information concerning the Constitution of
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for
the Statement published in July, 1949 (*postage 1d.*)
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(Reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	6/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England.....	8d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	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

Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....	(Cloth Edition) 7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...7/-	
Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan.....	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson.....	21/-
Odlum v. Stratton	
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia	
by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.....	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans	
by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

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