THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 15. No. 11. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1945. 6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

It may not have escaped your notice, Clarence, that when the Socialist Dr. Dalton reduced your income tax by one shilling in the pound, the Socialist Town Councils promptly put up your Rates two shillings in the pound. You didn't suppose you were going to touch any real money, did you?

(For the benefit of our overseas readers, who are often puzzled by the word, Rates are Local Taxes. They enable the banks to tax you twice over for the same thing.)

• • •

Well authenticated stories of organised sabotage of valuable and urgently needed material by Government order are reaching us from many quartrers. One of many such, is that an aircraft carrier on the way home from the East jettisoned twenty undamaged and unstripped bombers on the way. To take one item alone, a bombing aircraft has thousands of pounds' worth of the finest instruments extant, varying from the highest grade clocks and watches to wireless instruments and intercommunication telephones. It is almost impossible to buy a good clock nowadays and almost as difficult to get one repaired, but it is clear that the Government is not going to let you have those you have paid for.

• • •

The amusement of spotting winners has always enthralled the human, or ordinary, man in these islands, and, as distinguished from the staff of Socialist weeklies, we are all too human. We select Mr. W. J. Brown, the Independent Member for Rugby, as the coming feature of the House of Commons. Our reasons? Elementary my dear Watson! Employing the studied understatement so popular nowadays, he is quite intelligent, and reasonably honest. The three parties in the present political gymkhana are the Ints (intelligent but not honest) the Hints (honest but not intelligent) and the Nints (neither honest nor intelligent). Mr. Brown is *hors concours*.

• • •

There are few more significant indications of the real object of the Second Thirty Years War than the appointment, after the first phase, of the Jew stockbroker, Rufus Isaacs, to the Viceroyalty of India, and that of the ex-railway porter and Trades-unionist, Mr. Burrows, to be Governor of Bengal, after the second phase. We are of course aware that all men are now equal (and how!), and we have, in consequence, every respect for Jew stockbrokers and railway porters, more particularly the latter. But we also know that this view is not shared by any single native-born Indian, whatever opinions he may express for political purposes, and that the marvellous achievements of the British in India for the benefit of the Indians have been possible, not as the natives of the United States wish to believe by the methods of "Uncle Toms Cabin," but by the silent exercise of subtle qualities which Jane Austen and Anthony Trollope understood perfectly, but which are not noticeable in Trades Union activity.

There could be no better method of undermining the main pillar of British influence and laying India open to "American" exploitation. But, oddly enough, our thoughts turn to those stately *chuprassis* in their scarlet and gold, and blue and maroon robes who served a succession of Lieut. Governors with dignity and affection at Belvedere. In India the servant chooses his master; and we have no doubt whatever which type of dispensation is congenial to those believers in heredity. Doubtless Mr. Burrows will put their successors into a natty porters' uniform.

Slave State News

According to the *Daily Mail*, John Charles Good, a married man with one child, who has a job at which he can earn £7 a week, was summoned by the Ministry of Labour at Marlborough-street on November 5 for absenting himself from work without reasonable excuse and for being persistently late.

Mr. Walter Hedley, K.C., the magistrate who dismissed the summons on payment of £3 3s. costs, said: "I confess I think it is time the people were allowed to choose their own work."

Good, a skilled worker with an electrical firm, said he was willing to be directed anywhere in the country on essential work, but that he would not work at his present job, where the class of work was inferior to his capabilities.

Mr. Hedley asked counsel for the Ministry: "It is not of importance that he should be allowed a little liberty, I suppose?"

To Good he said: "The trouble is that none of us is allowed to choose what work we should do now. I have no choice but to administer the law."

On the day before, Mr. L. C. White, general secretary of the Civil Servants' Clerical Association told a London conference of 430 of its members who had been on service (not 'civil') that the Civil Service is losing its popularity. First open competition for grades had been postponed because of lack of entrants.

"A number of younger Civil Servants in the forces," said Mr. White, "have indicated that, although they intend to come back as a temporary measure, they have no desire to remain permanently in the Service."

Progress?

[ ] *justify the paradox that the thirteenth century is in some respects less distant than the nineteenth.*
— Reginald J. Dingle, *The Return to Metaphysics* (*Nineteenth Century Review*, November).

The following opinions of distinguished men are cited in an appendix to *The Thirteenth Greatest of Centuries* (J. J. Walsh) on matters concerning the question of the reality of human progress: —

LORD BRYCE (*Atlantic Monthly*, August, 1907)

It does not seem possible, if we go back to the earliest literature which survives to us from Western Asia and Southeastern Europe, to say that the creative powers of the human mind in such subjects as poetry, philosophy, and historical narrative or portraiture, have either improved or deteriorated. The poetry of the early Hebrews and of the early Greeks has never been surpassed and hardly ever equalled. Neither has the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, nor the speeches of Demosthenes and Cicero. Geniuses like Dante, Chaucer, and Shakespeare appear without our being able to account for them, and for aught we know another may appear at any moment. It is just as difficult, if we look back five centuries, to assert either progress or decline in painting. Sculpture has never again risen to so high a level as it touched in the fifth century, B.C., nor within the last three centuries, to so high a level as it reached at the end of the fifteenth. But we can found no generalisations upon that fact. Music is the most inscrutable of the arts, and whether there is any progress to be expected other than that which may come from a further improvement in instruments constituting an orchestra, I will not attempt to conjecture, any more than I should dare to raise controversy by enquiring whether Beethoven represents progress from Mozart, Wagner progress from Beethoven.

• • •

PROFESSOR FLINDERS PETRIE

(in *The Independent*, January 7, 1909): —

We have now before us a view of the powers of man at the earliest point to which we can trace written history, and what strikes us most is how very little his nature or abilities have changed in seven thousand years; *what he admired we admire; what were his limits in fine handiwork also are ours*. We may have a wider outlook, a greater understanding of things; our interests may have extended in this interval; but so far as human nature and tastes go, man is essentially unchanged in this interval. . . . This is the practical outcome of extending our view of man three times as far back as we used to look, and it must teach us how little material civilisation is likely in the future to change the nature, the weaknesses, or the abilities of our ancestors in ages yet to come.

• • •

PROFESSOR T. H. HUXLEY

(Rectorial Address, Aberdeen University.)

The scholars of the Medieval Universities seem to have studied grammar, logic and rhetoric; arithmetic and geometry; astronomy, theology and music. Thus their work, however imperfect and faulty, judged by modern lights, it may have been, brought them face to face with all the leading aspects of the many-sided mind of man. For these studies did really contain, at any rate in embryo, sometimes it may be in caricature, what we now call philosophy, mathematical and physical science, and art. And I doubt if the curriculum of any modern university shows so clear and generous a comprehension of what is meant by culture, as this old Trivium and Quadrivium does.

• • •

DR. AUGUSTUS JESSOP (*Before the Great Pillage*) 1901.

The evidence is abundant and positive, and is increasing upon us year by year, that the work done upon the fabrics of our churches, and the other work done in the beautifying of the interior of our churches, such as the woodcarving of our screens, the painting of the lovely figures in the panels of those screens, the embroidery of the banners and vestments, the frescoes on the walls, the engraving of the monumental brasses, the stained glass in the windows, and all that vast aggregate of artistic achievements which existed in immense profusion in our village churches till the sixteenth century stripped them bare—all this was executed by local craftsmen. The evidence for this is accumulating upon us every year, as one antiquary after another succeeds in unearthing fragments of pre-reformation church-wardens' accounts.

We have actual contracts for church building and church repairing undertaken by village contractors. We have the cost of a rood screen paid to a village carpenter, of painting executed by local artists. We find the name of an artificer, described as an aurifaber, or worker in gold and silver, living in a parish which could never have had five hundred inhabitants; we find the people in another place casting a new bell and making the mould for it themselves; we find the blacksmith of another place forging the iron work for the church door, or we get a payment entered for the carving of the bench ends in a little church five hundred years ago, which bench ends are to be seen in that church at the present moment. And we get fairly bewildered by the astonishing wealth of skill and artistic taste and aesthetic feeling which there must have been in this England of ours, in times which till lately we had assumed to be barbaric times. Bewildered, I say, because we cannot understand how it all came to a dead-stop in a single generation, not knowing that the frightful spoliation of our churches and other parish buildings, and the outrageous plunder of the parish guilds in the reign of Edward the Sixth by the horrible band of robbers that carried on their detestable work, effected such a hideous obliteration, such a clean sweep of the precious treasures that were dispersed in rich profusion over the whole land, that a dull despair of ever replacing what had been ruthlessly pillaged crushed the spirit of the whole nation, and art died out in rural England, and King Whitewash and Queen Ugliness ruled supreme for centuries.

• • •

ROBERT HUNTER (*Poverty*: CIRC. 1900)

How many people in the country [U.S.A.] are in poverty? Is the number yearly growing larger? Are there each year more and more of the unskilled classes pursuing hopelessly the elusive phantom of self-support and independence? Are they, as in a dream, working faster, only the more swiftly to move backward? Are there each year more and more hungry children and more and more fathers whose utmost effort may not bring into the home as much energy in food as it takes out in industry? These are not fanciful questions, nor are they sentimental ones. I have not the slightest doubt that there are in the United

States ten million persons in precisely these conditions of poverty, but I am largely guessing, and there may be as many as fifteen or twenty millions!

• • •

WILLIAM COBBETT (*History of the Protestant Reformation*)

These things prove, beyond all dispute, that England was, in Catholic times, a real wealthy country; that wealth was generally diffused; that every part of the country abounded in men of solid property; and that, of course, there were always great resources at hand in cases of emergency.... In short, everything shows that England was then a country abounding in men of real wealth.

• • •

FORTESCUE, (*Lord High Chancellor under Henry VI*)

The King of England cannot alter the laws, or make new ones, without the express consent of the whole kingdom in Parliament assembled. Every inhabitant is at his liberty fully to use and enjoy whatever his farm produceth, the fruits of the earth, the increase of his flock and the like—all the improvements he makes, whether by his own proper industry or of those he retains in his service, are his own, to use and enjoy, without the let, interruption or denial of any. If he be in any wise injured or oppressed, he shall have his amends and satisfactions against the party offending. Hence it is that the inhabitants are rich in gold, silver and in all the necessaries and conveniencies of life. They drink no water unless at certain times, upon a religious score, and by way of doing penance. They are fed in great abundance, with all sorts of flesh and fish, of which they have plenty everywhere; they are clothed throughout in good woollens, their bedding and other furniture in the house are of wool, and that in great store. They are also well provided with all sorts of household goods and necessary implements for husbandry. Every one, according to his rank, hath all things which conduce to make mind and life easy and happy.

• • •

Dr. Walsh himself says:—

An Act of Edward III fixes the wages, without food, as follows. There are many other things mentioned, but the following will be enough for our purpose:

	s.	d.
A woman hay-making, or weeding corn for the day	0	1
A man filling dung-cart	0	3½
A reaper	0	4
Mowing an acre of grass	0	4
Threshing a quarter of wheat	0	4

The price of shoes, cloth and provisions, throughout the time that this law continued in force, was as follows:

	£	s.	d.
A pair of shoes	0	0	4
Russet broadcloth, the yard	0	1	1
A stall fed ox	1	4	0
A grass fed ox	0	16	0
A fat sheep unshorn	0	1	8
A fat sheep shorn	0	1	2
A fat hog two years old	0	3	4
A fat goose	0	0	2½
Ale, the gallon, by proclamation	0	0	1
Wheat, the quarter	0	3	4
White wine, the gallon	0	0	6
Red wine	0	0	4

An Act of Parliament of the fourteenth century, in fixing the price of meat, names the four sorts of meat—beef, pork, mutton and veal, and sets forth in its preamble the words, "these being the food of the poorer sort...."

"The Social Crediter" Index

A South Australian reader, Mr. M. R. W. Lee, began an index of *The Social Crediter* five years ago "to keep track of articles and references which interested me." Interrupted by war work as a telephone technician, Mr. Lee resumed his work after a time, and has sent a copy to the Secretariat. With the omission of the matter in nine issues, the index covers *The Social Crediter* from February, 1940, to December, 1944, and will be completed in England and printed for distribution. A card index of the paper is in the hands of Mr. E. J. Pankhurst, two years of its life having been covered. It is hoped that an annual index will be available to readers as future volumes are completed.

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: (*Business*) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, *Telephone: Central* 8509; (*Editorial*) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, *Telephone: Sefton Park* 435.

Vol. 15. *No.* 11. *Saturday, November* 17, 1945.

The Government Defeat

The defeat in Committee of the Socialist Government by Members elected to support it has importance beyond its immediate significance. It demonstrates a revolt, perhaps largely unconscious, against the fact that Parliament is now only a puppet-show, and that policy is imposed, continuous, and sublimely contemptuous of the interests of this country —in fact, definitely inimical to them. It confirms, if confirmation were needed, that the general election result was not a vote for "Socialism," *i.e.,* the Slave State; but although it has naturally been so publicised by the Forces which wish to accelerate our progress to that condition by rushing legislation through a green and unsophisticated House of Commons. It was a protest *against* the Slave State; and it further demonstrates that the only possible Democracy is negative—a conclusion which is further confirmed by the clever propaganda against "negativeness." Jump over the precipice rather than take time to find out where you are.

The Secret Secret

Politicians and the newspapers still speak and write of the 'atomic' power and its uses as though their premises were axiomatic. 'Men of science however eminent' is a phrase which conjures up a picture of difference and, when used quasi-resentfully of a supposed intention of 'men of science,' of independence. The universities (if not the secondary schools) of Europe and America can mass produce 'atom-bomb scientists' by the score whenever the power of financial inducement says 'go.' So the difference and independence of the physicists upon whom public reputation has been conferred (by publicity agencies 'concentric'—to use Major Douglas's word—with finance) are not axiomatic. Nothing really distinguishes them from reputable economists save, possibly, the accident of the serial number of the scholarship they may have 'won.'

When *The Economist* says it 'casts its vote' for the world state, and hopes 'the public,' "after it has brooded on the atomic bomb a little longer, and has realised how sharp the choice is between the world state and destruction," will do the same, the implication in either case is not axiomatic. *The Economist* has no vote of its own to cast, and the 'public's' vote is a trigger mechanism which the 'voter' can operate or leave to someone else to operate, but which, in both cases, releases a missile directed at himself.

It is not axiomatic that the enormous power transformations which seem to be inseparably connected with nuclear fission at present are necessarily so connected. Like the truth of Newton's 'Laws' the principle of mechanical similitude requires demonstration, and its applications confirmation. Real innovators have from time to time come upon the scene with superior powers of understanding and but little equipment, and, whatever it is, it is not axiomatic that no 'atomic' tintacks for the wrappings of bankers' Christmas presents, and 'atomic' gum for azure envelopes are not awaiting judicious distribution. The House of Commons debate on the Police Force missed (as it invariably does) the most important feature of a sane notion of Law and Order, namely, that success in social organisation is inversely proportional to the force required to hold in check a minority of society's members, and when the minority tends to become a majority, the index of success falls to zero. Lawlessness in behaviour is increasing alarmingly, and most citizens of large cities have their daily tale to tell of delinquency which would not have been credited, let alone tolerated, thirty years ago, or even ten years ago. It is not axiomatic that the morons who administer present world policy (whence is it?) are prepared to add private competition to the load of their present worries; but the tendency is that way. Possibly *The Economist* has such a contingency in mind when it adds the phrase 'some super-suspicious neurotic' to the *cliché,* 'some aggressor' in its account of the origin of the coming 'atomic' war. Evidently it is aware of the existence of suspicion. Why the newspaper takes the trouble to repeat the silly notion that "Modern wars do not begin by accident, or because someone's gun happens to go off, [which is quite true]. They start because some Head of State [a Hitler] thinks he will win and thinks he himself will not be badly hurt in the process of winning" is rather a mystery. Possibly we overrate the intelligence service of *The Economist;* but most dockers, nowadays, know better than that why wars begin, and why this one continues, though, for the moment they are not getting any better press for their ideas than we are for ours.

Notwithstanding these observations, there is something as yet unexplained about the alleged "revolt" of the scientists. Accustomed to be heralded in all the slick advertisements as public and private benefactors, they may be feeling the chill wind of public displeasure much as a Bloomsbury Fabian might feel the November air after a night of furious planning. But the rebuke by 'Scrutator' in *The Sunday Times* suggests a certain serious irritation. They have, he says, "no title to arrogate to themselves the making of first-class decisions in the political sphere over the heads of the properly constituted [*sic*!] political authorities. It is not even as if experience had shown them particularly wise in such matters. Some may be, but the type is not." The 'genius' type! 'Scrutator' is much politer (as one would expect) to Professor Woodward who "holds the Chair of International Relations in" the University of Oxford (near Didcot). The Peer of Balliol (*The Times*, November 13) concurs. It seems a pity that *Truth* masks its insight, shown in the sentence, "... Sir John Anderson, the Government's newly found atomic expert, happens to be the highest authority on the background of the Anglo-American financial situation," with the ambiguous introduction "It is a lucky chance that..." The first 'Atomic' Prime Minister has himself the reputation of being 'a perfect machine.' And whose?

Atomic Bomb and Infringement of Copyright

By A. V. McNEILL (VANCOUVER)

Everybody knows now that the war began and ended with the use of overwhelming destructive power to force nations to surrender their sovereignty, exercised at the beginning by Hitler and at the end by the Allies.

"The villanies that you teach me I will execute and it will go hard but I will better the instruction."

"Bettering the instruction" of villains can obviously be justified only if it is restricted to purely defensive measures against villains, *i.e.*, against such aggression as we have suffered from Germany and Japan, and that *after* the event. But many of the comments on atomic bombing reported in our daily press make no restrictions in this sense. Several suggest that the threat of atomic bombing can be used to force free nations, not aggressors, "to come to their senses," *i.e.*, to give up their sovereignty and join a sort of World Federal Union. And a World Security Council is to be set up, endowed by us, at their sole and undisputed discretion, with the power to administer this typical Nazi policy. That is what Mr. J. M. Coldwell calls "socialising" it! Ye gods and little fishes! As if any group of human beings should be entrusted with such exclusive destructive power over their fellows.

The situation demands that some voice make it plain to Messrs. Truman, Attlee, Coldwell, aye, and perhaps to Churchill too, to all who have not publicly repudiated this extended use of atomic bombing to justify the policy underlying Nazi atrocities, that, whatever the war meant for them, it meant something more for the average British subject than a mere squabble with the Nazis over an infringement of copyright. The voice which will make this plain must be an authoritative voice, and, in a democracy,* there is only one voice which carries this authority and only one which our representatives must obey.

Under these circumstances the following statements describing the aims of the various Institutes of International Affairs made by their spokesmen, Dr. Arnold Toynbee, in 1931, deserve a far wider publicity than they have been given by the various publications or branches of that organisation. A comparison of dates shows that their formal and official adoption of Nazi philosophy anticipated Hitler's rise to power by a few years and Quisling by nine. I am quoting from pp. 808-809 of their Journal, *International Affairs,* of November, 1931. Dr. Toynbee is speaking:

"If we are frank with ourselves, we shall admit that we are engaged on a deliberate and sustained and concentrated effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and the independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign independent States which at present partition the habitable surface of the earth. . . .It is just because we are really attacking the principle of local sovereignty that we keep on protesting our loyalty to it so loudly. The harder we press our attack upon this idol, the more pains we take to keep its priests and devotees in a fool's paradise, lapped in a false sense of security which will inhibit them from taking up arms in their idol's defence. . . .

"And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands."

It is unknown to me whether the members of this organisation, as such, have ever identified themselves publicly with Nazism, as such, or whether they claim a closer affinity than that assured them by the possession of common aims and common methods. The fact that their spokesmen on the radio and in the press, in this country and throughout the Empire, have seemed to find it necessary to be, perhaps, unnecessarily loud in their public denunciations of Hitler, Quisling, and Co. suggests that the real ground of their resentment against these specimens—and it can be a real one—is based rather upon what they feel to be an infringement of copyright than upon any spiritual difference. What other grounds of disagreement could they have against people who, like themselves, were "engaged on a deliberate and sustained and concentrated effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign States which at present partition the habitable surface of the earth," (aims), and of course, "denying with their lips what they are doing with their hands," (methods).

The coining of new words, "Quisling," "Fifth Columnist," *etc.*, widely used by them, if not actually minted by sympathisers with the Institutions of International Affairs, is significant, and significant because it is unnecessary. It must obviously be done to shield somebody. "Treachery to humanity," the older expression, would surely fill the bill quite adequately, and, as the above quotations become better known, people may perhaps suggest new expressions of their own.

The headquarters of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs is at Toronto.

The issues before the Anglo Saxon peoples everywhere and especially before the peoples of the British Empire have become increasingly grave for years. Luckily the wide publicity given the first atomic bombs is making them increasingly clear. These issues are, whether we, admittedly nominally Christian peoples only, are to be committed behind our backs, *i.e.*, through the suppression by the daily press, or by other means, of the issues involved, to an acceptance of pagan, Nazi philosophies? Are we to allow the war which has just ended to be treated as a mere squabble with the Nazis over an infringement of copyright? The fine unforgettable words which Churchill used so aptly to describe the magnificent heroism of the R.A.F. in the Battle of Britain can be used, unfortunately just as aptly, to describe our own case now, though in a very different sense from that in which they were first used. "When did so many (the peoples of the British Empire) owe so much to so few" (the various Institutes of International Affairs and their financial backers)?

"The proposal [to nationalise Cable and Wireless] is of extremely mixed parentage involving the Coalition, Caretaker, and Socialist Governments here, and many of the Dominion Governments abroad." — *The Economist.*

---

*As our readers are aware, the continuing method of the Secretariat has been to explore, by appropriate action, the reality, not the theory of social mechanisms. We have tried, and are still trying, to discover the locus of effective sanctions for a policy which we could entertain. Whether or not the sanction we seek (not merely "a" sanction) is resident or effective in "a democracy," is a judgment which, in our opinion, is qualifiable by the test of our experience, that we are not living under any form of "democracy" of which we can approve as a just mechanism for the release of a Social Credit (or a Christian) policy.
— Editor, *T.S.C.*

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: October 29, 1945.

BANK OF ENGLAND BILL

Lieut.-Colonel Hamilton (Sudbury): ... an inquisitive mind led me to inquire into the processes of banking. I used to regard banks as very useful institutions for safeguarding a man's money and for saving him the trouble of handling large quantities of cash himself. I knew also that they were agencies for large-scale borrowing and lending transactions. I had a subconscious feeling that money was a commodity limited in extent, like potatoes. You either had it or did not have it, and if you did not have it, you certainly could not create it out of thin air. For us private individuals that is only too true, and painfully true sometimes. But I found that in the case of banks the situation was entirely different. Money was a medium of exchange and could easily be created out of nothing. When a bank made a loan, it was not a loan in the ordinary accepted sense of the word, the transferring of purchasing power from one party to another. For the greater part, the money was created in the act of making a loan, and, similarly, when a bank purchased securities, the purchase money was created in the very act of purchase.

I realise also that this process of creating money, and, at other times, the converse process of destroying it, is far and away the most important function of our banking system....

This Bill, when it becomes law, will enable the representatives of the nation to ensure that the supply of money is always adequate to the national needs. I look forward to a series of Measures in the months and years to come which will ensure in every part of our economic system that money will be used in the best and fullest way.

Colonel Oliver Stanley (Bristol, West): ... To sum up, we on this side of the House believe that this Bill can do no possible good, and may do very considerable harm. Of course, we know the real reason why it is being introduced —not a reason given by anybody in the House to-night. We know that the hon. Members opposite have got to socialise something. The Bank of England may not be the most important industry; it may not be the industry which will respond best to public control; it may not be the industry where the results are likely to be greatest, but it has this one supreme benefit—there is no other industry which you can socialise in five Clauses and a short Title. This Bill—if I may copy the gestures of the right hon. Gentleman—is not a natural necessity, it is just a party symbol. That is why we, on this side of the House, oppose this Bill. We oppose it not because it is a danger, but because it is a sham; not because it is going to do harm, but because it is going to do nothing at all. We object, when there are so many realities, so many real problems, demanding the attention of the Government of the day, that the processes of this House, and the time of its Members, should be wasted on a piece of political eyewash.

October 30, 1945.

BANK OF ENGLAND BILL

Sir John Mellor (Sutton Coldfield): Might I ask a question? The Chancellor of the Exchequer described this as a good bargain from the point of view of the Treasury. Does he mean that it has been subject to negotiation between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Bank of England?

Mr. Hall: In the sense in which I think the hon. Gentleman means "negotiation," the answer is "No." The position has been fixed at the present figure because this does, more or less, indicate what the present yield at the market price is.

INCOME TAX (P.A.Y.E. SYSTEM)

Sir William Darling asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, approximately, the number of employers operating pay as you earn; and to indicate any plans he may have for relieving them of this unpaid duty.

Mr. Dalton: About three-quarters of a million. I am now considering whether the undoubted advantages of P.A.Y.E. can be secured with less administrative effort.

WORLD WAR VICTORY (THANKS TO SERVICES)

Mr. Churchill (Woodford): ... I must, however, express my regret at the announcement which he made yesterday that the tradition which existed in this Island of voting monetary rewards to famous victorious commanders should have been abandoned on this occasion, and that no special mention of those commanders should be made in the Motion, which is certainly contrary to precedent in one respect. I should have thought that, at least, the two most famous soldiers whom we have produced since the Duke of Wellington would have received, by name, the thanks, at least, of this House, together with such leaders of the Navy and Air Force as might, upon consideration, have been found appropriate. The theory that the mass is everything, and that individuals are little or nothing, is not one which finds its most successful application in war. Once some equality in force has been achieved between two sides, it is leadership that counts, above all, and which, in fact, decides....

HYDRO-ELECTRIC SCHEMES

Major Ramsay asked the Secretary of State for Scotland whether he can give the details of the expenditure on the Tummel-Garry hydro-electric project.

Mr. Buchanan: The estimated cost of the mechanical and electrical work for the project is £1,172,000 and of the civil engineering works, including the power stations £5,006,000.

Sir B. Nevin-Spence asked the Secretary of State for Scotland if he will give a list of schemes prepared, or in course of preparation, by the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board; and to what extent the provision of electricity supplies in the remoter parts of the Highlands and Islands would be jeopardised if the Tummel-Garry scheme were abandoned.

Mr. Buchanan: The following schemes have been prepared or are in course of preparation by the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board:

Constructional Schemes

Sloy, Morar and Lochalsh.
Tummel-Garry and Gairloch.
Fannich.
Cowal.
Shira.

Skye.
Findhorn-Duntelchaig.
Affric.
Transmission from Shira and Sloy to Central Scotland.
Transmission from Tummel-Garry to Southern Perthshire.
Transmission from Fannich to Inverness, Keith and Aberdeen.
Staff housing for Sloy.

Surveys are now being made for schemes to supply Orkney, Shetland, Kintyre, Caithness, Ullapool and Lochinver. Where, as in the case of Orkney and Shetland, water-power resources are small, it is proposed to supply distribution schemes if necessary from oil engines.

Distribution Schemes

Orkney.
Shetland.
Morar.
Lochalsh.
North Cowal.
South Cowal.
Bute.
Great Cumbrae.
Gairloch.
Ullapool.
Lochinver.
Skye.
The Outer Hebrides.
Islay.
Mull, Luing and Seil.
Arran.

If the Tummel-Garry Scheme were abandoned, provision of electricity supplies to nearly one-third of these schemes would immediately be jeopardised and the supply to all of them would be seriously retarded.

October 31, 1945.

BANK OF ENGLAND (MONEY)

Sir John Mellor (Sutton Coldfield): I make no apology for opposing this Financial Resolution. Yesterday, after Question Time, the Leader of the House said he understood that it had been agreed officially with the Opposition that this Resolution should go through. I do not know exactly what he had in mind, but I should imagine that at any rate any understanding there might have been was no longer binding after the Chief Government Whip moved the closure before the end of time available for Business on Monday. If any one should, none the less, criticise me for opposing this Resolution now, I would pray in aid what Mr. Speaker said on the occasion when he was called to the Chair, at the beginning of this Parliament.

"I have been a back bencher for a long time, and when we saw the two Front Benches, Government and Opposition, putting their heads together, we always used to say, 'well, the back bencher is going to get a dirty deal'." [OFFICIAL REPORT, August 1, 1945; Vol. 413, c. 8.]

POLICE BILL

November 1, 1945.

Mr. Maude (Exeter): ...A lot of us in this House are quite young, but, nevertheless, as a people, we are a very old people. I am now going to pull out the stop on what I call the local feeling, which has not been sufficiently met. A lot of us are extremely proud of the fact that we have, for many years, conducted ourselves extremely well in our local areas. We have conducted our police forces very efficiently, and that is a thing of immense and real local pride to persons who enter local government, and not to those only. The citizens themselves are really proud of their police forces. If, in fact, I felt certain—and hon. Members can imagine how interested I should be in that—we were going to catch more criminals, that would be very good news indeed. But I do not believe it for an instant....

We seem to be living, if I may say so, in an age where there is a tremendous temptation to wish on to the people by way of legislation, things the people do not want at all. They do not want to have these forces. If they did want them, well and good....

Mr. Stokes (Ipswich): ...What we want from the Home Secretary is a repeated assurance of what the Lord President of the Council said in his memorable speech on October 14, 1942:

"I have assured the House that it is not part of the purpose of these Regulations to establish a national police force."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, October 14, 1942; Vol. 383, c. 1733-34.]

Mr. Marlowe (Brighton): ...I was glad to notice that the hon. Member performed his usual acrobatic feat of pretending to speak for the Labour Party, although his innate common sense required him to support the case we are making....

The case which the Government have tried to make is non-existent. There is no reason for this Bill except a tendency towards the nationalisation of the police or towards producing a national police force. The power is taken in the Bill and it can be put into operation. I am not content with merely an assurance that that will not be done. Of course, I accept it from the present Home Secretary....

Mr. Kinley (Bootle): ...Hon. Members in the Opposition are horrified at the idea of a national service. The police force is spread out from Land's End to John o' Groats, but it is controlled by the Home Office. Every force in the country is controlled from beginning to end by the Home Office. Although on our local councils we imagine ourselves to be very important people if we can secure election on the watch committee, we know, as members of the Council, that however proud we may be of our own borough police force, we can neither appoint nor dismiss a police constable, we cannot decide how many superintendents, inspectors and sergeants we shall have, nor can we decide what the conditions of service are to be. All these things are controlled by the Home Office. It is a local service in that we are permitted to pay one-half the cost of it, and we are not allowed to do anything but discuss financial matters, with which again we are not allowed to interfere....

Mr. Harold Roberts (Birmingham, Handsworth): ... speaking as a convinced local authority man, I felt very uneasy when I heard him say that this was a non-party matter. People of any experience of local government know that parties come and parties go. Sometimes we are governed by Liberals, sometimes Tories, sometimes Labour, but Whitehall never sleeps, and is for ever on the look-out to increase its authority at the expense of local authorities. To say that this is a non-party Measure was probably the

most damning thing that could be said about it. I suppose that every person in this Chamber has within the past few months fought a fiercely contested Election. Will anyone here say that any person said a word for or against any Measure of this sort? Were the electorate greatly excited to know whether or not we would support such a Police Bill as this? Of course they were not. The fact is that there is no demand for any Bill of the kind....

If only the Government could be induced not to put on the Party Whips in this case, but to leave the matter to an open vote, I should welcome it very much, because it is a very distasteful thing, for me, at any rate, to have a party issue made of what is really an issue concerning the independence that all patriotic Englishmen feel for their own district....

Lieut.-Colonel Derek Walker-Smith (Hertford): ... It may be that the right hon. Gentleman himself does not cherish any designs upon the independence of local authorities. I hope it is so, but he cannot bind posterity or even his immediate successors by his undertakings. I do not want to make invidious comparisons, but I do recall—and no doubt the House will recall—that the vices of Nero and the irregularities of Commodus had the scope they did because of the machinery built up supposedly for good purposes by Augustus Caesar and Marcus Aurelius. [*Laughter.*]...

Mr. S. O. Davies (Merthyr): ... He has dug up this Bill from somewhere in the archives of the Home Office, but why—I am serious about this—he affronted this House, and particularly his own party, by taking up our time and compelling us to apply our minds to this Bill I do not know, in view of the expectations aroused, after the pledges we made to our people. For a Bill of this kind there is not a shred of justification....

The town of Neath was mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman. That has one of the small police forces which are to be wantonly sacrificed by him. I happen to know the little town in detail. There is not a better, more cleanly or decently conducted little town in these islands. There is nothing that can be said against the conduct of the people. After all, what do we want? Is it a vast, organised, soulless machine or a high standard of conduct amongst the people of this country? They have it in that little town, with its own small police force, but, for some reason, my right hon. Friend will imply, "Your conduct is not good enough to suit me; I must get for you a far more efficient police force, and that I shall have by merging yours with a larger one." I could say a great deal about the police forces in these areas, but all I can do is to make my personal feelings clear on this matter.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Ede*): You have succeeded in doing that.

Mr. Davies: I hope I have, but it rests with the right hon. Gentleman to dissipate, if he can, the suspicions of a Member of the same party as himself, and one who was a Member of that party many years before he associated with it.

Churchill and Russia

A Reuter message (November 8) from Moscow records the following from a diplomatic Reception:—

Mr. Molotov, Soviet Foreign Secretary, recalled that Mr. Churchill once asked him in London when he would receive a decoration from the Soviet Government for his services to the Red Army.

"What services, I asked?" Mr. Molotov said, and Mr. Churchill replied, "In 1918, I was one of the inspirers and organisers of armed intervention in Russia. As a result of that intervention you have built up the magnificent Red Army and look what it has done since."

Mr. Molotov then clinked glasses with Major Randolph Churchill, who is visiting Moscow, and said "So let us drink to Winston Churchill."

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.