

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 6. No. 12.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

The Perfect Tyranny

By JOHN MITCHELL

German propaganda is active in asserting that the policy of the American Government is to use Great Britain's dependence on American aid to defeat Germany as a means of bringing pressure to bear on this country to submit to an Anglo-American Union, a Union in which Great Britain and the British Dominions would virtually occupy the position of being "America's Colonies." The press in this country have not been slow in reporting these German assertions, because there is, of course, no more effective way of discrediting opposition to Anglo-American Union than to label it Nazi propaganda. But there is plenty of evidence to show that this particular German statement is true.

If a statement in the May 16 issue of *Truth* is correct in saying that "the attitude [to Anglo-American Union] of the average Briton may be summed up as one of reluctant acquiescence. . . if there is no other way of winning the war," then it is true to say that the British are fighting this war to decide whether the British Empire will be America's Colony or Germany's. That this is not an exaggeration is made evident by an article entitled *Union Now With America* in *The Economist* for May 17. This says: "...the British sacrifice must be to recognise that we are the weaker, and the less numerous partner." The British may retain some initiative, the article continues, "but the ultimate decision must rest with the ultimate power, and that increasingly, lies over the oceans." And if the British refuse to join the Union, "then the war will have been fought in vain. The best that could then be hoped would be that America will be able to rescue Britain in the next war; the worst, and most probable, would be that she will not be in time." In other words the international Power will keep on organising wars until it achieves "world unity" under a World Government. If the ultimate decision in regard to British policy is to rest over the ocean then clearly we shall retain no more than the powers of a Colony; even a British Dominion has,

theoretically and officially, complete sovereignty.

The most interesting fact about this article in *The Economist* is its rejection of Mr. Streit's terms for an Anglo-American Union: his proposal that the Union should adopt the American constitutional system.

"What, then, is the road to unity, if this is a blind alley? It lies not through the grandiose planning of an Anglo-American Federation, but in the much more gradual and difficult creation of an Atlantic Commonwealth. Constitution-building is a delusion and a distraction. It concentrates thought on the machinery of politics, while all the time hard and continuous thought is needed on the policies themselves."

The writer then proceeds to define what should be done, and this may be summed up as a much greater liaison of Governments and peoples and their institutions. Notwithstanding this apparent disagreement on means, there is no such disunity on ends, as the article in question makes evident, and the writer is imbued with the same Judaic conception that good can come out of evil as the Jewish Messianists of old:—"we have had to plan wickedness in order to win righteousness. But out of this pain and degradation has been born the great redeeming hope of new comradeship and unity between the two halves of the great Atlantic Commonwealth."

All history proves the instability of a tyrannical social order, and this is due to its irreconcilability with the desires and impulses naturally manifested in men and women in general. A stable social order is one which conforms closely to the demands made by nature on human behaviour. In nature every action provokes a reaction, and consequently there is inevitably a reaction to every tyrannical order. It is clear therefore that those who would control the world must not only control the tyranny in being at any moment, but also the human force reacting against that tyranny, so that it can be used to set up another tyranny. And it is self evident that a Power which is successful in controlling both action and reaction must be hidden, otherwise it will attract an overwhelming reaction to itself. Furthermore it cannot remain hidden unless it has secret mechanisms of control. The significance of a statement by the well known Jewess, Madame G. R. Tabouis, in her book *The Private Life of Solomon* can perhaps be understood in the light of these considerations. She says:

"In contrast with the Solomonic ideal, Judaism can

**SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT
K. R. P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.**

Temporary Address:—
49 PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.
Telephone:—Wavertree 435.

only hope to dominate the world the day it renounces all temporal domination, whether secret or avowed, the day it comprehends, as Renan has pointed out, that its true vocation is, and always will be, exclusively of any other, the religious and moral improvement of the human race."

It is in this "religious and moral" field where we may look for that subtle method of control of people which has enabled the British Commonwealth of constitutionally sovereign states to be held to a common policy antagonistic to the real interests of its constituent parts, and it is because of this subtle method of control that *The Economist* is prepared to advocate an Atlantic Commonwealth possessing no legal bonds, on the principle that bonds which cannot be seen will not be attacked.

While it was almost certainly intended by the secret International Power that the Nazis should conquer and occupy Britain until America was strong enough to reconquer the country, thus enabling independent elements in Britain to be purged and increasing this country's debt to the U.S.A., there is little doubt that the Nazi tyranny has not been expected by this Power to endure for long, and for reasons which were discussed in a recent leader in *The Times* entitled *Darkened Europe*, from which the following passages are taken:

"He [Hitler] has ample armies with which to control the conquered and prostrate countries. But the submission of the conquered does not imply acquiescence, and still less that consent of the governed which is the basis of any durable government. . .

"... The oppressed of Europe are not a formless, illiterate, submissive mass such as the tyrants of the past have had to govern, but highly developed peoples with their own cultures, aspirations, and ways of life which Hitler will seek in vain to break."

In other words the Nazi Tyranny is up against what has always so far proved the downfall of all tyrannies, what Major Douglas has termed "the supreme arbiter, the self-conscious human spirit." Judaism, acting through many agencies, is a doctrine which seeks to conquer this spirit, and if it ever succeeds it will achieve the perfect Tyranny.

Two quotations from Major Douglas's article *The World After Washington*, published in 1921, will explain the motive behind the move to make the British Empire subservient to the U.S.A.:—

"... It is the purpose of this article to show that the actions of the responsible Governments of this planet are taken in accordance with a theory, to which the facts of life do not fit, and from which actions, in consequence, come results which are not in accordance either with the theory, or, to be charitable, the expectations of those statesmen from whose deliberations they proceed.

"This theory, although transcending all the bounds of what is called theology, is most easily epigrammatised under the title of the Doctrine of Original Sin. It assumes the existence of an ideal world, possibly a new Jerusalem, in which people would act, not merely differently, but from fundamentally different motives from those now at work in the world. It 'judges' those motives, finds them 'bad' and as a direct and logical consequence conceives the function of Government, using that term in the broadest possible sense, to be mainly to run and see what Johnny is doing and tell him he must'nt. That is to say it is Authoritarian. . . ."

"America is the modern citadel of the Doctrine—the G.H.Q. of Dollar Diplomacy, the home of moral uplift, the Blue Sunday, the hit-don't-argue policeman. We have progressed ourselves a good deal in this direction lately, but not so far that it would be noticed in Chicago. That the majority of American citizens, among whom are some of the kindest souls in the world, detest these things is, of course, quite beside the point—they have no more control over them than has the average Englishman over the price of petrol."

American "culture" is a substitution of individual thought by institutional thought, a system by which the individual as far as possible is eliminated as the judge, and the supreme arbiter is the Power which controls the institution. It should be clear that the fire which the secret international Power seeks to extinguish is individual initiative. If this Power is to be defeated, therefore, it is individual initiative which has to be defended.

PARLIAMENT

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS:

May 7.

Oral Answers to Questions

(32 columns)

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS)

Mr. De la Bère asked the Prime Minister whether, in view of the increasing growth of patronage and Government appointments which have been secured by a large number of Members of the present House of Commons, he will introduce legislation to limit the number of these so as not to exceed 50 per cent.

of the sitting Members, and thus ensure that the House of Commons remains representative of the electorate?

The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill): As my hon. Friend is aware, certificates which would prevent the extension of disqualification applying are required under the House of Commons Disqualification (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1941, to be signed by the First Lord of the Treasury, and a copy laid before the House of Commons. Any change in the law dealing with this matter ought, I think, to await the recommendations of

WAR SITUATION

the Select Committee now considering the position.

Mr. De la Bère: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that power always corrupts and that absolute power corrupts absolutely? Can he not see the danger of the power given to this group being utilised for intrigue or other purposes, and is it not absolutely anti-democratic?

The Prime Minister: I do not think that the general principle can be stated in such absolute terms. Power exercised under the vigorous and vigilant supervision of a properly elected Parliamen-

tary Assembly has frequently been found to be compatible with a very high standard of public life.

Mr. De la Bère: My right hon. Friend does realise, then that there is some danger?

Mr. Cocks: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the minds of Members on this side have never been corrupted in that particular way?

BANK OF ENGLAND (ACCOUNTS)

Mr. Stokes asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will introduce legislation to cause the half-yearly accounts of the Bank of England to be drawn up in a form recommended by a committee representative of banking, commerce, the recognised societies of accountants, and the general public, and to cause the accounts of the bank to be audited?

Captain Crookshank: No, Sir.

Mr. Stokes: Is the right hon. and gallant Gentleman not aware of the great dissatisfaction felt by a large number of professional people at the way in which these accounts are drawn up?

Captain Crookshank: No, Sir.

Mr. Stokes: If I send my right hon. and gallant Friend a representation on the matter, will he make a proper study of it?

Captain Crookshank: Yes, Sir.

WAR SITUATION ASSISTANCE TO GREECE (83 columns)

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th May]:

"That this House approves the policy of His Majesty's Government in sending help to Greece and declares its confidence that our operations in the Middle East and in all other theatres of war will be pursued by the Government with the utmost vigour."—[*Mr. Eden.*]

Question again proposed.

Mr. Lloyd George: . . . But the most serious aspect of [*Mr. Eden's*] speech, was that, in moving a Vote of Confidence in the Government he withheld essential facts from us. Why should the Foreign Secretary, while talking about the loyalty of Turkey, withhold the fact, which is perfectly well known, that Turkey allowed the German ships to pass through the Bosphoros and through the Dardanelles to seize those islands. That is a vital fact. . .

. . . We have suffered severe wounds,

painful and serious wounds—none fatal, in my judgment, but grave if neglected. The nation, before it can help—and it has to do a great deal more than it has done up to the present moment—must know the real facts. I took this line in the first year or two of the last war. I always thought it a mistake to obscure or to gloss the facts. I said, "You will never get the people of this country to do their best until you tell them the real truth, and the moment you do that, they will respond to every call which is made upon them. . ."

. . . There is America—and thank God for Mr. Stimson's speech to-day. This is what I want to say of America. I am not disparaging America. We have to hold out until America is ready with her equipment, but it is most important not to exaggerate what we are going to get, or rather, how quickly we are going to get it. I warn my fellow countrymen not to be impatient, and to see that we ourselves do the job until America is ready, and do it more thoroughly than we are doing it now. There will be disappointments. There is this to be said about America. I have had experience of American war organisation. It is full of disappointments. We must remember that the United States of America have never had Europe's experience of preparing against or for war with millions. . .

. . . That brings me to my last point. The Prime Minister must have a real War Council. He has not got it. He is a man with a very brilliant mind, one of the most remarkable men who have graced this House with their presence. There is no doubt about his brilliant qualities, but for that very reason, if he will allow me to say so, he wants a few more ordinary persons. He wants men against whom he can check his ideas, who are independent, who will stand up to him and tell him exactly what they think, but it is no use their doing so if they know nothing about it. . .

Captain John Dugdale (West Bromwich): . . . I do not intend to discuss strategy. I know from my own experience in one branch of the Services how little I know of the strategy even of that branch, let alone the strategy of any other, but I would discuss for a moment the policy that lies behind that strategy. Are we pursuing this war relentlessly and without having the brakes on, so to speak? Are we continually trying to wage this war with the brakes on? I think we are. I will give two examples of what I mean. The first, which has

often been cited, is that of bombing civilian populations. I believe that we are actuated by an entirely false set of standards. It may be that the policy pursued up-to-date of selecting certain targets for bombing has been the right one, and I am second to none in admiration of the work that has been performed by the R.A.F. and its bombing planes; but I say that these targets, particularly bridges and those mysterious things which only came to the light of day during this war, marshalling yards, can be and, in fact are being, repaired every day after they have been bombed. The Germans have a very rapid system of repair. . . It may be that our policy is better than theirs or their policy is better than ours, but we should at least try their policy and see whether it works. It may not work, but the fact that Hitler has considered it likely that the morale of our people would be broken by air raids suggests that he considers that the morale of his own people would be broken by such air raids. That is the first point I would make. . .

. . . Why is it that when we talk of the Fifth Column we consider it as something bad and something which only the enemy has? We do not treat this weapon as we treat weapons like the bombing plane and the machine-gun, but as something which we do not use. I am told that it is un-English and that it is not cricket. I reply that we cannot play cricket against a country that does not know the rules. Cricket is a British and not a German game. Why cannot we use German Fifth-Column tactics, not in exactly the same way as the Germans, as we can, but in a more successful manner than they have done? . . .

. . . What is it that has stopped us from taking action such as I have described? Who is it, or what is it, that has stopped us? Is it the Prime Minister? I find it difficult to believe that it is the Prime Minister! Is it the War Cabinet? I think it is, in fact, a feeling that the British people will not stand for this, a feeling, as I have said, that the British people will not consider that it is a British thing to do. I would suggest that the mind of the British people has changed very considerably from what it was a year ago. . . You will hear exactly the same thing over and over again: "We do not mind how strong the action you take, we do not mind what you do to the Germans, only, for Heaven's sake, do it." That is what we hear on every side, and not least among the soldiers, sailors and airmen

(continued on page ten)

Australian Scene

The Pacific Crisis and Section 42a

A note was published in last week's issue of "The Social Crediter" stating that the notorious Section 42a of the Australian Security Act had been repealed after pressure from electors on their representatives. An Australian view on the forces involved in this attempt at autocracy is given below. It is part of an article entitled "The Pacific Crisis" by ERIC BUTLER, which appeared in the "Melbourne New Times" of February 21.

I have suggested on more than one occasion that war, or the threat of war, might be brought to Australian shores by certain interests if it appeared that the Australian people were not showing much enthusiasm for the particular "new world order," which appears to be their main object in the present conflict.

On Thursday of last week, Mr. Fadden uttered an almost hysterical warning to the Australian people. The *Melbourne Herald*, as usual, rose to the occasion with some typical scare-mongering journalism which touched new levels of distortion and half-truth. For example, the *Herald's* posters last Friday evening implied that Japan had threatened Australia. No evidence of such a threat could be discovered by reading the paper itself; rumours from "usually reliable sources" concerning the movements of Japanese forces appeared to be the only foundation for the *Herald's* hints and assertions. Similar vague reports appeared in the other daily papers. The immediate result has been a first-class panic throughout Australia. Compared with the past few days, I don't think that I have ever listened to so much nonsense in all my life. Everyone is offering an opinion, from some of the Army authorities down to the "man in the street." "Japan will do this and Japan will do that," we are told, which seems to imply that the Japanese as a people desire to come to grips with us. Men who talk like that, whether they be Army officers giving their opinions to soldiers on parade or members of Parliament and editors of finance-controlled newspapers, are rendering Australia a grave disservice. There are two possible underlying causes of the present crisis: The first is that certain interests in Japan, acting at the behest of Germany, seek to extend their military operations southwards to create a diversion and diffuse the British effort. If this is so, the sole blame for such a crisis can be attributed to the Jewish International Banking Group of Wall Street, New York, who are attempting

a strategy in the Near East similar to the one they have applied to Europe. I will briefly deal with this presently. The second possible cause of the crisis is the tremendous effect that our years of educational work on the question of financial reform is having on the Australian people. Fadden and Co. have become almost frenzied in their frantic attempts to uphold the present financial policy. The introduction of the now-famous Regulation 42 A, with its impudent "Bankers Clause," was one of the most fascistic moves against any part of the British Commonwealth of Nations since the International Bankers crucified Newfoundland.

I am convinced that Regulation 42 A was mooted from outside Australia. However, once again we swung into action, with the result that the whole of Australia is ablaze with indignation, while the tide of public opinion further threatens the financial enemy within. It is at this interesting and critical stage that Mr. Fadden, aided by the daily press, launches the "Pacific crisis." Further curtailment of liberties can be expected, and a move towards general regimentation, unless a policy of sanity prevails. I appeal to every reader of this journal throughout Australia and New Zealand to refuse to be stampeded. A calm sane out-look is urgently wanted.

Mr. Butler then goes on to analyse the "Pacific crisis." He quotes first an article from the "Melbourne Argus" of three weeks before, in which their Special Correspondent is of the considered opinion that Japan does not want to enter the European War and will do her best to avoid it. Mr. Butler then points out that Kuhn Loeb and Company, the international bankers, were active in Japan early in the century, financing the Russo-Japanese war; that Japan has been set against China in a war of exhaustion which may leave the whole of the East dominated by finance, and that this could not have happened if the U.S.A. had not helped both sides; and that a key part is played by Bolshevik

Russia which was established by aid of German-Jewish-American bankers. He then describes the deterioration of relations between Great Britain and Japan, and continues:

Personally, I think that the scare has been deliberately created with a view to delivering an internal blow against Australian democracy. The enemy within must be beaten before we have any hope of making a maximum national effort. We are not making anywhere near a maximum effort yet, and will never be able to do so with an obsolete financial system. Organisation is lacking, red tape is tripping everyone up and individual freedom and initiative are being ruthlessly attacked. Primary producers are going bankrupt and losing heart. Taxation and debt are increasing. Food is being destroyed and production restricted, while we are urged to make sacrifices. If the day does come when Australia is attacked, and we should find ourselves without an adequate supply of modern equipment, those responsible for the present financial swindle should be publicly called upon to show why they shouldn't be tried for treason. . .

And another point. Why the suggestion during the "crisis" to conscript all and sundry? Is that part of THE PLAN, too? Can it be that the Government fears the Australian people are not sufficiently patriotic to fight without being conscripted? As a loyal Australian, I object to this inference. Let the Government "put its cards on the table," not make vague and wild statements such as Mr. Fadden has done, let it sweep the financial dictators aside, and the response from the people will be overwhelming. A well-trained and equipped army of enthusiastic volunteers is what we want. And they should be well paid, unless, of course, politicians, B.H.P. directors, and bank directors are also going to come down to "five bob" a day. Whether it be real or imaginary, this Pacific crisis should be a warning to all Australians to watch for any further encroachments on our

liberties by the enemy within. Unless we do, we may be stampeded by the press, politicians and other mouthpieces of the financial oligarchy, into a complete dictatorship within the next few weeks. The real victors will be the Jewish-American bankers, who seek to smash every semblance of British culture and democracy.

In conclusion, let me warn all Australians against all hysterical news presented by the daily press. Already it has become apparent that Mr. Fadden's frenzied warning was received with surprise in London, Batavia, Tokio and Washington. Mr. Fadden has since been trying to justify his action, although I notice that Mr. Spender was apparently rather sceptical concerning the alleged seriousness of the situation. It is not often that I agree with Mr. Spender, but I believe that he is right for once.

Feeling about the Australian Government's wartime financial policy is running extremely high. The following passage from a letter to the "Melbourne New Times" of February 28, from N. F. Rolls (who had returned from a 3,000 mile trip by car in the country) comments on this:

In all my travelling experience I have never seen the country so ripe for reforms along the lines advocated by the

New Times. All our spare time was taken up with interested people, answering questions, etc. There is no doubt that the Australian public are rapidly becoming money-reform conscious, and that the scope for the right literature distribution increases daily...

The following brief observations may serve to illustrate the position in the country districts:

In a once-thriving town on the Victorian border no less than 15 businesses have closed down during the past few weeks. In contrast to this, whilst shops are being sold up and demolished, huge banking and insurance buildings are being erected.

The biggest store in a large Western Riverina town recently returned unsold to the factory no less than 200 dozen of one article of clothing. In the same town garments usually sold at 7/11 are being offered for 1/- apiece.

Passing through hundreds of country centres, we were able to get a "close-up" of our "national effort." Of approximately 200 persons in one small town, 40 are drawing "relief." Every town has its gruesome quota of able-bodied unemployed men waiting for something to turn up, whilst road washaways resulting from recent floods remain untouched.

In view of the need for a co-operative national effort, these facts cast a damning indictment against the present financial policy of our governments.

The extent to which financial interests have become alarmed at the increasing pressure for money reform is indicated by the following report from the "Melbourne Argus" of February 3:

CANBERRA, Sunday.—It is believed that a national publicity campaign, which would involve expenditure of a large sum of money, in support of the Government's war-time financial programme, and to obtain full support against subversive activities, is being planned by the Department of Information. It is understood that sponsors of the plan contemplate appointment of a board of leading advertising experts, and that some members have already been chosen. It is proposed that the board should advise on routine organisation of publicity campaigns, and, in certain circumstances, should assist in distribution of advertising.

Strong protests were made against the suggestion that the Department of Information—a public institution, paid for by public funds—should be used to issue propaganda in favour of the present financial system.

Diary of Events

MAY 22: *Heavy fighting continued in Crete; some troops landed from ships but one convoy destroyed.*

Ontario and Alberta have withheld consent to Canadian Dominion Government's request that Provinces vacate field of personal income-tax and corporation tax for duration of war.

MAY 23: In France Admiral Darlan pointed out the mitigation of armistice conditions he had obtained by his policy and said Hitler had asked neither for French warships nor colonies.

MAY 24: *H.M.S. Hood sunk off Greenland, German "Bismarck" damaged.*

Mr. Andrews, Prime Minister of Ulster, and other Ulster Ministers, consulted with Mr. Churchill on application of conscription to Ulster: protest meetings held in Ulster.

In Australia, Menzies Government's candidate won bye-election; Menzies Ministry has 37 followers in Federal House of Representatives, Labour party 36, and one Independent. Menzies demanded National Government.

MAY 26: *Crete fighting was still heavy.*

Mr. De Valera, Prime Minister of Eire, made violent

protest against conscription in Ulster.

Document signed by General Doyen, chief of French Armistice Commission, which came into hands of Free French, shows Germans are planning total or partial annexation of nine French Departments, if they win the war.

MAY 27: *German battleship Bismarck sunk after 1,750 mile chase. Six ships have been lost in Crete action, which still continues serious.*

Marshall Pétain informed President Roosevelt that he will not permit Germany to have the French fleet or colonies, and that France will not fight for Germany against Britain. Mr. Churchill announced there would not be conscription in Ulster.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

All subscribers are asked to confirm by post card the date of expiry of their subscriptions to The Social Crediter.

They are also requested to report promptly delay, which may be due to enemy action, in acknowledgement of remittances.

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.

Editorial Office:
4, ACREFIELD ROAD,
WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL.
Telephone: Gateacre 1561.

Business Office (Temporary):
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, 15.
Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 6. No. 12.

Saturday, May 31, 1941.

'Frivolous,' says Mr. Churchill

Captain L. D. Gammans (who is nevertheless going on with his election campaign as the official Conservative candidate for Hornsey) says, "I regard this election as a wicked waste of time and money."

His opponent is Mr. Noel Pemberton-Billing, whose political history has at least as many points of interest as Mr. Churchill's—though not the same points.

Mr. Pemberton-Billing says: "a vote for Gammans is a vote for Churchill as leader of the Conservative Party. A vote for Pemberton-Billing is a vote for Churchill as leader of the nation."

It does not seem likely that Mr. Churchill will relish this sort of promotion at the hands of Mr. Pemberton-Billing. Indeed, with his well-known love for words that kill, the Prime Minister has characterised the author of the suggestion as 'frivolous.'

Mr. Pemberton-Billing is addressing nine to twelve meetings a day to Captain Gammans's total of four for the whole campaign. Whether, with fire-fighting, munitions-making, children-minding, form-filling, not to mention tax-paying and the arduous earning of the wherewithal to do all these things, the electors have time to attend for even the fifteen minutes which Mr. Pemberton-Billing's meetings are said to last is not stated by the newspapers; but it seems that extremity has pushed them to it. If they are at all attentive, and Mr. Pemberton-Billing at all communicative, the election ought to be a bright spot in the tedium of blitz. For Mr. Pemberton-Billing knows at least as much as Mr. Churchill does about the little ways of second-rate experts (of doubtful allegi-

ance) in control of first-rate experts in war production, though on this matter, as on the matter of the Prime Minister's representation, the two hold opinions which careful inspection, and punctilious statement, would probably show to be divergent. Both are for 'ultimate victory'; but when Mr. Churchill says ULTIMATE he MEANS ultimate; and when Mr. Pemberton-Billing says VICTORY he MEANS victory, unless we are greatly mistaken. Surely two who see so closely eye to eye, should not fall out over a mere election?

Some indication of how 'frivolous' Mr. Pemberton-Billing is may be gained from the following in an article he has just written:—

"Time and again the Liberal, Labour, and Conservative members, conscious of some public abuse or justifiable private grievance, have handed in their questions only to be sent for later by the Party Whip to be informed that the Leader of the Party objects to the question. When some question is put down by a member of the Opposition and is stopped by his own Leader, it indicates that acting on the information contained in the question, the Leader of the Opposition has made a deal with the Government, utilising this piece of information as—I say it unhesitatingly—a form of party blackmail to obtain some advantage for his party, but at the same time allowing the scandal or abuse to remain unexposed. . . . But the questions they fear are those put down by Independent members, for how can a party member jeopardise his whole political existence by placing the country *before* the party?"

This while doubtless a real live

striped tiger is not *the* real live striped tiger, 'red in tooth and claw,' which Mr. Pemberton-Billing should be starting up in our present political jungle. It is quite possibly the great grandfather of that tiger the electors of Hornsey want slain (though what with the queer brown and yellow striped glasses they are wearing and one thing and another, they can't see it very clearly). And if this means that Mr. Pemberton-Billing's hand has lost its cunning, or that his mind harks back to the past of twenty or so years ago, we're rather sorry. But why we're rather sorry wild elephants would not draw from us, since it might make Mr. Churchill even more killing-word-inventing than he is now. And that might rob the electors of Hornsey of a representative not altogether unsuited to their purpose.

There is certainly no ground for the supposition that Mr. Pemberton-Billing approves of the policy, which has been pursued 'by all means in our power,' of cramping Britain's war effort to the point where total dependence upon Roosevelt and his backers is inevitable, and "Union Now" a necessary consequence.

T.J.

PROVINCIAL PREMIERS CALLED TO OTTAWA

Mr. Ilsley, the Canadian Minister of Finance, announced at the beginning of May that the Premiers of all the nine Provinces had been invited to go to Ottawa to discuss, each in a separate conference, the Federal Government's proposal, outlined in the Budget speech, that the Provinces should relinquish the fields of taxation of personal and corporation income for the duration of the war.

Alberta and Ontario have both withheld their consent to this proposal.

In the recent elections in Manitoba, Mr. Bracken's coalition government was returned with a majority of 45, consisting of 25 Liberal-Progressives, 13 Conservatives, 4 Independents, 3 C.C.F., 3 Coalition "Social Creditors," 1 Independent Liberal and 1 Liberal. Opposition members-elect are two Conservatives, two Independents and 1 Workers' Committee representative.

The Sirois report was said to be criticised only by anti-coalition Social Credit candidates, who, including Miss Halldorson, lost their seats,

Defeating Opposition to the Interim Programme in Alberta

Treasury Branches in Alberta are now crediting every purchase made with vouchers with a two per cent. bonus up to \$100 of purchases monthly. This is in addition to the five per cent. bonus on all Alberta trade-marked goods.

Mr. E. C. MANNING and Mr. SOLON LOW announced this change in a broadcast address, one of a regular series on government policy given by members of the government.

MR. LOW: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. We have some good news for you this evening—news which should interest every listener. As you may be aware, during the past few weeks organised efforts have been made by certain concerns to sabotage the Interim Programme and to deprive those using the Treasury Branches of the many benefits to which they are entitled. Your government is not going to permit these concerns either to sabotage the Interim Programme endorsed by you at the last election or to deprive you of the advantages you receive by way of a bonus through using the Treasury Branches. Before I explain to you the manner in which we intend to safeguard your interests, I am going to ask Mr. Manning to give you some information you should have regarding the kind of organised efforts which are being made to destroy the people's confidence.

MR. MANNING: Yes, indeed, the new features which have been introduced into the Interim Programme in order to give the people the expanded services they wanted were very carefully planned in the light of all the circumstances involved in the present critical war situation. We took several months in this important preparatory work to make sure that every factor was considered from every angle.

One of the steps we took was to approach certain large manufacturing, wholesale and retail firms. We discussed the new features with them, obtained their criticisms and suggestions and made certain modifications in the light of these. Practically every one of the firms approached signified their willingness to co-operate under the proposed extended programme—including some firms which were not co-operating at the time.

MR. LOW: And after the new features were introduced?

MR. MANNING: Well one of the first reactions was an unusual amount of interest in the details of the scheme

displayed by certain organisations who have always done everything in their power to oppose every effort of the Government to assist the people of the province. Almost immediately the Calgary Board of Trade and the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce got busy. Purporting to speak for manufacturers, wholesalers and retail merchants these organisations passed resolutions against co-operating in the Interim Programme, issued grossly misleading press statements and sent out equally misleading circulars to retail merchants and others urging them to boycott the Interim Programme.

MR. LOW: The significant—I almost said sinister—fact is that the Treasury Branches have been operating for over two years and these so-called trade and commerce organisations have taken little or no interest. Now when the services are being expanded to benefit consumers, manufacturers and merchants alike they start attacking them with savage fury.

MR. MANNING: Yes. I think that the public will realise the significance of this. It just goes to show whom these organisations really represent. The only concerns that can feel the least anxiety about the strengthening of the Treasury Branches Interim programme are the financial institutions. They and they alone do not want the programme to succeed, because that would weaken their control over the economic life of the province.

MR. LOW: Exactly. Certain spokesmen for these organisations have declared that they are engaged in investigating how they can attack the legislation under which the Treasury Branches operate.

MR. MANNING: Don't you think they have over done this *ultra vires* stuff?

MR. LOW: I wish we could get the reply of our listeners to that question. I know that those I meet have very definite opinions on the subject. But to come back to the opposition being

organised by these Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade.

MR. MANNING: Well—immediately following the action of those organisations in declaring their open opposition and in circulating misleading exhortations to merchants not to co-operate, there was a gradual change in the attitude of certain of the large wholesale houses. Some of those who had expressed their approval of the new features cooled off and finally declared that they would not co-operate. I should make it clear that it was not always the fault of the Alberta managers of these firms. In some cases they wanted to co-operate but they had to carry out instructions from their Head Offices.

MR. LOW: And the same thing happened with some manufacturers. A typical example is the case of the sugar manufacturers. At first they told us that they could hardly refuse to co-operate if the beet growers would be prepared to accept transfer vouchers for their sugar beets, but after the first Beet Growers' Association had voted by a 80 per cent. majority to accept a portion of their pay for beets in Transfer Vouchers, the sugar factory immediately wrote me stating they would not co-operate.

MR. MANNING: With the result that Alberta sugar, the sale of which we want to encourage, cannot be trade-marked and purchasers cannot get their 3 per cent. bonus on it. It would seem that the factory is not anxious to expand the sale of Alberta sugar.

MR. LOW: Yes, certain other large manufacturers took the same position, no doubt under financial pressure.

MR. MANNING: Now that is one side of the picture. Many of the large wholesale houses, and certain manufacturers and some retailers have ganged up against the Interim Programme, no doubt hoping that this would prevent the people from obtaining supplies of Alberta Trade Marked goods, thus preventing them from getting their

Consumer's bonus. In other words they hoped that they could sabotage the Interim Programme by these tactics.

MR. LOW: That's plain—but there is the other side of the picture.

MR. MANNING: Yes. In spite of all this ganging up more than four times the number of manufacturers that were signed up under the old agreements are already co-operating under the expanded programme. Retail merchants are signing the new agreements at a far greater rate than they did previously. And we have the full co-operation of some wholesale merchants—sufficient to service all parts of the provinces except the far north, and the most southern areas. And we feel assured that these districts too will be able to obtain supplies of trade-marked goods.

MR. LOW: That means that except for those restricted areas retail merchants can now obtain Alberta trade-marked goods for Transfer Vouchers through established wholesale channels.

MR. MANNING: Exactly. It would be useless for retail merchants to buy Alberta trade-marked goods through non-co-operating wholesalers because these will not accept Transfer Vouchers for such trade-marked goods.

MR. LOW: But wholesalers are asked to accept vouchers only for trade-marked goods. They get 100 per cent. cash for other goods.

MR. MANNING: Yes, that is so in spite of the stories being circulated by certain trade organisations. Co-operating wholesalers are prepared to accept vouchers for trade-marked goods because they have the guarantee that the manufacturers of such goods will in turn, accept Transfer Vouchers from the wholesalers.

So you see, ladies and gentlemen, the kind of blocking tactics that are being used. The effect of these has been to make it extremely difficult for the co-operating retail merchant to obtain trade-marked goods up to the present time. In a few cases it may have been the merchant's fault, but generally speaking it has been due to this organised opposition. This places you, the consumer, in a very unfair position—because unless you can purchase Alberta Trade-marked goods by using transfer vouchers you cannot obtain your 5 per cent. consumers bonus. This situation is being notified, but in the meantime the government does not intend to let you suffer simply because a few concerns are ganging up to prevent you from getting your bonus. Now you can help solve this

difficulty by insisting on getting Alberta trade-marked goods when making your purchases. But in order that you shall not be deprived of your bonus benefits while you and your retail merchants are co-operating with the government to defeat this organised opposition against the Interim Programme, the government is adjusting the bonus feature to meet the present temporary situation. Please listen to this carefully.

Taking effect as from the beginning of April, in addition to the 5 per cent. bonus of Alberta trade-marked goods, a 2 per cent. bonus will be paid on all purchases of other goods with Transfer Vouchers. This special 2 per cent. bonus on the purchase of other goods with Transfer Vouchers will apply on monthly purchases up to \$100. It is necessary to limit it in this manner to prevent abuses and ensure that bona fide purchasers only obtain the benefit of the bonus.

MR. MANNING: I think that should be clear to all our listeners. The 5 per cent. bonus will continue to be given on all Alberta trade-marked goods and in addition consumers will get 2 per cent. on other goods purchased with vouchers up to the value of \$100 in any month. So it is up to them to insist on getting trade-marked goods in order to obtain the higher rate of bonus.

MR. LOW: And what about the big manufacturers of such products as sugar?

MR. MANNING: I think it is important for people to realise that the government can only furnish them with the facilities to gain the advantages of co-operation. It is up to the people to create such a demand for Alberta trade-marked goods that such firms will reconsider their decision and soon come to see that it is to their own advantage as well as to the advantage of the people of the Province to support the Interim Programme.

MR. LOW: There is one more point about which I understand our farmers are asking. They all want to know if any of the oil companies are prepared to accept Transfer Vouchers for gasoline products.

MR. MANNING: Yes. I hope all our listeners will take careful note of this. The following oil companies have already signed agreements and their products are therefore eligible for the full 5 per cent. bonus as Alberta trade-marked goods:

Canadian Western Distributors
Great West Distributors Ltd.

Becker Oil Ltd.
Drumheller Independent Oils Ltd.

We expect that other companies will shortly sign similar agreements.

MR. LOW: Our time is up ladies and gentlemen. In response to many enquiries we have endeavoured to give you authoritative information about certain features of the progress of the Interim Programme. It seems clear now that it is revolving into a fight between a few large finance-dominated interests controlled from outside the Province on the one hand and the people of Alberta on the other. You can be assured that your Government will go right ahead with the Interim Programme providing you give your full support. But the success of the Programme will, in the final analysis, depend upon your enthusiastic and vigorous co-operation. If you give us that backing, then you can look forward with confidence to increasing benefits, expanding trade, steady development of provincial resources and diminishing control by outside interests. Surely that is a goal worth striving for.

FREEMASONRY

*Major Douglas said recently:—
"In regard to Freemasons, I should have been convinced of their importance by Lapointe's answer to Norman Jacques, if I had not been before."*

Mr. Norman Jacques, New Democracy member of the Canadian House of Commons, on May 24, 1940, asked the Minister of Justice the following questions:

(1) Whether, in view of the contradiction involved between the right of free speech and free assembly which are an accepted constituent of British Institutions, and the existence of secret Societies which in these circumstances, suggest that their activities are subversive, the Prime Minister will consider the advisability of making such Societies and the membership in them illegal.

(2) Whether a return might be made to the House of the names, and members of the Government who are members of Secret Societies, and also of the Presidents and General Managers of Banks who are similarly affiliated.

Mr. Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, replied:

(1) This question relates to a matter of policy and it is not customary to make a statement in reply to same.

(2) Answered by No. 1.

Centralisation: The Mayor of Kensington versus Mr. King-Hall

The Times of May 27 published letters on civil defence from Mr. Stephen King-Hall, M.P. for Ormskirk, and Mr. R. C. D. Jenkins, Mayor of Kensington, which well exemplify opposing opinions on centralisation.

Mr. King-Hall says:

"Sir, the whole question of the defence of the home front in all its aspects against enemy air attack is a military operation, and it will be a source of wonder to our descendants why his Majesty's Government does not recognise the unfairness and ineffectiveness involved in expecting our peace-time system of local government to be a suitable piece of administrative machinery for the conduct of military operations. It is nonsense to say—as some Government spokesmen do—that those who want to transform the existing arrangements into something more swift in action and up to date in its grasp of the strategy and tactics of total war are attacking local government. Such accusations are a smoke-screen concealing inexcusable delays. The transfer of powers from local authorities to new organisations is necessary in order to win the war and thus preserve local government. If it be true (which I doubt) that many things needed on the Home Front cannot be done because the public will say it is dictatorship, *then a big drive must be made to explain to the people why a German "blitz" is a military operation* [our emphasis] and can only be countered by defences organised and operated on military lines. The word 'military' has a wider meaning than army...

"We must recognise at once that as this war increases in violence this island will become an operational aerodrome for U.S.A. aircraft. The essence of our problem arises from the fact that more than 46,000,000 people must live and work on this aerodrome and defend it against air attack and invasion. We need a war cabinet minister for defence, whose area commanders-in-chief should be the Regional Commissioners. The Army and Air Force G.O.C.s of Commands, the health, police, and other 'civil' authorities should be linked in small executive committees to the Regional Commissioners."

Whatever can we think of the realism of one who can solemnly advocate 'a big drive' to 'explain to the people why a German blitz is a military

operation'?

Mr. Jenkins says:

"Some of us are concerned by a policy which might be considered to be advocated in an article written by a Special Correspondent which appeared in your issue of May 16. It recommended that local officials should be 'set free to act under orders' of a Regional Commissioner beyond the narrow limits of their own authority.

"This is not the first time a suggestion has been made that the elected representatives of local authorities should be superseded, and that in civil defence matters local government officers should take their orders direct from representatives of the Central Government. It may be remembered that in September, 1938, a secret instruction on these lines was issued to town clerks and their chief constables, who were thereby placed in a most invidious position. That instruction was very quickly withdrawn. Subsequently the Government wisely concluded that each local authority should appoint 'an emergency committee which should be associated with the controller and to which would be given wide powers to act on behalf of the council in matters of civil defence.' The controller is the servant of the local authority, who are responsible for all his acts. After nearly two years of war this system of democratic control has been proved to be at least as successful as the conduct of most Government Departments—and less hampered by 'red tape' so far as local discretion can be exercised. It would be unfortunate if the admitted mistake of 1938 were to be repeated. The recent decision of the Government to accept full responsibility for fire brigade services, especially in sparsely populated areas, can be justified—but that is a special case and a self-contained service."

He goes on to describe the co-operation between Regional Commissioners and local authorities which is generally most friendly, and points out that it is to the credit of both authorities and commissioners that only in one or two cases have the latter had to use the powers that they possess under the defence regulations to supersede local authorities. He continues:

"In actual practice neither the Commissioners nor local authorities worry about exact powers when rapid

action is necessary. Moreover there is much friendly co-operation between local authorities. In London, for example, our complicated local government system is working well and *harmonious co-operation is producing much better results than an enforced centralised control ever could have done* [our emphasis.]

"If there really are any persons in this country who would like to abolish our democratic local government system and substitute control from Whitehall—on the Continental pattern so thoroughly practised in Germany—I suggest they should refrain from pressing their views until the war is over. One thing is certain. If any attempt is made to upset the broad democratic basis of our local government system, and to use war conditions as an argument for replacing it by direct control by Regional Commissioners, there will be implacable resistance from many public-spirited citizens who have given time and energy to local government work. Such a diversion of their energies from civil defence work would not be in the national interest."

CANADIAN WHEAT STOCKS

The Federal Government had not in mid-April announced the details of its 1941 wheat policy, but some of the regulations had been tabled in the House of Commons. These provided for subsidies for land under summer-fallow above the area under summer-fallow in 1940, for the acreage sown with grass or coarse grains over the acreage for such crops in 1940, and additional sums per acre if lands sown to grass or rye in 1941 are still in grass or rye on July 1, 1942, even if they have been summer-fallowed or sown to coarse grains in 1941.

In other words, the Canadian Government is persistently encouraging the reduction of wheat-growing in a country which has been previously encouraged to organise for large-scale wheat production.

Yet it is becoming increasingly evident that vast food supplies will be needed in Europe after the war—the spectre of famine is already looming in some parts of the continent.

Canadian farmers can grow wheat and can store it: all that is needed is to give them a fair deal, an adequate reward for what they do.

Parliament *continued from page three*

who are tired of idling, of waiting and seeing the Germans doing things which we are not allowed to do...

Mr. Lambert (South Molton):... He [the Prime Minister] can act as he thinks best in the interests of the country, and, judging from the Press—of course, I have no inside information—I should say it is quite possible that some of his Ministers are not quite equal to their responsibilities. I have been troubled a good deal lately with gentlemen who call themselves “planners,” and those who ask what is to happen after the war. I should like someone to tell us what is to happen in the next three months, and more especially, what is to happen in 12 months ahead. What I tell my people in the West of England is this: What we have to consider is who will do the planning. Will it be by this Parliament, under King George VI, or by Adolf Hitler? The job is to see that we do our own planning. For my part, I feel pretty confident...

... If they want an additional member of the War Cabinet, they could not do better than invite Wendell Wilkie, if he would come. [An HON. MEMBER: “And Al Capone.”] That may be the hon. Member’s choice.

Major McCallum (Argyll):... I had the honour up to a year ago to be on General Wavell’s intelligence service... We have heard a good deal about the intelligence service. One speaker said it was not comparable with the intelligence service in the last war. As I served in the intelligence service during the last war, ever since, and in this, I might perhaps not be able to give an impartial judgment, but I am certain, from what I have heard from our own and Allied authorities in the Middle East, that our intelligence there is extremely good. With all due respect and humility, I would say that one or two statements in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs (Mr. Lloyd George) do not help the intelligence service. I refer particularly to the statement about German ships passing through the Dardanelles. The right hon. Gentleman said it was common knowledge and that he had read it in the Press. I have not read it myself, but I may be a very bad intelligence officer. I have asked several of my hon. Friends sitting around me, and I cannot find anyone who has read it in the Press. Statements of that kind are calculated to do us a great deal of harm, particularly

where Turkey is concerned...

... I should like to ask those who have the drawing-up of the B.B.C. communiques, or the B.B.C. authorities themselves, to give us those communiques in a sober, objective manner. Do not go in for boasting. Do not say, “We have captured the last Italian capital in Africa,” when five minutes later we lose it. Being a Highlander, it may be that I suffer from superstition more than most people, but I believe, that if we state soberly that we have done such and such a thing and we have not been able to do such and such a thing, the country will prefer that to being told some fantastic story which has to be denied a few days later.

Major-General Sir Alfred Knox (Wycombe):... There are three Members in the War Cabinet of the party that generally sat opposite before the war. We know that it is necessary to have political representation, but would it not strengthen the hand of the Prime Minister if he had more advisers from outside people? We know that the Prime Minister is not a man who hesitates to make necessary changes. Would it not be better if he had people who were, perhaps, too old to take any active part but who might advise him on such questions as relate to the Air, the Navy and the Army? For instance, I would suggest Lord Trenchard, Lord Chatfield or Lord Milne, to mention only three names. Do not hon. Members think that such advisers would be more useful than people who are accustomed to managing trade unions? Would they not give better advice?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Ronald Ross (Londonderry): Is not my hon. and gallant Friend encouraging the Government in the very vicious habit of settling their strategy themselves, rather than leaving it to their Service advisers? Is he not fulfilling what was said by M. Clemenceau, that war is too serious a matter to be left to soldiers and that it ought to be done by the politicians? If the politicians do not approve of their naval, military or air Departments, they ought to get them changed, and not look after strategy themselves.

Sir A. Knox: The question is whether the War Cabinet are to direct the war themselves or not. I understand that the only person who is directing the strategy of the war is the Prime Minister. Would it not lighten his

enormous burden if he had some practical assistance. I shall sit down now, as I am terrified of exceeding my time.

Mr. Granville (Eye):... Democracy is fighting for its existence. I was interested in the suggestion made in the speech of my right hon. Friend this afternoon. I would ask the Prime Minister, is it not possible to get a man of the calibre and driving force of Mr. Wendell Wilkie or Mr. Harry Hopkins, and to use his great knowledge and power to help turn the scales now, by joining in a great unified arms drive in the British Commonwealth and the United States of America?... Just as we had a unified command in the last war, so we need one now, in war production. One day, in my view, we shall see the war effort of the British Empire and the United States of America directed by a democratic allied war council, comprising the leaders of the United States of America and of the British Commonwealth. This council will direct the winning of the war, the making of the peace and the carrying out of post-war reconstruction under the security of the air power of the British Commonwealth and of America. Some people call that union. If that is union, then I support it. In my judgment it is the real alternative to a Hitler-dominated civilisation. Let that be the call to the people of this country; let that be the message to the people of America and of this island, that goes out from this Debate.

Mr. Noel-Baker (Derby):... I put these doubts in a very inoffensive form, I hope, to the Prime Minister, and what I think it comes to in the terms of the Motion is, Could we by any means in February last have sent more guns and planes and transport to help the 20 Greek divisions which were in the field and to mobilise the extra seven divisions which they had? Could we at the beginning of November or December last have sent the greater part of our Air Force from this country to the Middle East? Only the Government know the answer, because only they know the strength and the flow of armament production and the shipping which they can command. Looking backwards, only they can decide whether we have too much of the island fortress state of mind, but I ask them, for future guidance, to consider this. If the only way to help the Greeks had been deliberately to postpone the equipment of our new divisions in this country, would it not have paid as well?...

The Prime Minister:... But there

are two points on which I think I can a little relieve my hon. Friend's [Mr. Lloyd George's] fears and anxieties about Turkey. First of all, he said they had allowed ships which carried the German troops to the Greek Islands to come through the Dardanelles. They had no right to stop them. While at peace, they had no right whatever to stop them. That would be a decision to quit their neutrality...

...I think the Government were right to put down a Motion of confidence, because after our reverses and disappointments in the field, His Majesty's Government have a right to know where they stand with the House of Commons, and where the House of Commons stands with the country. Still more is this knowledge important for the sake of foreign nations, especially nations which are balancing their policy at the present time, and who ought to be left in no doubt about the stability or otherwise of this resolved and obstinate war Government...

... My right hon. Friend the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs made his usual criticisms about the composition and character of the Government, of the war control and of the War Cabinet, and the House is entitled to know, has a right to know, who are responsible for the conduct of the war. The War Cabinet consists of eight members, five of whom have no regular Departments, and three of whom represent the main organisms of the State, to wit, Foreign Affairs, Finance and Labour, which in their different ways come into every great question that has to be settled. That is the body which gives its broad sanction to the main policy and conduct of the war. Under their authority, the Chiefs of Staff of the three Services sit each day together, and I, as Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, convene them and preside over them when I think it necessary, inviting, when business requires it, the three Service Ministers. All large issues of military policy are brought before the Defence Committee, which has for several months consisted of the three Chiefs of Staff, the three Service Ministers and four members of the War Cabinet, namely, myself, the Lord Privy Seal, who has no Department, the Foreign Secretary and Lord Beaverbrook...

... How was it that this very large number of Germans got across to Libya without our Intelligence or generals knowing about it? Perhaps they did know about it; or perhaps the numbers

were not so very large, after all. It depends on what you call "very large." At any rate, our generals on the spot believed that no superior German force could advance as far across the desert towards Egypt, as soon or as effectively as they did; and, secondly, that if they did advance, they would not be able to nourish themselves. That was a mistake...

... I ask you to witness, Mr. Speaker, that I have never promised anything or offered anything but blood, tears, toil and sweat, to which I will now add our fair share of mistakes, shortcomings and disappointments and also that this may go on for a very long time, at the end of which I firmly believe—though it is not a promise or a guarantee, only a profession of faith—that there will be complete, absolute and final victory...

Question put...

The House divided: Ayes, 447; Noes, 3.

[The 'Noes' were Mr. W. Gallacher, Mr. D. N. Pritt, and Dr. A. Salter; Tellers: Mr. Maxton and Mr. McGovern.]

May 14.

Oral Answers to Questions

(37 columns)

REQUISITIONED PROPERTY

(COMPENSATION).

Commander Sir Archibald Southby asked the Secretary of State for War whether, in the case of business premises compulsorily requisitioned by the War Office, such compensation is paid as will fully cover the amount of rent for the premises for which the dispossessed occupier may be liable under an existing agreement from which he is unable to escape; or whether the rent compensation paid is an arbitrarily fixed sum which does not cover the liabilities of the dispossessed occupier?

Mr. Law: My hon. and gallant Friend is under a misapprehension if he supposes that the sum payable by way of compensation in cases of this kind is arbitrarily fixed by the War Department. The amount is determined by the Compensation (Defence) Act, 1939, and the War Department has no power to go beyond its provisions. Under the provisions of that Act, compensation in respect

of requisitioned property must be assessed by reference to the rent which might reasonably be expected to be payable by a tenant under a lease granted at the time when the property is taken over.

Sir A. Southby: Will my hon. Friend appreciate the case I brought to his notice where the War Department requisitioned premises from an individual who has to pay £250 rent while receiving only £100 from the War Department? As his means of livelihood has been taken away, will my hon. Friend say how the individual concerned will find the other £150?

Mr. Law: The rent payable by the War Office, under the Act, can only be what the premises are worth at the time. In a great many cases it is the unfortunate fact that the value of the premises has deteriorated between the time that the original lease was taken up and the time the War Department took over. We are bound by the Act and cannot do any more.

Sir William Davison: Is it not desirable that some changes should be made? It was my experience recently that some premises were taken over for educational purposes and that a man had to pay £20 to £30 more than the amount he received from the War Office.

Sir A. Southby: Does my hon. Friend mean that when the War Office requisition premises from an individual, they will pay less in rent than the individual himself is already bound to pay? If so, that is a most unfair and unjust decision.

Mr. Law: The War Office has power to pay only what the premises are worth at the time, and if there is any unfairness or injustice, it is not on the part of the War Office but on the part of the House of Commons in passing the Act.

Sir W. Davison: Will my hon. Friend have the whole matter looked into? In the experience of many of us, great hardship is being caused through people having to pay the balance of rent which they are not receiving. The House would, I am sure, pass a one-Clause Bill in a short time to remedy the position.

Sir I. Albery: Will the Lord Privy Seal assure the House that this matter will receive attention?

Mr. Attlee: Certainly, Sir.

Sir A. Southby: Will it receive early attention?

Mr. Attlee: Certainly, Sir.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Correspondence to the Hon. Secretary, 17, Cregagh Road, Belfast.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Association: All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats. Enquiries to R. J. Northin, 11, Centre Street, Bradford.

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER is obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Meets regularly on the first and third Sundays in the month. Time 2-30 p.m. Members are asked to send their present addresses to the Secretary at 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Enquiries to Wavertree 435.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP. Lunch-hour reunion on the first and third Thursday in each month at 12-30, at the Plane Tree, Great Russell Street. Evening reunion at 6-30 p.m. on Friday, June 6, at 21 Milton Road, Highgate, N. 6. (Mrs. Hyatt). Underground to Archway or 134 bus to the Winchester. Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association. It is important that all Social Crediters on Tyneside should maintain contact. Write Hon. Secretary, R. Thomson, 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; or 50, Ripley Grove, Copnor.

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

URGENTLY REQUIRED

A copy of Warning Democracy. If any reader is willing to sell, or lend his copy of this book to K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., for use by a printer (it will get soiled), will he please send a postcard to the Manager, K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

The Social Crediter

If you are not a subscriber to THE SOCIAL CREDITER, send this order without delay.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

Please send THE SOCIAL CREDITER to me

Name

Address

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-

„ Six „ „ 15/-

„ Three „ „ 7/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer, Social Credit Expansion Fund, c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

I enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name

Address

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND.)

Name.....

Address.....

TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE, THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT, 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Advisory Chairmanship of Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute

£ : : , { per month, per quarter, per year,

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

I herewith enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the above mentioned funds.

Signature.....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.)

This list is reprinted for reference. Owing to enemy action only the starred books can at present be supplied.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy (edition exhausted)
*Social Credit 3/6
Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
*The Monopoly of Credit 3/6
Warning Democracy (edition exhausted)
The Tragedy of Human Effort... 6d.
*The Use of Money 6d.
Approach to Reality 3d.
Money and the Price System ... 3d.
Nature of Democracy 2d.
Social Credit Principles 1d.
Tyranny 3d.
and
**"This 'American' Business" 3d. each 12 for 2/-

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster 4d.
Debt and Taxation 2d.
ALSO
*The Bankers of London
by Percy Arnold 4/6
Economics for Everybody
by Elles Dee 3d.
The Power of Money
by J. B. Galway 3d.
The Purpose of Politics
by H. E. 3d.
Tax-Bonds or Bondage and the Answer to Federal Union
by John Mitchell 1/-
Barrier to Health
by Dr. Douglas Boyd..... 6d.
*Lower Rates (pamphlet) 3d.
*The Press Ban on Parliament
by John Mitchell..... 1/6
*Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson.....6d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report (again available) 6d.
(All the above postage extra).

Leaflets

- *Bomb the German People 100 for 1/9
Invincible Britain
by John Mitchell2d. each, 1/6 doz.
What we are about
by H. E.50 for 1/6
Hitler and Churchill Finance
by John Mitchell50 for 1/9
What 'Capital Levy' Means to You
by C. H. Douglas.....100 for 2/6
Beware of Federal Union
by R. L. Northridge.....50 for 1/9
This Plan would Enslave Britain
by John Mitchell9d. doz. 50 for 2/6
(The above are post free).
Temporary Address:—
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., as from 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.