

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 13. No. 19.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 13, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

In 1884, a light mail stage coach, carrying passengers, ran daily from Edinburgh to Newcastle-on-Tyne, where the mails and passengers caught a train, arriving in London by coach and rail in one day. Sometimes they did in 1944, too.

The key-note of the Pope's Christmas Broadcast was the limitation of the power of the State.

The Times compressed and paraphrased the Broadcast, and omitted any mention of the limits of the State.

There is something very nauseating about Professor Laski and his claptrap enthusiasm for "the common people." Professor Laski himself, fortunately for the rest of us, is not a common person, and the very last thing he has any intention of becoming is a common person. As Stalin is reported to have said, he would rather reign in Hell than serve in Heaven. Fortunately, there are quite a large number of people who have no intention of having this country turned into a hell in order that a select body of Laskis may reign over it.

The picture of Great Britain which the Planners, largely inspired by Professor Laski's race, are so anxious to paint, of a great mass of "the common people" possessing all the virtues, and trodden down by an effete aristocracy possessing none, but of great wealth and determined to prevent them from enjoying a tolerable life, is quite useful for American consumption and Trades Union Congress amusement. But there are many heartening signs that it has lost its effectiveness as an instrument with which to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for international business. The "historic right of the Left to victory" is going to have a rough ride; and Professor Laski gives us the impression of corresponding to the gentleman who was the 'ossiest man on foot, and the footiest man on a 'oss as ever we did see.

The refusal of the right to deal in the new issue of G.E.C. stock by the Committee of the Stock Exchange is a blunt intimation to the Treasury that this is not yet a completely Totalitarian State. The Treasury has always been imbued with the idea that its powers are limitless and its responsibility only to its private God; and its success in collecting savage fines for infringement of regulations intended to demonstrate that "private" bank balances are at its mercy has only strengthened its belief. If the agitation for "State" money, which is carried on by various monetary reform organisations had been originated by the Treasury itself, it could hardly have served its purpose better. But, of course, in the main, this disastrous clamour

is the outcome of the elementary inability to refrain from the use of words of which the meaning is undefined.

Not many matters are a ground for certainty nowadays, but on two of them it is possible to be fairly dogmatic. There will be no sensible improvement in world society until there is a radical decentralisation of money power; and there will be no decentralisation of money power by any centralised Government, no matter what it may call itself.

So far as Great Britain is concerned, every so-called progressive movement has become the focus of the money power, for reasons which are quite simple. Every progressive movement is assuming (sincerity of intention) a distributive movement; and every distributive movement which does not distribute credit is inevitably a movement for organised robbery, which the money-power is delighted to support. The distribution of credit is the distribution of the substance (under-standing) of things hoped for, the *evidence* of things *unseen*: things seen belong to somebody, and their arbitrary distribution by *force majeure* is robbery, no matter how it is disguised.

An understanding of this situation is the key to the policy of scarcity—which is the Ark of the Covenant of High Finance-World Dominion. Given the illusion of a fixed and insufficient body of wealth, a popular movement for the destruction of "vested interests" (stability of tenure) can always be worked up. And stability of tenure is the one thing which the money power will not tolerate except for itself.

Nothing is more remarkable than the contrast between the sentiments expressed by Gladstone in regard to the claims of "the City" to dominate finance, and the Liberal Party, so long led by Gladstone, the chosen instrument of international Jewry. And the Lloyd George who courageously opposed the South African War as a gold racket, was the chosen instrument of the Isaacs, the Samuels, and the Mondes, in their concerted attack on "the landed, vested interest"—an attack which coincided with and diverted attention from the degradation of "British" commercial morality to a standard, or the want of it, lower than that of the South Sea Bubble.

By fairly common consent, one of the most attractive of the British Dominions, in climate, natural resources and remarkable similarity to Great Britain in scenery, is New Zealand; and it is highly instructive to consider the course of events during the past half century. In area New Zealand closely approximates to Great Britain, but its population is little over one and a half millions, of whom about forty thousand emigrate annually in normal times. In spite of the fact that its export per head of the population (pre-war) was the highest in the world, its currency was at a

discount of 25 per cent, on sterling. Its pre-war Debt was nearly £200 *per capita*. Its State-owned narrow-gauge railways had discontinued dining-car services because they did not "pay," in spite of the abundance of Hydro-electric power for cheap operation. With, fundamentally, one of the finest populations in the world, the pick of English and Scottish emigration, and a native stock, the Maori, unique in its assimilability, New Zealand was stagnant. Why? The answer is easy—Finance-Socialism.

One of these days, New Zealand will be a centre of world-civilisation; but it has a lot of house-cleaning to do first, beginning with Mr. Walter Nash, and proceeding to the local Freemasonry racket.

There seems to be little doubt that encyclopaedism—the splitting of knowledge into "subjects"—has a curious, mesmeric, or magical consequence; the inhibition or destruction of the capacity to relate or compare experiences. The propaganda for "full employment" is so completely in the teeth of the whole theory of modern industry and the experience of the past seventy-five years that it would be supposed that it would be met with a howl of derision.

But it is not; and an article by a well known woman "public relations" speaker, published in the *Sunday Times* of December 31 observes that "After the war many women who have not done so before will have to work for their living." That is to say, not only are we going to find work for the previously unemployed; but we are going to multiply the number of persons who require employment because they must "work for a living."

Anyone retaining a modicum of native intelligence would ponder over the present situation of the world and conclude that since it had developed contemporaneously with an immensely increased capacity for production, it would only be common prudence to make sure that still further insistence on production would not exacerbate it. But the inescapable fact is that success in any line of endeavour in the modern world requires the cultivation of the habit of speaking to a brief. Just as a barrister sells his forensic talent for the purpose of winning the case entrusted to him, so the modern professional man or woman is compelled to disregard the objective and concentrate on the means. Not very much of that discipline is necessary to hide the objective from view.

"They [the Communists] have already recruited a large selection from the ranks of the Fascist Party, and their style and methods are strongly suggestive of Fascism. If you go into any Communist headquarters, you find the same type of well-groomed young official, with the same rather haughty and aloof manner that you did in the past in any *Casa del Fascio*."

— "Leadership in Rome," *The Times* December 30.
Now, isn't that odd? What's in a name?

"The self-sacrifice attributed to Socialists, I interpret as the desire for self-aggrandisement. The renegade intelligentsia, before mentioned, choose to be big shots chasing shadows, to being subordinate but useful members of an organised community creating the substance." From a letter signed "Onlooker, Coupar Angus," published in the *Dundee Courier*.

SEMITISM

The British-Australia Association sends the following, published as a leaflet, from Gympie, Australia:—

"In association human beings are more effective than in isolation. This is true in all fields. Two men working together will achieve greater results than they would if they work separately.

"If the amount of work achieved by one man is represented by the letter 'm', then the amount of work achieved by two men working separately may be represented by 'm' plus 'm'; but if they work together the work they achieve will be greater than 'm' plus 'm' and may be represented by 'm' plus 'm' plus 'a' where 'a' equals what is called the increment of association.

"The increment of association arises wherever Individuals associate for a common purpose, and is found operative in a beaver-colony, or in a beehive, as well as in human society.

"In human society the increment of association is a most important factor, and in large measure it is the desire to reap this most valuable increment of association, that draws men and women together into communities.

"Now there are two doctrines which govern the flow of the increment of association from the individual to society, and the flow from society to the individual. One doctrine may be called the *Doctrine of Inclusion*; the other the *Doctrine of Exclusion*. Where the doctrine of *Inclusion* is operative there is no discrimination in favour of any section or individual and no discrimination in disfavour. This doctrine is most naturally practised in a society which is homogeneous, *i.e.*, a society formed of individuals of the same race, of the same culture, the same way of life, holding generally to the same or similar religion and philosophy. It is the holding of these things in common which is the hall-mark of a Nation. It may be noted in passing that the internationalists blind themselves against all perception of the reality and fundamental existence of this homogeneity which constitutes a Nation. Nations are as much an expression of a true and real relationship as is the family on a smaller scale. In fact the Nation may be regarded as an extended family. The inter-nationalists are as determined to destroy the family as they are determined to wipe out the sovereignty of nations.

"Where the *Doctrine of Exclusion* operates there is discrimination in favour of some section, which is very often distinguished as being composed of individuals of alien origin.

"The individuals of such an alien section determine that while they shall accept all increment of association which flows to them from the community generally, they shall not reciprocate by allowing a free and compensating flow of the increment of association to proceed from them to the community, instead they determine wherever possible to direct such flow to the benefit of only members of their own alien section. Thus when an individual of such alien section succeeds in capturing a position of high office, he endeavours to use his elevation to further the preferment of an individual of his own alien group. The result of this immoral and inequitable interference with the normal and just flow of the increment of association, is to rapidly advance the interest of this peculiar alien race or group, at the expense of the general community. Unfortunately,

however, for the final success of this exclusive group, there comes a time when the general community becomes conscious of the advantage that these intruders have been able to secure for themselves; it becomes a matter of general observation that members of such an alien section occupy positions of power and authority out of proportion to their numbers.

"Action and reaction are equal and opposite and wholly automatic.

"No people have practised the Doctrine of Exclusion more persistently and consistently than the Jews; and no people have so consistently reaped a bitter harvest of retribution. Antisemitism is only the natural and inevitable reaction against Semitism. This red herring is drawn out whenever any individual contributes a constructive idea that may make the life of both Jew and Gentile a little easier. Till the Jew abandons the Doctrine of Exclusion we want no more of him in Australia; and we must at all costs resist the idea being circulated, of forming a segregated community in the Kimberly district.

"If, as it is suggested, there is a vast number of landless refugee Jews, seeking to colonise yet another land, why not turn their eyes to Madagascar. This country is fertile and would yield a good return for their labours; but what is more important the Jew would be unfettered by Gentile laws and customs. The Jewish race have at their disposal for this desirable end, the Jewish Colonisation Association, better known as the I.C.A. If, however, the I.C.A. prefer to press upon the Australian citizens and the British Empire colonisation schemes that would be detrimental to us, we here will be left no alternative but to open negotiations with the government of Madagascar ourselves for the benefit of the refugee Jew. It seems that we should proceed along a very definite course in this matter because the suggestions as enunciated by Steinberg are a direct menace to the future well being of Australia."

"INEPT AND UNFOUNDED"

"Wealth therefore, which is constantly being augmented by social and economic progress, must be so distributed amongst the various individuals and classes of society, that the needs of all, of which Leo XIII spoke, be thereby satisfied. ... In this connection it must be noted that the appeal made by some to the words of the Apostle: 'If any man will not work, neither let him eat,' is as inept as it is unfounded. The Apostle is here passing judgment on those who refuse to work though they can and ought to work; he admonishes us to use diligently our time and our powers of body and mind, and not to become burdensome to others as long as we are able to provide for ourselves. In no sense does he teach that labour is the sole title which gives a right to a living or to an income."*

The Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pope Pius XI.

*A footnote refers to II Thess., iii, 8-10.

PRINCELY

A B.U.P. telegram from New Delhi published by the *Daily Telegraph* on December 4 recorded "the unwillingness of the [Indian] Princes to introduce the same rates of income-tax and excess profits tax in their states as exist in British India."

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 7, 1944.

PAINT INDUSTRY

Major Procter asked the Minister of Labour, in view of the need for domestic paints, if he proposes to implement the recommendations of the Select Committee on National Expenditure in their Eighth Report on the activities of the miscellaneous chemical control, and cancel the lists of selected firms receiving preferential treatment with regard to their labour.

Mr. Bevin: In view of the increased demand for paint for houses, I have decided, in consultation with my right hon. Friend the Minister of Supply, to cancel the lists and to apply the same rules with regard to the deferment and withdrawal of labour throughout the paint industry.

NATIONAL FIRE SERVICE

OFFICERS BOARD (PSYCHIATRIST)

Mrs. Tate asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department the nationality of Dr. E. Guttmann, the only doctor on the N.F.S. Officers Selection Board; and why he was appointed, in view of the fact that he is not a British medical officer, that his qualifications are inferior and that he only got on to the register in 1939.

Mr. H. Morrison: The National Fire Service Officers' Board applies the procedure of War Office Selection Boards in assessing the qualities of officership in the individuals who come before the Board, and I am advised that, for this purpose, the occasional assistance of a psychiatrist is necessary. When the National Fire Service Officers' Board was set up, there was difficulty in finding a fully qualified psychiatrist who had the special experience required, and eventually an arrangement was made with the Mill Hill Emergency Hospital, which is a part of the Emergency Medical Service and situated within easy reach of the Board's premises, for Dr. Guttmann, who is a psychiatrist on the staff of the hospital, to assist the Board in an honorary capacity, as and when he can spare the time from duties at the hospital. Dr. Guttmann, who is a German refugee from Nazi oppression, has been in this country since 1934, and I am advised that his qualifications and reputation in this particular field are of the very highest.

COMPANY CONTROL (ENEMY ALIENS)

Captain P. Macdonald asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the introduction of legislation prescribing that no alien of enemy nationality may hold the controlling number of shares in any company, and that under all circumstances an available British subject shall be given a preferential claim to employment over any such alien, providing he is capable of doing the work in question.

Mr. H. Morrison: I cannot undertake to introduce legislation on these or related matters at present. In any case, the issues are not as simple as might appear from my hon. and gallant Friend's Question. For example, many refugees from Nazi oppression and other aliens of enemy nationality have materially contributed to the war effort of the United Nations as members of the Forces or as civilians,

(continued on page 6)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*

One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 13. No. 19.

Saturday, January 13, 1945.

Why 'Labour' Shouldn't Govern

One of the Hulton tabloids has an article entitled "Can Labour Govern?" The conclusion is that it can't, but there is no suggestion that it is ridiculous that "Labour" should govern. "Labour" is a catch-phrase for one function of industrial production (the mentality of agricultural labour is completely distinct from that of factory labour) and there is no more reason why "labour" as such should govern than that left-handed albinos should.

But it is becoming obvious that this idea that a community is something expressly devised to be ordered about by somebody (*i.e.*, Some body) is due for drastic revision.

It is important to become conscious of the change which these people, who for the purpose of discussion we may call Mond-Turner, wish to bring about; quite a fundamental change of social outlook, and one which is carefully disguised. It is not novel, particularly in Germany and the United States. But it is essentially un-English, and anti-Christian. Our traditional conception of "employment" is the sale of time for money or other good and sufficient considerations. What differentiated employment from slavery was that it was a self-contained contract—often a bad and inequitable contract, but self-contained. What the employee did with the time he did not sell was his own business. That he sold too much time for too little consideration did not affect the principle.

But, under the guise of "welfare," housing schemes and so forth, all fairly good in themselves, but all under Trust control, big corporations such as Lever Bros. in England and practically all the big Trusts in America began to acquire control of the employee's leisure. The Pennsylvania Railroad forbids "the use of alcohol" *off duty*, and most of the Trusts claim the right to penalise opinion. The Pennsylvania boasts that it never fails to catch an employee the second time he enters a "saloon," and will prevent his employ by any American Railroad thereafter. Hidden dossiers, never seen by the individual to whom they apply, are kept and circulated. Black-listing is ruin.

That is the Empire of Big Business which the abolition of private incomes and property, under the slogan of "full employment," is intended to inaugurate. There is a complete answer to it, and its name is Social Credit. "Yes, we know all about that; and it is the only idea we fear" as the Soviet Kommissar remarked.

The same Hulton tabloid to which reference has been made contains a statement that "the profit per ton that the coalowner kept was almost exactly the same (1s. 6d.)

as the pay his father got for every ton of coal he cut." The "father" was a Lanarkshire miner. The gross profits of the mining industry are twelve million pounds and the wages are one hundred and seventy six million pounds (pre-war) or nearly fifteen times as much. Now, what is Messrs. Hulton's big idea in suggesting that profits and wages are equal? The article in which it occurs is a vicious attempt to suggest that the miner, (unlike Major Philip Sidney, V.C., M.P., who "although no doubt he could have been, was not one of those irresponsible idlers of the years before the war. He had often 'toyed with the idea' of going into politics") cannot normally afford to make Parliament his career. We shall see how much truth there is in that statement a little further on. We might perhaps suggest to the millionaire Hulton coterie that irresponsibility is more dangerous employed than unemployed. Or should we address our remarks to the Ministry of Fuel and Power, with the international chemical cartel grinning in the background?

There are so many rackets being put over the bemused islanders "in war, or under threat of war" that it is perhaps invidious to make distinctions. But since we have been told that our only wealth is our coal which has been forcibly acquired for "the nation" (to be paid for in debased pounds at pre-war price) for less than the cost of five days of war ("we are a poor, poor country, and only hard work and the lowest standard of living will save us") we might as well keep our eyes on the coal racket.

Before the war, under 800,000 persons were employed in *all* mines (coal and minerals) in Great Britain, and the number is presumably less now. But Mr. Will Lawther, the acting President of the new National Union of Mineworkers, states they are now one of the largest industrial Unions in the World, and "politically no other Trade Union is comparable to them." "The British Miners had more than 40 M.P.'s and controlled another 100 Labour seats."

Of the 800,000 mineworkers, a large number is under 21 years of age, and consequently has no Parliamentary vote. Let us assume that an equivalent number of miners' wives vote with their husbands, a generous assumption. Not all miners vote "Labour."

There are probably 30,000,000 Parliamentary votes of which the miners by assumption have less than one thirtieth. But, on Mr. Lawther's own showing, they, the miners, one sixtieth of the population, control one fifth of the 615 Members of Parliament, and arrogate to themselves the right to dictate *the* terms on which the main source of "the nation's wealth" (again by definition) shall be worked.

IN WHOSE CONFIDENCE?

While our true friends in Quebec are wrestling with the scandalous attachment [Greek: *skandalon*.] of Social Credit to Collectivism and Socialism, a weekly news letter, *Reality*, published in England, carries, over the signature G. Hickling and under the heading "In Confidence," an article, unexceptionable for the greater part, stating that we can throw Jonah (?The Financial System) overboard if all of three conditions are observed:—"(1) Does the proposal include the nationalisation of the nation's credit? If not the remedy is a fake." We heavily underline this gratuitous opinion of Mr. Hickling's. It is the diametrically opposite of ours.

The Fight in Australia

During 1944, affairs in Australia have largely paralleled those in this country; the differences being in emphasis and incident rather than in the outcome of policy. Major Lloyd George has little to learn from Mr. Mighell, his Australian counterpart—they have attained much the same results. On February 26, the Coal Commissioner issued orders to coal owners to open and to miners to work the pits. On March 3 we read that "Mr. Curtin has described his failure to settle coal mine anarchy." On March 10, the offending colliery was "taken over by the Government." And in August four thousand miners were still idle in twelve pits.

In February "Major Cameron... protested... in the House of Representatives against censorship [of] letters addressed to him as Member of Parliament. The *Sydney Morning Herald* (March 3) said: "Preliminary disclosures concerning the secret examination of private letters within Australia have shocked and angered people who had supposed that espionage of this kind could only exist in totalitarian countries. What was initiated as a security device... has developed into a detestable system of official surveillance, of which the creation of police-State dossiers of citizens [is] the natural and noisome offshoot." Parliamentary opposition took this seriously, and brought the matter to a conclusion. So, on March 15, *The Sun* announced in banner headlines: "Opposition Climb Down on Censors: Accept Limited Probe."

In July we find Dr. H. C. Coombs, Director of Post-War Reconstruction, considering "the effect of the greater participation of Governments in... the direction and control of industry" in a brochure *The Special Problems of Planning*, in which prospect the *Sydney Morning Herald* appeared to be acquiescent.

In the sphere of Party Politics Ross Gollan (*Sydney Morning Herald*, July 24) asks: "What is the future of the two Opposition Parties—or, in more exact terms, have they a future at all? Why and how this Government... is constantly inspiring... infringements of ordinary democratic liberty..." His answer may be applicable elsewhere. "The picture foreshadowed for 1946 or later is that of the present official opposition disappearing... with some few members living on parliamentarily as Independents: a dwindled Country Party rump... the major Parliamentary conflict being entirely between two parties developed from the present Labour Caucus; one bound to tenets [of Mr. Curtin] and the other created and swayed by sectional selfishness and totalitarian prejudice." He did not indicate the objectives of those contending or whether the conflict was real: just "conflict."

Against this background it may be anticipated that the Referendum was a culminating point of a series of moves made by the Commonwealth (Labour) Government of Australia to centralise power at Canberra. In 1942 a Bill so to amend the Constitution met with a reception such that it was not pursued. This was followed by pressure and negotiation calculated to induce the Provincial Governments to pass measures ceding powers to Canberra. In the early part of 1944 government opinion was fairly confident as to the result of an appeal to the electorate; a correspondent wrote "... there is a solid block of regimented labour behind the 'Yes' vote... communists are solid for it and that includes many of the so-called 'intellectuals'—especially on

the science side of their supporters. Then the soldiers are being carefully prepared by Government lectures and speakers, and it is scarcely likely that they will stress the 'No' aspect." Dr. Evatt, the Attorney General, was moved to remark: "The Commonwealth Government has patiently awaited implementation, and if the States at present holding out wish to avoid a war-time referendum... they should act quickly." This had no effect.

The Referendum which followed (August 1944) appealed for the assumption by Canberra of fourteen widely differing powers for five post war years. These substantially followed those which the British Parliament so confidently assumes and is steadily transferring to the Statute Book in such enactments as the post-Beveridge Scheme, the Education Bill and various Planning Bills. By virtue of its Federal Constitution, Australia could not be precipitated into totalitarian planning in quite that way; but the request, in the one referendum for powers of such diversity, was an open invitation to discuss, divide, and rule. Social Crediters concentrated on a clarification of the issue. In July, possibly owing to progress on these lines, an attempt was made to elevate the public aim above such sordid simplicity. "The meaning of this controversy is 'Shall Australia have full stature as a nation?'" (R. Windeyer, K.C.) By early August Mr. Curtin was reduced to "hysterical demagoguery" which, in leaders written on the eve of the Referendum, was countered by the *Sydney Morning Herald* in the words: "In the end discussion has returned to the simple though vital theme: should the Federal compact be cancelled in essential respects and the substance of the powers reserved to the States be transferred to the Commonwealth? What are the 'very things for which the national existence was staked in war' if not the traditional liberties of all British subjects—their right to lead their lives as their consciences and inclinations dictate without regimentation by conqueror or by bureaucrat?"

The proposals were rejected. A 'Yes' vote in four States was necessary to carry the Referendum. New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, and Tasmania voted 'No.' South Australia and Western Australia voted 'Yes.' The result contained interesting features; as, in New South Wales ten *Labour* seats voted 'No' while the 'Yes' majority at Barton, represented by Dr. Evatt the author of the referendum proposals, was only 161 in a count of 57,347 votes. Correspondents comment:

"The 'No' advocates had a good press, (this was not so when the Bill to alter the Constitution was introduced in 1942); the tone of press and conservative opinion had been on the side of the alteration, but the position at the time of the referendum had been entirely reversed, though the propaganda on both sides ran along party lines the voting did not appear to do so." (This from New South Wales). "The fact that the daily press and the banks were openly and strongly supporting the 'No' campaign certainly caused a number of people to vote 'Yes,' just to be opposite to the 'Capitalists.' No previous classification of people coincided with the alignment on the two sides; and I doubt whether the 'No' vote recorded indicates any genuine swing to truly democratic ways." (A South Australian comment). "Not one electorate in this [Queensland] State voted for it."

In this there is matter for reflection:—in the protection afforded to the Australian citizen by the Federal Constitution; in the considerable counter party vote acting against normal

party propaganda; in the signs of division, whether this be calculated or miscalculated on the part of Australian totalitarians; and, on a deeper level, the overall result. However he may have come to it—blindly or by incoherent motives—the Australian made the 'right' decision.

Dr. Evatt's management of this affair has been crude and raw. Australians may now expect more subtle measures, possibly from another quarter.

A footnote which may not be irrelevant: In the *Sun* (September 27) it was reported that "A soldier on leave who advocated Social Credit was arrested and driven 100 miles to give evidence at a 'security' inquiry. . . the Attorney General [the ubiquitous Dr. Evatt] said he could not see how he was arrested—he was a witness." According to a correspondent there is undoubted evidence that "a movement is on foot to discredit Social Crediters by charging them as being subversive both in their actions and outlook." The case of Mr. W. H. Hand was reported in *The Social Crediter* last week. The totalitarians are by no means having it all their own way. — H. E.

CORRECTION

The Social Crediter: Parliament: page 7, paragraph 2, December 23, 1944. Sir W. Smith should be Sir. W. Smithers.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

while others have rendered valuable services by establishing industrial enterprises giving employment to British workers to the advantage of the national economy.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS: HOUSING

Mr. Donald Scott (Wansbeck): . . . Will labour and materials be made available to the small contractor?

That is very important, because in almost every country town, and one might say in almost every large village, there is a small builder, a man with immense local experience of local conditions and types of buildings and materials and everything else. It is only right and proper he should have a chance of getting in too. In the same way, will it be possible to have material and direct estate labour made available for the estate owner or owner-occupier who wants to build agricultural cottages or repair existing cottages. I have seen a very large number of the agricultural cottages that have been built during the war. I say nothing about their interiors, but I must confess that in only one village, that of Thropton, in Northumberland, have my aesthetic susceptibilities not been hurt. It must be possible to build houses which match up with the local buildings, and at the same time tone in with the countryside. We do not want the same drabness of type from Land's End to John o' Groats. We are still individualists. In spite of a great deal of what has been said in this Chamber, we are not so much planning fodder. . .

Mr. Quibell (Brigg): . . . There are people whose ordinary businesses were brought to a standstill at the outbreak of the war, and there are many joiners and bricklayers and others who are capable of performing any task in the building trade. I know some works which have nearly a third more bricklayers to-day than they had previous to the war and, if E.P.T. was not helping them to pay the wages, a

large number of them would not be there much longer. If the Ministry is serious about it it can easily get the figures of the skilled men who were employed previous to the war, and the number now employed and you will find that there is an enormous number of skilled men doing unskilled work. For that reason I cannot see the tremendous difficulty that is said to exist. I am forced to the conclusion that the problem of the temporary and the permanent house is only the casing—the outside fabric. You are going to have the same standard fittings in the one as in the other. The more one thinks about the problem, the less there seems to be in the case for the temporary as against the permanent house, and the more heavily I come down on the side of the permanent house.

In my borough the number of houses that we require to catch up to the present demand is something less than 1,000. . . if the whole of the building operatives in the town were released from the Army or from other occupations, the problem could easily be solved by building permanent instead of temporary houses. The building trade, if it was properly and thoroughly organised, could solve the difficulty without us having some of these abortions called temporary houses. I do not know what steps the Government have taken to ascertain the number of men but in my borough we could solve it if they would let us have the men and the material.

If it was possible to obtain bricks and labour, the best house we could build is the old fashioned brick house, but I do not think the Government is encouraging the manufacture of bricks. I understand that there are huge stocks in various parts of the country, but in the district that I know very well half the brick yards are derelict and no attempt has been made to open them. I do not think some of them are very keen on doing it. While they get 3s. per thousand for doing nothing they seem to be quite content to rest on their laurels. One of the first steps the Government should take is to see that we begin the manufacture of the raw materials and that the brick yards are in the districts where houses are required. I am in favour of the traditional type of house. What is the difficulty about building it? Is it shortage of material? [HON. MEMBERS: "Labour."] Every one says that but no one attempts to give any real facts about it. I have heard speech after speech by people who make that bald statement without giving the facts.

Mr. Lipson: Has the hon. Member made any estimate as to the number of permanent houses of the traditional type that could be built by the industry in a year and the number of temporary houses?

Mr. Quibell: No, I have not, and I doubt very much if there is any Member of the House who could. If you want to put in concrete floors, whether up or down, you will meet with determined opposition from those who will have to inhabit the houses. For that reason the traditional type of floor and the traditional roof should be used. I do not think there would be the slightest difficulty in regard to timber. I have heard it said that there will be an abundance of shipping, and there is an abundance of timber. There is as much timber to-day, except for what is being used during the war, as there was five years ago. We have tremendous resources in Canada. For five years previous to the war we imported 350,000 standards a year. It is only a question of getting it here. Nothing looks better than a timber roof with good slates or tiles. There is any amount of timber in the world and any amount of slates

in North Wales. There is nothing better to put on a roof than good Penryn slates. We have tiles, clay, even raw material except timber, and the timber can be imported if only we had the shipping available...

Mr. Bellenger (Bassetlaw): ... I do not think that right hon. Gentlemen who sit in Government offices have any practical idea of the job facing the men who are, as it were, in the front line trenches. Who are they? For bomb damage repairs they are, in the main, the small jobbing builders. It is all very well to create tremendous organisations of large scale contractors to build Government ordnance factories, aerodromes and hostels—they may be able to do it efficiently, although it has taken some of them a long time to learn how to do the job—but in regard to small dwellings in London, which has one-sixth of the population of this country, and which, in relation to its size and population, is probably our most blitzed town, bomb damage can only be tackled efficiently, speedily and economically by small building contractors. I speak with knowledge of the borough of Kensington, in which I have operated professionally, as I have said, for 25 years, and I have been surprised to see, on numerous boards affixed to house property, the names of builders I have never heard of before, certainly not in London. These firms are being given contracts or jobs by local authorities without any regard to the efficiency of their work.

I make this allegation: that some of their work is scamped. I myself have had to go back, with whatever labour I could gather, and do over again certain work which has been carried out by large building contractors. It is no good the House shutting its eyes to facts which are known by building employers, surveyors and estate agents. I do not think we realise that most of the letting of property is done in London by estate agents, who have seen for themselves the great waste of labour...

The amount that can be spent on any house in one year, without a licence, is now £10. It used to be £100. For anything over that, one had to get the approval of the local authority, and then the Ministry of Works. What happens? I have put forward applications for permission to do work not greatly in excess of £10, and certainly under £50, and they have been ignored. There are stacks of applications at town halls for licences. If the Minister says that labour cannot be obtained I say that I can get it and so can many others, in a small way. There are hundreds of men who would be willing to give their spare time, perhaps at a week-end, to help to make flats ready for habitation. When I have approached my council they have said, "If you get a licence, where will you get the labour?" I have replied, "Leave that to me; that is my business not yours."

They have replied, "Oh, no, it is not. It is our business to know where you are going to get the labour." ...

Mr. Manningham-Buller (Daventry): ... There is another matter that applies particularly to the country part of which I represent, and that is the question of condemned houses. I am not in favour of lowering the housing standard but I am satisfied that in that county a great many houses have been condemned which ought not to have been, and it will be disastrous if our housing situation is accentuated in consequence of the mistakes that have been made in the past. I should like to quote from a book which has just been published and which we were told to read by the

Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Town and County Planning in a recent Debate. It is a book called "Our Building Inheritance." It says:

"It is a most reprehensible practice which allows medical officers of health to condemn a structure and order its demolition when they have no architectural knowledge to enable them to pass judgment. It is true that the Ministry of Health has an architectural staff, but its existence is something of an anomaly, and it certainly cannot prevent the false diagnosis of buildings and their unjust sentence by the doctors. The County of Northampton presents a serious example of the losses to which absurdities lead. The historic town of Higham Ferrers and many another Northamptonshire village have been threatened with mutilation and the removal of well-built stone houses and cottages merely because the health authority cannot distinguish between good building and bad and is not sufficiently informed of the value, both practical and cultural, of a rural architecture that needs only judicious repair and modern equipment to meet all needs. It seems incredible that anyone can be so blind to what is excellent as to desire to obliterate the beautiful stone buildings of such a county and substitute what is generally so much worse. It is more incredible that we allow such misjudgment to have power and to impoverish us all."

I have sent the Minister of Health photographs of no fewer than four reconditioned buildings which have been condemned. I have only had an opportunity of going over one of them myself, and I should be perfectly content to live there...

House of Commons: December 12, 1944.

SCOTLAND

Coal Fields Committee (Report)

Mr. J. J. Davidson asked the Secretary of State for Scotland if he is now able to publish, or, alternatively, issue to Scottish Members a copy of the Report of the Scottish Coal Fields Committee.

The Secretary of State for Scotland (Mr. Johnston): The printing of this report, I am now happy to say, is approaching completion and copies, I am informed, will be in the Vote Office next week.

Mr. Davidson: In view of certain rumours with regard to what I may call that more serious aspect of this Report, will my right hon. Friend consider issuing at the same time a statement as to what steps the Department has taken in the meantime?

Mr. Johnston: The Report is published in the first instance for the information of Parliament, and it is thereafter for the Government or Parliament to take whatever steps they think proper.

POUND STERLING

(DOMESTIC PURCHASING POWER)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what, on any convenient bases, was the purchasing power of the £ sterling in 1913, 1938 and at the latest convenient date.

Sir J. Anderson: In my answer to my hon. Friend the Member for Central Leeds (Mr. Denman) on 6th July, 1944, I explained the difficulty of estimating changes in the domestic purchasing power of the £ over the whole field of personal expenditure. I stated, however, that on the basis of the estimated levels of retail prices given in the National Income White Paper 1944 (Cmd. 6520) the domestic purchasing power of the £ in 1943 was about 71 per cent. of that in 1938. Similar estimates of the change between 1913

and 1938 are not available. For that period, but not for the later period, the change in the domestic purchasing power of the £ was probably reflected with reasonable accuracy by the change in the official cost-of-living index, and on that basis the domestic purchasing power of the £ in 1938 was about 64 per cent. of that in July, 1914.

ANNUAL PRODUCTION

Sir W. Smithers asked the President of the Board of Trade the value of the annual production per head of the population, for the years 1913, 1938 and at the latest convenient date.

Captain Waterhouse: This information only becomes available for years in which a Census of Production is taken. For 1935, the latest census year, the value of industrial

THE POWER OF THE BUREAUCRACY MUST BE REDUCED!

"On November 25 the Social Credit Secretariat published its proposals for dealing with Bureaucracy (see the "R.I.B." No. 143, 4/12/44). The first unmistakable counter-move on the part of the Party-Political triumvirate was manifested in the *Evening Standard* of December 21, where Sir Herbert Williams put on record a near-libellous and 95 per cent. inaccurate statement estimated to besmirch C. H. Douglas. Commenting (but without soiling its pages with the actual word Douglas) the *Daily Express* recommended every reader to acquire Sir Herbert's article, and to study it as a document specially significant to the coming general election. It sure is! —as Lord Beaverbrook's Canadian friends would exclaim, and C. H. Douglas's Canadian friends would echo. If for no other reason, one cannot help admiring the man who has succeeded in manoeuvring the boycotters of his policy into a position where they cannot attack him without either admitting to the reality of the policy or making fools of themselves."

— "D.D." in *Regional Industrial Bulletin*,
January 1, 1945.

(including mining) output per head the population was about £50, the corresponding figure for 1907, after making an allowance for the inclusion of Southern Ireland in the published figures, being approximately £30.

COAL INDUSTRY

Mechanisation and Technical Efficiency

Mr. Derville asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether the Report of his Departmental Committee on the mechanisation and technical efficiency in British collieries is likely to be available by the spring or summer of 1945; whether it will be made public; and whether it will take into account the contents of the recent confidential report of the American experts.

DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT BELFAST GROUP

Public Address

in GRAND CENTRAL HOTEL

on THURSDAY, JANUARY 18 at 7-30 p.m.

Subject: Bureaucracy.

Questions and Discussion.

Major Lloyd George: The answer to the first two parts of the question is "Yes, Sir." As regards the last part the Report of the American Mission has been made available in confidence to the members of the Committee who will, presumably, have regard to its contents.

Mr. R. Morgan asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether the Report of the American technical experts on British coalmines will be made available to members of the Committee appointed by him to report on the future of mechanisation in British coal production.

Major Lloyd George: The Report referred to by my hon. Friend was made available in confidence to the members of the Technical Advisory Committee in October last.

BUILDING TRADE (LABOUR AND MATERIAL)

Sir R. Tasker asked the Minister of Health what is the number of builders who have ceased business since September, 1939, due to deprivation of labour and material; and what is the number of men who were employed by building firms in London who have been instructed to proceed to the provinces to engage in building operations.

Mr. Bevin: I have been asked to reply. I regret that the information is not available.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS: RURAL HOUSING

Major Sir George Davies (Yeovil): ... I submit that if we want to work on the lines of least resistance, we must first give inducement to the landowner, not to make money out of it but to undertake the rehabilitation and reconditioning of these cottages and, where possible, to rebuild. Secondly, we must see that the impaired resources of the small builder are not further impaired, but are increased, so that this work can be done...

I want to emphasise what I have already said. What are the outstanding features of our villages and of our cottages in England? One is that the cottages nestle, and the other is that the villages cluster. If we depart from that, we shall lend a hand in ruining the beauties of rural England which we could maintain, with all the latest amenities of refrigerators and vacuum cleaners, of gas and water laid on, and all the rest of it. But in our anxiety to hasten an improvement in our rural housing—and I am second to no one in wanting to hasten it, and in not wanting the best to impede the development of the less good—all of us should see that what is spoken of as "Merrie England" is, at the same time, maintained.