From Week to Week

BEST CUSTOMER.

Investors in the U.S. are getting broad hints that they may be asked to subscribe to a 5000 million dollar loan to Britain. Wall Street rumour is that negotiations are proceeding for such a loan.

The U.S. attitude is beginning to resemble that of the City towards South Africa. Briefly, it is this—"Finance our best customer whose strength means much to our security." These words were actually used by Mr. Charles Taft, director of the U.S. Office of Economic Affairs. The subject will probably come before Congress in January. — Dundee Courier, November 18.

Mr. Solly Bloom is active in the Senate to secure its support for the loan. Solly, you remember, was hysterical with rage when Mr. Chamberlain tried to avoid a war.

So you see, Clarence, you'll have won the war under the direction of General Eisenhower, saved America, lost your overseas securities, established the reign of P.E.P. and the bureaucrats, and pay-as-you-earn interest on (to begin with) £1,250,000,000 Bonds "created out of nothing." And America will have won the war, won the peace, won the money, not had one bomb on her, and won your savings. D'markrazi's marvellous, isn't it?

Mr. Kingsley Martin, Editor of a Socialist weekly, says we are watching a socialist revolution Socialists would never have dreamed of. We are not Socialists, but in our youth we have eaten a heavy supper before going to bed, and wakened screaming.

The constitutional sovereignty of this country is vested in the King-in-Council—the King by the advice of his Ministers. The Ministers are the servants of Parliament, and Parliament takes its mandate from the electorate.

There never has at any time been a mandate to Parliament, nor a Parliamentary majority for what is humbly called Socialism—the transfer of all real power from the electorate to an unelected, irresponsible and undemissable bureaucracy. The subversion of the constitution without a mandate is called treason, and those who participate are called traitors, and are liable to death by hanging or decapitation.

During the past thirty years, the constitution of this country has been continuously subverted. As a consequence security of life and property has largely disappeared, the country-side has been ruined, taxation has increased tenfold, miseducation and inaccurate and misleading propaganda has divided the population and we are threatened with vassalage none the less real because wrapped in the jargon of international finance. Oh dear no, the cause isn't war—it is socialism, the supremacy of the group over the individual, the race spirit, "Old Adam," which is the cause of war.

The war-maker of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is titular Germany, and socialism is hatched in Germany, or by "Germans" in America.

It is socialism, the transfer from the individual to an irresponsible abstraction which may be called the State, or what-have-you, of attributes which he ought never to surrender which has been the cause of war throughout all history. "We war not against men, but against Principalities and Powers." Christian Socialism? It makes to laugh.

In the face of the experience of the parallel progress of centralised power and ever greater misery and catastrophe, the rapturous folly goes from strength to strength. It has taken the Social Credit Movement twenty-five years to obtain any considerable following to the proposition that the root of our troubles has been financial. And, the world over, there are Social Crediters, and honest ones, who are throwing the whole weight of their efforts into "the control of money by the State" without giving five minutes thought to the problem of how they are going to control the State or who controls it now. They are solving the contest between policy and administration by handing over policy to administration. It would appear to be incontestable that humanity prefers to travel the hard road.

"And they [the Pharisees] brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, 'Caesar's.' Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar, the things that are [present indicative] Caesar's..."

The widely syndicated Dorothy Thompson is always rather suspect of Communist bias, but she is patently correct in her statement that, as the war approaches its end, it becomes a naked struggle for power and position, as between the Allies, and a naked struggle for survival so far as the Germans are concerned. The Soviets are not interested, and never have been interested, in taking Germany off the back of Western Europe in general, and Great Britain in particular. Having cleared Russian soil with British help, they are tidying up the Balkans to suit their future needs; and as for Poland—well, if the English went to war to save Poland, its just too bad. Similarly, the Americans don't feel any special need for hurry—they don't want the earth, only the sea and the sky, and selected bits of the best earth to come down on. As for Great Britain, the Mediterranean, Greece, and the Middle East will do to go on with, as...
"spheres of influence." (Isn't it splendid that Sir David Waley can find time to "organise" Greek finances?)

Things being thus and such, the final defeat and occupation of Germany can go into cold storage for a while. "In war, or under threat of war," the controllers can go on controlling, and the "B.B.C. can go on extolling them. Why stop just now? Of course, the flying and rocket bombs are a nuisance, and it is cold and wet in Holland; but there are deep shelters for the chosen, and anyway, we must have time to arrange that no-one essential to the real objectives of the war is overlooked. After all, we've got full employment, haven't we?

What with one thing and another, Clarence, and all the people who matter doing so nicely out of it (you get twenty-three courses and five kinds of wine at the Kremlin and Trades Unionists get all the best seats), we see no reason why all these warnings from authoritative sources shouldn't be well grounded. The war might go on for years and years and years.

The announcement that the Electricity Commissioners propose to spend £90,000,000 on extensions to electrical generating capacity, is at once a challenge, an insult and a warning. It is a challenge because it is a clear and important instalment of State Capitalism entirely unconditioned: it is an insult because it involves a commitment of the energies of the manpower of the country while a considerable proportion of it is abroad: and it is a warning that our masters are hell-bent on destruction on exactly the same lines, even if with the use of slightly different words, as in 1919. "Full employment" has simply been substituted for "More Production."

If Parliament has no more influence on the policy of this country than it is exhibiting, the sooner that bauble is taken away, the better. It is being insulted daily by the modern Socialist Cromwells.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 10, 1944.

DEBATE ON THE ADJOURNMENT

GERMANY (WAR CRIMINALS)

Miss Rathbone (Combined English Universities): ... Only the other day I had a copy of an anonymous article, sent to me by the author who is doing distinguished academic work at Oxford. In it, he analyses very closely the characteristics and the background of the men who took part in the attack on Hitler's life on July 20. He showed, contrary to what some people have tried to maintain in this country, that they were an extraordinarily mixed bag. They included Junkers, distinguished generals, fervent Catholic members of the professional army, Prussians, South Germans, trade union leaders and a good many Jews. ...

Mr. Petherick (Penryn and Falmouth): ... These people are dangerous, and it is unwise to put into the hands of any Germans these dangerous toys. Therefore, without any savagery or any injustice, at the end of this war, we must see to it that it is really impossible for war to happen again.

There is, at least, one measure we could take, by splitting off Prussia from the rest of Germany. ...

Why was it that Germany was able, within a short space of time, to build up an army, a navy and an air force at the end of the last war? It was because under the Versailles Peace Treaty she was allowed to have an army of 100,000 men, and she simply kept all her best officers and N.C.O.s and was able to build up the gigantic structure from the effects of which the world has been suffering for the last five years. If you at once took away that 100,000 men, if you did not allow one man, if you broke the German general staff from top to bottom and saw to it that she was not allowed any army, navy or air force and then if, even at the end of five years, Germany should wish to start again, how incredible it would be for her to do it. ...

Lieu.-Colrmel Elliott (Glasgow, Kelvingrove): ... I would like to point out that Hitler seized a going concern when he came into power. That going concern is exactly what the hon. Member for West Bromwich (Mr. Dugdale) wishes to see re-established after this war. I would like to say, agreeing so far with the hon. Lady the Member for the Combined English Universities (Miss Rathbone), that it will be very difficult to withstand the argument that a shrunken and impoverished Germany, as she called it, should be denied all possibility of being built up again after the war.

The difficulty this House, this country and the world is in is that that was the way things started last time. It was in this way that Germany was supported and built up. The hon. Member for West Bromwich spoke about the loans made by bankers of this country to Germany, and I interrupted to point out that the big loans made to Germany were the Dawes and the Young Loans which, although I do not want specially to refer to it now, were made under the auspices of a Socialist Government. ...

Lieu.-Colrmel Elliott [After other speakers]: How can we prevent this frightful disaster coming again on the peoples of the world? ... We cannot by any device make the world safe for democracy or anything else. You cannot make the world as you will. Only the Almighty can do that. We can only do the best we can with the means at our disposal, and that is to see that as far as possible our kindly view of life prevails and that we are ready to do our utmost and weigh in and support that view of life when it is threatened. Our great weakness is that in all the years between the wars we did not recognise our enormous responsibility ...

Mr. Austin Hopkinson (Mossley): ... It was my business to know a good deal about the rearment of Germany, and I have made a study of it ever since. I can say that the rearment of Germany under the Weimar Republic had gone to lengths far beyond what hon. Gentlemen opposite believed. The German Army system was built up already and a very large amount of the necessary material for war was already in existence, not only in Germany itself, but war material in Russia on German account. So far as the German Air Force is concerned, for two years the Nazis positively delayed matters, they made such an utter mess of the whole job. The real foundation of the Luftwaffe started immediately after the last war, the foundation of the personnel being pilots of the last war who were determined that the Luftwaffe should come to life again in due course. Further, as regards
material, aircraft works in Germany were building up their production for years before the Nazis came into power, and prototypes were already in very big production. If the Weimar Republic had been in existence in 1933, 1935 or 1936 the German Luftwaffe would probably have been a much more powerful force than we found it.

...Until the decision was made in the General Election of 1935 there was a very grave risk in the critical years. When we knew that the war was upon us, as we knew from 1935 onwards, the leader of the Labour Party, now the Deputy Prime Minister in the War Government, said, "We are unalterably opposed to anything in the nature of re-armament." They voted for a Vote of Censure against the Government in March, 1936, because the Government proposed to re-arm on an adequate scale to carry out our obligations under the League of Nations.

...I turn to the question of the punishment of German war criminals. I have never concealed my view that our own war criminals are much more important, and that the sooner we deal with them the better.

House of Commons: November 14, 1944.

BOOKS (PAPER ALLOCATION)

Mr. Graham White asked the President of the Board of Trade the actual tonnage of paper which will be now available for the production of books under the recently announced increased allocation; and if he has been able to arrange for additional labour to be liberated to enable an increased output of books to be made.

Mr. Dalton: The total amount of paper allocated in the present four-monthly period for the production of books is 9,118 tons, an increase of 1,433 tons over the allocation in the last period. The Publishers' Association have informed me that the increase in their quotas will be largely used to produce longer runs, which are more economical of labour, and I am in close touch with my right hon. Friend, the Minister of Labour, on the labour requirements of the industry.

COAL INDUSTRY (JOINT RESOURCES BOARD, REPORT)

Captain Thorneycroft asked the Prime Minister (1) what were the sources of the information contained in the Report of the Joint Resources Board on the Coal Industry which was made available on the understanding that it would not be published; and whether such sources of information have been consulted as to the desirability of publication;

(2) what representations he has received from the Mining Association and the Mineworkers' Federation as to the desirability or otherwise of publishing the Report of the Joint Resources Board on the Coal Industry and the nature of such representations;

(3) what representations have been received from Government Departments or organisations in the U.S.A. objecting to the publication of the Report of the Joint Resources Board on the Coal Industry.

Mr. Attlee: The Report of the recent United States Coal Mission was, as my right hon. and gallant Friend the Minister of Fuel and Power earlier informed the House, prepared as a confidential Report to the Combined Production and Resources Board. The information on which the Report was based was obtained from a great number of sources, official and other, at a series of formal and informal meetings last summer. In view of the intention that the Report should be confidential, no question arose of consulting these sources of information as to the desirability of publication. As my right hon. and gallant Friend stated on October 17, it would be undesirable to set a precedent of publishing confidential joint Reports to the Combined Production and resources Board. It will be appreciated that this is a decision taken by the Government as a matter of general policy.

As regards representations as to the desirability or otherwise of publication, my right hon. and gallant Friend received on August 22 a personal letter from the President of the Mineworkers' Federation of Great Britain asking that the Report should be published in order to dispel certain rumours originating in the United States. No representations, one way or another, have been received from the Mining Association, Government Departments or organisations in the United States of America concerning the publication of the Report.

Captain Thorneycroft: While thanking the right hon. Gentleman for that reply, may I ask him whether, if no objections to publications have been received and the only representations have been requests for publication—and these representations have come from all sides of the House—he does not think this matter could be reconsidered? Further, is there any foundation for the statement that in addition to some of the comments on the attitude of both miners and mine owners representations have been made in the Report about the attitude of His Majesty's Government?

Mr. Attlee: I have explained to the hon. and gallant Member that this is one of the series of Reports, and that it is undesirable to set a precedent by publishing them. I have no knowledge of the other matter to which the hon. and gallant Member has referred.

STERLING BALANCES

Sir H. Williams asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the value of Treasury Bills held by Empire and allied countries as sterling balances; and what are the respective percentages of the total.

Sir J. Anderson: I regret that the information for which my hon. Friend asks is not at my disposal.

Sir H. Williams: Has not my right hon. Friend any information at all about these very large obligations contracted in sterling?

Sir J. Anderson: Yes, I have a good deal of information, but the particular information for which my hon. Friend asks is not at my disposal.

BILL PRESENTED

HYDRO-ELECTRIC UNDERTAKINGS (VALUATION FOR RATING) (SCOTLAND)

"to amend the law of Scotland with regard to the valuation for rating of hydro-electric undertakings and for purposes..."
Social Credit and The State

We have frequently expressed the view that, in the first place, what we know as European civilisation, which it is the express objective of this paper and of the Social Credit Movement so far as in them lies, to preserve, restore and enhance, is the embodiment of the culture of the medi-aeval Church, for the most part institutionally but not individually now represented by what is commonly known as Roman Catholicism. That many of the worst features of the social and industrial systems of the present day can be traced without difficulty to the spirit and ideology of the Lutheran and Calvinistic Reformation, is equally true.

But it must be agreed that no institution of the magnitude of the Mediaeval Christian Church suffers schisms so deep and far-reaching without the existence of some grave internal defects to which attack can be directed. It is one of the great tragedies of history that the reformation had to be Germanic, but it is incontestable that there had to be a reformation.

We are impelled to refer to a matter, which at first face seems a little outside our orbit, by certain information we have received as to the activities of Cardinal Villeneuve in attacking the Social Credit movement in the Province of Quebec—activities which link up directly with the Lutheran and Calvinistic Reformation, is equally true.
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Social Credit and The State

We have frequently expressed the view that, in the first place, what we know as European civilisation, which it is the express objective of this paper and of the Social Credit Movement so far as in them lies, to preserve, restore and enhance, is the embodiment of the culture of the medi-aeval Church, for the most part institutionally but not individually now represented by what is commonly known as Roman Catholicism. That many of the worst features of the social and industrial systems of the present day can be traced without difficulty to the spirit and ideology of the Lutheran and Calvinistic Reformation, is equally true.

But it must be agreed that no institution of the magnitude of the Mediaeval Christian Church suffers schisms so deep and far-reaching without the existence of some grave internal defects to which attack can be directed. It is one of the great tragedies of history that the reformation had to be Germanic, but it is incontestable that there had to be a reformation.

We are impelled to refer to a matter, which at first face seems a little outside our orbit, by certain information we have received as to the activities of Cardinal Villeneuve in attacking the Social Credit movement in the Province of Quebec—activities which link up directly with the disastrous attitude of pre-reformation ecclesiastics, and stand in sharp contradiction of the admirable pronouncements of the Pope. In passing, we noted contemplatively the marked consideration and publicity given to Cardinal Villeneuve by the "B".B.C. on his recent visit to this country.

These activities are alleged to be based on a document emanating from the Vatican Secretariat, of which we have a copy, but of the authenticity of which we are frankly sceptical. It is an outstanding instance of the curious technique to which we have often made reference and which we can generally associate with Communism. Perhaps an example will illustrate what we mean, and to avoid any discussion as to whether we are misrepresenting the quotation, or are misrepresented by it, we give the original with an English translation:

"Il est à craindre que, par la centralisation de la monnaie aux mains de l'Etat, comme le prêche Douglas, on en vienne à substituer les potentats financiers privés contre une plutocratie de l'Etat, qui n'est peut-être pas moins dangereuse."

(Emphasis added)

This matter is of such obvious importance that we propose to deal with it at some length at an early date. Our Catholic friends the world over will realise the kind of ammunition which the situation will provide to their enemies.

Blue-print

"... many... have, through their cruelty, been unable to maintain their position in times of peace, not to speak of the uncertain times of war.

"I believe this arises from the cruelties being used well or badly. Well used may be called those (if it is permissible to use the word well of evil) which are committed once for the need of securing one's self, and which afterwards are not persisted in, but are exchanged for measures as useful to the subjects as possible. Cruelties ill used are those which, although at first few, increase rather than diminish with time. Those who follow the former method may remedie in some measure their condition, both with God and man; as did Agathocles. As to the others, it is impossible for them to maintain themselves. Whence it is to be noted, that in taking a state the conqueror must arrange to commit all his cruelties at once, so as not to have to recur to them every day, and so to be able, by not making fresh changes, to reassure people and win them over by benefiting them. Whoever acts otherwise, either through timidity or bad counsels, is always obliged to stand with knife in hand, and can never depend on his subjects, because they, through continually fresh injuries, are unable to depend upon him. For injuries should be done all together, so that being less tasted, they will give less offence. Benefits should be granted little by little, so that they may be better enjoyed. And above all, a prince must live with his subjects in such a way that no accident should make him change it, for good or evil; for necessity arising in adverse times, you are not in time with severity, and the good that you do does not profit you, as it is judged to be forced, and you will derive no benefit whatever from it."

—NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI
The Concentrater Concentrated

A Commentary on the Eighth Report from the Select Committee on National Expenditure, Session 1943-44, with special reference to The Paint Industry.

This time two years ago the Paint Industry was about to be concentrated. The basic idea was that by putting productive capacity out of action by the elimination of the small man the “national interest” would be well served. Unexpectedly the “lamb” refused to be sacrificed, pointed out that he was better alive and failed to see how the fight for “freedom” could be promoted by eliminating him. His freedom at any rate was in danger and he was having none of it. So it was that he set to work to fight his own battle behind the lines. That his action was fully justified is revealed in the following extracts and comments:

The concentration scheme, according to the Eighth Report from the Select Committee on National Expenditure Session 1943-44, meant that “All the larger firms, including the fourteen subsidiaries of the largest combine in the industry were to be nucleus firms, and between 250 and 300 smaller manufacturers were to have their works closed.” The ostensible excuse for closing the works was that “in March 1942, in view of the shortage of some essential raw materials and the consequent contraction in the volume of the industry which was envisaged, [note it had not yet happened] it was decided that it was desirable to concentrate the industry, and the Controller of Miscellaneous Chemicals proceeded to select “nucleus firms.” Before this could be done, however, statistics had to be obtained by the Board of Trade. The statistics when received were entirely misleading as the questionnaire was wrongly drawn up in a vital particular. In 1941, “the industry was working to maximum capacity” and some firms were so overwhelmed with orders on government account or unable to complete their contracts through destruction of premises by enemy action that subletting became the order of the day. Now the Board of Trade asked a return of the Paint sold by a manufacturer during a period. Thus a big firm who had sublet a part of its orders to say half a dozen small firms may have sold 100,000 gallons of which say 60,000 were manufactured on their behalf by the small firms. Thus the Board of Trade return showed 160,000 gallons sold in all, 100,000 by the large firm and 60,000 by the small. Actually however only 100,000 were made. It also made the capacity of the large firms appear much larger relatively than they were in point of fact. So that in spite of the smaller firms being vital to the “National Interest” in 1941, they were to be virtually killed in 1942 with the aid of misleading statistics. Facts of this nature were skilfully presented to Captain Waterhouse, M.C., M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade by “The London Committee” [an ad hoc group acting on behalf of the condemned firms] and valiantly supported by Members of Parliament of all parties in an interview in November 1942. The Controller of Miscellaneous Chemicals was also present together with officials of the other Ministries concerned.

After consideration of the evidence then given, the Board of Trade issued a Memorandum on the Position of the Paint Industry on January 4, 1943, in which it stated that “Owing to the changed circumstances the Board of Trade now no longer intend to proceed with the compulsory concentration of the industry…” It would appear in this context that “changed circumstances” is a synonym for “putty and paint” in hiding things unpleasant to behold.

It was that interview at the Board of Trade which led to events which Major Procter, M.P., later described as “making parliamentary history” and it further demonstrated that a small group taking sound action can still get consideration in this country. When Captain Waterhouse knew the facts he acted promptly and fairly.

But this was only Round I. Rounds II, III, etc. were or are to follow. Thus paragraph 20 in the Report says “Early in 1943 a fresh attempt was made to concentrate the industry. It is not clear whence the initiative came, but as the result of discussions between the Ministry of Supply and the Ministry of Labour two lists containing 174 paint works were drawn up” … “So far as the Ministry of Supply was concerned, the Ministry of Labour was free to take all the labour from the rest.” Thus whereas the first concentration scheme envisaged concentration with compensation this scheme envisaged complete confiscation. So in part 21 the report goes on, “Once again protests were made by the excluded firms, this time to the Ministry of Labour, from which an assurance was obtained that no small firms would be compelled to close and that all firms would be allowed to keep their key men. In the event, no small firm, your Committee were assured, has actually been closed. Moreover, the withdrawal of labour from all firms, large and small, has been considered by the Man Power Board, each case on its merits and on similar principles.”

This is of course a very condensed report on the results of much correspondence and many interviews. In one interview, not backed by the presence of M.P.s, Mr. M. S. McCrorquodale, M.P., one of the Joint Parliamentary Secretaries to the Ministry of Labour said he was seeing us, [not because presumably we had a just complaint] because there had been a certain amount of publicity over the Paint Industry and in almost the same breath that our parliamentary action had not done us much good! Where would we have been if we had been good “lambs”?

In reference to the Paint Industry the report concludes as follows: —Paragraph 22. “Your Committee do not, however, consider that the treatment of the Paint Industry has been satisfactory.” It goes on to say that if concentration was deemed necessary the White Paper (Concentration of Production, 1941, Cmd. 6258) should have been followed. “As it was… the system of lists was adopted, with the result that the firms not on the lists, which were in the main the small firms, were discriminated against in regard both to the protection of their labour and to their obtaining of Government orders. Your Committee do not consider that the result was either economical or fair.” Since the Committee took the evidence they “have been informed that direct orders for paints, other than special kinds, are no longer to be limited to firms on the lists.” “… but the continued existence of the lists still results in discrimination between firms in regard to labour. Your Committee therefore recommend that the lists should be abandoned.”

As the writer is interested in the Paint Industry* he has given more space to this than other matters in the Report but this significant sentence in paragraph 26 is worthy of attention. “On the whole, the operation of the Chemical
Control has tended to strengthen rather than diminish the preponderance of the strongest interests in the chemical industry," and adds "...there is a danger that too much reliance may be placed on the strength of a single concern." Thus we inevitably reflect "only in War or conditions approximating to war will the British Government contemplate wholesale planning." Meanwhile, "the Miscellaneous Chemicals Control no longer exists as a separate entity..." (paragraph 2 of the report). Thus the Control that drew up the lists has itself been "concentrated"! So the diggers of pits sometimes fall into them themselves!

R. Gaudin.

*Mr. R. B. Gaudin is President of the Paint Manufacturers and Allied Trades Association, Ltd. His article is not an official Communication.

PARLIAMENT (Continued from page 3 connected therewith," presented by Mr. T. Johnston, supported by the Lord Advocate, Sir Archibald Sinclair, Mr. Ernest Brown, the Solicitor-General for Scotland, Mr. Westwood and Mr. Alan Chapman; to be read a Second time upon Thursday, and to be printed [Bill 54].

FUEL AND POWER ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. Keeling asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether he can now name the members of the Fuel and Power Advisory Council.

Major Lloyd George: Yes, Sir. I have already informed the House of my intention to set up this Council and that I had secured the services of Sir Ernest Simon as Chairman. I have now appointed the Council as follows:

Mr. Geoffrey Crompton,
Dr. E. S. Grumell, C.B.E.
Sir Harold Hartley, K.C.V.O., C.B.E., M.C., F.R.S.
Professor C. N. Hinshelwood, F.R.S.
Professor John Jewkes, C.B.E.
Viscount Ridley, C.B.E.
Sir Robert Robinson, F.R.S., D.Sc.
Mr. Geoffrey Summers, C.B.E.
Secretary—Mr. R. N. Quirk.

The terms of Reference are as follows:

"To consider and advise upon questions, referred from time to time by the Minister to the Council, concerning the development and utilisation of the fuel and power resources of the country in the national interest."

RUSSIAN HISTORY (UNIVERSITY STUDIES)

Miss Ward asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any steps have been taken by the University Grants Committee to provide at selected universities chairs of Russian history.

Sir J. Anderson: I understand that a number of universities are contemplating developments in the study of Russian history and that these projects are included in the universities' general proposals for post-war developments, the financial implications of which are now under consideration by the University Grants Committee.

MINISTRY OF SOCIAL INSURANCE BILL

Dr. Russell Thomas (Southampton): ...If by any chance this scheme does not work—and it might not work if the economic condition of our country is not looked after very carefully when the war is over—it may well be nothing less than organised poverty—I would rather bear with that scheme if I knew, as I have said, that it was being run under a national Minister. That would maintain my spirits. I dislike the word "social" intensely. I dislike it when applied to Governmental matters because these things, I believe, originated in Germany. The Germans were the past masters—the forerunners—of all this sort of thing. In the last century they established social ministers for pensions, for health insurance, and so on. They did that consistently, because they were so full of charity and brotherly love towards one another.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs (Mr. Lloyd George) who has been recently much extolled, borrowed his scheme from the social aspirations of the Germans, but he did have the decency to call it "national insurance." I remember too that when British doctors were going to refuse to work the scheme because of its obvious injustices he was so impressed by the State sociability of Germany that he even thought of bringing those social-minded German doctors into this country to take their place. Right up to the beginning of the war the Germans maintained their sociability—they had their "Strength through Joy" movement. They promised motor cars for all. They endeavoured to produce perfect physical health in the workman by sending him to the labour camp at a shilling a day. That social method resulted in the most ruthless totalitarian regime in the history of the world, in the most savage war of all time, and even during the war they still stick to their social methods by winter help campaigns...

...In the year 1789, a nation which was wishing to become super-social and which wanted to establish sociability among nations for all time, quarrelled with its past history, and destroyed its traditions and the happiness of more than one generation. These people did not foresee, however, the corruption and the disruption and the humiliation of the Third Republic. Those are some of the reasons why I dislike the word "social".

House of Commons: November 15, 1944.

MINERAL RIGHTS (NATIONALISATION)

Commander Agnew asked the Prime Minister if he will introduce legislation in the forthcoming Session to nationalise the rights in minerals other than oil and coal and to provide appropriate compensation for the present owners.

The Prime Minister: No, Sir.

Commander Agnew: Is my right hon. Friend aware that there is much support from those engaged in conducting these industries from the point of view of private enterprise for the view that the continued retention of these rights in private hands particularly where deposits are contiguous, is a serious obstacle to their efficient winning?

The Prime Minister: Well, these are some of the opinions which will no doubt be ventilated in due course.

Mr. Shimwell: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell me
and the House how it is possible for him to resist a Conservative demand for nationalisation?

The Prime Minister: One swallow does not make a summer.

House of Commons: November 16, 1944.

PALESTINE: "Jewish Standard" Editor (Speech)

Earl Winterton asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he has considered the speech of Mr. Abrahams, editor of the "Jewish Standard," at a recent public meeting in London, a copy of which has been sent to him, accusing the Government of Palestine of having an anti-Jewish bias and the Palestinian constabulary of being partly composed of former members of the British Union of Fascists; and, if, in view of the damage which these untrue statements may do in Palestine in its disturbed condition, he will take action against Mr. Abrahams under the Emergency Powers Act.

Mr. H. Morrison: I have seen the report of this speech, and I appreciate the reasons which had led my Noble Friend to bring it to my notice. The decision whether proceedings should be taken does not, however, rest with me, and I am, therefore, sending the papers to the proper authorities for consideration.

Mr. Mander: Will my right hon. Friend not countenance the idea that we should try to put into prison those people with whose ideas we do not happen to agree?

Earl Winterton: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for your protection on the charge made by the hon. Gentleman; and I would call attention to the fact that the gentleman in question has subsequently condoned, in an article which he wrote in his paper, murder in Palestine. I ask that the hon. Gentleman who has made a statement on the wireless during 1944 is 78. The number of hon. Members who have spoken on the wireless during 1944; and the number of Labour and non-Labour, respectively.

Mr. Bracken: The number of hon. Members who have spoken on the wireless during 1944 is 78. The number of Labour Members is 22 and the number of non-Labour Members is 56.

ALL OVER ALIKE

A recent message to The Times announced that Mr. W. Russell Grimwade, a member of the council of the University of Melbourne, had given the university £50,000 for the foundation of a school of bio-chemistry devoted both to teaching and research. This gift has only once been equalled in the history of the university.

Mr. Grimwade, who is chairman of the directors of Drug Houses (Australia), Limited, the largest firm of manufacturing chemists and druggists in the southern hemisphere, said the correspondent, has been active in the war-time production in Australia of drugs previously imported.
To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

*Associations desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in the following: —

Name, address, and approximate number of members of Association

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat;†

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to The Social Crediter regularly in the proportion of at least one copy for every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..................... Deputy's Signature.........................

To accompany the above form, a brief statement is requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

Hewlett Edwards,
Director of Organisation and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.
†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

"THE COMMISSIONERS"

"... Four years ago the British Medical Association formed a Planning Commission... I am, Sir, your obedient servant, Henry S. Souttar, Chairman, Medical Planning Commission." — In The Times, November 25.

Mr. J. Griffiths, M.P., in an address to new voters (those belonging to the eight millions who have not voted before) told a meeting arranged by the Hampstead Fabians that the Labour Party believed in planning on a national scale. The war organisation of the last five years had altered fundamentally the make-up of the country. The Labour Party proposed to take over centralised controls as they were, and operate them for a new purpose. Particular mention was made by the speaker of the Ministry of Fuel and Power, for the taking over of which a complete plan was ready.