From Week to Week

Speaking at Glasgow on October 11, Mr. A. E. MacColl, Deputy Chairman of the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board, said that a Trading Estate was planned for the North of Scotland, and it was hoped to attract the manufacture of fertilisers and other chemical products.

"My heart's in the Hielans, my heart isna' here; I'm aye makin' I.C.I. fertiliser.

Or, as the posters will say, *Come to bonnie Scotland, the Wideness of the North!*

With an audacity which can only be admired, Mr. MacColl characterised as reactionaries anyone who opposed "a great work." The Electricity authorities who are being opposed in their efforts to ruin the cities of Durham and Lincoln, ought to co-opt Mr. MacColl and Lord Airlie. They would assure the Friends of Lincoln and Durham that the substitution by the view of a nice concrete cooling-tower of the contour of a Gothic Cathedral is a great advance in culture, and that anyone who does not agree is a reaction- ary. Nothing daunts these people, and nothing impresses or, apparently, teaches them anything. The fact that the Planners’ New Deal in the U.S.A. was only saved from spectacular collapse by the outbreak of a World War which rocked, and may yet wreck, civilisation; and that their schemes automatically set in motion forces leading to a still greater catastrophe, doesn’t mean a thing to them. They will have their employment-slave state, or nothing, even if it means the end of the world. Well, it’s up to you, Clarence.

It is one of the most daunting features of the present era, and one which, in all seriousness seems to confirm the theory that, for a time at least, Satan is unchained and the world is given over to the Powers of Evil, that electricity, which bore the promise of a better and brighter world, is rapidly becoming the vehicle of man’s utter degradation. To say that nowadays the primary intention of the expansion of electrical energy distribution is the enhancement of the standard of living of the Highlands, or of anywhere else, is an insult to the general intelligence. If the North of Scotland Hydro-electric Board are primarily concerned with this, let them wire up every house and croft in the area, build small dams to provide off-takes from the high-fall burns, without elaborate engineering works or alteration of the catchment areas, and install plant in small, well-hidden power stations, to be operated by the local population.

Such stations require only a trivial amount of attention. But of course this policy would decentralise political power as well as hydro-electric power, and is anathema.

"The [Jewish] criminals in Palestine, with their active and passive sympathisers, are directly impeding the war effort of Great Britain, which is playing such a vital part in the struggle against Hitler. They are assisting the enemy."

— Officer Administering the Government of Palestine and C. in C., Middle East, jointly.

Now isn’t that odd?

While distrust and dislike of the Monocratic (Totalitarian) State, even as operating in once-great Britain, is widespread and growing, it does not appear to be recognised clearly enough that it is a fundamental denial of the Trinitarian conception of society, on which the whole of British achievement is based, and of which the right of appeal to an entirely independent authority is an integral part. The first great conscious blow at this principle—a blow which no doubt influenced Lord Hewart in his great book *The New Despotism*—was the reduction of the Judges’ stipends, under the false plea of financial necessity, in 1933; a plain warning that the Judiciary served the Government, not the people.

Judges should be paid directly, and independently, by non-governmental agencies, and Government employes should be personally responsible for the costs of all parties in actions brought against their Departments successfully.

"I have talked here with a number of Rumanian Jews and found that all of them are building their own hopes for the future on Anglo-American understanding of their problems.

They admit that they are no longer persecuted; they no longer live in terror; they breathe as free men and women; they don’t starve. But still—when will the Allies occupy Rumania and make it possible for Jews to emigrate to Britain and America?"

— *The Russians take over in Rumania*: Edgar Snow. Wonderfully well informed, aren’t they?

A syndicated-feature writer in Washington expresses the opinion that much patience will be necessary to preserve good Anglo-American relations. He goes on to illustrate what he means by explaining that we have treated India badly, and ought to give it up, and that our policy in the Argentine is deeply resented because it is not so greatly to our disadvantage as the Americans feel that it ought to be.

One of the most dangerous features of the drive for State Socialism which has been the major domestic objective under cover of the war, is the so-called Co-operative Society—an organisation about as co-operative as a growing cuckoo. Under the pretence that it makes no profits, without, how-
ever, explaining where it gets the money for the colossal purchases of real estate which it makes, it escapes taxation. Its offshoot, the Co-operative Building Society, is simply a taxing institution, so that it wins both ways. Its invasion of a small town seems to bring with it an infection of drab uniformity which provides a non-conformist contrast to the garishness of the chain stores with which it is careful not to compete. No petrol difficulties appear to embarrass its immense fleet of motor transport. The whole question of its activities is due for a complete overhaul. But we shan't have it because it would lead into quarters which are far removed from retail trade.

Our contemporary, the Scots Independent, commenting on the impertinences of Mr. William Phillips on the subject of India, suggests that Sir Stafford Cripps be sent to the U.S.A. to investigate and report on the vicissitudes of the North American Indians since the arrival of the Pilgrim Fathers. Both the idea, and the selection of Sir Stafford to carry it out, seem tinged with genius, if somewhat optimistic.

The Sunday Pictorial publishes a remarkable article on Captain Ramsay, M.P., of which we should imagine more will be heard. Subject to correction by experts on that peculiar piece of legislation, the Official Secrets Act, we should have thought the article in question to be a flagrant breach of it. The article suggests knowledge of the evidence given at the trials of Tyler Kent and Anna Wolkoff, both of which, if we remember rightly, were held in camera.

The fact that eleven candidates stood for Quebec Province constituencies, and not one was elected, is definite evidence of the disservice done to Social Credit progress by amateur party politics. The candidates stood for constituencies which, on the face of it, e.g., by circulation of Vers Demain, by crowded and enthusiastic meetings, and even by verbal promises, were overwhelmingly Social Credit. The actual vote was contemptible.

This is not the occasion on which to analyse this phenomenon; but it may be remarked that it probably takes a 75 per cent. actual majority of opinion to gain a bare victory against skilled electoral technique and expensive party machinery.

The drastic calling in of bank-notes, and the “freezing” of bank deposits in Belgium ought to inject a little thought into the enthusiasts for State monopoly of currency and credit. The edict is an affirmation of the power of “the State” to ruin everyone in twenty-four hours. De facto, the power, completely uncontrolled, exists here; but de jure, bank deposits are under the control of the several banks.

U.S.A. UNEMPLOYED: 1940

“In March, 1940, Mr. Roosevelt had been in office seven years. Yet the depression was still with us. We still had 10,000,000 Americans unemployed. These are the figures of the American Federation of Labour. Is that fraud or falsehood? If so, let Mr. Roosevelt tell it to the American Federation of Labour.”

—Mr. Dewey, Republican Presidential Candidate.

The ‘Education’ Peril

Some of the cruder methods of propagandising under the cloak of ‘education’ are mentioned in an article from a correspondent published in The Tablet for October 7. The article is specially devoted to education and re-education in Southern Italy, and, in the first paragraph the writer remarks: “It might be thought that grammar, physics and mathematics, at least would be free from fascism, but these texts were even worse than those dealing with history. After all, you can bring in ‘Italian’ territories to which you aspire—Corsica, Nice and Tunis—in area problems; you can repeat the catch-phrases and the name of Mussolini endlessly in grammar; and engines of war can take priority in your illustrations of the physical sciences if you know your propaganda material sufficiently well…”

Some generalisations which the writer has permitted himself are worthy of notice. For example, he says: “…it is obviously much more difficult to impose party doctrine in the higher realms of education than in the lower.” Again, “It is much more difficult to laud Mussolini and all his acts in an educational system rooted upon the classical tradition and classical authors than in one founded on modernism and so-called ‘progressive’ ideas. Indeed, the classical education itself became a refuge for those who opposed the regime. It is not without significance therefore that the fascist Minister of Education, Gentile, should have abolished the Faculty of Arts of Messina University under the guise of reforming the university.” “Whatever opposition which existed to the party line, outside the Church, rested mainly in the universities, and, again, of these, in the southern universities.” ‘Competent observers’ are cited as believing that “as much as nearly a half of the staff of the University of Rome” were strong fascists; but “nothing like that proportion existed in any one of those southern universities”—[Naples, Messina, Catania, Palermo.]

Mussolini “found it necessary” to institute a “more pliant” university than those previously existing, “The Benito Mussolini University of Bari.”

We observe that it has not yet been deemed expedient to revive Cardinal Wolsey’s plan for a university at Ipswich under the title of the Ludwig Mond-Turner University, or to found, ex abundanti cautea, a Winston Churchill University of Marlborough.

SASKATCHEWAN

Dealers in Dominion stocks widened their quotations yesterday for Saskatchewan loans from a normal spread of two or three points to 10 points. They did so in response to news from Toronto of a remarkable statement made by the Premier of the province in a recent radio address. Foreshadowing an alteration in the powers enjoyed by the Local Government Board, he is reported to have said that the Government intended to amend the legislation “so that the decision of the Local Government Board shall be binding upon the bondholders and other creditors as well as upon the municipalities.” The time is past in this province, the Premier is quoted as having added, “when bondholders are to be dealt with as a privileged group who are entitled to special favours.”

—The Times, September 27.
The Press Boycott

Wanted: Readers of The Social Crediter, or others, who will guarantee the equivalent of hoarding display of the front page of the Edmonton Bulletin for August 9, 1944. (Alberta Election Result issue).

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: October 9, 1944.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING BILL

NEW CLAUSE.—(Power to extend the area of a local planning authority.)

Sir D. Gunston said... if we passed this Clause, we are driven to accept, whether we want it or not, centralisation based on the big town. Are we convinced that that is necessarily the right solution in the development of local government? I am not expressing an opinion, but I think it would be unwise to drive us to that conclusion...

I will say that if we passed this Clause we would take away the protection of Parliament from the small local authority. We can argue whether that is wise or not, but that is what will happen. Are we sure we ought to take away the protection of Parliament from the smaller authorities? Are we sure that the smaller local authorities are always more inefficient than the larger ones, that they do not understand their localities as well as the larger ones do?... there is the Urban District Council of Kingswood, which is practically in Bristol... That Council does very good work. It may be argued that it ought to go in into the City of Bristol... under present law, if that local authority objected to going into Bristol, it would not have to unless it had been established by Private Bill procedure in Parliament that it must go in.

Mr. Petherick: ... We have heard a good deal of the City of Plymouth, and I do not want it to be thought in any way that I am making a purely Cornish speech on this Clause. Our relations with foreign powers continue to be friendly. I do not suppose we were ever on better terms with Devonshire and the City of Plymouth...

The City of Plymouth has recently said—I speak subject to correction by the Noble Lady the Member for the Sutton Division (Viscountess Astor) or anyone else conversant with the facts—that it did not want any extension of the borough. It is reasonable to ask, therefore, why it is that they have suddenly changed their minds within the last year and have asked for these further extensions... I do not think it is a good thing, on balance, for a great city in one county to be allowed to sprawl into an adjacent county. There is such a thing as county spirit. That does not mean that you dislike your next-door neighbours at all, but the spirit ought to be fostered in every way...

Mrs. Beatrice Wright (Bodmin): ... there is almost a racial point at stake between Devon and Cornwall, and it would almost require a plebiscite to put it right. I can speak with great feeling on this subject as I am anything but a native of Cornwall, and it has taken me fourteen years even to begin to understand the controversies of a local nature and for the people to understand me...

The Cornish feel strongly that it was not put to them that these Clauses were coming up to-day in the House of Commons and that they have had no chance of discussing them locally...

Viscountess Astor: We have had an interesting Debate, but I am afraid a rather disappointing one. I realise the truth of what the hon. Lady has just said about local and national prejudice. I have lived in England 37 years, but I am still a Virginian. Nothing in the world would ever make me anything but a Virginian...

Surely we want to try to take prejudice out of planning. We ought to think of something bigger than what the local prejudices are. Plympton, for instance; we have all heard complaints about Plympton. We asked Plympton to cooperate in the planning of Plymouth, and what did Plympton say? They said "No." They did not want to. We told them about the devastated area where we have a chance to rebuild, under one of the world's best planners, and we asked them to come in. What was their answer? They said they did not want to; their charter was 20 years older than Plymouth's and they were going to have the borough surveyor...

Mr. Petherick: ... and a new kind of world will go over all sorts of boundaries—counties, further even than England. This world will never be built up if we as Members of Parliament stand up for the vested interests of national county and town prejudices....

House of Commons: October 10, 1944.

COAL INDUSTRY

Domestic Supplies

Mr. Rhys Davies asked the Minister of Fuel and Power if during this winter, before allowing any coal produced in this country to be sold abroad, he will see to it that the reasonable requirements for comfort are available for our own people.

Major Lloyd George: As I have informed the House on previous occasions, we are not exporting any coal except what is necessary for the war effort. Subject to this qualification the answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. Bowles: May I take it that any coal which is exported to Italy is in conformity with and in pursuance of the Prime Minister's statement that our policy is to "let them stew in their own juice," and that we heat it up for them?

Colliery Companies (Profits)

Mr. Bowles asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what is the gross increase in profits of the colliery companies contained in the latest returns over those disclosed immediately before June 3, 1942.

Major Lloyd George: There has been no gross in-
THE SOCIAL CREDITER

Not Enough People

So extraordinary a production as "People For The Commonwealth" (Planning: a Broadsheet issued by PEP—Political and Economic Planning—No. 226) calls for some special effort to explain it. We are quite ready to make it, and readers accustomed to our habitual sympathy for the downtrodden, of whom PEP have been for some time at least the most eminent, will not be surprised to hear that Planning, No. 226 is the outcome of Friday the Thirteenth.

Whether fifteen pages of self-contradiction can be said to afford scope for the drawing of a conclusion or not, the conclusion we are intended to draw, if stated with more precision than PEP would favour, is evidently that the vera causa of the world's miseries has at last been discovered (by that fact-finding agency PEP) and is no less than this: that the people in the British Empire who have so signally failed to associate successfully up to the present time are far too few. "Your country needs you!" must be emended.

And so (on Friday the Thirteenth) PEP appeared to shout "Let there be more!" Since the natural and spontaneous response to such a cry of distress from any source is "How many do you want?", and not, by any means, grudgingly, "What do you want them for?", we turn our sympathetic attention to those passages whence a knowledge of this matter may be gained.

It has occurred to PEP that if there were only more people, there would be more work; and if there were more work, there would be more wages; and if there were more wages, there would be more markets; and if there were more markets, there would be less pressure on the home markets; and then there would be better times; and if there were better times, new industries could be started, 'attracting' people, there would be more work; and if there were more work, there would be more wages; and if there were more wages, there would be more markets; and if there were more markets, there would be less pressure on the home markets; and then there would be better times; and if there were better times, new industries could be started, 'attracting' more people from places where the standard of living had fallen, so that the financial and man-power obligations and other difficulties...would be spread over a much bigger population'; and if there were a much bigger population—

Even before the war Professor Leacock had been so bold as to estimate that Canada's optimum population was 250,000,000; many others, less bold, have accepted the figure of 50-60,000,000." PEP, we gather, with a sudden burst of enthusiasm for "great" prosperity, favours Colonel Drew, the Premier of Ontario, and a modest 50,000,000, though why this is so if the more there are the more prosperous they are, is not clear from the data provided.

Let us say 57,500,000 which is a more convenient figure than it looks, being exactly five times the present population of Canada.

The South Africans will be glad to hear that within twenty-five years "it would be desirable" for South Africa to have double its present population of ten and a half millions. Australia's seven millions shall jump to 20,000,000, and New Zealand's one-and-a-half to ten, the first "as rapidly as possible" and the second "within the next generation."

Apparently the beneficiaries of past and current planning do not find it convenient, for some unexplained reason, to assist in promoting any considerable natural increase in their respective populations, so that the 78,000,000 of "new blood" required "must" chiefly come through moving some people from where they are now to where they are "needed" to support the theory that prosperity is directly proportional to density of population (not here in England, of course, but everywhere else).

Sixty million emigrants "sailed from the shores of Europe" during the century which ended with the last war. We wonder why they did. We gather that they were not, however, up to the high standard required by modern conditions, particularly in regard to modern capital production (new industries). If South Africa, for example, "is to carry out the big industrial schemes now contemplated in post war years, the country will have to import skilled artisans of almost every class." The "needs" of the Dominions may be summarised as 78,000,000 of the very best, between the ages of 20 and 35, preferably British. We picture England, that jewel set in a silver sea, populated at last only by Sir William Beveridge (in full employment, of course), coaxing to their long-abandoned haunts the cave bears and the woolly rhinoceroses of a distant past. It is evident that Englishmen, particularly young Englishmen are going to be 'welcome' (for a time) everywhere else but in England, where it is still possible that there will be "not enough jobs" for them.

One singular omission we observe in PEP's broadsheet. There is no mention of the Jews. The British are praised. "Next in order of desirability will be North Europeans." The Canadian Government, it seems, has prepared a list of 'preferred' countries—Belgium, France, Germany, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden. "Italians may be well received." "Poles, too, may not be unwelcome." "The possibility of emigration from the U.S.A. should not be entirely ruled out of account." There is no mention of our friends the Russians. Doubtless Russia will soon be so industrialised as to be herself a "needy" territory, though not, it is to be hoped, acquiring "the boa constrictor habit of Australia of bolting her immigrants and then resting until they have been digested." As this amusing publication observes, "No one would suggest that, whatever else may happen, this habit should be followed after the war."

And, of course, "no one would suggest" the growth of the habit of asking why people should be bred and carted about in order that the financial burden of governing them—i.e., carting them about—should be spread one way rather than another, or spread at all.
WAR GUILT

The second phase of the twentieth century’s Thirty Year’s War seems to be drawing to its close. At any rate two points are beyond doubt. One is that a continuation of this war, or any fixed phase of it, will wipe away, probably irrevocably, what we know of Western European civilisation, particularly democratic institutions and policy. The other indisputable point is that the cause of this war is in some ways connected with the German Empire as constituted in Versailles in 1871 by the treachery of Bismarck and against the political judgment and expressed wishes of King William III of Prussia, who then became Emperor William I of Germany.

It can be taken for granted that practically the whole of the peoples in Europe are sick of war and want peace. The few who hope for its continuance fall into two categories: those to whom the war means high wages and those who have consciously used the war for the imposition of an alien policy. The latter are our real enemies whatever their alleged nationality. The former largely fail to realise that there is no necessary connection between war and the higher standard of living among the poorer classes which accompanies war. The main national policy in this connection can be taken as being a desire for permanent peace.

Clearly some action must be taken by the Allies to take away from the German Empire as it stands to-day the capacity to wage war for some time to come and to ensure that the Germans’ will to world domination and war is finally broken. This applies whether those ultimately responsible for the war are inside or outside Germany.

The military situation has now (September, 1944) developed so far that the Allied Governments are bound to have discussed among themselves not merely the subject of the military occupation of Germany but also the treatment and political education of the Germans. In a truly democratic country it would be sufficient for the people’s desire to be known, as the least suspicion of the Government not carrying out that desire would bring down sanctions on that government’s heads. As however, one of our great allies is openly a dictatorship, another is probably a camouflaged but de facto dictatorship and this country is full of high placed candidates for dictatorship, the matter cannot be left with a mere declaration of popular policy. This is especially so as there is no mechanism for proving that permanent peace is such a policy and the voter’s application of his sanctions to enforce his policy has hitherto been only sporadic, tentative and experimental.

There is, however, in Great Britain and the British Empire at present a small minority of politically conscious individuals who know how to get what is shown to be a popular demand. It is this minority that will save European civilisation after the present, second, phase of this war, if it will be saved at all. It is this minority that must teach the masses how to express their wishes and how to apply their sanctions and particularly how to fix responsibility for failure to carry out a defined policy.

Certain expert advice was tendered to the Allied governments in 1919 and 1920 in the political, financial and military spheres of action, advice, which if followed, would probably have prevented the present war. That advice was ignored with disastrous consequences. It is known that the same interests that put pressure to bear on the Allied governments not to take that advice, propose to try and save German military tradition and aspirations again. It is up to the British people to prevent such a repetition of treachery.

The difficulty confronting the British in this matter is of course the fact that this is a question of action and therefore a matter for the expert in the different spheres involved; hence the insistence on fixing responsibility. It is all the more important that the politically conscious minority, to whom readers of this paper belong, should be clear in their minds as to the nature of the Germans’ guilt and how it came about. This is all the more important in view of a tendency perceptible in some of the publicity in this country and in the U.S.A. which seems to suggest that peace will be assured if certain things are done to Germany and the Germans irrespective of what happens here or elsewhere.

This publicity presents the Germans as all black and us as all white. It is at times misrepresenting expert opinion in an attempt to lull the general public into an unsuspecting apathy. Just as charity is supposed to begin abroad, so our own house is not to be cleaned until last. To use another metaphor, an examination of the beam in the Germans’ eye may teach us something about the dangerous splinter in our own.

Broadly speaking the way in which the Germans have been used as a means towards world dominion has been by being brought up in what they themselves call the “Fritzsche Tradition.” The phrase refers to Frederic “the Great,” a King of Prussia who had a supreme contempt for Germans, for German manners, and even for the German language. It is he who introduced the many Germanised French words that are such a strange feature of the German tongue as spoken to-day. That tradition consists mainly in regarding greatness as equivalent to military prowess; in a conviction—very strange and contradictory in the old Fritz—that the Germans are destined to rule the world with a rod of iron and in a complete disregard of honour and truthfulness when dealing with foreigners. The adoption of this tradition, deeply rooted after 300 years, created a ruling class for whom war was an end in itself. As for the masses it inculcated a blind obedience to whomever was set over them.

Flaws in national, just as in personal character are unfortunately very rarely recognised as such by the possessor of them. The Germans possess a very serious flaw in their character—speaking as of a generality—in that they love uniforms and marching in parade. The men who originally financed the Nazi Party were good psychologists and took full advantage of that weakness. The Germans’ sin was to fall into that trap and to listen to the blandishments of Hitler, who to start with virtually said to them: “give me your liberty and in exchange I will get you back your self-respect.” In this connection it is well to remember that the individual German had lost that self-respect not to any appreciable extent on account of losing the war in 1918 or even on account of the stupid terms of the Versailles treaty; but almost wholly through the humiliation and fear heaped on him by the 1920-1921 inflation, a purely internal affair and engineered largely by the same men who later financed the Nazi party. Thanks to the subtle publicity and misrepresentation, the almost hereditary military tradition and their temperament they fell easy victims. The few who did
not were removed. Mr. Douglas Reed pointed out quite recently that the Nazis have not eliminated the Jews, or the Communists; but the democratically minded.

The above analysis may be mistaken for an effort to excuse the Germans. It is nothing of the sort. We are dealing with a psychological condition and if any cure is to be permanent, the diagnosis must be complete and accurate to enable the correct treatment to be applied. Let us at once emphasise that as regards War Guilt the Germans are black. That in itself does not make us white, far from it. We ourselves tolerate the League of Nations Union and all its studied misrepresentation and deliberately false argument. We, as a nation, did nothing to stop Baldwin and others in their efforts to turn Great Britain into a tenth rate power. Have we, the mass of electors, ever done more than look bewildered when the party whips forced through Parliament some measure that was contrary to our wishes? No! and there is some of our guilt.

There is no doubt whatever that powerful forces are trying to establish world dictatorship, forces that are working in every country in the world. The first step towards this end must necessarily be to persuade some nation that under that dictatorship it will be privileged. The Jews and the Germans have fallen for this bait worse than any other nation; but it is being tried on us as well as on others. The Germans with their clear mind realised that the only way to maintain a dictatorship was to have only one political party. It fitted in with their traditions and very few saw its disadvantages. In Great Britain, whose people have a fairly highly developed political instinct, such a direct, not to say crude, method would be unacceptable.

As flaws in the German character were used so skilfully to make the Germans into tools, it is more than likely that similar methods are being used on us. Now it happens to be a characteristic, generally speaking, of the English, Welsh and Irish that they are born gamblers in a mild way. A glance at any of the daily papers will show the astonishing amount of alleged valuable space that is given to so-called sport and is ample evidence that this trait is being exploited in some subtle way to some sinister end. The trait has certainly been used for the benefit of the Party System. It has for many years been part of the "political education" of the British to regard elections as a gambling, an object on which to place a bet. The British have been lead subtly and partly with success to vote not for what they want but for the side most likely to "get in." Instead therefore of the German one-party method, an attempt will be made to achieve the same end by subterfuge means. Instead of being a Nazi party it will be called a Party Truce and the motions of competitive elections and differences of "policy" will be carried out.

While it is highly desirable to keep an eye on the political education of the Germans, that is not all. To maintain peace we also have much work and grave responsibility at home. One of the first tasks must be to break the strangle hold over Parliament by the anonymous controllers of the Party funds. H. R. P.

Substantial quantities of South Wales coals, says the Western Mail, are to be shipped to France during the next few months. Moderate shipments have been made since "D" Day and increased supplies are now called for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gross credit balance</th>
<th>Rate per ton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>16,150,000</td>
<td>1/9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942 1st half</td>
<td>6,679,000</td>
<td>1/5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942 2nd half</td>
<td>6,891,000</td>
<td>1/6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>12,962,000</td>
<td>1/6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944 1st quarter</td>
<td>1,936,000</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The results for 1944 are subject to adjustment at the end of the year.)

Coal Commission

Miss Ward asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what is to be the future of the Coal Commission set up under the chairmanship of Sir Ernest Gowers; how far the work he undertook was completed before the outbreak of war; and whether any amalgamations have resulted during the war.

Major Lloyd George: Under the Coal Act, 1938, the Coal Commission became the fee simple owner of all un-worked coal in the United Kingdom, on the 1st July, 1942, and its principal function is to exercise all the duties of unified ownership of the minerals. The Commission has also, however, a second function, under Part II of the Act, which is to endeavour to bring about the amalgamation of colliery undertakings, where they think it desirable. I assume that my hon. Friend is referring only to this second function. The Commission stated in their first annual report that they did not propose during the war to proceed with any proposals for amalgamations which might require the making of an Order by the Minister, but the future of Part II of the Act is now under consideration. With regard to the last part of the Question, a few colliery amalgamations have been made or are in course of preparation by the parties concerned.

Export

Mr. Thorne asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what the Government receive in exchange for the coal they export to various foreign countries.

Major Lloyd George: The limited quantities of coal shipped to foreign countries are exported either to meet the operational needs of our Forces overseas or in order to obtain supplies essential to the United Nations' war effort. My hon. Friend will realise that I could not on security grounds give details of these supplies.

Mr. Rhys Davies: In view of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman's answer to a previous question to-day are we to take it for granted now, that we do export coal for sale abroad, in return for supplies coming into this country for the war effort?

Major Lloyd George: There is nothing inconsistent in this reply with the one I have given to the hon. Member. I have always said in this House that we export the minimum
which is necessary, that is either for operational purposes directly, or for the furtherance of the war effort of this country.

Mr. Thorne: What is the difficulty in giving a return of the export of coal?

Major Lloyd George: The trouble is that a great deal of this coal is directly concerned with operations and, therefore, I cannot disclose the figures.

Mr. Shinwell: On what basis are we supplying coal to the civilian population of Italy, and are we getting anything in return for it?

Major Lloyd George: We have not supplied any coal to Italy since January.

Cotton Industry

Mr. Bowles: Would it not be a good economic policy to ensure that every consumer of cotton goods in this country was served before any cotton goods were exported?

Mr. Dalton: No, Sir, that would not be a good policy. It would mean that the people of this country would fail to secure the imports necessary in order that they should have a proper standard of living. The policy of the Government which has been frequently indicated, is to keep a proper balance between home and export trade.

House of Commons: October 11, 1944.

Terrorist Activities

Mr. Hamilton Kerr asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any statement to make regarding recent terrorist outrages in Palestine.

Colonel Stanley: There has unfortunately been a re-crudecence of Jewish terrorist activities in Palestine. On the night of 27th September attacks were made on four police stations by members of the Irgun Zvai Leumi, the military organisation of the New Zionist organisation. They were planned and executed by a force estimated to have been at least 150 strong and armed with bombs and automatic weapons. There were casualties among Palestinian police and civilians and considerable damage was caused to police buildings. Casualties were also inflicted on the terrorists and two men were arrested, one of whom had been wounded. Quantities of ammunition, two bombs and Irgun flags were seized. On the morning of 29th September a senior British police officer, Mr. J. T. Wilkin, of the Criminal Investigation Department, was assassinated while walking to his office in Jerusalem. The assailants escaped. On the night of 5-6 October the Tel Aviv offices and stores of the Department of Light Industries were raided by 50 persons, some of whom were armed, and textiles valued at £100,000 were removed. The raiders announced themselves as being members of the Irgun Zvai Leumi.

These attacks, the object of which is to further political aims, seriously impede the war effort of the United Nations and can do nothing but harm to the Jewish cause...

Earl Winterton: Is my right hon. and gallant Friend aware that those of us who are in touch with opinion in that country, are most alarmed by the information which is reaching us that both sides are arming preparatory to civil war after the war? Will he consider publishing a White Paper on the subject, as the majority of people in this country have not the least idea of the seriousness of the situation, and the terrible strain placed upon the administration in Palestine?

Colonel Stanley: I agree with my Noble Friend that it is most important that people should realise the very tense situation there. I will consider in what way we can bring it to the public's attention.

EMERGENCY POWERS (DEFENCE)

COAL (CHARGES)

Major Thorneycroft (Stafford): The hon. Member for Wigan (Mr. Foster) said that in matters of this kind we were entitled to inquire how the money was being spent, and I believe that that is very true and right. At the same time, within the rules of Order which have been very properly laid down, it is necessary that we should not range too wide on that particular question. I hope that on another occasion we shall be able to do so. The hon. Member for Gower (Mr. Grenfell) reminded us that he was the author of this coal charges scheme and he is a parent who knows the limitations of his own child. While it performs a useful function, everybody will agree that it is not an answer to all the manifold problems of the coal industry. The effect of this Order is to increase the levy by 4s. up to a total of 12s. Before we part with the Order we ought to consider the position into which we are getting. Since 1940 or 1942, by successive stages, we have built up these levies to a figure of 12s.—not far off the total production cost per ton of coal before the war. The fact is that if we take the total turnover of the coal mining industry as some £300,000,000 a year, no less than approximately £100,000,000, or one-third of it, is raised by this artificial transfer that is going on within the industry itself.

What in fact has happened is this: By this Coal Charges Fund, the rates of which we are increasing to-day, we have built up a screen in front of this industry and it is difficult at any time—and probably in this Debate out of order—to invert what is going on behind that screen. I do not want to go into the production side at all, but I do emphasise this, that when you have built up a screen of that kind it is the responsibility of this House on appropriate occasions to look behind it and find out what is happening. I believe it was the Minister of Reconstruction the other day who pointed out that these arrangements for stabilisation and price-fixing and so forth may be all very well in their way, but they conceal any kind of efficiency, and it is the duty of Members of Parliament to watch that that screen is not exploited.

The hon. Member for Gower (Mr. D. Grenfell) asked my right hon. Friend whether, at an early date, we could have a further Debate upon these matters. I would reinforce that request. We have had a Debate, it is perfectly true, fairly recently, but it is fair to point out that in that Debate though a number of questions and suggestions were put from all sides of the House on matters of reorganisation, not one of those questions or suggestions was in any way answered by the Government. I hope that my right hon. Friend on the next occasion will be fortified by the advice of his colleagues, and will be able to come down to the House and put the Cabinet's constructive proposals in front of us. The hon. Member for Gower referred to the leading article in
to-day’s Times, to which he paid what I believe was a well-merited tribute. Perhaps I may quite one sentence:

“It is the highest possible output, efficiency, and enterprise that matter, not (in themselves) either public or private ownership.”

I believe, if the hon. Member for Gateshead and those he represents—and he carries great and well-merited weight in the mining industry—approach the matter in this way, and we on this side do the same, that my right hon. Friend will be able to do something which will assure us that this Order is being a useful thing and not just covering something which is leading to inevitable disaster.

Mr. Magnay (Gateshead): . . . There is the utmost concern about these frequent increases in charges. Not long ago the price at the pit mouth in the North was 12s. a ton. We have been warned by the Minister that we are going to have a very hard winter and very short commons in coal and, on top of that, that we are to have to pay 12s. a ton in charges. I say to constituents of mine who are miners, “What on earth are you doing? In spite of the Greene Award and all kinds of awards, in spite of what Will Lawther and Ebby Edwards have said, that there would be an easement in this respect and that we might expect a better output, what are you doing?” It is not in our countrymen to shirk their work. They are honest working men. They are the very stock from which I come. But far too many people say, “We shall get no peace at all if some of the younger men stop off work, particularly on Saturdays, because of the Income Tax.”

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is introducing quite another subject.

Mr. Magnay: I will stop there . . .

TRIBUTE?

Professor J. R. Sullivan, M.P., Chairman of the Social Security Society of South Africa, an Economist, and would-be exposers of the ‘fallacy’ of the A plus B theorem, is the ‘initiator’ of a social security “Code” in the line of Bismarck. Lloyd George, and Beveridge, to be financed by taxing everyone, “from the very rich to the very poorest.” In an address on May 11, 1944, he said: “I have to pay tribute to the masterly exposition of the price gap, given by Major Douglas before the Macmillan Commission.”

Dr. Evatt’s adoption, in Australia, of the same strategy is doubtless a coincidence.

Inside France

“Reports which there is no means of checking, but which have plainly some substance, tell of numerous local ‘Soviets’ established in the French provinces, and of complete Communist control in various cities, notably Marseilles and Toulouse, and perhaps Tours and Bordeaux. In the case of Toulouse the evidence is strongest, for there Communists appear to control the broadcasting station. There is no broadcasting from Tours or Bordeaux.”

“The findings of an enquiry similar to the Gallup Poll published recently in the Paris newspaper Liberation, include a verdict on the question “Which nation will most help France towards recovery after the war?” More than two-thirds of those replying pinned their hopes in the United States...” —The Tablet, October 14.