

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 15. No. 13.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The Socialist (C.C.F.) Party has sustained a crushing defeat in the Manitoba Provincial Elections in October. The latest figures in our possession which are incomplete, are Coalition (Prog. Conservative, Social Credit, etc.) 37, C.C.F., 7. Our office boy is still looking for the result in the *Threepenny Daily Worker*.

The extraordinary lengths to which the Bloomsbury Cult—the exaltation of a special type of intellectualism divorced from practical experience—can tinge policy is well illustrated by the appointment of a Chartered Accountant to control Krupps. Although, fifty years ago, such an arrangement would have excited derision, it has become quite a commonplace, evoking little or no comment. It was a feature of the post-1918 period, and contributed noticeably to the tragic decadence of British affairs which we are evidently being urged to repeat—almost step by step.

Yet it is possible that it is a phenomenon which lies close to the heart of things. A very able Jew, when taxed with the desire to enslave the Gentiles, replied "You Gentiles will always be slaves until you can learn to distinguish between numbers and things." The growing ascendancy of the accountant, as a link between the actual producer and the control of the Financial Centre—in this country Somerset House and the Bank of "England"—would seem to indicate that we are getting deeper into slavery with every day that passes.

London School of Economics Bulletin. One hundred German submarines in perfect order and surrendered in Loch Ryan are to be taken out to sea, fitted with depth charges and sunk. They contain enough high grade steel to make several hundred thousand motor cars, enough electrical plant to light every village in Scotland, enough clocks to fit every house in a fair-sized village with the best clock that money can buy, enough copper to make non-corrosive water pipes for the houses of a fair-sized town, enough fittings to furnish a village, and enough instruments, electrical and other, to replace a fair proportion of those damaged in, say Burma, in public utility undertakings. This far-sighted example of "Planning" under a Socialist Government with despotic powers is evidence of the ability to provide full employment with complete austerity, as promised by Sir Stafford Cripps.

At the same time, inflation, which consists in distributing money without providing equivalent goods, will be dealt with by distributing wages for making goods to replace those sunk, sending the goods where you can't buy them (preferably to Russia) and then taking the wages back by P.A.Y.E.

If this delirious export policy is pursued a few months longer, the sterling area will be paralysed. We don't think Sir Stafford Cripps has the faintest conception of what he is doing—he strikes us as being, like his uncle and aunt, the Sidney Webbs, so completely devoid of any sense of reality, that he would not recognise a fact if it singed his eyebrows. But someone knows what he is doing.

We notice with pleasure that Squadron-Leader Christopher Hollis, M.P., was one of the forty-five Members who voted for the annulment of the Tummel-Garry Scheme. We understand that an appeal to the House of Lords is pending and defer further comment until this is decided.

The "B."B.C. giving news objectively. 6 p.m. Sunday, November 18, 1945:—"General de Gaulle has made a first-class blunder. *Even* the Catholics, speaking privately amongst themselves—"

Evidently when the French Catholics speak privately amongst themselves, they arrange to have a microphone wired to the announcer of the "B."B.C. Or does the news come *via* Moscow?

It is a measure of the impotence of the British Member of Parliament that the quality of the speeches made in the House is now uniformly far lower than that of many made, for instance, in the Canadian House of Commons. There is a certain lack of endeavour clearly noticeable, as though the speakers knew, as in fact they do know, that what they say will make no difference to the issue, which has been "planned" before they speak. The speeches are merely a façade of "D'markrazi."

An article by Mr. Beverley Baxter in *Maclean's* (Toronto) says that "Britain" is becoming the laboratory of political experiment.

Of course, they generally kill the guinea-pig but Mr. Chuter Ede is importing a superior breed in large numbers.

The thousands of bottles of finest champagne, wines and liqueurs which have been confiscated at the German Embassy in London are not to be sold to the public, nor is "the public" to be credited with their value. They are reserved for "Government Entertaining." Now where have we heard of a similar Government in which the Kommissars get twenty-three course dinners and six kinds of wine, and "the public" lives ten in a room and eats scraps, when lucky?

In the Nova Scotia Provincial Elections, the Socialists (C.C.F.) lost one of their three seats. The other two are coal-mining constituencies in close affiliation with Mr. Sidney

Hillman (Schmuel Gilman)'s Labour-Communist organisation. The defeated Socialist was the C.I.O. of the Party in Nova-Scotia.

• • •
An Educational Gestapo is to be organised (it probably is waiting in the wings) which is to spy on every child in every type of school "with a view to making recommendations as to its future work in life" ("B."B.C. News Bulletin, November 21, 8 a.m.). Doubtless if found biting its nails, it will be "directed" to chiropody.

You notice that World Industry is the object of being born.

• • •
The World Planners. Australian Department. "Dr. Evatt particularly showed an animus against the English. No matter what I said, he interspersed his remarks with 'That is just the way the English do things.' Cecil Brown (American War Correspondent). "From Suez to Singapore."

Dr. Evatt is Australian Minister of External Affairs, and regarded as the chief Planner. It is rather a curious fact that the Radical-Socialist Bloc, so powerful in French politics in the Armistice years, which was composed almost entirely of Freemasons, called itself "le Cartel Radical Socialiste." A Cartel is an association to keep up prices. The Radical-Socialist Bloc has been completely swamped in the recent elections by the Progressive Catholics—a fact which should be noted carefully by those people who imagine that all is over bar the shouting for the Big Idea.

• • •
We should like to know what Mr. Churchill has to say about his friend Mr. Bernard Baruch who according to the Melbourne Herald "Hiding behind the anonymity of 'an elder statesman and eminent citizen' came out vehemently against the British case." We are far from undiluted admiration of Mr. Churchill, while admitting his great qualities in certain situations. But we are quite confident of one thing; he is no traitor. And any Englishman who would condone the continued prostitution of the interests of Great Britain and the British Empire to the New York Jews who have played pitch and toss with us for thirty years would be a much dirtier traitor than those standing trial for their lives to-day.

• • •
We are inclined to believe that the breakdown of the present negotiations being conducted between Lord Keynes and Mr. James Byrnes (universally accepted as being the shop window for Mr. Bernard Baruch) would be in our best interests, although Mr. Baruch would no doubt try to make us suffer for it. But if it does take place "anonymity" will not hide Mr. Baruch.

• • •
Mr. Emanuel (God with us) Shinwell, Minister of Fuel and Power, has been damped—christened as they laughingly call it—"Ernest" by the "B."B.C. (News Bulletin 8 a.m., November 23).

"Ernest" says he finds a few technical difficulties in nationalising the coal industry, and wishes the House would agree to let him confiscate it—just like that. Most people would find their difficulties temporarily eased if they were authorised to steal anything they wanted, but it does eventually have a disturbing effect, as "Ernest" is due to find out in the next year or so.

Tactics

Strategy is, broadly, the affair of generals; tactics the peculiar business of troops. Generalship has provided those who are politically with us with a strategy. There has been dissent from this strategy among those not politically with us. Objectively, we should describe these dissenters as generally those who have not completely disengaged themselves from the twin ideas of 'majority rule' (control of minorities) and 'socialism' in one form or another (supremacy of the group over the individual).

However innocently, they seek the employment of a *mechanism* which they favour. The purpose of the mechanism is hazy, unspecified, or too-loosely specified. It is indefinite. The mechanism is definite, so they embrace it and unconsciously substitute it for a policy. Policy has receded as mechanism has come to occupy their minds.

The strategy disclosed from time to time in these pages (though more rather than less continuously) is not objected to by those who truly entertain the objective it is designed to gain. It is seen, however, to have too little tactical expression. That is a matter for the individual social creditor (and his natural allies).

While, in warfare, every effort is made to preserve secrecy concerning matters of strategy, it does not seem, in practice, easy to keep the larger strategical issues from the knowledge of the enemy, possibly because they are the inevitable counterpart of his own strategical problems. The actual measures taken to express a strategy are in an altogether different case, and every move is watched to see whether it discloses which choice of possibly divergent strategies has been made by the opposing forces, whether it is likely to be well developed, what actual forces may impede its development, *etc., etc.* Tactics are a key to strategy as well as an index to the necessity for counter-action. For this reason, tactical advice communicated through the Secretariat has either been of a kind which could be developed quickly (the Electoral Campaign for the Abolition of Poverty, the Lower Rates Campaign, the short-lived Tax-Bonds Campaign, the Anti-Bureaucracy Campaign of the recent general election, the still more recent campaign against monopolistic spoliation of Scotland—in each of these the correctness of the underlying principle was demonstrated and the relative insufficiency of the forces available, except locally, *e.g.*, at North Berwick, where Sir William Beveridge was dislodged for reasons well understood by those who did the dislodging, namely the electors in the constituency, or, rather, enough of them to matter. The outcome of the Hydro-Electric campaign will depend on the sanctions engaged, which will partly depend upon the energy expended in fortifying their will.)

In such tactical operations, maximum publicity is generally in our favour: we have nothing to hide, and are seeking persistently to disclose something of vital importance to everyone, rather than to conceal it; concealment (at least of the truth) is the necessary strategy of the Dictatorship. At the same time, minute advice concerning tactics which can be developed only over a considerable period has great disadvantages. The initiative passes to the opposition because his mind is already better prepared than the unsophisticated individuals who are advised, and the opposition has full opportunity for diversions and has abundance of supplies.

(Continued on page 8)

A Maiden Speech

The following are passages from the maiden speech of Mr. Patrick H. Ashby, member of the Canadian House of Commons for East Edmonton which seat he won in the general election:—

The people of Edmonton East, like the majority of the people of Canada, are honest, hardworking people, trying to make a living. Let me repeat—and I shall repeat quite a lot of things—they are trying to make a living; but ninety *per cent.* of them never do make a living. They exist while trying, but they exist only. The object of work and toil is to obtain a living, and by a "living" I mean a full and abundant life. There are mighty few people in this great dominion, this wonderful country, with all the marvellous resources and advantages which God has bestowed upon it, who obtain a living. Ninety *per cent.* never obtain a full and abundant life no matter how hard they struggle.

We are slaves indeed, slaves to these "isms," to systems, to methods such as those which this government has practised and supported ever since it has been in office. There is, however, one difference between the people of Edmonton East—in fact, the people of Alberta generally and the rest of the people of Canada. Albertans are becoming enlightened; they are no longer voting for methods and means but are voting for and demanding ends or results. That is why I was elected to represent them and their will, and I am here on instructions from the people of my constituency to demand certain results. They are going to get those results, I tell you, before I am through. When all the people of Canada—and in the east, too they are becoming enlightened—realise that they can have democracy, by which I mean a form of government that makes it easiest for the greatest number of people to enjoy the largest amount of individual freedom and security, and when they realise the full meaning of democracy and elect individuals to represent them, and not some other form of government or some "ism" or some method, we shall begin to make real progress.

The reputation which has been built up by party politicians in the past is not an enviable one. I have yet to hear an adult speak with respect of party politicians. The name "politician," if you will pardon my saying so, stinks to high heaven. The names of many politicians are being associated with such criminals and scoundrels as Dillinger and Hitler; and when the people of Canada begin to lose faith and trust in the men they elect to represent them, it is time we turned over a new leaf and began to represent the people.

In Alberta we have a government which is respected by the people because they have not failed to any great extent in carrying out their promises, but have tried to the best of their ability to serve the people instead of ruling them. That is our duty here as members of this parliament—to serve our fellow men, not to rule them.

We in Alberta are not hampered in this progressive movement by any natural laws or any laws that God has made, but only by man-made rules and regulations. I must say that we have been hampered only by the actions of political bosses in Ottawa and in this parliament; for had we been given the freedom to go ahead as we desired, without any interference with the rights of other provinces or any other part of the great empire we call the British commonwealth of nations, to-day we would have seen in

Alberta, and possibly in the rest of Canada—for the rest of Canada would soon have followed—a majority of the people enjoying, for the first time in their lives and the first time in modern history, a full and abundant life.

We have just passed through in this war a period in human history that will forever remain a blot, and a bloody blot, upon the records of party politics. For this war was not fought between peoples, because the majority of the people everywhere are too busy trying to make a living to be bothered with making wars. The people, I know, were used by the various dictators, whether hidden or open, who wished to gain for themselves advantages over one another. On the one hand we have dictators hiding behind the scenes centralising control, trying to gain control over the whole earth. Whether you believe it or not does not alter these facts. On the other hand there was that notorious dictator named Hitler who also coveted that position. They are insane; there is no doubt about it in my mind. It is a peculiar mania from which they have suffered, the mania to rule.

It is our duty in this house not to rule but to serve, and yet I find that the majority of members desire not to serve their people so much as to serve the party to which they belong. Before this war the federal government of Canada, who were supposed to represent the people, did not represent the people of Canada. The people of Canada wanted food and could not buy it even though the stores offered it for sale. They could not buy it because they had no money and this government said, "We have no money. We cannot build highways, we cannot build schools, we cannot reforest our burnt-out areas, we cannot build public works or carry on other activities because we have not the money." And so the people starved, living in misery, suffering and privation which was unbelievable, and must be unbelievable to many members here who have not seen the conditions under which the people lived.

Thousands of our people died as a result of the actions or inaction of this government, who were then supposed to be representing the people of Canada. Thousands of our boys who went overseas in this war rode freight trains seeking means to get a living, and failing to do so. We all know this if we stop to think. But the moment war was declared the money began to flow forth in billions upon billions of dollars. We then found money enough to produce great highways, airports, tanks, guns, ships, planes, bombs, bullets by the millions. We erected great factories and equipped them with all the most modern machinery, and we trained men and women and paid them well while training them to operate these machines. And with all this production we took the most able-bodied of our boys and sent them over to deliver these goods to people who did not want them. Those people said "We will not take them and we will blast you out of the sky and sink your ships if you try to deliver them." Our boys said, "We will deliver them and you will get them just the same." Well, we delivered them without charge to the enemy. We delivered them absolutely free, and we were all far more prosperous during the war than we ever were before. . . .

One of the first things that the people demand of me is that all taxation on all incomes of \$5,000 a year and less shall be immediately abolished. I hope you have that down. The second is that the old age pensions be increased and the age limit reduced. Our national leader, the hon. member

(Continued on page 7)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

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

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

Vol. 15. No. 13.

Saturday, December 1, 1945.

Pandit Nehru and Great Britain

In common with a number of other amiable well-wishers, Pandit Nehru informed the Indian National Congress that "Britain" [*sic*] is now a third rate power. Commenting in passing on the similarity between this remark and that of the "B."B.C. that General de Gaulle had made a tactical error of the first magnitude when he took the course which has proved effective in electing him to the head of the French Government, we think that some attention is nevertheless due to it. Is it true? If it is, when did we become a third class power, and why? Is it because we have fought a successful war, and if so, how is it that Pandit Nehru *et al* sing in chorus that there are only two first-class powers, the other two partners in the tri-partite victory, U.S. and Russia. Or is it because, for some not very obvious reason, we are still badly-fed, under-clothed, and under-housed and are advertising the fact everywhere like mendicants while the other two partners are doing quite nicely, thank you. We have been told in the plainest terms by "our" Government, that what it calls "austerity," *i.e.*, underfeeding, under-clothing, and bad housing is its policy. Is that because the first item on the programme of a Socialist Government is to ensure that we are a third class power? Is the unwieldy, artificial, multi-linguaged U.S.S.R. necessarily a relatively greater power (even in the orthodox and probably obsolete sense) now, when any part of the British Empire can be spoken to in a split second and reached in four days, than it was when Australia was five weeks away?

Or is the explanation of the whole situation that we are being attacked from every quarter, both internally and externally, because our enemies are afraid that we *still* are not a negligible quantity and will stop at nothing to bring us down? Why is Pandit Nehru, a traitor if ever there was one, so resigned to the "greatness" of "America" and Russia, and so sure that if only "Britain" is abased, their "greatness" need cause him no anxiety? God wot, it is time some of these questions were asked and answered.

"America's Place"

Columbia (New York) University is, in its general complexion, the local edition of the London School of Economics, together with a Law School which has no exact equivalent here. A gentleman whose portrait appears on the cover, Professor Nathaniel Peffer has written a book called *America's Place in the World*, and America's Place in the World is just what you would expect from Professor Nathaniel Peffer, of Columbia University. His book requires,

and will get, more than a passing word; but in the meantime, one point in connection with it requires to be brought out, and kept out. That is the use of the word "America" when U.S.A. is indicated. We can imagine the derision, not to say annoyance, which would be caused if English writers persisted in calling England "Europe"—there is quite a lot of heat generated if "the English" are taken to include the Scots and the Welsh. The United States are not geographically the largest area in the American Continent; they are far further culturally from the Brazilians and the Argentines than are the English from the Scots; and the main, and common, thesis that United States citizens are alone civilised, peaceable, non-grasping and generally inoffensive is not universally accepted over any considerable area of the American Continent south of the Mexican border.

Majority Government v. Democracy

(From the *Dundee Courier*.)

Sir,—Having regard to its rather technical nature, the Tummel-Garry project can be said to have awakened a truly formidable opposition; enough, at any rate, to have indicated to a Government priding itself upon its "democratic" basis and its understanding of the immediate needs of the people that the scheme should have been put in cold storage till (a) the demands for food, warmth, and shelter had been adequately met and (b) alternative methods, less repugnant to the local population of creating electricity had been thoroughly investigated.

We know what happened. The bulldozer tactics employed by the "Government" came as a shock to many; but not to those who for years have observed the tactics of succeeding "Governments."

The ruthless and dictatorial treatment of the minority opposing the project (and the majority of the British electorate could, of course, not be expected to take an active interest in the technical, to some extent local, question under discussion) is exactly what we should expect from a "majority" Government.

It is a truism that those ostensibly in control of a modern State (any modern State) can and do penalise successive minorities because they claim that they represent a majority. It is conveniently forgotten that we are all at one time or another in a minority. Parents are in a minority; farmers are in a minority; skilled men are in a minority; country-dwellers are a minority; and the politically wise are very much in a minority.

This is the fact which so-called "democratic" party-governments exploit, playing the various sections against each other, claiming the right—which they continuously exercise to overrule every minority which, together, constitute the majority.

If the Tummel-Garry "defeat" will help our people to realise the truth that party, or "majority" government, is a hollow sham which inevitably leads to one party government (dictatorship) and gets us further and further away from true Democracy (a state of affairs in which minorities are secure) then the Government's "victory" may prove a Pyrrhic one and the people's "defeat" the beginning of a genuine and lasting victory.—I am, &c.,

W. L. RICHARDSON.

Feadan, Lawers, by Aberfeldy. November 20, 1945.

Hydro-Electric Scheme in Parliament

House of Commons: November 14, 1945.

Mr. Snadden (Perth and Kinross, Western): I beg to move,

"That the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board—Constructional Scheme No. 2 Confirmation Order, 1945, dated August 22, 1945, made under the Hydro-Electric Development (Scotland) Act, 1943, a copy of which Order was presented on August 23, be annulled."

In moving this Motion, which I realise is a serious thing to do, and no doubt an unpopular step to take, I would like to make it plain to the House at the outset that I only decided to do so after the most serious and earnest consideration. I have lived in the district concerned, I have walked over almost every yard of the ground affected and have seen for myself precisely what is involved in this major operation of the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board. I have also attended the public inquiry and studied the evidence given before that tribunal. It would be an understatement to say that I speak only for my constituents, because I have reason to know that large numbers of people on both sides of the Border who love historic Perthshire and the central Highlands, view with genuine alarm what is proposed under this scheme. As the House knows, the scheme has been confirmed by the Secretary of State, but the final responsibility, as is right, rests with this House under Section 5 (5) of the Act of 1943.

We are all agreed about the vital part to be played by hydro-electricity in the development of Scotland for the future of our country. I do not think we shall be selfish about it, or allow any sectional interest or view to stand in the way of progress. We are all agreed on developing our national wealth, and we know that certain beauty spots may have to be sacrificed in the present age, and that here and there beauty may have to give way to utility and service. No one wants more than I do to see a rapid development of the electricity supply, especially to our farms and crofts throughout rural Scotland, but I think the House will also agree that the beauty of the glorious lochs and majestic rivers of Scotland, as well as the latent power hidden in them, is equally a part of our inheritance, and if that inheritance does not demand a fierce uncompromising protection, it at least demands our most serious consideration before drastic hands are laid upon them, and they are removed from the scene for all time.

When the Hydro-electric Development Act was before the House I was on the other side of the House, and I believed, as I think the majority of hon. Members believed, that the special Amenity Committee set up under that Act was specifically appointed for the very purpose of giving us adequate protection against the destruction of amenities. The Amenity Committee was, in fact, to be the bulwark against any possible engineering irresponsibility. Hon. Members know that the Committee has rejected that part of the scheme with which I am concerned. Further, the future livelihood and the general welfare of the people affected cannot be lightly brushed aside. Was not the main purpose of the Act of 1943 to foster and increase the welfare of the people of the Highlands?

The case, I submit, against this scheme is not based solely on agricultural grounds, although serious damage is

to be done to the agricultural industry. Nor is it based on the adverse report of the Fisheries Committee which recommended that certain parts of the scheme should be abandoned. That aspect of the case will be dealt with probably by one of my hon. Friends. My case is simply that the price to be extracted in the loss of amenity from one of the loveliest parts of Scotland is too stiff a price to pay even for power, and that it was never the intention of Parliament, in giving powers to the Board, to allow them to endanger a countryside so lovely and so famous. Further, at a time when everything possible should be done to encourage the tourist industry, upon which this district entirely depends for its livelihood, one of the most famous tourist centres in the whole of Scotland is to suffer irreparable damage. . . .

According to the Board's own survey, this scheme will contribute only one-twentieth part of the untapped energy still available in the Highlands of Scotland. . . . are still unconvinced that such a drastic scheme is necessary, or that those of us who supported the Act of 1943 ever contemplated a plan endangering a countryside so rich in natural beauty and known to tourists not only here but throughout the world.

The development scheme of the Hydro-Electric Board contains 102 different schemes. This is only construction scheme No. 2. . . .

It is clear to anyone who has studied the Tribunal's report, from paragraphs 17 and 27, that all that is necessary is for the Hydro-Electric Board to get a certificate from the Central Electricity Board to the effect that they are short of power.

When they have got their certificate they can push through any scheme, because then it is held to be in the public interest to do it. It is admitted in paragraph 27 of the Tribunal's report that considerations of amenity were not even taken into account by the Electricity Commissioners. This question, it says, is left to the two statutory committees. The whole thing is beautifully arranged. The inquiry quite clearly shows that the Tummel Garry scheme was selected simply because it was most convenient for the supply of the Central Electricity Board, whose sole concern is to supply industrial England and some parts of Scotland.

The Commissioners and the Electricity Board, who appear to be quite inseparable so far as I can find out, and neither of whom are located in Scotland, are in complete control. Nothing can be done without their consent, but anything can be done at their command. It is not the needs of the Highlands that constitute the governing factor. . . .

Colonel Gomme-Duncan (Perth): . . . but I hope hon. Members in all parts of the House will exercise their own judgment, regardless of any Whips. Why are they to be put on? Is it done to save the face of the Secretary of State who has confirmed the Scheme? I cannot believe that it is. I wish to say how much I regret that he is still not able to be with us tonight. I know that he would come out of this, if he agreed to withdraw, reconsider and possibly amend it, a far greater man than if he confirmed what has been done so far. He would not lose face, neither would the Government; they would gain immensely. I have no doubt that in Scotland the Government would considerably gain in status if they gave reconsideration to this particular Scheme. I feel quite sure that a large number of hon. Members opposite have had a letter from Mr. Donald MacPherson of Inverness, a leader of the Labour Party in the

Highlands and a member of the Inverness Town Council. Among other things which he says is:

"The methods and activities of the Board during the past year have been such as to fill us with acute apprehension."

He also says, going on to develop the theme:

"The country is to-day virtually in the hands of engineers thinking only in terms of concrete, machinery and volumes of water."

He appeals for support for a Motion to have the Tummel-Garry Scheme annulled and says:

"I ask that Parliament shall exercise its function and keep in check any powerful combination of interests which might attempt, as they have done in this case, to take powers into their hands which it was never intended that they should have."

So speaks a leader of the Labour Party in Inverness. I have kept the House too long and I ask to be forgiven, but this is my constituency and I am speaking for my constituents. In all the circles in which I have been—and they include people of all parties; I have thousands of signatures here, many from Socialists, thousands of them, and so has my hon. Friend the Member for Perth and Kinross, Western (Mr. Snadden). This matter—this whole business, the way it has been treated, and the way the Board has gone about things, to say the least of it, leaves a very nasty taste in the mouth, and I beg of the House and the Government not to tie themselves up to what, quite frankly, I believe to be a tremendous ramp. I am not asking for anything more except reconsideration and amendment, but I must Pray for annulment under the Procedure of the House, and I second this Prayer in all sincerity, asking that we may have the support of the House on behalf of the people of Scotland, and of Perthshire in particular.

Mr. Alexander Anderson (Motherwell): ... We recognise that there must be some sacrifice of amenity—it is the privilege of Pitlochry to make that sacrifice for the benefit of Scotland. ...

Major Ramsay (Forfar): ... I have learned to hate the word "amenity" because I am not quite sure if I know what it means. No two people have given me the same definition, and to be perfectly frank, when speaking to people outside this House, I have never heard so much nonsense talked on any subject as on this one.

I have heard some say that the scheme proposed for Pitlochry will improve the scenery, and I have heard others say that it will ruin that scenery. These two extremes seem to me to present a case with which something must be wrong. They cannot both be right. I am, therefore, trying hard to make my own definition. I believe that great charm of the Highlands is their natural beauty, that is their scenery, the sculpture that is God-made and not man-made. It is the greatest asset of the Highlands, this natural beauty and charm. But I do not think that defines amenity fully. I am quite sure that amenities are something which, if this scheme goes through, are going to be spoilt—or at least there is a risk that they are going to be spoilt. I have a feeling that if man could improve on the natural scenery it would still be intolerable to the Highlanders. ...

It amazes me that the Government should have put on the Whips this evening. I know I am not the first Member to say so, but it is astonishing that they have taken this action. I cannot possibly believe that it is a Party matter. ...

November 15, 1945.

HYDRO-ELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT (SCOTLAND)

Commander Galbraith (Glasgow, Pollok): ... I want to find out, if possible, what is the real driving force behind this scheme. Those of us who passed the Hydro-Electric Development Bill believed it was going to benefit, not in small but in large measure, the Highlands; that the Hydro-Electric Board, being a Scottish Board, would work to that end, and that it would have constantly in mind the advantage and the needs of the Highlands, and little else. I want to show from the Tribunal's report how that has worked out in practice. We are told in paragraph 10:

"The Tummel-Garry project is intended, primarily, as a revenue producing undertaking to meet in particular peak load demands on the Central Electricity Boards' Central Scotland grid."

Paragraph 17 says that to justify their purpose, the Board maintains a triple contention, first, that it is warranted by the broad intention of the Act of 1943; next, by pointing to the urgent and immediate needs of the Central Electricity Board, and, finally, by reliance on the approval if not the compelling encouragement of the Electricity Commissioners. In paragraph 19, the needs of the Central Scotland grid are again stressed, they state that it was essential that the power to be developed by the Tummel-Garry scheme should be available for that purpose. Paragraph 26 tells us something which I am afraid we, in this House, overlooked when we passed the Development Bill, that is, that by their power of veto, the Electricity Commissioners can control the whole development policy of the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board. Later we are informed as to the point of view of the Commissioners. Their first consideration—and I do wish Scottish Members to note this—is the need of the Central Electricity Board for more power, and, secondly, the need of the Hydro-Electric Board to develop schemes which will show a margin of profit. Sir John Kennedy, who gave evidence on behalf of the Commissioners, went on to indicate that the types of profit-making schemes which would meantime earn the approval of the Electricity Commissioners were those designed to generate electricity for sale to the Central Electricity Board, and that the Commissioners did not take into account either amenities or fishing interests. He might well have added, for indeed it is only too apparent that they took no notice of the interests of the Highlands as such. I do beg the House to bear with me while I make two other quotations from that report, because they seem to be of very great importance. I want to quote paragraph 30 of this report to the House. The tribunal say in that paragraph:

"We consider, therefore, that the policy which the Board have adopted in promoting this Scheme is one which they are entitled to adopt, and even one which, in the circumstances, having regard to the pressing needs of the Central Electricity Board, as these were set before them, and to the attitude of the Electricity Commissioners, they are constrained to adopt. It appears to us further that in the absence of evidence to contradict the testimony of the Central Electricity Board, or of successful challenge of the discretion of the Electricity Commissioners the conclusion cannot be avoided that the Board had little option but to follow the course so plainly indicated for them."

These last words surely make the position clear: "To follow the course so plainly indicated for them." Indicated by whom? By the Electricity Commissioners? Who can doubt, in the light of these quotations, and particularly, of

these final words, that the whole object of this scheme was to supply electricity to the country at large, and that the Highlands are of but secondary importance. If any doubt remains let us consider what the tribunal had to say on the alternative scheme, which certain of the objectors contended would be more truly in the public interest—The Glen Affric and Quoich projects. They said:

"There is no doubt that the development of such projects would be in accordance with the Board's statutory duties, and would enable them to satisfy the demands of the class of consumer specifically indicated in Section 2 (1) (c) of the Act of 1943. There is equally no doubt that such a project would be financially and economically more adventurous than one with a ready-made customer and an instantly computable profit at hand. It is also true that such a project might play a part in attracting industry to the Highlands, and thus, if successful, bring new blood to an exhausted and dwindling economy. It would not, however, meet any of the needs of the Central Electricity Board. . . . Such a scheme would also have to obtain the approval of the Electricity Commissioners, and while, of course, it is impossible to dogmatise on the hypothetical, it appears to us very doubtful, in view of Sir John Kennedy's evidence, whether such approval would mean-time be forthcoming."

Surely, the position is now quite clear. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members may laugh, but this is a serious matter. The water power resources of the Highlands can only be developed as may suit the Electricity Commissioners, who have no specific interest in or duty towards the Highlands. . . .

Mr. Henderson Stewart (Fife, East): . . . The Cameron report tells us about it—no appeal lies against the decision of the Electricity Commissioners by the Board; the veto of the Commissioners can control the whole development policy of the Hydro-Electric Board. According to the evidence of this impartial committee the Board is completely under the domination of the Commissioners in London. I cannot help saying I am ashamed of Lord Airlie—who bears a great name—that he does not resign his office now, in view of the pressure put upon the Board. Had he taken his courage in his hands as he has done in the past and said openly—[*Interruption.*] I am glad he is here. Had he stated publicly that his duties could not be performed because of the excessive pressure of the Electricity Commissioners the whole House would have supported him. I invite him to take that step now—and his colleagues.

Question put accordingly,

"That the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board—Construction Scheme No. 2 Confirmation Order, 1945, dated August 22, 1945, made under the Hydro-Electric Development (Scotland) Act, 1943, a copy of which Order was presented on August 23, be annulled."

The House divided: Ayes, 45; Noes, 263.

Division No. 19.	Ayes.	11.35 p.m.
Agnew, Cmdr. P. G.	Joynson-Hicks, Lt.-Cdr. Hon.	
Boles, Lt.-Col. D. C. (Wells)	L. W.	
Bossom, A. C.	Keeling, E. H.	
Bower, N.	Lindsay, Lt. Col. M. (Solihull)	
Boyd-Carpenter, Maj. J. A.	Lloyd, Maj. Guy (Renfrew, E.)	
Bromley-Davenport, Lt.-Col. W.	Lloyd, Brig. J. S. B. (Wirral)	
Challen, Flt.-Lieut. C.	Mellor, Sir J.	
Clarke, Col. R. S.	Mott-Radclyffe, Maj. C. E.	
Corbett, Lieut.-Col. U. (Ludlow)	Ross, Sir R.	
Crothwaite-Eyre, Col. O. E.	Scott, Lord W.	
Darling, Sir W. Y.	Spearman, A. C. M.	
Dodds-Parker, Col. A. D.	Spence, Maj. H. R.	
Dower, Lt.-Col. A. V. G.	Stewart, J. Henderson (Fife, E.)	
(Penrith)	Stoddart-Scott, Lt.-Col. M.	
Drewe, C.	Stuart, Rt. Hon. J.	
Fraser, Maj. H. C. P. (Stone)	Studholme, H. G.	
Galbraith, Comdr. T. D.	Thornton-Kemsley, Col. C. N.	
Harvey, Air-Comdr. A. V.	Turton, R. H.	
Houghton, Maj. S. G.	Wakefield, Sir W. W.	

Hinchingsbrooke, Viscount
Hollis, Sqn-Ldr. M. C.
Hope, Lt. Col. Lord J.
Hurd, A.
Hutchinson, Lt.-Cdr. Clark
(Edinburgh, W.)
Jennings, R.

Ward, Hon. G. R.
Wheatley, Lt. Col. M. J.
Williams, C. (Torquay)
Tellers for the Ayes:—
Mr. Snadden and
Colonel Gomme-Duncan.

A MAIDEN SPEECH (Continued from page 3)

for Peace River (Mr. Low), yesterday suggested \$50 a month at the age of sixty years. I always like to turn things around. I think it looks a great deal better if we say \$60 a month at the age of fifty; and if the people desire it I can assure them they can have \$100 a month at the age of forty. It all depends on what the people want. We are their servants, and that is what we must be if we are loyal, and if we are not traitors to them. We are here either to serve them or to rule them, and I am sure I am not here to rule the people of my constituency. I am here to accept from them instructions as to what they want; and when the people of this great British empire realise the situation and compel their members of parliament to serve them, then God's gifts will open before us as though we saw the light of day for the first time in our lives. Then we will begin to live, for that is all human beings work and toil for—to live. . . .

I have left until the last a discussion of the demands by our returned soldiers and merchant seamen. First of all, these men want good houses to live in. We have forests, an abundance of trees, plenty of mills and help. We have great factories, and can manufacture anything from nails to doorknobs. I see no reason why every returned soldier should not have a good home. There is only one obstacle in the way. That is found in this House of Commons—and it will be removed, I can assure you of that. Our returned boys want the sum of \$6,000 set aside for the purpose of building houses for themselves. I do not say we should build the houses and rent them to the soldiers. They will build the houses for themselves, to suit themselves where they want them and when they want them.

Our returned men have instructed me to demand:

First, that the sum of \$6,000 shall be set aside for the purpose of providing a house for each soldier and merchant seaman returned from this war who desires one.

Second, that they shall receive hospital treatment and medical care for life, with permission to choose their own doctors and hospitals. This would prevent their being used as human guinea-pigs, as were so many of the old soldiers in the last war.

Third, security—and that is what they are demanding for their old age. They have saved our country and saved us from destruction; why should they not have all the rewards they desire, when we can so well afford to give them to them? It would take from no one to give these boys \$6,000. They are demanding security in their old age.

I have been instructed to demand, in their names, that in addition the sum of \$10,000 be placed in trust in the Bank of Canada for themselves, their wives and their children. If the trustees are satisfied that the investment is sound, this money can be used to establish them in a good business of their own.

Another demand is that all the widows of all the returned men and merchant seamen continue to receive identically the same pensions as did their husbands who died.

I well remember listening over the radio when those dictators met on the Atlantic and said that they were pre-

pared to give us poor slaves the four freedoms. I remember sitting with a companion in a hog pen, my companion being a sow who was about to increase the hog population of the country. I said to the poor old sow: "I have been far more generous to you than these dictators are to us poor slaves, because I have given you more than four freedoms. Why, I have already given you free hospitalisation and maternity care. Then, you have freedom of speech, for you can grunt all you like and I care not. You have freedom from fear, for so long as you obey the rules and regulations your dictator lays down I shall never beat you. You have freedom of religion, because I don't care if you worship the old turkey gobbler roosting on the hen house. You have freedom from want, because your self-feeder is in front of you, and in it you will find everything you desire. You will find luscious alfalfa in the pasture, and you may help yourself to it. I have given you a fifth freedom—yes, I have given you freedom from toil, because I do not make you work, as we poor slaves are forced to work."

For toil is work men do because this government compels us to do it or to go without. That is toil, and work is something men do because nature compels them to do it. So it is clear that I have also given my sow freedom from work, because I do the work for her. I clean out the barn—or the members of my family do it—and grow the feed for her, grind it and feed it to her. She also has freedom of leisure. But there was one freedom I dare not give my cattle, my hogs, or my sheep, one which was purposely left out of the Atlantic charter, and that is the freedom of choice. That freedom of choice, sir, is the freedom for which the people of Canada are now crying, and which they shall get.

TACTICS

(Continued from page 2)

But it should no longer be necessary to broadcast minute instructions concerning tactics, even for campaigns not based upon a familiar model. The great issues consciously in the minds of most members of the community suggest their own tactics. The battle is 'joined': either the individual lies down at the given signal, accepting defeat without opposing to it any force at all, physical or moral, or he 'does something about it.' We are nearer by many stages than we were even three months ago to the point where our special assistance is in guiding the hand of the resister into intelligent and effective resistance and away from useless if not disastrous reaction. Reaction is a phenomenon of physics; resistance is a moral quality. Even officialdom is now less assured in face of public objection. Its very insolence is a sign that a pathological state is developing at its heart. The enemy is sick. Thus we begin to hear of citizens who manage to 'get away' with what belongs to them! The increment of association is something usually connected with a time element: a pound weight applied to the rope every half hour for twenty hours has a different result from a weight of forty pounds applied at once. If we have heard it once during the past week we have heard it twenty times that Inland Revenue officials specially dislike letters which concern them (in an official capacity) being addressed to Members of Parliament. As the bureaucracy grows, there are more and more targets for the suffering public. In a single locality during the past fortnight we have heard of the apparently spontaneous institution (with the guidance of infuriated schoolmasters of the better sort—and there is, in all ranks of society a better sort) of Parents' Councils

designed to adjust the perspective of the dupes of P.E.P. etc., etc. They may not all know whom they are after; but they sound as if they were eager to learn! Even Labour Members of Parliament are not all rogues, and, indeed, it is probable that the newer they are to the shock of Parliament the less roguish. Certainly they can be informed. But (to come back to tactics) they are probably more open to receive information concerning matters upon which they have shown some perplexity than upon matters outside their ken.

— T. J.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	(reprinting)

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
Why You Are Short of Coal by Aims of Industry.....	6d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.