

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 21.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 27, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

Congressman Emmanuel (God with us) Celler, of N'Yark, in common with Mr. Emanuel (God with us) Shinwell, temporarily of Whitehall, has some similarity to a fractured steam-pipe—much noise and blow, but poor delivery. Both of them dislike the English (our local Divine Manifestation calls them Tories, but he means the English) and both emit unpleasant noises at intervals to intimate their intention of putting the English where they belong, which is where the great mass of the Russians have been put by similar Divine Manifestations. The Big Idea is drawing to its supreme consummation; and we may with advantage recall the warning of Pope Benedict XV on July 25, 1920, regarding "The advent of a Universal Republic, which is longed for by all the worst elements of disorder, and confidently expected by them."

If the issues were not so momentous, it would be grimly funny to observe how each Socialist State, as the beauties of its regime percolate to the shrinking non-Socialist world, is violently repudiated by our Bloomsbury Pinks (where they are not drawing fat Ministerial salaries) as not being Socialism but Fascism. "Nazism," never, if possible, referred to by its proper title of National Socialism, has almost annexed from the Italian Guild Socialists the copyright of that colourless word; but it is increasingly applied to the Cartel-Bureaucratic-Banking Autocracy which masquerades as a "British Labour" Government.

Perhaps the most pathetic aspect of this hatred of theory put into practice is the repudiation of the Communist by the contemporary Socialist—in particular, the common type of Socialist who "thinks" in mass conceptions, such as "the Workers", "the people", "democracy", and other collectivism. Since these are abstractions which can be given almost any concrete meaning desired, his personal conception is unlikely to correspond with any embodiment of them held by the "practical" politician, who, without exception, is primarily concerned with obtaining, keeping and increasing power. Bearing in mind that genuine English Socialism has been dead for a century, and that the Socialist Prophet is Karl Marx (Mordecai) who wrote the Communist Manifesto, it is difficult not to sympathise with such men as the late Karl Kautsky, as gentle a pirate as ever slit a throat, in his endeavours to show that Russia is not a Socialist State, and that Communism is just a Fifth Column to paralyse the intended victims of Russian World Conquest. According to Mr. Sidney Hook, who writes an able introduction to Kautsky's *Social Democracy versus Communism*, Harold J. Laski in England and Max Lerner in the U.S. are representatives of this type. "The simple formula of their mode of

thinking is that Russian practices and policies are almost always historically and morally justified, while the Communist Party line in their own [*sic*] countries is almost always wrong. . . . They therewith reveal that they have not the courage of their confusions" [*op. cit.*].

Kautsky's book, however, is valuable not so much for its apologia of Socialism in theory as for its clear perception of Socialism (under the name of Communism) in practice.

Nothing could be more true than his italicised passage on p.101: "The fundamental aim of the Communists of every country is not the destruction of capitalism but the destruction of democracy and of the political and economic organisations of the workers." Full of cliches, yes. But its drift is unmistakably honest.

Without Comment. Mr. Justice Lazure, in sentencing the Jew "Fred Rose" (Rosen), the Labour-Progressive (Communist) M.P. for Montreal-Cartier, to six years' imprisonment for conspiracy said, "You were born a foreigner, brought here, I am told, poor and miserable . . . Not only have the conditions prevailing in this country made you happy, free and prosperous, but citizens of this city have elected you to a position of honour . . . a member of our Parliament. Instead of showing a deep gratitude to this country, you were willing to sacrifice its interest and safety. . . . Even if you were sincere, which I doubt, this . . . cannot be tolerated."

"Sam Carr" another Jew, national organiser of the Labour-Progressive Party, is mentioned in the fourth and final Report of the Royal Commission on Espionage with the observation "It would not be difficult to conclude that Carr was sent to this country in 1924 as a professional Soviet agent, and has acted as such continuously."

## Parliamentary Reform

This letter was sent to, and published by, the *Dumdee Courier & Advertiser* on July 17, with the exception of the portion in square brackets, which was deleted:—

Sir,

The letter of Mr. J. E. Geddes published under this title in your issue of July 11th, brings into prominence an issue which will have to be faced if the people of these islands are to survive as an independent nation, and its solution is antecedent to Scottish Nationalist effectiveness. Neither is it solved by the substitution of a so-called Conservative Government, although with certain safeguards, that might be a means to an end. At the moment, the Opposition, of all shades of opinion, is conspicuously lacking in effective criticism of *policy*, either through genuine lack of under-

standing or by reason of surrender to arguments less creditable.

The root of the matter is belief in a false (ballot-box) democracy, which in fact is merely a mechanism by means of which the resources of the country, both material and human, are placed at the disposal of a small group of cosmopolitan intriguers who have no interest at heart beyond the furtherance of their own world-wide plans. Any observation of Parliamentary proceedings at the present time must demonstrate the truth of this statement.

The essence of a genuine democracy is personal responsibility, not collective irresponsibility, and not majority ownership. A little reflection ought to convince anyone that a state of affairs in which the whole basis of an individual's life-long training and activity is at the mercy of an anonymous, irresponsible, ballot preceded by propaganda on the mass scale made possible by broadcasting [by such organisations as the Army Bureau of Current affairs, now transformed into a "peace time" body financed from America, and superimposed on a necessarily misinstructed electorate] is certain to lead to irretrievable disaster unless vigorous action is taken to replace it by something less amenable to capture by enemy interests.

I am, etc.,

C. H. DOUGLAS.

Fearnan, July 14.

### Our Money

In the marshalling of the fifteen to sixteen hundred quotations of which this book\* is composed the author's ingenuity has been concerned to provide facility of access to information on many subjects and from varied sources. Each paragraph is a quotation from one of three or four hundred writers, the highroad through this maze being indicated in the chapter headings—War, Work, International Banks, Party Politics, are some of these. Bye-roads are signposted by cross references among the same material—in a *list of series*, such as Bureaucracy, Monopoly, Education: in *answers to questions* (Have Minorities any Rights? What's wrong with a World Bank?): by *definitions*: and by *indices* of Persons and of Points of Interest.

There are lapses; e.g., in treating of Freedom, its only adequate definition is not quoted: the list of Authorities omits Nesta Webster, and that of Subjects freemasonry. Shaw's damnation of socialism and Keynes's of monopoly are so far at variance with their respective activities as, unless perhaps for confrontation, to be of doubtful use. Such details have their importance; but as a reference book the usefulness of "Our Money" is unquestionable. We wish it success, and a wide distribution.

### Spain

The Spanish Government "does not look upon itself as set and rigid, but is open, evolutionary and perfectible, and aspires to a greater perfection in its institutions, jurisdiction and representative system, in its own interest and not as a result of pressure from abroad."—Reply to the United Nations Security Council.

\*Our Money, by "Peta," 6/-. The Burleigh Press, Lewin's Meads, Bristol.

### Bread Rationing

A well attended meeting of the British Housewives' League was held on Wednesday afternoon, July 17, in the Bromley Church Institute. A very cordial welcome was extended to new members, quite a number having come from the Chislehurst and Bromley Common area. The address was given by the Chairman, Mrs. B. M. Palmer.

Every new member was provided with a copy of the policy, and asked to read it carefully. The Chairman said it could not have escaped their notice that the present conditions were steadily worsening. During the last few weeks there had been a cut in milk, a cut in soap (did members realise that soap was still being exported?)—railway fares had gone up by 16 *per cent.*, the London Passenger Transport Board had increased their fares, the price of coal was rising, and also the price of gas. The American Loan was likely to prove disastrous to the prosperity of the Empire, and last, but not least, there was the threat of bread rationing. There was no *world* food shortage. The present crisis was the result of criminal mismanagement and deliberate restrictions, which have been long in operation, and of which the present government is taking the greatest advantage. Had they noticed that the bread coupons were ready in their ration books, and that the loaf had been by some "fortunate" chance reduced to 14 ozs.?

One bright spot was the revolt of the Master Bakers, who were undeterred at present by threats of seven years' penal servitude and fines of thousands of pounds. They would remember that more than a million pounds had been paid out last year in Western Australia to compensate farmers for not growing wheat, but it was not generally realised that acreage restrictions were still in force in Canada. The Western provinces, more especially Alberta, were insisting on the sowing of another five million acres, in addition to the 23½ million already planned, in spite of threats from the government that if they did, no more than fourteen bushels an acre would be allowed to enter the markets. They might well ask why such things should be; the short answer was that those who controlled prices were not working in harmony with God's plenty.

It gave them all the greatest pleasure that Mrs. Lovelock's petition had been presented at the Bar of the House of Commons. Whether granted or not, a tremendous amount of excellent work had been done, and they would not cease from fight until not only bread coupons, but the whole rationing system was behind us. But this was not the work of a few weeks. They must prepare for a steady fight. Just as the driver of a great locomotive is careful not to waste the power under his control, so they must see that their physical energies and emotions were not dissipated in useless effort. They were conducting a great experiment in Bromley; they were trying to conduct an association in a new way. Instead of having an office and a staff of typists the members themselves were taking their share of the administration and helping to spread the real facts concerning the situation. There was now available the excellent first number of the *Newsletter*, edited by Miss Dorothy Crisp; and in a week or so they would have their own *Voice* for distribution. But they must see to it that all this expenditure of energy brought them a profit on their outlay, or it would be wasted.

It would be interesting to know why the Opposition had not delayed their prayer for the annulment of the bread

rationing Order by a week or a fortnight. Even so short a delay might have meant much. Mr. Macmillan had expressed his desire to help the League in every way possible, and had forwarded their list of questions to the Ministry of Food. These questions were still awaiting a satisfactory answer. The most important of these referred to the extent to which food supplies for Great Britain depended on decisions of the Combined Food Board; and in view of the oath taken by Ministers on appointment, by what authority supplies of food for this country have been handed over to the control of a body not responsible to the Crown. It was understood that Sir Waldron Smithers had interested himself in this question, and would try to get it on to the Order Paper. [Applause]. Members would be informed of the outcome.

The meeting ended with informal discussion, and tea. The next reunion is fixed for September 4, at the same time and place.

### The Policy:

The following in 'display' type, is the policy of the British Housewives' League (Bromley Group), under whose auspices the meeting was held:—

- (1) To provide British housewives with an effective voice in all matters affecting their welfare.
- (2) Our primary object is an ample distribution of wholesome, unadulterated, natural foods, good and sufficient clothes, and adequate housing.

The League shall, in all respects, while the need lasts, give priority to those interests of its supporters, and others, which concern the securing of a just and sufficient distribution of those material necessities which are as much the basis of the Spiritual as of the physical life; wholesome, unadulterated natural foods, good and sufficient clothing, and housing which accords with English moral and social standards.

- (3) Extra-national control, coupons and continued rationing are a threat to our future.

The League shall set itself against the false, totalitarian notion that the satisfaction and freedom of the individual can be increased by the extension of extra-national control, rationing coupons and other devices of centralised autocratic governmental power; these things which the war was fought to dislodge and overcome, are an affront to the highest sentiments of the British people, and a threat to their future.

- (4) Authoritarian control is antagonistic to the deepest religious sentiments of our countrymen.

The above purposes of the League are rooted in the belief:

(a) That the deepest religious sentiment of our countrymen, whatever their professions, is favourable to the free expansion of human personality, and is antagonised and thwarted by the authoritarian control and restrictions; and

(b) That such restriction as oppresses the people, now that the diversion of national energy to war purposes is at an end, is political, not physical, and constitutes a mischievous interference with the recovery of our great and victorious country from the ordeal it has survived.

- (5) The league shall be non-party and non-sectarian.

No member shall attempt to use the League for the purpose of forwarding the interests of any party or creed.

## PARLIAMENT

House of Lords, July 4, 1946.

### Evictions from Battle Training Areas.

The Earl of Cranbrook had given Notice that he would ask His Majesty's Government when those evicted from the battle training areas in Norfolk and Suffolk will be allowed to return to their homes; and move for Papers. The noble Earl said: My Lords, the Motion which I have put down on the Paper refers to certain areas in Norfolk and Suffolk, but they are only typical of a great many similar areas throughout the country, and with your Lordships' permission I would like to give you some short explanation of the present position. Early in the recent war, the military authorities decided that they would have to start a new form of training, and that the troops would have to be trained in areas where live ammunition of every sort could be used in conditions approximating as closely as possible to war conditions. It was accordingly necessary to find, or to create, large uninhabited tracts of country where these exercises could take place with safety to the civilian population. I believe that in the mountainous districts of the north and west it was found relatively easy to discover such areas, but in East Anglia it was necessary to turn out of their homes very considerable numbers of people over quite a considerable area.

In the battle training areas of Norfolk and Suffolk some four or five villages were completely evacuated, and about 1,600 people were evicted from their homes. . . .

Incidentally, I should like to pay a tribute to the way in which the military authorities, in my part of the world at any rate, carried out their obligations. During the time I had the opportunity of seeing them—and that was up to the end of the war—there is no doubt that these obligations were carried out in the letter and in the spirit, and when the war ended the population could have returned to their homes after very small repairs and renovations. That was the position. The population were turned out on the very distinct understanding that they would return when the war was over, and the war has now been over for some little time. But the military authorities are still in occupation, and nobody has yet been able to extract from the Government a statement as to when these people are to be allowed to return. . . .

At this moment the country is faced with a shortage of houses and a shortage of foodstuffs. In the three battle training areas in Norfolk and Suffolk there are 14,000 acres of agricultural land, and over 400 houses waiting to be used. It seems wrong—I had thought of using a stronger word but I do not wish to say anything particularly rude—that these available national assets should be wasted for a moment longer than is absolutely necessary. I combine my question with a Motion for Papers because I have a strong suspicion that I am going to receive the same sympathetic and procrastinating answer that many people have received before. I feel that I have a personal responsibility so far as these areas in East Anglia are concerned, because I was one of the people who gave the most definite promises that the people should have their land and houses returned after the war. . . .

. . . The local authorities responsible for those areas are getting suspicious, and I must confess that I myself am getting suspicious that the Government intend not only breaking the promises which they induced me to give these people, but

(continued on page 6)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*  
*One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.*

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

Vol. 16. No. 21.

Saturday, July 27, 1946.

### Soviet "Democracy" in Alberta

Criticism has justly been levelled against the Alberta Government for permitting the passage of the "Act to Provide Health Services for the People of Alberta" which received the Royal Assent on March 27, 1946. The new Act is more than 'socialistic', a term unfortunately understood to stand for a sympathy with the underprivileged both intelligible and appropriate in its proper place; and doubtless this cloak was the only garment of respectability it wore during its passage through the Legislature. But we are not concerned with its disguises. What the Act is is an essential part of the totalitarian world plot bearing exactly the same relationship to the Marsh Report as our own Health Service Bill bears to the Beveridge Report. There is only one world plan. The people of all countries which have experienced even such instalments as have matured are heartily sick of it, but cannot, for the moment, get rid of it, and every day which passes binds them more securely and makes escape more difficult.

We have expressed the opinion, and experience suggests not the slightest necessity for modification of it, that the Act of Parliament passed by Mr. Churchill's Government in this country for the control of credentials, falsely called an Education Act, and the Bill to control certificates of fitness to work, miscalled a Health Service Bill, left over to be passed by the inheritors of Mr. Churchill's socialist policy, were, each independently of the other, sufficient, given time and freedom from interference, to shackle the country with a complete, comprehensive and inescapable totalitarian rule. To recognise the force of the evidence in favour of this opinion, it is only necessary to recognise that neither physical nor mental health is something with a constant formula capable of being ladled out to 'the public' with a spoon. The essence of planning is either honest confusion on this point (which stamps the confused person as an incompetent and unsuitable for any office in which his defects can involve other people) or villainous resolve to exploit the confusion of electorates for subversive purposes. The measures referred to are key measures draining initiative from all individuals subject to them.

Under which category Dr. Cross the Albertan Minister of Health should be catalogued is a matter for later—but not much later—assessment. What he has done, and what he has assisted the Albertan Government to do, is to sell an experiment in public administration, which has had many exceptional features to recommend it to the attention of the whole world, to the Planners in Ottawa (who are, of course,

merely a local branch of World Planning.) They and their internationalist masters will be overjoyed at a signal success. They have taken a key position, and their choice of it for attack is merely an indication that Canada is the focus.

The challenge should not be neglected. The Legislative assembly of Alberta can still boast several members who at least had the insight to oppose the measure presented by the Government, and this they did strenuously. They have been let down, and we should be disappointed if, when they recover from their surprise, they cannot devise means for reversing the position.

Unlike the voluminous White Paper which preceded the presentation to the Imperial Parliament of the National Health Service Bill, and the Bill itself, the Albertan Act is contained in a document of only eleven pages, the meaning of which anyone can master in a few minutes. In brief, it provides for the further taxation of the people of Alberta to fit them for full employment, and confers on "the Minister" authority to "enter into agreements with physicians, surgeons, dentists, hospitals, and other persons or corporations for the provision of services"; to "prescribe the records which shall be kept"; and to provide for "the inspection of the services to be rendered," for this purpose. The administration is to be by a "Director" who with "such other officers and clerks as may be required" is to be appointed by and hold office during the pleasure of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. "The Minister" is to have general power to make Regulations and to do "such other things as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of" the Act.

This is the now familiar form of Government by bureaucratic decree. Concerning the objections to it, as applied to medical questions, the considerable literature published by the Medical Policy Association in England is available for study by publicists and others in Alberta, and it had better be studied unless Albertans desire to exchange their reiterated hope of a just social order for the illusory benefits of being dragooned into fitness for ever fuller employment.

Sections 8 and 9 of the Act are worthy of the close study of students of the art of constituting majorities. They provide for a referendum to be held in each district in which it is proposed to bring the provisions of the Act into operation. If sixty *per cent.* of the persons voting favour the addition of an area to a "health insurance district" the Director "may" add it. On the other hand he "may" also, after three months from their rejecting the scheme, "by order detach any area from or add any area to the district as established," and "direct a second vote to be taken," and so on! This has been correctly described as the introduction of Soviet "democracy" to cover the theft of economic democracy. This in Alberta?

T. J.

### Non-delivery of "The Social Crediter"

The Publishers desire to remind readers that action to reduce the relatively small number of cases of non-delivery of *The Social Crediter* to subscribers cannot be taken effectively unless data are available. The Publishers are reasonably satisfied that the cause of non-delivery does not occur at the distributing end.

## Transition to Totalitarianism

Except partially in the economic sphere, we have never had a system which could properly be called democracy. Democracy literally means government by the people; but the people is a collectivity, and there is no real sense in which a collectivity can exercise self-determination as can the individual. The actions of the whole of society may be determined on behalf of society by individuals specially authorised, in matters affecting society as a whole; thus a universal decision to go to war as a special case, or a universal agreement against murder as a general case, represent collective actions for which individual exponents are required. But the matters about which all individuals are agreed are extremely few; collective action is practically never the outcome of universal self-determination, and when it is not, individuals must clearly be determined against their will.

Any permanent or semi-permanent government therefore involves the determination of the many by the few and what we incorrectly call democracy actually consists of some mechanism by which the many can limit the determination exercised by the few. The British parliamentary and judicial systems at their best probably represented the greatest development of this power of limitation. The whole idea was to limit the power of the Executive. It was not government by the people; it was restraint of government. The idea that Parliament itself is a governing institution is a corruption of the real idea, and has led to the corruption of Parliament. And the idea of "government by the people" is leading to the destruction of liberty, through the elevation of the idea of government, at the expense of the idea of restraint.

In 1929 Lord Hewart drew public attention to the fact that a self-conscious group was working to remove the restraint of Parliament on the Executive. Its great method was to induce Parliament to pass Acts which empowered "the Minister" to make Regulations having the force of the Act itself—"as if enacted in this Act" is a form of words in use—and, further, to place decisions made by "the Minister" beyond the jurisdiction of the Courts.

Lord Hewart's book (*The New Despotism*) succeeded in bringing this process under scrutiny. There ensued a period of crisis for the sponsors. But they successfully argued that under modern complex conditions, this delegated legislation was absolutely vital, and they got away with nothing worse than the creation of a Select Committee of the House of Commons whose duty it is to examine all Regulations, and call the attention of the House to any which it considers should be further considered; and the House has the power to disallow such Regulations, provided it does so within forty days as a rule.

This compromise seemed to meet the danger; in fact it made it graver. For a process that had been going on quietly and almost in secret, had now received a sort of Parliamentary approval, and consequently a great impetus. And all that was required to defeat the safeguard was such a volume of Regulations which rapidly ensued, as would make any task of proper examination impossibly onerous. Dr. C. K. Allen, in an article in *The Sunday Times* of June 2, 1946, relates that "Not long ago the Committee confessed that it

was utterly overwhelmed by its task. One Member complained that the agenda for a single meeting weighed 1 lb. 7 ozs. At another session sixty-seven Orders, many of them technical and complicated, had to be swallowed at a draught. It is not humanly possible for the Legislature, which is supposed to be responsible to the electorate for this kind of government, to keep abreast of what is being done in its name. Every new Act places a bewildering medley of powers in the hands of Ministers."

But the powers are really placed in the hands of bureaucrats. The bureaucracy itself forms a highly, and increasingly, centralised government, concealed behind the increasingly empty parliamentary forms. Some time ago we must have reached the point where the bureaucracy could completely dispense with Parliament—as, no doubt, it soon would, if a further attempt were made by the green-grocer and engine-driver M.P.s to interfere with the plans of the "experts"—the bureaucrats trained at Sir Ernest Cassel's expense "to run the future Socialist State."

Thus at the present time we are governed on totalitarian lines by a bureaucratic dictatorship. The sole advantage we have over frankly totalitarian countries is in the possession of an instrument—Parliament—which *could* be used to assert the sovereignty of the people over the Executive. That is the issue, for nothing else is possible until it is done. We shall certainly go in one of two directions: either the bureaucracy will abolish the potential threat of Parliament, replacing it with something like the Soviet "Parliament"; or public opinion will force the dictatorship to disgorge the powers it has arrogated, which is an essential preliminary to any sort of reconstruction.

Any new Government—whether Liberal, or Country Party or Social Credit—which imagines it is going to "do better" than the present party in power is likely to be a menace; for it would have the same false impression of its function, as well as the inexperience which would make it the more malleable in the hands of the experienced bureaucracy.

The position has deteriorated much further in Great Britain than in Australia. As Dr. Allen observes, "the war has virtually killed the immemorial doctrine of *ultra vires* and the peace merely embalms the corpse." But here the doctrine of *ultra vires* is bound up with the integrity of our written Constitution. It is the great barrier to what Emeritus Professor Roscoe Pound calls "administrative absolutism." Dr. Allen refers to Professor Pound as the foremost jurist of America, a "lifelong exponent of sociological jurisprudence and of 'social control' through 'social engineering'", who yet now utters the most solemn warning against the havoc which is being wrought in American law and life by just this process.

There is a world front of totalitarianism; in the Australian sector lies as a major objective the Constitution. The coming Referendum presents an opportunity to bring its importance to public recognition, and expose the forces working for its overthrow.

—From *The Australian Social Crediter*.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3)

that they are unwilling to face up to the fact that they have to break those promises and are stalling off the evil day.

*Viscount Long* . . . In my part of the country we have come to the conclusion, as has the noble Earl who has just sat down, that the policy of His Majesty's Government, through their various Departments, is "What we have, we hold, and the rest of you can go to the devil." That is the view to which we have come in Wiltshire. We believe you have no other policy. We believe you have not got anybody there doing anything. I say what I have said with the full knowledge that I have the backing of every single agriculturist in that part of my county, and not only their backing but that even of men serving in the War Department who see the way things are going.

*Lord Walsingham*: My Lords, this is the first occasion on which I have ever sat or spoken in your Lordships' House. . . . I would like to support with all the force I can everything that has been said in favour of the handing back of these battle training areas, and I appeal to your Lordships to support with all your might those of us who are trying to get them back. I only know one of them intimately, and I confess a great part of it is my property. I know one of the others by old association, but I have not visited it for years and I do not know much about the circumstances there.

I would like to tell your Lordships a little about the one known as the Stanford battle training area. When it was taken over in 1942, a very definite promise was made to us that on the conclusion of the war it would be returned and that the people would have their homes back. That promise was made on two occasions in my own presence and like the noble Lord, Lord Cranworth, I did my best to get that promise across to the people. I did my best to persuade the people (who I like to regard as my people, because they have been there for so long with my family) that they must consent to go without making a fuss, and I used as my argument two things: first of all the promise that it would be for as short a period as possible, and secondly, that it would save a great many casualties among their relations and friends; and indeed the training that was carried out there did save a great many casualties and was of very great value.

Now all those thousands of people who were turned out are clamouring to get back. They belong there; we can trace some of the families back to Saxon times. They have simply hated to be uprooted. It is true that most of them have been found accommodation of a sort in their own county, but it is not in every case satisfactory accommodation. The great thing is that they are not in their own homes. Then the retention of this area is gravely prejudicial to the local housing situation. There are in it, I believe I am right in saying, 200 houses, and if we could get those 200 houses back into occupation, the housing difficulties in two rural districts would be practically solved. I know that is so, because I sit on the Council of both those districts. Those houses, in spite of the shaking up they have had over all these years (and it has been pretty severe) are not bad structurally. A good many ceilings will have to be replaced, nearly all the windows will have to be replaced, and the gardens have gone to jungle, but otherwise the houses are sound. If we could but have them back it would be an enormous relief to our housing problem.

The farms could very soon be producing food again. The area is about half heath, timber and woods, and half farmland. Those heaths could be planted up, and indeed a great many of mine would have been planted up by now if we could have had that area back. In 1942, when the area was taken over, using unskilled labour and harvesting the crops much too early, the war agricultural executive committee salvaged and sold £40,000 worth of grain and seed. Hundreds of acres of sugar beet were lost, and of course all the other crops. Three of those farms were producing literally hundreds of thousands of ducks every year—I am not exaggerating. They weighed about 4 lb. each and provided a very great deal of food. In addition to that, we are missing the other things that would be produced there—hay, milk, meat, and great numbers of turkeys and other poultry.

We are suffering from two plagues, one of which the noble Lord, Lord Cranworth, has mentioned, namely rabbits. Those things are swarming all over the district and doing an incalculable amount of harm. The war agricultural executive committee have but very seldom been able to make attempts to exterminate them. They had about a month at it last Christmas, but now you cannot see where they have been; the rabbits are worse than ever. The other thing is a weed called ragwort, or canker weed as we call it locally. It has seeds like thistle-down and spreads all over the district. The only thing with which I can compare it is prickly pear, and many of your Lordships have seen what they can do in South Africa. It poisons the pastures, and I speak with some feeling about the poisoning of pastures, because I have already lost three horses from ragwort poisoning since this area was taken over. From those three points of view, the deep desire of those thousands of people to get home again as they were promised, the local advantage to the housing situation, and the national advantage to the production of food and timber that is possible in that area, I think that the return of the area to its former occupants is really urgently called for. I beg your Lordships to do everything you can to help us get it back.

*Viscount Cranborne* . . . The Germans have been defeated but these people still remain in exile, not because of the Germans but because the Government Departments, in whose word they trusted, still delay in giving up their land. Now a dark suspicion is growing in all these countrysides that they will have to stay in their lodgings permanently. . . .

I feel a little shy about repeating what is the same story, in effect, as has been told by other noble Lords, but I would like to get the fact across to the Government that it is not just one or two individual cases which are being raised but is a thing which is happening in all parts of the country. When the people of the island left in 1942, they received absolute assurances that they would be allowed to return when the emergency was over. They were told by the War Office land agent that their tenancies would be maintained, and notices were served upon them containing these words which I think are very significant:

"This means that when the War Department has no further use for the property and it is handed back, you have every right to return to the property. It should not be assumed by you that because the War Department has turned you out you lose your right of occupying the premises again."

That was the assurance, or one of the assurances, which was given them. But since then their hope of getting back is rapidly turning to despair. . . .

*The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for War (Lord Nathan):* My Lords, let me say at once that I have listened with the fullest regard to everything which has been said by noble Lords this afternoon, and I have found it a sobering experience. . . .

. . . Making certain assumptions, we have formed conclusions as to what are the minimum requirements of the Army in the post-war world. I think it will interest your Lordships to know that in round figures the "peak" holding of land in this country during the war was about 11,500,000 acres, a very large area relatively to the all too small area of these islands in which so much had to be done. At the latest date for which I have figures available, March 31, upwards of 9,000,000 acres, or over 80 per cent. of that land, had been returned to its owners.

*Viscount Cranborne:* Am I to understand that the whole of the area to which we have been referring is only 400,000 acres? Because it seems to me a remarkably small acreage.

*Lord Nathan:* I should not like the noble Viscount to be misled. What I said was that at the moment, under Defence Regulation 52, we hold just over 2,000,000 acres; we hold full rights under Defence Regulation 51 over only 426,000 acres. . . .

Since I received a note of his [Lord Mottistone's] questions early this morning the telephones have been busy but I am still not in a position to give what he or I would consider to be a suitable reply. That does not mean that his questions are left in abeyance. It is open to him either to raise the matter in your Lordships' House again or, if he would prefer it, to allow me to write to him with the answers.

*Viscount Long:* Surely there is one question that can be answered on the floor of your Lordships' House. Are the promises to be redeemed or are they not? I should have thought the answer to that question was quite clear, and if it is not answered the people are bound to say, and rightly so, that the Government are not going to keep their promises. I do beg of the noble Lord not to treat this question of promises as lightly as that. . . .

. . . It is useless for the noble Lord to say that no promises could have been made. The promise was made to a mass meeting of the tenants at Imber in 1943 by the G.S.O.I of Southern Command, repeated by him again at Warminster and finally at Devizes by the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Southern Command. The promise was made to the very people interested in that very area.

*Lord Nathan:* I am sure the noble Viscount would not make that statement unless he felt he had good grounds for it, but I am bound to say that until this week no suggestion has, to my knowledge been made about any promise having been given in regard to Imber; and it would indeed, as I have said, be wholly inconsistent with the terms upon which the tenants of Imber hold their property. . . .

*Viscount Cranborne:* I think we want to get this clear. I do not even yet quite understand what the noble Lord means. To me a promise is a promise. If a G.O.C.-in-C. comes down to a district and says, "I give you an undertaking that you shall come back," the fact that it does not conform with Order in Council No. 325, or whatever it may be, does not carry any weight with me at all. The fellow has given a promise, and that is all there is to it. I think the people of the district have a perfect right to assume that he is

speaking as a representative of the authority of the Government and to regard it as a promise on the part of the Government. No Order in Council annuls that promise.

*Lord Nathan:* Far from dissenting from what the noble Viscount has said, that is what I was wishing to say to the noble Lord, Lord Walsingham. The fact that a promise has been made is of course a factor that must be taken into consideration by the Government.

*Viscount Cranborne:* It is not a factor; it is a fact.

*Lord Nathan:* Certainly, it is a fact which must be taken into consideration by the Government, even though the promise was made by a preceding Government. I am not for one moment questioning either the fact that the promise was made or its validity when made.

*Lord Cranworth:* May I ask the noble Lord if that somewhat extraordinary definition of a promise also applies to the Orford battle area?

*Lord Nathan:* It will certainly be to my convenience, and I think greatly to the convenience of your Lordships, if I may be allowed to take these areas separately. I promise the noble Lord that I will fulfil my undertaking to deal with each of the areas separately. . . .

. . . I am not in the least trying to run away from the promise. I am trying (it would appear a little unskillfully) to show that there is a promise which the Government recognise as having been made as a promise. With regard to the Stanford area, I am not in a position at this moment to make a definite statement as to the manner in which or the time when that promise can be implemented. Indeed, in the light of that promise to which reference has been made the Government will be bound necessarily to take into consideration all the circumstances of the time and to have regard to the requirements of the public interest and safety. I am unable to say anything definite to the noble Lord this afternoon on the subject of Stanford, except that of course the representations which he has made and the facts as to undertakings given by the Government to which I have referred, are matters of the first moment to be taken into consideration. I should like to take this opportunity of saying to and of the noble Lord that the War Office has every reason to be grateful to the noble Lord who has exercised his great prestige and authority in the part of Norfolk where he lives in support of a public interest at a time when it was of the utmost importance that that should be done. It is a tribute to the noble Lord that those amongst whom he lives and those who live as his neighbours have followed so patriotically the lead which he gave them. . . .

. . . I think the noble Earl will have to be good enough to let me look into the question. The noble Viscount, the Leader of the Opposition, spoke with great fervour and feeling with regard to Purbeck. I fully understand his feelings. As a stranger not living in that part of the world but having been a visitor both in my private capacity as well as my public capacity, I can well understand the feelings which he has for that most beautiful part of our countryside. . . .

. . . One of the difficulties arises from the fact that there are very large and important installations at Purbeck, the demolition of which and replacement elsewhere, I am advised, would involve the expenditure of some £4,000,000. I agree with what the noble Viscount said in the course of his

observations, to the effect that money ought not to be the deciding factor in a matter of this kind. I merely mention the fact that these very large sums have to be taken into consideration. What is important, as standing in the way of release, is that if we were to find the alternative site— . . .

*Viscount Cranborne*: I am most grateful to the noble Lord for what he has said, but I wish to get the position absolutely clear. Am I now receiving an absolute assurance that Purbeck will be evacuated but that the date is uncertain? Or is the noble Lord saying: "If we can find another site, we may evacuate Purbeck"? . . .

*Lord Nathan*: . . . Whilst I cannot give the noble Viscount a firm assurance of a positive character without referring to my right honourable friend, I can certainly tell him this: that we shall, with affirmative minds, look for an alternative site which would answer our purpose. . . .

*Viscount Samuel*: My Lords, I had not intended to speak in this debate, although I am very greatly interested in this subject. . . .

*Viscount Cranborne*: My Lords, I am not entitled to speak again, but arising from what the noble Viscount has said, I would recall that I gave some advice to the House at the end of my speech. I do not depart from that advice. I said that this was the first time this subject had been raised in a full debate, and I thought it only fair to the Government that they should have a chance of putting the matter right. Without departing from that I must say that I am profoundly discouraged by the answer which we have had, and I should have no hesitation in encouraging the noble Earl to put down another Motion as soon as may be. Next time, perhaps, we shall not be so moderate.

*Lord Nathan*: My Lords, I do not think either that I am entitled to speak a second time but perhaps I might say, following the noble Viscount's remarks, that so far as the allocation of land is concerned it is not being considered purely as a War Office matter. It is being considered under the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, as an inter-Departmental matter, so that a complete statement may be available. . . .

*The Earl of Cranbrook*: My Lords, I must confess that I listened to the reply of the noble Lord, Lord Nathan, with mixed feelings. I am a humane man, and my first feeling was one of sympathy for the noble Lord at having to bat on such a sticky wicket. Naturally I am glad to hear that one of these areas is to be released, but I am exceedingly sorry to hear that he cannot give us such an assurance about them all. And I am more than disturbed that he gave us no really good reason for saying that the other areas could not be returned. To my mind he rather glossed over the fact that some of us gave pledges on behalf of the Government, and that those pledges are not receiving the consideration which they should. Nor do I feel that the noble Lord can claim that his Department have proceeded with the expedition which they should. He told us that the completed plans were sent to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning two months ago. That was nearly a year after the end of the war with Germany. . . .

I hope that the noble Lord, the Under-Secretary of State for War, will impress upon the Ministry of Town and Country Planning that this is not merely a question of the right of access by holiday makers to some beautiful parts of the country. The real point at issue is that the Department is dealing with flesh and blood, with live communities, villages

and hamlets, and with the people in them who are wanting to return to their homes. The matter can not be looked upon with what I may call the cold, artistic, town and country planning outlook. It is the people themselves who are at stake, and I would ask the noble Lord to remember that. . . .

House of Commons, July 8, 1946.

### Food Rationing (Petition)

*Vice-Admiral Taylor*: I beg to present to the House, Mr. Speaker, a humble Petition of inhabitants of the residential borough of Paddington, as follows:

"That in the present state of food rationing they consider that they and their families are under-nourished. Wherefore, your Petitioners pray that there shall be no further cuts in the rations, but rather that the rations should be increased in amount and variety."

The number of signatures to the Petition, Sir, is 10,000.

*Mr. Jenner*: On a point of Order. As a resident in that borough, Mr. Speaker, am I entitled to raise my protest against this Petition being presented?

*Mr. Speaker*: It is an old custom of this House that anybody can present a Petition.

### U.N.R.R.A. (Questions to Ministers)

*Mr. De la Bère* asked the Prime Minister whether in view of the substantial financial contribution this country makes to U.N.R.R.A., he will now name the Minister to whom questions concerning U.N.R.R.A. should be directed, since affairs affecting the administration of U.N.R.R.A. are not matters for the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster; and whether a full statement of the work carried out by U.N.R.R.A. from 1st January to 1st June, 1946, can now be given to this House.

*The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison)*: The Foreign Office is responsible for supervising, and coordinating generally, relations between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and U.N.R.R.A., and questions relating to the general policy of His Majesty's Government towards U.N.R.R.A. should be addressed to my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Questions relating to the procurement of U.N.R.R.A. supplies from the United Kingdom should be addressed to my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade. . . .

*Mr. De la Bère*: Is the Lord President of the Council aware that the people of this country want the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and that they are afraid they cannot get it if various Ministers answer in bits and pieces regarding U.N.R.R.A.? . . .

*Mr. Skeffington-Lodge*: Is my right hon. Friend aware that there are a great many rumours in regard to U.N.R.R.A. supplies, and that many of them are mischievous in character? Will he take steps to let the general public know just what does happen to the supplies which are distributed in Europe through U.N.R.R.A.?

*Mr. Morrison*: When we know particulars of those misapprehensions we shall certainly be glad to give them attention.