

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 6. No. 2.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 22, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

“WHERESOEVER THE CARCASE IS—”

By C. H. Douglas

Now that Mr. John Winant, millionaire, assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, has come from the International Labour Office at Geneva, as Ambassador and instructor to Mr. Ernest Bevin on the Labour Policy of Great Britain, Mr. Averill Harriman, multi-millionaire, has come to take charge of our Finance, Mr. Wendell Wilkie has taken our temperature, and Mr. Harry Hopkins, late of the Federal Loan and Mortgage Board, remains as bailiff's man, and all of these are enthusiastically welcomed by the Socialist Party, it is perhaps of some interest to find an answer to the riddle—“When is a rich man not a rich man?” (for the purposes of Socialism).

The first answer can be obtained by inspection, as our Maths. Master used to say. It is when his riches are the result of monetary manipulation, and particularly, the result of bond flotation and sale. Each and every one of our, probably long-term, guests is in the orbit of the Kuhn, (i.e. Cohen), Loeb Finance Group. Not one of them is a manufacturer, or an agriculturalist, but all of them are here primarily to fix the conditions under which both manufacturing and agriculture are, they hope, to be carried on for the next five hundred years. And all of them are in enthusiastic agreement with the Socialists in the main tenets of Socialism. These are:

- (1) A Preamble that sets out the many glaring defects of the present Economic and Social Systems. (No mention or criticism of Finance permitted). Obviously this gets a majority vote at once.
- (2) “Labour creates all wealth.” Wealth is the object of life, especially if not used but exported. Therefore *Present* labour has a right to all wealth so long as it exports it. Anyone who has the enjoyment of wealth without labour, is a parasite. (From this postulate is derived the curious inversion that anyone paid by the State is *ipso facto* not a parasite.)
- (3) The holding of property, particularly land or buildings, by an individual, is robbery of the Public and is likely to lead to the use of property for pleasure. The holding of property by *any* organisation is better, and the larger the organisation and the more secure it is from criticism by individuals, the better it is. The State, which is immune from Prosecution by Legal Process, is better still, at the moment, but a World State, which would be Omnipotent, would be best of all.

- (4) Everything can be reduced to a Book of Regulations. For this reason, a Civil Servant in Whitehall, or Washington, or Geneva, can farm land in Ross and Cromarty, or Cheshire, or Alberta much better than the farmer who lives on the land. Or if he can't, it doesn't matter much, does it? Nobody knows the Civil Servant's name, he'll never see the farmer or the farm, and anyway, both the farmer and the Civil Servant will be dead soon.
- (5) The main objective, therefore, is to take everything from the individual, vest it in an untouchable organisation, the larger the better, and thus change the choice of minor tyrannies, which are vulnerable into an overriding single tyranny, which is invulnerable. Taxation is the primary tool by which to attain this desirable end, but restrictive Law, and in particular Licence Law, is a valuable auxiliary. But Law is the Agency both of taxation and Licensing.

When you have done this, you can put everyone on the wage and salary list, and invent a job for them, even if it's only filling in Forms to show how many people are filling in Forms. Then you will have solved the unemployment problem, which is the curse of Capitalism—if you don't know enough to recognise it as the coming of the Age of Leisure. And if people don't like filling in Forms, well, “He that will not work, neither shall he eat.”

Now, there is every justification for the acceptance of Socialism of this character by a very large majority of the population at this time, for reasons which a little later, I propose to recapitulate briefly. It is a remarkable tribute to the sound instincts of the Anglo-Saxon public that the majority is not larger, and that it is far from solidly convinced.

But before dealing with the grounds for the views somewhat reluctantly held by this majority, let us for a

On Other Pages

This Peace Aim Talk by John Mitchell

New Ways of Housekeeping ... by B. M. Palmer

Parliament

few moments consider their millionaire friends, for instance, Mr. Winant, Mr. Averill Harriman, or even President Roosevelt, not forgetting Mr. Benjamin Cohen, *et al.*, in the background. Why are they so anxious to vest all property in the State, at any rate in England, and to tax the private property owner out of existence?

Why, for instance was it freely stated in Washington in 1920 that a certain notorious witness was given £10,000 from New York to advocate the nationalisation of the coal industry; that the Railways, although ostensibly Company owned, are since 1920 entirely divorced from the control of their Shareholders; that Mr. Montagu Norman "welcomes" nationalisation; that the London School of Economics, founded by the Fabian Society but mainly endowed by Sir Ernest Cassel, is practically a manufactory for Bureaucratic Socialists with international financial doctrines; and much other evidence to the same effect?

However reluctantly, I feel that we must abandon any explanation of these phenomena which assumes, for instance, that Messrs. Winant, Harriman, and Hopkins (assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen) have come over here to commit financial suicide, or to sell all they have, and give to the poor. I feel almost certain that the "New Order" in Europe, and Great Britain in particular, like the Socialist Paradise in Russia, while it may impoverish and enslave millions, and destroy the culture and achievements of many centuries, will still leave Messrs. Harriman, Kuhn, Loeb,

et al., assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, in a situation which they regard with complacency. That is, of course, if nothing goes wrong.

We have therefore to approach Socialism, in order to appreciate it as a policy, from a somewhat unfamiliar angle. What is it that is concealed in a doctrine whose first postulate is a protest against economic inequality, which makes it so attractive to a special group of international millionaires who are the outstanding beneficiaries and primary cause of the inequalities attacked?

Obviously, the answer to this most important question will be found, not in what Socialists have said, but in what Socialism has done. And the first step to understanding what Socialism has done, is to be clear in regard to what Socialism has *not* done, such as invent and develop railways, roads and bridges, motor cars, dynamos and aeroplanes. The activities of Socialists have been almost exclusively in the field of Law (assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, *et al.*), and the situation in which we find ourselves is only to be understood by considering the Socialist legal trend against a background of scientific advance for which Socialism can take no credit whatever, but for the use of which it is responsible to the extent that its legislation has affected such use.

(To be continued).

(All rights reserved).

C. S. Douglas

DIARY OF EVENTS

MAR. 12—*In Somaliland British forces have been advancing steadily, taking many prisoners and much war material. Mussolini personally in charge of operations in Albania. German air-raid on Merseyside.*

MAR. 13—*Greek army throw back heavy Italian offensive in Albania, captured 10,000 prisoners. In Abyssinia enemy in retreat towards Harar. R.A.F. made heaviest raid of the war on Berlin, Bremen and Hamburg. Nine enemy planes shot down at night over Britain.*

MAR. 14—*Germans attacked Clyde and Merseyside, eleven raiders shot down. R.A.F. raided Rotterdam, Hamburg and Emden.*

MAR. 15—*Mr. Roosevelt broadcast speech pledging fullest aid to Britain. Germans bombed London; R.A.F. bombed Dusseldorf.*

MAR. 16—*Mr. Bevin announced registration for conscription to industrial work of men of 41-45, women of 20-21. Germany not satisfied with Yugoslav offer to sign non-aggression pact, demanded concessions considered incompatible with neutrality. French have agreed to allow America to supervise distribution of food allowed through blockade by British.*

MAR. 17—*British have taken Berbera, in British Somaliland. Yugoslavia will sign non-aggression pact with Germany.*

MAR. 18—*2,300 dead and injured after raids on Merseyside and Clydeside (March 12-14).*

Professor Noel Hall, a Director of the Ministry of Economic Warfare, has been appointed to take charge of the economic warfare work at the British Embassy in Washington.

German submarine reported off the U.S. coast.

"The Bank is only Made of Men"

"And now the squatting men stood up angrily. Grampa took up the land, and he had to kill Indians and drive them away. And Pa was born here and he killed weeds and snakes. Then a bad year came and he had to borrow a little money. An' we was born here. There in the door—our children born here. And Pa had to borrow money. The bank owned the land then, but we stayed and we got a little bit of what we raised.

"We know that—all that. It's not us, it's the bank. A bank isn't like a man... That's the monster.

"Sure, cried the tenant men, but it's our land. We measured it and broke it up. We were born on it, and we got killed on it, died on it. Even if it's no good it's still ours. That's what makes it ours—being born on it, working it, dying on it. That makes ownership, not a paper with numbers on it.

"We're sorry. It's not us. It's the monster. The bank isn't like a man.

"Yes, but the bank is only made of men.

"No, you're wrong there, quite wrong there. The bank is something else than men. It happens that every man in the bank hates what the bank does, and yet the bank does it. The bank is something more than men, I tell you. It's the monster. Men made it, but they can't control it."

—From "The Grapes of Wrath," by John Steinbeck.

NEW WAYS OF HOUSEKEEPING

By B. M. PALMER

It seems that the people of Croydon do not like the expression "Communal Feeding Centre" and the title "Civic Restaurant" is to be used.

Here is a specimen balance sheet of a communal feeding centre, taken from the *Sunday Express*:

"If 200 people pay for meals per day a centre should cover running expenses. It would work out as follows:

| Takings: | £ | s. | d. |
|--|----|----|----|
| 150 adults a day at 8d. | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 50 children a day at 4d. | 0 | 16 | 8 |
| Total daily takings | 5 | 16 | 8 |
| Total weekly takings with Saturday at £2 | 31 | 3 | 4 |

| Expenditure: | £ | s. | d. |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Cost of food | 23 | 13 | 4 |
| Wages: | | | |
| Supervisor | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| Cook | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Daily woman | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Fuel | | 15 | 0 |
| TOTAL expenditure | 28 | 18 | 4 |

NET profit 1 5 0

"In country districts, where wages are lower and voluntary workers more plentiful, the wages bill is reckoned to be: Cook £2, daily woman 15s., which, with voluntary supervisor, shows profit of £4.

"Both estimates (from actual working conditions) presuppose free premises with light. Profit goes to repaying the Food Ministry's loan of £200 for starting the centre and for replacements.

"In addition to paid staff a scheme like the above requires two assistant cooks, two counter helpers and two for cleaning up."

Those of us who have passed the winter near any heavily bombed areas are relieved that the storm has been weathered with less misery, disorganisation and disease than at first seemed possible.

The credit is due to large numbers of self-effacing men and women, whose names will never be known, but whose sane common sense has been the major factor in civilian morale. The people had to be fed—the civic restaurants (for that is what they should be), were

the reply, and there is no doubt they are doing the job well. This has to be said, and I want to lay stress upon it, because there has been a tendency to overlook the fact that something had to be done as quickly as possible for a homeless population.

But at what a price is it done! We find from the balance sheet that the municipality provide the premises and lighting free of cost, and that at least six voluntary helpers are needed, whose job is no sinecure. The wages of the supervisor and cook are meagre in the extreme, and cannot be said to cover more than out of pocket expenses. And some supervisors accept responsibility with no salary.

Such is the system under which we are living and fighting this war—commercial exploitation. The people are getting good food at a low price, which, of course, is their right as citizens; but the voluntary helpers are exploited, the small restaurant which cannot compete goes out of business, and lastly the ratepayers must foot the bill for overheads, premises and light, and are responsible in the long run, for all that is done.

If only people could be brought to see that this exploitation of their own power to do work, which is the only thing they can call their own, is definitely against the best interests of the community! Surely the labourer is worthy of his hire—this is another of those precepts to which the Church turns a deaf ear and a blind eye. Look at the whole edifice of voluntary charity, built up on free service—its result is to alleviate the lot of the world of underdogs, and to aid and abet the state in sapping the spirit of independence of its members. The civic restaurants are an extension of organised charity, supported by the ratepayers.

The Food Minister is of course, delighted, for several reasons. He thinks the scheme is going on for a long time, and will be definitely extended. The £200 grant to start the centre is repayable by the organisers over a period of five years.

The next step is the Thirty House scheme, according to the *Sunday Express*:

"An experiment shortly to be carried out by the Ministry of Food to introduce communal feeding to better-class homes. The basic idea is to have 30 houses in a street or road band together for the chief meal of the day.

"Instead of 30 women shopping, 30 women preparing food, cooking it, serving it, and cleaning up afterwards, the idea aims at telescoping the 30 efforts into one.

"Every road its own restaurant is the motto.

"It will not be carried out easily. The people behind it realise that. They know they have to fight a mighty array of snobberies and idiosyncrasies.

"Unneighbourliness, gastronomic likes and dislikes, break-up of family life, arranging supplies of crockery and cutlery, fixing a common mealtime, private entertaining, and a score of other things—some petty, some important—all figure in the list of objections to the scheme.

"The experimenters will try to show that these things are out-weighted by the saving of time, fuel, labour, and money, and above all by the ending of the tyranny of the kitchen and the exacting demands it makes on the housewife every mealtime."

The enormous difficulties that would be created by such an attempt, and the tremendous loss of privacy involved seem to me to brand this scheme as what it really is, an attack on family life and individuality. The Ministry of Health is relying on a "pooling of resources"—see what is said concerning cutlery and china—and is hoping for the enthusiasm of well-meaning idealists to put it over. I do not think it has the least chance of success, if I know anything about husbands. There are, of course, some women who talk about the tyranny of the kitchen, but the tyranny is usually lack of money and conveniences.

Miss Clementina Black's *New Way of Housekeeping* of which the "Thirty House Scheme" seems to be a travesty was published in 1918 by W. Collins & Sons and is now out of print. In view of the present tendencies the

following passage from her book merits attention:—

"But,—and this point I believe to be crucial—our reconstructed house-keeping must still remain in our own hands. We must not allow the control of a business so intimately connected with our personal lives to be carried on and regulated at the will and for the profit of any outside people.

"We must seek the best possible expert advice, we must choose the most highly skilled persons to work under us; but they must work *under* us, be responsible to us, and be liable to discharge if they do not suit us.

"Better a hundred times to grub on in discomfort as we do now than allow benevolent people or 'business people' to determine what, when and how we shall eat, who shall serve us, and what hours we shall keep.

"Docile, dangerously docile, as English people have of late shown themselves, any system of reconstruction that actually took their homes out of their own hands would assuredly be brought to failure by their passive resistance."

But of course the feminists, who

are nearly all Socialists with strong communists leanings, have always wanted to get women out of the home, into the office and factory. They have always advocated communal nurseries for babies while the mothers were at work, and the mass production of home necessaries and luxuries, because the home-made articles "compete with industry." It seems that we are all existing in order to support industry. But if you lay down as a fundamental that no one shall have a right to the necessities of existence unless he or she sells his or her labour, you arrive at all sorts of absurd and unnatural conclusions and in the end, you have a nation of wage-slaves. This is the idea of the feminists. They are always talking of the tyranny of the kitchen, but you never hear them mention the tyranny of the factory or office.

In a radio address the other night one of our lion tamers said that women were exhibiting a strange reluctance "to come forward" into factory life, and he repeated the promise that communal nurseries or minders would be provided for the children. Considering that there are still 500 thousand unemployed, and

many more making marks on little pieces of paper, it seems rather strange to drag a lot of young women out of their homes and start another department of experts with more people making marks on pieces of paper, in order to have communal nurseries. But perhaps the nurseries are wanted rather than the winning of the war. Many months ago Lady Astor said the mother was only necessary to the child during the first year.

"A new world must be built through a world war."

However these things do not worry me unduly; when they are tried we can count on the natural reaction to unnatural conditions. There is always a risk but I think the risk is worth while. Experience is the best, perhaps the only, teacher.

Meanwhile I think it would be a good idea to know something about the private lives of our lion-tamers. I'd like to know the size of their incomes, the number of their children, how they were educated, in fact, what *qualifications* they have for all this damned interference with everything.

PARLIAMENT

QUALIFICATION OF M.P.'s FOR POSTS IN GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE

March 4, 1941.

Oral Answers (31 columns)

EMPIRE BASES (LEASE, UNITED STATES).

Mr. Stokes asked the Prime Minister whether His Majesty's Government intended to carry through the transfer of land in the Colonies and the completion of the terms in connection with the leasing of naval bases to the United States of America, without first referring to Parliament?

The Lord Privy Seal (Mr. Attlee): I would invite attention to the Reply which I gave to the first part of the Question asked by the hon. Member on 3rd December, which applies equally to questions arising out of the leasing of the areas referred to as to the leasing of any further areas for naval or military bases.

Mr. Stokes: Are we to understand that the Government feel free to dispose

of British Colonial possessions without reference to this House? Is the Lord Privy Seal aware of the genuine concern felt by the inhabitants of some of these possessions at the clandestine way in which their revised constitution has been dealt with?

Mr. Attlee: In reply to the second part of the supplementary question, the answer is "No." In reply to the first part, I can only refer the hon. Member to the answer I have given.

Mr. Stokes: I beg to give notice, in view of the very unsatisfactory nature of the replies I have had on this subject, that I shall raise the matter at the earliest possible moment.

HOUSE OF COMMONS DIS-QUALIFICATION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) BILL

(69 columns)

Considered in Committee.

CLAUSE 1.—(Prevention of dis-qualification.)

Mr. Lewis (Colchester): I beg to move, in page 1, line 5, to leave out "First Lord of the Treasury," and to insert:

"Committee of Privileges of the Commons House of Parliament."...

I would ask that the Attorney-General should tell us definitely what is in the mind of the Government with regard to the presentation of these certificates and the particular procedure that would follow. I ask whether the certificate would be debatable and, if so, how a Debate would arise.

The Attorney-General (Sir Donald Somervell):... He asked what is the purpose of the Government in putting into the Bill this provision as to a certificate. In the first place, it will be noted that the certificate has to state not only that the appointment is required in the public interest, but also that it is for

purposes connected with the prosecution of the war. Those words were inserted in order to make it clear that the Government did not intend and had no desire to use this power except for a purpose connected with the prosecution of the war. . . .

Mr. Lewis: In view of the statement made by the Attorney-General, I beg to ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lewis: I beg to move, in page 1, line 5, at the end, to insert:

"owing to the fact that no-one else with suitable qualifications is available." . . .

. . . The Prime Minister seemed to take the view—if I am correct in this matter it appears to be extremely serious—that it is desirable in war-time to get as many Members of Parliament as possible away from their ordinary duties. He used these words:

"There are many traditions which justify the desire of the Government to find useful employment for hon. Members."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 27th February 1941; col. 733, Vol. 369.]

The most useful employment for the ordinary Member of this House is his duties as a Member of Parliament. It is very unfortunate that the Prime Minister took the line that he did upon that point, and if it is to be the basis of the Government's policy, it may lead to very undesirable—perhaps, indeed ultimately dangerous—consequences. We are often reminded, when the Government come to ask us for exceptional powers, that we retain in this House the ultimate responsibility and, the ultimate power. That seems to make rather important the question of who remains in the House. Over 100 Members are serving in the Armed Forces of the Crown, and many of them find it difficult to attend important Debates. If they were serving overseas, they could not attend. . . .

. . . The Press to-day is so regulated that this House is the only place in which public opinion can be brought with any force to bear upon the Government of the day. If that force is to be effective, it is essential that there should be present in this House a large majority who are not Ministers, Under-Secretaries, private secretaries or others connected with the Government. What is happening to-day is that that proportion is being steadily reduced. Take the case which is the immediate cause of this Bill. If the right hon. Gentleman is sent to Canada, at first sight it would

seem that we should lose a Minister. We should not. If another Member is appointed in his place, what happens is that by his going to Canada we lose, not a Minister, but a private Member. If the policy is to be followed of seeking room for a Member of Parliament, where—to use the Prime Minister's expression—useful work can be found for him to do, and if that process does not stop, circumstances might arise where we should find the majority of Members holding office under the Crown or intimately connected with the Government. That would be very undesirable and might be a source of danger. . . .

. . . We see all over Europe our embassies being closed because of the war, and people with the right kind of experience and capacity without employment. Is it suggested that not one of those would have the qualities sufficient to fit him for the position of High Commissioner in Canada? Is it that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ross and Cromarty is the only or, indeed, the best man to fill that post? We should bear that distinction in mind. I do not say for a moment that he cannot do the job perfectly well. I have no doubt that he will make a success of it, but it is absurd to suggest that he is the only man who can do so or that it was necessary to come to the House to find anyone to fill the appointment. I would urge the Government, if they resist this Amendment, at any rate to give up the idea that it is their job to seek employment outside the House to occupy the time of Members, and that they should regard the Bill simply as a permissive Measure to enable them to make use of a Member's capacity in some exceptional post.

Earl Winterton: I believe that it is now the practice of a large number of members of the public, being unable to obtain any accurate report of Parliament in the Press by reason of the curtailment of space owing to the war, to buy the OFFICIAL REPORT. I hope that, if they do so, they will read the speech which has just been delivered by my hon. Friend opposite. It is of great, and almost of historic, importance. . . . But my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister has suggested that in war-time, at any rate, it should be the object of the Government to co-operate in endeavouring to find positions outside this House for Members of Parliament. That is a completely wrong principle. There may be exceptional cases where it might be justified. . . . I deplore the

suggestion that it is the duty either of the Government to appoint, or of Members of Parliament to seek, work for the Crown outside this House in time of war, with the sole exception of service in the Armed Forces of the Crown. . . .

Sir P. Harris: I should like to endorse what has just been said by my noble Friend about the speech we had just previously heard. With the gist of his arguments I think the whole Committee will agree, namely, that the main duty of a Member of Parliament is to attend to his duties in this House. . . .

Mr. Bevan: I should not be in the least worried if the Amendment was carried and did impose such strict limitations upon the Prime Minister's powers that only in very exceptional cases indeed would he be able to issue his certificate, because I think the House last week wanted him to use his powers only in very exceptional circumstances. I very much regret the speech which the Prime Minister made on Second Reading about the House of Commons. I think the House was stamped by a cacophony of rotund Churchillisms which made up one of the most unfortunate speeches I have ever heard fall from the lips of the Prime Minister. In some of its passages I think it was a disgraceful speech. No one who is proud of our Parliamentary institutions could possibly have listened to some of its generalisations without a sense of shame. They could only have been uttered by Lord North or somebody like that who was intending to buy the House of Commons in order to carry some particular Measure.

Sir. I. Albery: Lord North was far
(continued on page 9).

THE PRESS BAN ON PARLIAMENT

Compiled and edited by
JOHN MITCHELL

(includes as a separate section:
What 'Capital Levy' Means to You
by C. H. DOUGLAS)

PRICE 1/6 net.

(Postage on single copies 2½d. extra.)

from—

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

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:
12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.
Telephone: Bank 5260.

Vol. 6. No. 2.

Saturday, March 22, 1941.

HITLER PUTS THE RATES UP

Herr Hitler has bombed our big cities, spreading murder and destruction. He has pulled down much of our property in rather a messy fashion, and imposed on us at intervals a sort of living nightmare to remind us that what the imagination and ingenuity of the American can encompass on the screen in a 'super-colossal' film can also be compassed in living flesh. In response he has evoked resentment, a number of ribald jokes and a determination to get him where we want him.

And amongst other effects that Hitler has produced, he has inflamed the problem of rates to an extent that demands a radical solution.

Is that solution to be one in favour of the financial institutions that hold municipal debt and which are the rival competitors with Hitler for the dictatorship of this country?

Or is it to be one more fitting to a nation fighting for freedom, one which will free Mr. Smith, Mr. Jones and Mr. Robinson to devote all their initiative to the thing they most want to do at the moment—getting rid of Hitler? It is obvious that while Mr. Smith and his friends are willing to accept dangers and discomforts with their customary calm, they cannot be expected to put up with unnecessary and artificial burdens as well. "I could do that with my hands tied behind my back!" is a traditional boast, but when your life depends on your success it is better to have your hands free.

It is the large towns that have suffered most because they contain a high proportion of the essential war factories and other items known as 'military objectives,' including compact areas of little houses.

In London, Birmingham, Manchester, Cardiff and other large towns, the rate levied has produced far less revenue, as many houses have been closed, their owners moving to the country, houses and shops have been demolished and partly demolished, and office blocks have gone out of occupation. On the other hand, with A.R.P. and other services the demands on the local authority for service are considerably greater.

That is the problem facing councillors in big cities: London (which has reduced its rate by 6d.) and Coventry (maintains the same figure) are presuming that the government will bear a very large part of the cost of replacing air-raid damage. To budget for Coventry to rebuild its damage it would be necessary to put 6s. on the rate. Cardiff has raised its rates by 10d. and Birmingham by 2s. at a time when the small man's ability to pay is going down. Big factories are de-rated, so that the increased rate falls on the small retail shopkeeper on top of compulsory stock insurance, insurance of premises and plant against war damage, limitation of supplies, and, of course, increases in almost all their general expenses. This in turn is passed to the consumer through prices: a few years ago the rate percentage represented in the retail price of the article sold was 5 per cent. It would now be more.

Representations that losses of rate income in bombed cities and towns should be accepted by the Government as a national liability were made to the Minister of Health by Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, Coventry, Liverpool, Manchester, Portsmouth, Sheffield and Southampton. The reply was that financial assistance from the Govern-

ment would only be forthcoming when a local authority could prove that it was on the edge of bankruptcy; and then it would be necessary to submit estimates for expenditure for scrutiny by Ministry officials and to accept the Government ruling upon the exercise of economies, the levying of higher rates and the utilisation of reserves.

Faced with this challenge in Birmingham, some members of the City Council, and even some members of the Finance Committee of the same council, suggested that the city should budget for a financial deficit rather than impose extra burdens on the rate-payers.

The solution that will at once not only stabilise the rates but cut them, is for the financial institutions that hold the larger part of Municipal debt to bear more of the losses. As their holdings were mainly bought by means of costlessly created credit, they have already made huge profits, and it is high time that they shared in the 'equality of sacrifice' that they are so anxious to force on the individual.

E. S. E.

MISUSE OF B.B.C. TALKS

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson is to ask the Minister of Information in the House of Commons:—

Whether he is aware of the injury to our united war effort arising out of the propagation on the British Broadcasting Corporation, in war-time, of highly controversial political doctrines which many men and women are unwilling to receive; whether he is aware of the growing misuse for this purpose of the religious talks, preceding the 8 a.m. news, by anonymous speakers claiming the support of high authority in the Churches for their views; and whether he will take power to control this abuse of public confidence.

CAPITAL LEVITES

After the war of 1914-18 "the New Jerusalem" was a common phrase for the better world still being promised and the capital levy a much-touted method of bringing it about.

Mr. Eric Linklater interrupted a boring speaker at a meeting on these subjects:

"Is your New Jerusalem to be exclusively inhabited by Capital Levites?"

This Peace Aim Talk

MR. R. R. STOKES, M.P., *Socialist and Moralist*

By John Mitchell

Certain groups of people, mostly of a socialistic turn of mind, are pressing the Government to declare a statement of war and/or peace aims. Among these people is to be found Mr. R. R. Stokes, M.P., whose activities in Parliament have been frequently reported in this journal and which have probably earned for him the goodwill of all our readers. Mr. Stokes has distinguished himself in the eyes of realists for his attitude in Parliament towards the Government's monetary policy. Judged by Social Credit standards his criticisms have been incomplete, but compared with the efforts of his colleagues they have been refreshing. But Mr. Stokes is a Socialist and like all Socialists he is a moralist.

The immediate cause of these remarks is two leaflets; one of which, entitled *Peace Aims*, is issued by a group styled the "Parliamentary Peace Aims Group" of which he is hon. secretary, and the other, which does not name its publisher, but is in the same style and is signed "Dick Stokes," has the title *Why Don't We Tell The Germans What We Mean?* and the sub-title, *The kind of leaflet which should be dropped over Germany.* The *Peace Aims* leaflet advocates unadulterated Socialism—the "profit motive" in industry is to be abolished (evidently it is thought that people will work in order to make a loss) and no individual is to own any capital or land (the "State" is to own it all). Eight reasons are given why it is said to be necessary for the Government to make an immediate statement of these "broad Peace Aims." One alleges it "would shorten the war" and another says it "would give encouragement and hope to the peoples of the invaded countries."

The other leaflet (to be dropped over Germany) offers the Germans all that the Socialists made such a fussy protest about when Hitler took possession of it without consulting them—Austria (if Austria agrees), the Sudeten Lands and the Polish Corridor. This sort of propaganda, says Dick Stokes, will "drive a wedge between Hitler and the Germans by showing that Hitler has lied to them" and will show them that "we are not out to destroy Germany."

In a "Symposium of Peace Aims under the General Editorship of William Teeling" published in 1940 and entitled *After the War*, Mr. Stokes is one of fourteen essayists. Here Mr. Stokes the moralist makes his appearance. He tells us about "the ideal peace aims which we all *should* desire" and "the main points which *ought* to form the foundation for peace at home and abroad." It appears that Mr. Stokes believes that people desire things which he thinks they should not desire and that they must conform to his will. Then, suppose the designer of the Spitfire had been a moralist like Mr. Stokes and had gone to work to design something which he thought *ought* to form, instead of trying to discover what *does* form the foundation of a good fighter, what sort of plane would have been produced? Mr. Stokes does not say: "what is physically possible is financially possible." He says: "What is morally right is economically possible." God was content with the natural order. It is the natural order which determines what is and what

is not a good fighter. As the Archbishop of York recently pointed out it is the "reversal of the natural order which is characteristic of our phase of civilisation" and that our object must be "to reverse that reversal" if the people are to achieve what *they* desire. But Mr. Stokes is not content with the natural order; he wants some abstraction called a "moral order." He thinks that the "neutral" countries are more "moral" than those who are fighting to defend their freedom. Otherwise why does he advocate that Great Britain should give up *the power* to defend her independence and sovereignty:—

"...Multilateral disarmament by the Powers in Europe so that never again may this hideous slaughter break out. Such disarmament will inevitably take time, but as a gesture of goodwill all nations concerned will immediately hand over the effective material fighting strength of their air forces to a selected neutral or neutrals."

Among Mr. Stokes's co-essayists are the chairman of the Federal Union Club, the Earl of Rosse, the General Secretary of the Fabian Society, John Parker, M.P. and Sir Richard Acland. There are also a number of Conservative M.P.'s. Even these people are inclined towards the Federation idea. But they are guided to some extent by reality. Captain Alan Graham, M.P. is ignorant of the economic causes of war and the possibilities of modern production methods and he is in favour of a Franco-British Union and other regional federations, but he is capable of making the following statement of fact, which conflicts curiously with Mr. Stokes's proposals:

"Smaller units of government also give far greater scope for the development of the individual as a conscious political man and critic than do huge political units. The inner tragedy of the German people since the days of Bismarck is their incredible facility for submitting to the yoke of any ruler, no matter how unscrupulous, and for supporting his every action, no matter how criminal, with blind obedience, until, like the gadarene swine, he and they all rush over the steep place into ruin and, so long as they remain a large unit, their impetus is such as to drag all Europe down with them. Unlike the British and French peoples they are not used to the exercise of political liberty over a long period, and cannot therefore criticise or control their rulers. Therefore, until they can do so, they must be rendered innocuous to the rest of Europe. This can only be done by smashing for ever the control over the German soul of the Prussian, now Nazi, idea."

The correctness of this view of the German character is established by historical events and is well supported by the evidence adduced in the broadcasts by Sir Robert Vansittart published under the title *Black Record*:

"It would be an interesting study," says Sir Robert, "to compare in detail the Kaiser's Germany with Hitler's, and to show how Nazism is not an aberration but an outcome. The similarities are so numerous that I have no time for all of them..."

There is a great deal of irresponsible talk on this question of war and peace aims. No one but a fool would suggest that the people of this country are participating in the war aimlessly. They are engaged in a fight to prevent someone imposing his will on them. They know that they have an enemy employing military means to impose his will on them, and their war aim *is* to prevent this enemy doing this and to deprive him of the power to do so. That is something obvious to everyone; it does not need to be embodied in a Government proclamation. Many people in this country also suspect, and with reason, that *an* enemy is doing his utmost to take advantage of the conditions brought about by the military war to impose *his* aims upon the British people by other than military means. In this other war the aims of the British people, consciously or unconsciously, *are* to prevent this enemy achieving his aims and to deprive him of the power to do so. This is a matter of the personal aims of each individual and of the character of the person holding them, his will-power and the knowledge he possesses. This personal aim (how can it be other than personal?) is a matter of inclination. Neither

it, the individual's will-power, nor his character will be affected by any statement of war aims. It will be affected only by the addition or suppression of knowledge about matters related to its achievement. Mr. Stokes's aims are to deprive the individual of the ownership of land and capital and to enlarge the area of government so that the individual has less control over it. If these aims were adopted by the Government and put into effect the individual would have lost the undeclared war, because someone else's will would have been imposed on him, and his will to win the military war would be weakened.

Governments of any description can have only one aim in war or peace which is basically acceptable to the people, and that is to serve them; and broadly, people get the government they deserve. Peace aims will in reality be decided by what the people *do* to make *their* aims effective, or what they do *not* do; and *what they do will be affected by their consciousness of what is possible and their consciousness of their power to achieve what they want.* No statement of aims by the Government now or at any time will affect this.

DOLLARS TO DOUGHNUTS

A Canadian correspondent writes of the situation:—

"Mackenzie King, whom Abie describes as the King of Ottawa, is broadcasting on behalf of the appeal for loans 'Bonds to give us Freedom' (not his title—an advt.)—curious combination. We are betting dollars to doughnuts he will not remember his election pledge that 'Usury once in control will wreck any nation.' His admission that he gave in to Ilesley, the Finance man, regarding the Sirois Report shows what a jellyfish nature he has. One of our people asked him why he did not make good his promise to control credit and currency. His reply was, 'We do the best we can.'"

REPORT ON EVACUATION

Extracted from the Cardiff Education (War Emergency) Sub-Committee Minutes, February 7, 1941.

The Director of Education reported as follows:—

"An Enquiry Form was issued through the Head Teachers to the parents of all children attending Cardiff Schools on the question of the evacuation of school children over five years of age from the City to other areas, and a Parents' meeting was held at each school. . . .

"The total number of children, viz.:—8,520 for evacuation compared with the total registers of 32,530 produces a percentage of 26.19 per cent. . . .

"On examination of the areas which

were bombed in the "Blitz" the percentage of evacuation desired by the parents is not higher than in the other districts of the City. . . .

"... It would appear therefore that no single area could be said to desire evacuation as a special request, and also the census established the non-desire of a majority of parents for the evacuation of school children."

THE NEW CATHEDRAL

A refreshing realism was shown in a recent talk on the future of Coventry Cathedral by the Provost of Coventry who pictured the new Cathedral as a big building combining the beauty of the old design with something new expressing this age, and gathering into it all the beauty of the past.

He said that the rebuilding will begin after the war, when there is enough money available, but he had no idea as to the cost. He was not an economist; but at the end of the war there will be heaps of muscle and skill, and the building will be erected not by money but by men. He had sufficient faith in the imagination and latent powers of Englishmen to believe that they will build a more beautiful Coventry Cathedral, and that it will have a wonderful future.

SIMPLICITY

"Simplicity, then, paradoxically is the outward sign and symbol of depth of thought. It seems to me simplicity is about the most difficult thing to achieve in scholarship and writing. How diffi-

cult is clarity of thought, and yet it is only as thought becomes clear that simplicity is possible. When we see a writer belabouring an idea we may be sure that the idea is belabouring him . . . What is involved in the progress from technicality to simplicity, from the specialist to the thinker, is essentially a process that I compare strictly to metabolism. No learned scholar can present to us his specialised knowledge in simple human terms until he has digested that knowledge himself and brought it into relation with his observations of life. Between the hours of his arduous pursuit of knowledge (let us say the psychological knowledge of William James), I feel there is many a 'pause that refreshes,' like a cool drink after a long fatiguing journey. In that pause many a truly human specialist will ask himself the all-important question 'What on earth am I talking about?' Simplicity presupposes digestion and also maturity: as we grow older our thoughts become clearer, insignificant and perhaps false aspects of a question are lopped off and cease to disturb us, ideas take on more definite shapes and long trains of thought gradually shape themselves into a convenient formula which suggests itself to us one fine morning, and we arrive at that true luminosity of knowledge which is called wisdom. There is no longer a sense of effort, and truth becomes simple to understand because it becomes clear, and the reader gets that supreme pleasure of feeling that truth itself is simple and its formulation natural."

—From "The Importance of Living" by Lin Yutang.

Parliament (Continued from page five).

too frightened of the House of Commons.

Mr. Bevan: And the right hon. Gentleman, I hope, will have increasing reason to be afraid of this House. Many people seem to forget that the liberties which we are now supposed to be defending were never won against a foreign foe—although they might be lost to a foreign foe—but by civil strife, inside and outside this House. The Prime Minister seemed to me on Thursday to have insulted a very large number of Members of this House... he said that the House was rising once more in the public esteem because a larger and larger proportion of Members hold offices of profit under the Crown.

...I hope that there will emerge in this House a far greater spirit of independence than has been shown in the last 12 to 18 months... It is becoming, not less, but increasingly difficult for independently-minded Members to state their point of view, and to exert influence upon the Executive. Such space as the public Press is able to give to the Debates is almost invariably devoted to the reporting of the official speeches. The criticisms passed upon the Government, although those criticisms represent the views of millions of people outside, do not get any publicity at all. At the same time, the critics are unable to mobilise and focus pressure of public opinion upon the Executive, because means of communication are entirely cut off. This is rather a dangerous situation. An anti-toxin can be found only in increasing vigilance by hon. Members in attendance, and in a loosening of the bonds of party allegiance. I have suggested more than once in the House that the only way that we can correct this unwholesome condition is for the Government to be compelled more and more to collect its majorities from free discussion and free votes in the House... I think it would be a tragedy, and a disgrace to our people, if we allowed the observations of the Prime Minister on Thursday to pass unchallenged, and allowed it to be assumed that the latter part of that speech represents our idea of constitutional government in this country.

Mr. Maxton:... I was interested in the Second Reading Debate from far off, but my first knowledge of what has taken place was not from the newspapers. It was through the wireless, and all that I gathered from it was that

the Prime Minister had made a brilliant speech and that the Second Reading had been carried without a Division.

Mr. Bevan: That sort of thing always happens.

Mr. Maxton: I think that was a shocking thing. Hon. Members have talked about newspapers not being able to give a show, but surely an organ of State like the British Broadcasting Corporation could have said that dissent was entered by certain Members, if only to give us an indication—

Earl Winterton: I think all of us in all parts of the House might well co-operate and have this scandal ended. It is not the first time that it has happened.

Mr. Maxton: The other point I wanted to make was this: I was shocked on reading the newspapers to learn that the Prime Minister was making this a matter of confidence. I agree that the Prime Minister had the right at some point to ask all his supporters in the House for a greater loyalty than he had been having. I do not agree, and never have agreed, with being in an in-the-Government and out-of-it position. My position, and that of my hon. Friends, has been quite clear from the start; we are outside, and I only regret that through my absence on the Second Reading there was no Division; there would have been if I had been here... I shall support the Amendment if the hon. Member for Colchester (Mr. Lewis) presses it to a Division, and if he does not do so, I hope that some other Amendment on the Order Paper in the names of other Government supporters will be pressed to a Division.

Mr. Granville (Eye): There is growing up in the House of Commons a tendency, which has shown itself throughout this Debate, to regard the House of Commons as superficial, to regard the House of Commons as being unimportant during war. One hon. Gentleman opposite said that it was the place where the Prime Minister required a sounding board, with big battalions to come and cheer when necessary, and then to go away and be good boys in the meantime. I have heard it said that the Mother of Parliaments has become an old woman. I have heard it said by Government supporters and even by hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House that during a war you do not want Debates... if Parliament is a

reality in time of war, if you believe in democracy, if you believe in the working of democracy, if you believe in free government as represented in this House of Commons, then you ought to debate the great issues of war. During the Debate on man-power on 22nd January, the Prime Minister said:

"I think I have said before that to try to carry on a war, a tremendous war, without the aid and guidance of the House of Commons would be a superhuman task. I have never taken the view that the Debates and criticisms of this House are a drag and a burden. Far from it. I may not agree with all the criticism—I may be stunned by it, and I may resent it; I may even retort—but at any rate, Debates on these large issues are of the very greatest value to the life-thrust of the nation, and they are of great assistance to His Majesty's Government."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 22nd January, 1940; col. 257, Vol. 368.]

Therefore, if I say that some of the recent activities of the House of Commons have made one wonder whether democracy is going to function, it is because, when we are pressing for a Debate on the vital issue of food production... we are told there is no time before Easter, although we get up at an early hour after discussing Scottish land drainage.

I personally give 100 per cent. loyalty to the Prime Minister. I do not care whether it pleases him or not; I am stating my view on behalf of my constituents...

There has been a wide discussion in Committee, and I am merely trying to adduce the argument that an extension of the appointment of these ex-Ministers, or even of Members of Parliament, is weakening the effectiveness of Parliament in fighting for democracy. I am not pleading that there should be any alternative, but that there should be no great extension of these powers once the Bill has received a Third Reading. The hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Pickthorn) gave a long description of what he thought the function of Parliament was. He said it was something with which to measure the Prime Minister's stock. I believe that the function of Parliament is to represent the people. It is the authority of the people behind any Government. I do not believe it should be any of the things which the hon. Gentleman described. In this Bill we may be giving away something which our forefathers fought for during hundreds of years. If you do not believe in the working of democracy, be honest

and say so; but if you do believe in democracy, you cannot shelve it in time of war, and hope to bring it out just as it was. . . .

In a total war, Parliament is or should be the political front-line. If there is one lesson from this war which affects democracy, it is the lesson, "Do not destroy the power of Parliament." In giving this Bill a Third Reading we shall be doing something which is revolutionary in the democratic practice of this country. We may be taking away the foundation stone of representative government. We may damage the structure in that process. For my part, I think that this House of Commons should at all costs guard our institutions of democracy. We are the last bulwark of free government. This Parliament is the voice of democracy, which should be heard by millions. I believe that if democracy is worth fighting for, it is also worth preserving in the process.

Mr. Cocks (Broxtowe): . . . The Attorney-General will no doubt remember the great speech, delivered to electors of Bristol, by Edmund Burke on the position of a Member of Parliament, in which he proclaimed the independence of Members of Parliament and declared that Members were here as representatives and not as delegates. In that speech he also defined our duties to our constituencies. He said:

"It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions to theirs; and, above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own."

I fail to see how these high and arduous duties, this "strictest union," this "closest correspondence" and this "most unreserved communication" can be carried out if the waste of the wild Atlantic rolls between a Member and his unfortunate constituency somewhere in the North of Scotland. But these defects of the Bill—and there are many—seem to me to pale into insignificance and, in the words of the author of the "Young Visitors," to be "piffle before the wind," when compared with the brilliance and glory of the appointment which rendered it necessary. It has been said in the Press that Members of the Labour party have been animated by personal or political prejudice against the right hon. Gentleman in question. Surely there never was a more grotesque suggestion

than that. . . . Nobody has ever said that about the sudden rise of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ross and Cromarty (Mr. M. MacDonald). We always knew that his position was not due to any family influence; we always knew that his promotion was due to his native brilliance, which had never before been adequately recognised outside his family circle. We knew it must be there, or he would not be where he was placed. We admired his swift rise to power as we admire the ascent of a rocket, and when he comes back from Canada with his breast glittering, like Goering's, with decorations, we shall admire the rocket's stars. We have watched his career with interest, we have admired the masterly way in which this statesman handed over British naval bases to Ireland, and although he received little popularity for that feat in this country, I am sure that any little thing of that sort he might do in Canada will gain for him greater popularity in the New World than he has ever achieved in the Old. Again, in considering this Bill, I admire very greatly the ingenious way in which the Prime Minister one by one is getting rid of what are called the "Munichers." One by one they are all departing—

"All, all are gone, the old familiar faces." One is presiding at the Old Bailey, instead of standing in the dock, another is sitting upon the Woolsack, a third has gone off across the Bay of Biscay to Madrid, and now a fourth has booked his passage to Canada—the latest play-boy of the Western World. It is true that most of them, although they have left us, have gone to take up remunerative appointments. They have fallen politically, but they have fallen on velvet. That is the Prime Minister's way. . . .

March 6.

Written Answers (20 columns).

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (RE-GROUPING).

Mr. Emery asked the Minister of Health whether steps will now be taken to re-group the boundaries and areas of adjoining local authorities so as to facilitate post-war reconstruction of districts that have suffered war damage?

Mr. E. Brown: No, Sir. I do not think this House or the localities concerned would regard the re-grouping of areas as practicable or desirable under present conditions. It is a matter which can only be dealt with in the light of post-war circumstances.

SUPPLY: ARMY ESTIMATES.

(75 columns).

Mr. Turton (Thirsk and Malton): I should like to pay my tribute to the very great speech which we had from the Secretary of State, especially his description of the victorious campaign of General Wavell in Africa and his account of the training that is going on in this country. . . . For some months I was an adjutant of a battalion in this country and in France. I served in the administration in the General Headquarters of the British Army in France. I served in the administration of the War Office here, and for the last six months I have been serving in the administration in a division. Those are my references.

After that experience of 18 months in the war, my conviction is that no civilian business could possibly be run on Army lines without going bankrupt in a very short time. The amount of paper, of time and man-power that is wasted fill me with tremendous alarm. To-day we have an Army which, in training and fighting is absolutely magnificent, but yet we are detracting from its value by making officers and men undergo Civil Service methods and red tape that binds them up throughout the whole of their Army career. I therefore very greatly welcome the small crumb of comfort which the Secretary of State held out regarding the Standing Committee for Administration which, he said, was practising decentralisation. This problem is one in which we have to adopt not the old methods of committee inquiry, but revolutionary methods if we are to solve the very real problem which exists in the Army.

I shall give the House three cases, which have to be anonymous, but which are true cases which at any time I could show to the Secretary of State as evidence of what I mean by this waste of time. A postal order was sent to a paymaster before Dunkirk. That was in June. The battalion later wrote to the paymaster, who said he had never received it, and it did not in fact arrive. The paymaster decided that authority must be sought to write it off. The battalion thereupon wrote to the brigade, the brigade had to write to the division, the division had to write to the command, and it was not until November that that postal order for £1 11s. had been written off at a cost far exceeding the sum involved.

There was another case just after Dunkirk of a warrant officer who had not proved himself a sufficient leader of men for those very trying times, and in June his company commander was anxious for him to be tried in a less onerous position. The recommendation went up from the company commander to the battalion commander, from the battalion commander to the brigade commander—none of them are allowed to take any action on this matter—from the brigade commander to the divisional commander, from the divisional commander to the corps commander, from the corps commander to the Army commander, and eventually to the War Office. During the whole of that time the warrant officer remained with his unit. Everybody knew that there had been these reports against him, and it was not until February of this year that a letter was received saying that the War Office had agreed to the course that had been suggested last June. That is not good for the Army. It is a system which is sapping its vitality, and I ask that something should be done urgently on this matter. I appreciate the experiment that is being made, but really it is time for quicker action than that. . . .

The personnel in the Army, from the private to the general, is very fine, but I have noticed, and I think that those who are serving to-day will agree with me, that there is a shortage at the moment of what I call the "middle-piece officer"—the senior company commanders, who are vitally necessary in both the old Army and the new one. The middle-piece officer is at the moment too young and the reason for the lack of this most essential part of the modern Army will be found in the offices up and down the country. The staff officers, the more brilliant young Regular officers, go to the Staff College and are then put into the staff, and under the present system in war-time they remain there the whole time until they get a command. I venture to make this appeal to the Secretary of State. He has only recently assumed his high office, but I ask him, in view of the urgency of this matter, to decentralise at once and not merely to decentralise to command, but to decentralise right down to the divisional brigade. A divisional commander is trusted with the lives of 15,000 men, but is not trusted with a postal order for £1 11s. I had one letter to deal with which took from November to February in connection with a sum of 9s. that had been paid

to a camp reception station a year before. Everything involving any money has to go to the War Office, and the Financial Secretary to the War Office has no power to delegate to the divisional or brigade commander, both of whom have to be leaders of men and have to have a knowledge of accounts to get to their position. I used to trust far more financial responsibility in peace-time to my farm bailiff than can be entrusted to anybody less than a corps commander in the British Army. . . .

Mr. Law: . . . Let us consider for a moment what "Red tape" is. "Red tape" is, essentially, the system of control and regulation which any organisation, which is so big that it is beyond the direction of a single hand, must have. . . . Red tape, wherever you find it, has this characteristic, that in any individual case the slashing of red tape is an advantage but in the sum of individual cases you cannot do without it. If you slash it, throughout the whole organisation, you do not get the beneficial revolution which my hon. and gallant Friend has asked for; you get absolute chaos. . . .

. . . The War Office does not think at all of profit. It has to think not only of military efficiency but how to fit this enormous Army into the civil structure of the country. It has to think of reconciling civilian rights with the safety of the State, and all these things again mean more red tape and more regulations. You cannot get away from it. It is true that in an individual case red tape means obstruction and delay, but in the sum of individual cases you cannot get away from what is called red tape. One might put it rather succinctly by borrowing a metaphor from theology and saying that red tape in a Government Department is purgatory but a Government Department without red tape—without regulations—would be just plain hell. . . .

March 11.

Oral Answers (27 columns)
TRADE AND COMMERCE
INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION

Mr. Cary asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he will give an assurance that in the reorganisation of industry firms which have benefited by the war, such as aircraft and munition works, and continue to expand by taking workers from other trades, shall be made to compensate the non-essential industries which are shut or merged

and also will be placed under a statutory obligation to assist in replacing employees in their former trades in the post-war years?

Mr. Lyttleton: As explained in the statement which I made on 5th March, the firms enabled by industrial concentration to work to capacity are expected by the Government to provide a measure of compensation for firms that are closed down. The difficulty of my hon. Friend's suggestion is similar to that which precludes the use of public funds to provide compensation in these cases. With regard to the last part of the question, my right hon. Friend the Minister of Labour and National Service is anxious that all possible assistance should be given so that workers now transferred to munitions work may return to their former employment after the war, and for this purpose records will be kept of workers transferred through the concentration of the less essential industries. He does not, however, think it practicable to place statutory obligations for reinstatement on the employers to whom they are transferred for war work.

Mr. Cary: If three-quarters of our industrial life is to be brought into common employment in war production surely any scheme of compensation must be cast as wide as possible and not limited to a few sections of the home trade?

Mr. Levy: How does the right hon. Gentleman reconcile what he has now said with the fact that a great many employers have entered into an obligation to make up to civilian rates the wages of employes who have left for the Army? Is this obligation to be null and void?

Mr. Lyttleton: I was asked whether it was the intention to impose an obligation to re-instate. The answer is, "No."

BEWARE OF FEDERAL UNION

By R. L. NORTHRIDGE

PRICES: 25 for 1/-; 50 for 1/9.

Obtainable from:

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

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

Group Meeting on April 3, 1941. In the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at 8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon Sec., 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. 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. Next reunion on April 3.

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.

The Social Crediter

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

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.
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, 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

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, 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

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.)

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 1/2d.
- 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/- (Postage 2 1/2d.)
- Barrier to Health by Dr. Douglas Boyd..... 6d.
- Lower Rates (pamphlet) 3d.

(All the above postage extra.)

Leaflets

- 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
- Bomb Hitler! by C. H. Douglas (out of print)
- 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

(The above are post free.)

All from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

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