

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 8.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It is quite clear from the speech made in the Canadian House of Commons on January 31 by Mr. J. H. Blackmore (Social Credit, Lethbridge) that the defects of the party system are being demonstrated in the Social Credit Party, as in any other. In the main, the inspiration of his remarks was clearly Mr. Herridge's book, recently reviewed in these columns together with an obvious attempt, in his absence, to remove the impression made by Mr. Norman Jaques, M.P., in his comment on Jewish influence in international politics.

The speech was neither good social credit, nor good politics. It could hardly have been better designed to alienate the immensely powerful French Canadian element if it had been expressly delivered with that intent. The worst features of what is now miscalled "appeasement"—the policy at first pursued by Mr. Aberhart with such disastrous results, but abandoned under electoral campaign pressure—are evident in it, in spite of the lesson which ought to have been learnt from the short and unhappy incursion of Mr. Herridge into Canadian politics which resulted in the loss of seven Social Credit seats.

A few more speeches of this kind, as coming from the House Leader of the Social Credit Party, and Social Credit will become popular in the present House of Commons, and moribund in the country. Mr. Blackmore's place is in the Federation of British Industries, or its Canadian equivalent.

We commend the situation to the electors of Lethbridge while there is yet time.

• • •

The attitude of one young delegate to the boys and girls "Target for To-morrow" Conference held in Edinburgh on April 13 and 14, shines like a good deed in a naughty world. Asked for his views, he said he thought a man with ten bedrooms ought to be able to build an eleventh without Government interference. A young Pecksniff virtuously objected that no man ought to need more than ten bedrooms. "I didn't say he needed more than ten bedrooms: I said he ought to be able to build more if he wanted to" replied the first speaker. That young man will go far.

• • •

We congratulate Mr. C. H. Allen, of Millswood, South Australia, on his dissent from the enthusiasm of Professor Laski in regard to Abraham Lincoln.

It is a curious fact that Left Wing politicians are full of the misdemeanours of the British Empire, for instance over Ireland; and almost in the same breath with which they castigate "Britain," will laud perhaps the most high-

handed tyranny perpetrated to that date—the refusal to allow the originally self-governing Southern States to secede from the Federation. The reasons expressed for wishing to secede have nothing whatever to do with the principle.

At the time of the American Civil War, the American Continent was as nearly safe from external invasion as it was possible for any portion of the world's surface to be.

The policy of the North was an internal policy, although probably externally inspired, and no military expediency could be invoked in extenuation. There was no internal disorder which local authority could not suppress. There was not one valid argument which can be adduced in favour of Lincoln which would not be far stronger if applied to military subjugation by Northern Ireland of Eire. (This seems to have struck a recent advocate of a United Ireland, who anticipated a logical difficulty with the disarming enquiry as to the strength of United States intervention in the present war if it hadn't been for Lincoln!)

When we recall that Professor Laski owes everything he is (whatever he is) to the fact that he has been allowed to grow up in this country, we can only assume that his admiration for the forcible suppression of the Southern States arises from the pattern it provides for the suppression of the Arabs in Palestine.

• • •

So far as national, as distinct from individual democracy is concerned, the record of the British Empire stands out in a class by itself. The essence of democracy is the right to contract out. There is not a portion of the Empire which can understand that right (ninety per cent. of the population of India have not the slightest desire to understand it) which is not either in possession of it, or moving towards it as fast as common sense will permit. If Mr. de Valera (who, as distinct from the thousands of Irishmen who are fighting gallantly in it, has contracted out of the war) wishes to contract out of the Empire, we do not think he will meet any great opposition outside his island. But we can assure him that he's not going to put over the double-nationality trick so popular with Professor Laski's co-racialists.

If Loan Finance were permanently dissociated from the Empire link, nothing could harm us, and the attraction of our orbit would be irresistible.

• • •

The "Canadian" Broadcasting Company the offspring of the "B."B.C., has just announced that it will allow free time on the air to the *three* national political parties to present their views. No, Clarence, the Social Credit Party which is in power in Alberta is *not* included although it has ten members in the House of Commons at Ottawa. The

three parties are the Liberals, the Conservatives, and the C.C.F. (Socialist) Party, which does not control a single Provincial Government, and has one more member (eleven) in the House of Commons than the Social Crediters. Well, they know where their danger is coming from, and so do we.

It will be remembered that "British" broadcasting derives from the Marconi Company, who own all the key patents.

G. K. Chesterton considered that the Marconi Scandal was the most deadly blow at the British Empire which it has ever experienced.

• • •

Now that your constant nagging has worn Mr. Montagu Norman down, Clarence, we should like you to notice how nice everyone is being to him, except you. Noel Coward, we understand, has written a song "Don't lets be beastly to the Germans," and we think you ought at least to treat him like a German. After all, see how kind he was to them, at your expense. As all the best people and newspapers are saying, well if he did make mistakes, he meant well. Just think what an encouragement to continue his policies that is going to be to Lord Carto.

## "Government by Gallup"

Reactions to the publication in *The Social Crediter* of the text of the elaborate questionnaire document circulated by the British Medical Association suggest that, while intense hostility to the method has developed among doctors, their resentment is, or was in the earlier stages, partly due to inability to define clearly what it was that had hit them. It is, perhaps, easier to sympathise with their state of mind than to analyse it, except in terms of real politics, a science with which the general public is regrettably unfamiliar. It's learning. The doctors were in much the same position as a third witness for the defence, excluded from the court during the examination of witness one and witness two, and under cross-examination, but, by some oversight, he does not know whether for the defence or for the prosecution. For the non-medical reader, the Gallup form made practically no appeal to professional vanity. There were questions which seemed irrelevant. Objective assessment was easier. The first hint of criticism in *The Social Crediter* was followed instantly by a broadcast press claim that 'full' information of the character of the questionnaire form had been given to the public. Readers are as well able to say as we are that the public was told what the planners wished them to believe.

The relationship between the British Medical Association Executive and the Gallup Poll people (British Institute of Public Opinion: Affiliate of the American Institute of Public Opinion, Director: Dr. George Gallup) is not clear. Inevitably one pictures a rising business organisation shrewdly aware of a palpable business opportunity. It is reported that the British Medical Association Executive 'improved' the draft ballot-paper, which, in any case shows more than traces of haste in preparation. It might be hazarded that Dr. Hill, "the Radio Doctor," glossed the solecisms, while the 'experts' of the "British" Institute supplied the finesse.

Dated round about April 14, every doctor received a post-card, 1d. prepaid, some addressed by typewriter, others in the sort of hand which goes with addressing agencies, asking him in even black letters to return the questionnaire "to-day" if he had not done so. The plea which had been put forward for urgency was that the British Medical Association Executive was awaiting data from which to elaborate 'its' policy.

Meanwhile the Medical Practitioners' Union (General Secretary, Alfred Welply, M.D.) has entered the lists "lest it should be accused of shirking the practical issue." For this reason, "The Union sets out what it would have the Minister do in order to lay sure foundations for the building up by health workers of their share in a better world." One point in the Union's policy is compensation for "the workers" for "loss of capital value of practice and other things incidental thereto." (When they have spent their capital, they 'go back to work'!) A back-page diagram shows a rectangular block at the top (PARLIAMENT), and "The Ailing Public" at the bottom. There is naturally more ailing public than parliament. The contents of the intervening space might conveniently be summarised as "The Paraphernalia." Why shouldn't Dr. Welply call in the services of the British Institute of Public Opinion? No one can say they haven't done their work well in rather difficult circum-

## Programme for the Third World War

by  
C. H. DOUGLAS

This work, which has appeared serially in *The Social Crediter*, is now published in one cover,

Price 2/-

## The Problem of the Medical Profession

A Political Primer for Patients and Doctors

by B. W. M.

1/-

## British Medicine and Alien Plans

by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.

(With an Appendix by B.W.M.)

1/-

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED  
49 PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL 15.

stances. Our objection is to the nature of the work. It is open to anyone to fill the gap which exists between individual policy and expert administration. The success or failure of human society depends upon its being done. We want a Civil Service of Policy. The inception of such a service, faithfully ascertaining what individuals want, not what individuals think, and its rise to be an integral part of the State, is we repeat *necessary*. And we do not mind who does it, provided it be done. Our objection to its being not done, but pretended, arises chiefly from the fact, capable of general verification, that things pretended and not in fact done have either no real results or results different from those which are presumed to be intended. Every tree brings forth fruit according to its kind. There are more contentious measures to come and these matters have a wide bearing.

The following letters have passed between *The Social Crediter* and the organisations indicated:—

- (1) From the Managing Director of the  
British Institute of Public Opinion,

Mr. Henry Durant:—

March 28, 1944.

Dear Sir,

“Government by Gallup”

May I be allowed to try to elucidate some of the queries raised in your leading article on the White Paper dealing with a National Health Service and our questionnaire issued to every doctor.

You refer to “nine tons of printed poison” having been despatched. More than  $\frac{7}{8}$ ths of this weight is made up of official copies of the White Paper itself. When, therefore, you go on to imply a comparison with Littlewoods you do far less than justice either to the importance of the whole project of a National Health Service, or to your own sense of social significance.

There are, approximately 52,000 names on the Medical Register, not 70,000 as mentioned by you. Distribution of the questionnaires to these doctors has been strictly controlled by the BMA and we, the British Institute of Public Opinion, will be responsible for analysing the returns and making the report.

The doctors may sign the form, or not, as they wish and the object of leaving open to them the decision about signing is to secure as frank answers as possible from as many as possible.

The questionnaire has been published in full in the *British Medical Journal* of this week and the questions are, therefore, open for inspection by any interested person. You quote questions relating to the personal circumstances of the doctor. This factual information is required in order to assess the replies received, to show how far they come from doctors who are representative of the profession as a whole.

Nobody, I think, will venture to quarrel with your assumption that the control and direction of the medical profession cannot be left solely to doctors. The Government and Parliament clearly have a duty to protect the interests of the community as patients. At the same time, the doctors are entitled to express their views and this questionnaire is an attempt to give them an opportunity of doing so.

- (2) Reply:—

March 30, 1944.

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of explanation. Before considering its publication in *The Social Crediter*, I should be glad if you would be so good as to elucidate the statement of your opinion that no one would quarrel “with your assumption that the control and direction of the medical profession cannot be left solely to doctors.” The sentence in which these words occur and the two following suggest that your organisation has knowledge (1) of the hands in which control of the discharge of functions in society should reside, (2) what the duties of the Government and Parliament are, and (3) what the rights and privileges of doctors should be. From what we understand to be purely a business organisation exploiting a particular technique invented by Dr. George Gallup, all these claims seem to call for explanation, and I shall be interested to learn what you have to say on the point.

- (3) From Mr. Durant:—

March 31, 1944.

Madam,

I thank you for your letter of yesterday.

The factual explanations given in the first five paragraphs of my letter are quite independent of the concluding paragraph of that letter. Accordingly there seems no justification for withholding publication of facts whilst you indulge in discussions on the metaphysics of Government.

The statements made in the last paragraph of my letter are self-evident to every person who does not believe in the Corporative State. I am at a loss, therefore, to understand why you should question them.

- (4) Reply:—

April 6, 1944.

Sir,

Yes, the first five paragraphs of your letter of March 30 were of a different nature from your concluding paragraph, and I note that you do not reply to my questions concerning that paragraph, but prefer to suggest obliquely that I am a believer in totalitarian government. The fact to the contrary, concerning the Social Credit Secretariat, of which my letter was an expression, is so apparent in all that we say and do, that I need not discuss a fantastic suggestion.

It is one thing to practise a metaphysics without disclosing its nature, and while appearing to be unconscious of it, and another to defend it when its nature has been discerned through the results of its operation, and I should still be interested to learn particularly why a business organisation engaged in exploiting a technique for the estimation of public opinion should react unfavourably to criticism directed to the point that it is eliciting *opinion* bearing exclusively on technical matters and in a hypothetical situation, from persons not specially qualified, and is *not*, to any extent at all, eliciting a statement of *policy* concerning the objectives of the individuals concerned, although it gives more than tacit consent to the proposition of its employers that the ascertainment of *policy*, not of opinion concerning matters of administration, is the objective of the technique employed.

In regard to your opinion about the number of Regis-

(Continued on page 7

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 12. No. 8.

Saturday, April 29, 1944.

### WORK

The first thing any healthy organism does when lacking it is to provide itself with a store of surplus energy. The first thing any organism with surplus energy does, is to find means of expending its surplus energy. Nature knows only one way of achieving this end (it may be regarded as an end, even when it is also a means to another end). The release is obtained by doing work.

It is hard to see how the importance of these facts of observation can be exaggerated or belittled. They are facts. When, however, someone says he finds the views of Social Crediters repellent because he believes in work and Social Crediters, by implication, don't he is misleading himself. The tree no more than the cat can evade the necessity for doing work. Because of his more clearly formulated, more numerous and more complex objectives, man is under a greater necessity of doing work than most creatures. But no creature needs work to be "found" for it. The choice does not lie between work and idleness. The choice, when there is a choice, lies between work chosen by the individual for his own ends, and work undertaken because of some external compulsion. The choice is between forced-labour and free activity. Forced-labour is one, perhaps the chief, mark of slavery. There is scarcely any theme more richly and diversely treated by Douglas than the work theme. Among Social Crediters it offers few if any difficulties. Yet it is, in practice, one of the hardest things to tie down the baffled citizen to a realisation that he is deceiving himself when he gives ear or voice, as the case may be, to the absurd doctrines of the "full-employment" merchants.

"... there are two separate and distinct inducements to what is called employment. The first inducement is involved in the necessity under which humanity labours to provide itself with bed, board, clothes, and such so-called luxuries as are effective in setting free individual energies. That is an elemental necessity imposed by the natural conditions of our existence, and it is a primary necessity, in the sense that until it is met we are not free to devote our attention to other matters. It is incontestable that the most efficient method of dealing with this primary necessity so far evolved is by co-operative methods such as have been incorporated in the industrial system of the past hundred years or so. But the second necessity under which men and women labour, *after the primary necessity has been met*, can broadly be described as the satisfaction of the artistic instinct; which can be further analysed and defined as the

incorporation in material forms of ideals conceived in the mind." (*Social Credit*, Pt. II, Chap. III).

When you see a man with a nail in one hand and a hammer in the other, it is a fair inference that he intends to drive home the nail somewhere. But if you saw a man with a nail in one hand and the potential equivalent of a twelve-pounder gun in the other, you would wonder what he was up to.

A discrepancy of this order, or worse, is becoming evident not only to ourselves but to the general public in regard to most of the plans which are being peddled through parliament. The lip service in favour of the Education Bill falls upon less and less attentive ears. The doctors are, in some parts of the country, notably the Scottish counties, quite wide awake, and there are rumours that even Tavistock House has lost a little of its complacency. In trade union circles what a year ago was borne swiftly along on the flowing tide of class mythology excites remark, even challenges understanding. But the big schemes go forward, and we have to hold them up. When the war ends, an immense potential will be available for constructive policies. Then why turn Scotland into a vast generating station? What are the premises underlying the intention? Do they want the power to drive a nail into a Whitehall notice board? Or do they think we cannot begin too soon to prepare for the next war? War is the fruit of policy. Has the next-war policy been decided? Then, let it be reversed. There is at least time, as well as all necessary opportunity for that. Or is this too a device to secure full employment? Even supposing the policy of these developments were agreed to by the people, why this extremity of centralisation? Are the county councils not nearer to effective control and closer to a knowledge of local needs than the Central Electricity Board? The public is quite ripe for a show-down, and had not exceptional means been taken to blanket it, it would have occurred spontaneously. While the parties manoeuvre for position, the country is forced into challenge of the whole idea of their mode of operation, indeed of the whole idea of government. If small nations have rights, small people have rights. The rights of small nations do not seem so easy of disposal this year as last. The roulette wheel does not come to rest at the right mark. And what is this notion of the manipulation of party majorities but the invocation of a roulette wheel? That the whole substratum of a man's life should be spun from under him by an irrational twist is monstrous, and will be challenged. T. J.

### STILL PLENTY

A supporter writes:—

A special Senate sub-committee on post-war economic policy has reported that the value of property in the hands of the Government of the U.S.A., according to the *Paint, Oil and Chemical Review* of February 24 this year, may be as high as \$75,000,000,000. While some of this production will consist of critically scarce materials, the journal says that some "will consist of materials which will be so plentiful that to dump them on the market would mean that no factory manufacturing those products could turn a wheel for years to come and consequently could employ no one."

Yet, as stated in *The Social Crediter* for April 15, 40 per cent. of total production in the United States is devoted to normal things.

## The Thwarting of Alberta

*The text of an address broadcast on January 24 by the HON. E. C. MANNING, Premier of Alberta.*

Last week I dealt at some length with the Social Credit proposal that a National dividend should be paid to each and every *bona fide* Canadian citizen to supplement wages, salaries and other sources of earned income. The money or credit necessary to pay such a dividend would be created under the direction of Parliament, and its distribution would supplement the National income thereby increasing the purchasing power of the Canadian people sufficiently to enable them to buy the entire output of their productive effort. This is a reform measure which distinguishes Social Credit from all proposals which are being put forward as a basis for Post-War reconstruction.

As I emphasised in our last two broadcasts, it is the one method by which full economic security with freedom can be assured to all Canadians. Well, as I expected, my reference to a National dividend has again called forth the parrot-like cry that has been emanating from certain political quarters for the past eight years. Here it is—"If dividends for all is a sound and practical idea why has the Social Credit Government in Alberta not paid the dividends which were promised in 1935? Why hasn't Social Credit been introduced in Alberta where the Government had a clear mandate from the people? What about the \$25.00 a month?"

Tonight I am going to answer them bluntly. It is time that the people of Canada knew the truth about this matter. The majority of people in Alberta are aware of the facts, but unfortunately anti-Social Credit propaganda has given the rest of Canada a grossly misleading picture of the Alberta situation. I assure you that I am only too glad of this opportunity to put the record straight in this respect.

I want to take our memory back to 1933 and 1934. You will recall that the depression was then at its height. Unemployment, relief, soup kitchens and widespread destitution were the order of the day. It was under these conditions that the people of Alberta first heard of Social Credit. While bankers, economists and politicians were trying to explain to the people that something they called "an economic blizzard" had struck the country, and that really the ghastly conditions created by the depression must be accepted as an unavoidable evil beyond human control—there arose above all this confused talk the attention compelling voice of the late William Aberhart, who, at that time was the principal of Calgary's largest collegiate institute, and a man with an outstanding reputation as an educationalist.

He told the people in plain and unmistakable language that they were the victims of a vicious, un-democratic and un-Christian monetary system. He denounced the restriction of production, when men, women and children were living in dire need of the goods which could be produced in abundance, and while tens of thousands unemployed and destitute persons were anxious to work and to produce goods. He fearlessly attacked all the accepted axioms of orthodox economics and finance, exposing the fact that the root cause of the trouble was a vicious, monopolistic money system, which was being operated as a super-racket. He tore aside

the veil of humbug and mystery surrounding the question of money, and showed that by correcting the evil features of the monetary system it would be possible to produce an abundance of goods and services for the use of the people, and to distribute these to ensure economic security with freedom for all. He pointed out that the key to the whole problem was the distribution of sufficient purchasing power to enable the people to purchase the goods which they had proved themselves so able to produce in abundance.

Week after week the dynamic voice of William Aberhart spoke to the people of Alberta from public platforms, over the radio, and through the printed page. The logic, the common sense and the power of his challenging message attracted more and more attention. He urged the people to form groups to study this question; he inspired them with a new hope; he gave them a new vision of what democracy should mean.

By the end of 1934 a strong Social Credit movement was organised in Alberta. Under Mr. Aberhart's leadership the Provincial Government of the day was urged to introduce Social Credit reforms. In spite of all the pressure which could be exerted by the people of the province, it soon became evident that the Government had no intention of doing anything about it. The other political parties likewise turned down the people's demands. There was only one course left—namely, for the people to organise for political action. Groups got busy and organised their constituencies. Next a provincial platform was adopted and a provincial leader was chosen by the delegates sent by the constituencies to a provincial convention. Social Credit candidates were chosen to contest every provincial constituency—candidates pledged to do a job that none of the existing political parties would carry out.

The result of the Alberta election of 1935 is now a matter of history. Fifty-six Social Credit candidates were elected out of a total of sixty-three seats in the Alberta Legislature.

Shortly afterwards a Federal election followed. The Conservative Government was in disrepute. The Liberal Party under the present Prime Minister of Canada, made a strong appeal to the country to be allowed to deal with the chaotic conditions created by the depression. Speaking in Saskatoon in September, 1935, Mr. Mackenzie King gave this solemn pledge to the people of Canada:

"Canada is faced with a great battle between the money power and the people, a battle which will be waged in the new Parliament. I plead for a sweeping Liberal victory to carry out my policies of public control of currency and credit. Until the control of currency and credit is restored to the government, all talk of sovereignty of Parliament and democracy is idle and futile."

He also stated in Prince Albert, during his election campaign of 1935: "Social Credit will spread like wildfire over the whole of Canada and over the whole world if Premier Aberhart can make his scheme work. If Social Credit ever gets a chance to prove itself, it will be in Alberta. Mr. Aberhart has the whole province in his hands and if a Liberal government is returned to power at Ottawa, he will be given the fullest opportunity to work out his plans."

As you know the Liberal Party swept into office, Al-

berta sending a solid block of Social Credit members to the House of Commons for the first time.

Mr. King had promised the country a reform of our monetary system. He had pledged himself to give Alberta a free hand. It looked as if the stage was set for the great battle between the money power and the people.

It took the Alberta Government several months to deal with the chaotic financial position which it has inherited. In its efforts in this direction it soon found that, notwithstanding the election pledges of the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, it could look for no help from the Federal Government. We found ourselves implacably opposed by the large financial corporations, by the banking institutions and by the Bank of Canada itself in our efforts to deal with the debt situation, and other deplorable conditions resulting from the chronic shortage of money.

As the time went on it became more and more evident that a show-down was inevitable, and accordingly at a special session of the Alberta Legislative Assembly in the summer of 1937, legislation was passed to provide for the introduction of the Social Credit reforms for which the government had received such a sweeping mandate. The battle was on.

The effect of that legislation was immediate. The financial press across Canada denounced it vehemently, denounced the Alberta Government and denounced Social Credit. Similar attacks came from even further afield. Sections of the American and British Press took up the same cry. *The Times* of England demanded the disallowance of the legislation, and notwithstanding Mr. Mackenzie King's election pledges, the legislation was disallowed by the Federal Government exactly eleven days after it became law.

Then started a campaign of mis-representation and abuse directed against the Alberta Government and Social Credit which is probably unique in the history of our dominion.

The Alberta Legislature met again in special session two months later and further legislation was passed to gain our objective. Royal assent to this was withheld, and the Legislation was referred by the Federal Government to the Supreme Court of Canada where it was declared *ultra vires*.

The decision of the Supreme Court was appealed to the Privy Council, but without success. The story from there is well known. Practically every piece of legislation passed by the Alberta Legislature which claimed for the people of the province the right to monetise their real wealth and to issue and control their own financial credit within their own boundaries either has been disallowed by the Federal Government or declared *ultra vires* in the Courts.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the only reason why Social Credit has not been introduced in Alberta. That is the only reason why our people are not receiving the dividends that were promised in 1935. That is why the vast resources of our Province are still not being fully utilised. That is why in all our efforts to increase health, educational and other social services, and to improve the economic and social welfare of our people, we still are being limited by the unnecessary man-made financial restrictions imposed on us as on all other Canadians by the present monopolistic orthodox monetary system. That is why we anticipate the coming Post-War era with the gravest concern, knowing that if the

financial restrictions of the present monetary system are not removed before that time, adequate post-war rehabilitation is financially impossible and Canada is headed for a repetition —on an even greater scale—of the economic chaos and destitution which marked the hungry thirties. The Government of Alberta constantly has insisted that if the Federal Government will not let us institute these necessary and long over-due financial reforms within our own Province on the grounds that we have not the necessary constitutional authority, then they, as the possessors of such authority, should act in this matter, and act without further delay.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we maintain that it is inexcusable that a Provincial Government should be prevented from acting on behalf of its own people in this all important matter while, at the same time the Senior Government of Canada persistently refuses to do anything to bring about these necessary financial reforms on which the future of our country may well depend. Under these circumstances there is only one thing that the people can do, namely, members to the Federal Government who exercise their democratic right to send are pledged to institute these essential financial reforms, to the end that the Canada of tomorrow will be a land in which our standard of living and our economic security will be limited, not by man-made scarcity of money, but only by the abundance of our Natural Resources and our collective ability to produce the things we need. To this end the Social Crediters of Canada are organising for definite political action on a Nation-wide front. Last week I announced that a National Social Credit Convention will be held in the City of Toronto early in April. This Convention is being called for a threefold purpose:

- (1) To formulate a National platform.
- (2) To elect a National leader, and
- (3) To establish a national political organisation for the purpose of placing Social Credit candidates in the Federal field, throughout the entire Dominion of Canada.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, a great deal of work remains to be done before that convention. Groups have to be formed, delegates have to be selected by the people and arrangements have to be made to meet the expense of sending them to Toronto. The time is short, and I therefore urge you all to get busy now.

There are two immediate steps you can take. First, if you are not at present getting our weekly paper, *Today and Tomorrow*, you would be well advised to subscribe for it without delay. It not only contains a wealth of information on current issues necessary in forming study groups in your locality, but it will enable you to keep in close touch with this movement all across Canada. Second, contact your friends and neighbours, who you believe will be interested in this crusade dedicated to the welfare of the Canadian people. Talk the matter over with them and endeavour to arouse others to the importance and the urgency of acting now before it is too late.

In answer to Mr. Thorne, on April 18, the Minister of Health said 16,319 medical practitioners were under agreement with the insurance committees in England and Wales on January 1, 1944.

"Government by Gallup" (Continued).

tered Medical Practitioners, our figure was taken from the most recent available Medical Register, for the due preparation of which the General Medical Council is responsible under Statute. That the number of names on the Register has fallen from 69,428 to 52,000 we shall have pleasure in publicising if and when official authority is forthcoming for the statement.

The motive you advance for seeking information about personalia is, in any case an *ex parte* statement; but in regard to this matter, I would again draw your attention to the ambiguous use of 'representative of the profession,' a phrase which hides the fact that the answers *may* reveal the *opinions* of doctors on certain matters of administration contingent to the hypothetical institution of control of doctor and patient, but cannot in any sense represent the doctors' *policy*, collectively or individually.

(5) From Dr. Charles Hill,  
Secretary, British Medical Association:—

4th April, 1944.

Sir,

I was interested to read the article "Government by Gallup" in *The Social Crediter* of March 25th, but regret that it has been written in incomplete knowledge of facts.

I hope the degree of horror and indignation with which it is coloured is not so great as to preclude consideration of the following points, and arrival at a more dispassionate judgment on what is, I claim, a dispassionate Questionnaire. It is a disservice to the doctors and the general public not to allow it to stand or fall on its own merits.

The White Paper (a Government document) plus an Analysis of it (a B.M.A. document) plus a questionnaire (an independent document) has been sent to every doctor. This seems to me to be a just balance, and indeed the only fair way to enable every doctor to express in writing his own opinion.

Our Analysis of the White Paper was published in full in the *British Medical Journal* on March 18th, and the Questionnaire appeared in full in the same *Journal* on March 25th. They are both therefore available to public and press alike. In addition I have already announced my willingness to supply copies as far as I am able to anyone who applies to me. The answers to the Questionnaire will go to the *British Institute of Public Opinion* who will submit a report on them to this Association. This report will be published by the Association.

The fact that opponents of the B.M.A. criticise us at one moment for voicing opinions unrepresentative of the profession, and at the next for endeavouring to secure the written opinion of every member of the profession shows an inconstancy [sic] of thought, derived, I suspect, from fear. It may be that our critics fear the voice of the profession, and also any democratically expressed opinion which might prevent the fruition of their own particular schemes.

(6) Reply:—

April 6, 1944

Sir,

In reply to your letter of April 4, I do not think it is

your critics who "fear the voice of the profession." The great care and ingenuity which appear to have been devoted to securing the doctors' *opinion* concerning matters of administration in which they have no special competency, while falsely representing this as their statement of *policy*, in which they, and they alone have special competency, suggest that it is not your critics who fear the voice of the Medical Profession, but the executive of the *British Medical Association*. The doctors seem to be endeavouring, against heavy odds, made heavier by the amazing technical resources of their planning opponents (with whom we should include their "representatives"), to express their policy; but are simply not allowed to do so, while every effort is being made to hypnotise them (and the public) into the belief that they are in process of doing it, and, later, they will be considered to have done it. This is a sinister situation, since the doctors are thus inveigled into the prejudicial and unenviable position of being an unserviceable protection to their patients against exploitation. This is potentially a professional and a still greater public disaster.

This is to take first what is the more considerable subject matter of your letter. Concerning other matters, without suggesting for a moment that there are not facts—and relevant and significant facts—about the long-continued pressure to impose control on doctors and patients, known to the executive of the *British Medical Association*, *etc.*, *etc.*, and not, for the time being at all events, to us; we cannot concur in the suggestion that the article "Government by Gallup" in *The Social Crediter* was backed by knowledge which was incomplete in regard to essentials. At the same time we appreciate that the B.M.A. Executive makes a careful selection of the facts it desires other people to consider. We have not yet discovered a member of the lay public who has been furnished by the *British Medical Association* with a copy of the questionnaire form. A copy of the form, and a note concerning it were published in our issue of April 1. To judge from correspondence with ourselves, the *British Institute of Public Opinion* is itself oblivious to the distinction between representation of technical opinion and correct representation of policy, which, since you have such implicit trust in the method which you have been persuaded to adopt, is a material matter for your consideration. It is the policy of doctors, and not their opinions on administration, which it is important to ascertain in their own and the public interest. May I ask what is your opinion of the future status and functions of the B.M.A. and its officers when the totalitarian scheme so adroitly concealed in the White Paper has got into its stride?

#### MR. HUGH MOLSON, M.P.

Mr. Hugh Molson, M.P. "does not claim to be an economist, but holds that it is the function of a politician to translate the theories of economists. . . ." A sample 'translation' is this:—"A number of people, notably Major Douglas the founder of Social Credit, jumped to the conclusion that the cause of the trouble was insufficient currency." The words appear in a pamphlet obviously designed in the interest of those who fancy their chances of imposing the Work State.

## Points from Parliament

House of Commons: April 18, 1944

### TRADE AND COMMERCE

*Sir W. Smathers* asked the President of the Board of Trade what was the total value of our imports and what proportion of them was paid for by invisible exports in 1913 and up to the last normal year preceding this war.

*Mr. Dalton*: Imports may be paid for either by exports or by items not recorded in the Trade Returns, and there is not normally a precise balance. Accordingly, percentage figures are inappropriate, and the following table gives, in addition to the values asked for, the value of exports of United Kingdom goods. Corresponding figures are not available for the years 1914-1922.

Year.	Merchandise and silver bullion and specie. Value of retained imports.	Value of United King- dom exports.	Estimated excess of credits on other items.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	(£ million)		
1913 ...	674	541	339
1923 ...	987	779	348
1924 ...	1,151	813	410
1925 ...	1,177	786	438
1926 ...	1,127	664	449
1927 ...	1,103	716	469
1928 ...	1,086	733	475
1929 ...	1,119	738	484
1930 ...	966	579	414
1931 ...	806	397	304
1932 ...	658	371	236
1933 ...	636	373	263
1934 ...	702	409	287
1935 ...	741	481	293
1936 ...	804	459	327
1937 ...	973	531	386
1938 ...	876	500	322

*Notes:* (A) As from 1st April, 1923, all transactions between Southern Ireland and Great Britain and Northern Ireland have been treated as external and are accordingly included in the above figures. Previously, such trade was internal and was excluded from the figures.

(B) The figures in column (4) include the net difference between receipts and payments on Government account, and the latter includes reparation payments and payments or receipts in respect of the principal of inter-Governmental loans.

### Goods and Services (Price Control)

*Sir Smedley Crooke* asked the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that insufficient publicity is given to the objects of the Goods and Services (Price Control) Acts of 1939-44, and the various maximum price Orders made thereunder; and will he consider arranging with the B.B.C. for regular broadcasts in the interest of both the public and the trader on lines similar to the well-known kitchen front.

*Mr. Dalton*: Price Control is one of our best defences against inflation and profiteering, and I share my hon. Friend's desire that this Act and the Orders made under it shall be fully understood. I am grateful to the Press and the B.B.C. for their help, and I shall continue to do all I

can to obtain suitable publicity on this subject.

House of Commons: April 19, 1944

### CHEMICALS (IMPORT LICENCES)

*Mr. Liddal* asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies to what extent I.C.I. are now the sole importers licensed by the Palestinian Government for the import of certain chemicals; and whether such imports relate solely to chemicals manufactured by I.C.I. or whether the licence covers other chemicals imported by I.C.I. but purchased by them from their competitors in Great Britain.

*Colonel Stanley*: I have made inquiry by telegram of the High Commissioner for Palestine and will communicate with the hon. Member on receipt of the High Commissioner's reply.

### DR. SCHACHT

*Mr. Petherick* asked the Minister of Information in what capacity Dr. Schacht is employed by his Department.

*Mr. Bracken*: Dr. Schacht, who is an Orientalist of world repute, is employed on a fee basis to check the texts and proofs of certain of the Ministry's publications in Arabic and Persian.

*Mr. Petherick*: Is he still a German subject?

*Mr. Bracken*: Yes, Sir, he is still a German subject, but he is no relation to that slippery doctor who lived in the City during the last seven or eight years.

### PAINT INDUSTRY (CONTROL)

*Sir H. Williams* asked the Minister of Supply if his attention has been drawn to the fact that, in the year following the concentration of the paint industry, the principal firm in that industry, Messrs. Pinchin, Johnson and Company, Limited, has increased its profits from £453,000 to £553,000 and its dividend from 8½ per cent. to 10 per cent.; and whether any employees of this firm or of any of its subsidiaries are or were on the staff of his Ministry engaged in controlling the paint industry.

*Sir A. Duncan*: Yes, Sir, but I would point out that the paint industry has not been concentrated. A member of the staff of a subsidiary of the firm referred to is serving in the Miscellaneous Chemicals Control.

*Sir H. Williams*: Is it not the case that, although the industry has not, technically, been concentrated, the Government are routing orders so that only certain firms are privileged to receive orders; that the Ministry of Labour has taken as much as possible of the labour employed by other firms, and that concentration has, therefore, been achieved not straightly but crookedly? . . . .

*Mr. Ernest Bevin* said in Parliament on April 20 that up to February 29, 1944, 127 employers and 23,517 workers were prosecuted in England and Wales for 'offences against the industrial code which were not punishable before the outbreak of war' (the wording of Mr. Rhys Davies's question). No employers and 1,807 workers were sentenced to imprisonment.