

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 24.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 17, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

Re-Creation—The Choice

Some years ago, during the opening years of the Electoral Campaign, Major Douglas stated that if Social Crediters would devote as much time as most people gave to their favourite game, the battle would be won. This advice was not followed by many of those who had asked for it, for reasons which, possibly, they only understand; but Douglas's words, to those who had the privilege of hearing them seem now to recall the very atmosphere of a lost world, a world over-flowing with plenty, leisure and play. True, we none of us had as much of these things as we wished, but how much we had can only be counted by our present losses in a land of artificial scarcity, where the time-lag of insanely efficient control of bed, board, clothes, shelter and travelling has the effect of covering all our activities with glue, each commitment that we make clinging to and misplacing another in a frenzy of frustration, the more wearing because we know how grand a thing life might be, with time for adventure and also for rest; but now, never again, it seems, never in our lifetime, will that comparative leisure return, when all that was needed to set the wheels turning was money in our pockets. The time of the "favourite game" has passed. The last ounce will be demanded of everyone of us, in winning the battle that has developed into the epic of the ages. For we are fighting in the last ditch. We are people of almost no leisure, with greater anxieties than we had ever thought possible, many of us with lowered vitality. But it is inevitable that this should be so. One might almost say, "only in chaos, or under threat of chaos, will the English awake to Social Credit" and it is in such conditions, heavily handicapped as we are, that we ourselves have to take the field. *The time is now.* There is no waiting for another day.

There is a story told of people who lived in a large and luxurious mansion on a lofty mountain, where they played, worked, loved and intrigued to their hearts' content; there was even an unsolved crime; yet everywhere, permeating everything, was a peculiar acrid odour, taking the savour from life. They suddenly knew that the mountain was completely encircled by a forest fire. For a moment panic ensued, until they took the grim determination to get out. The writer believes that we are at the point immediately before the moment. Can we harness the emotion into the invincible resolve?

We have little to lose, but everything to gain, not in a problematical future, but now. If we are honest with ourselves, we know that reaction in the old sense is impossible, and if persisted in can be no more than anodyne; senses must be blunted to the present and blunted yet again or the old pleasures sought in the old way result in unbearable nostalgia; there is the German haircut on the mountains, the propaganda oozing through the spoken and written word, even through

music itself, everywhere the smoke-cloud, darkening the glory of an April day . . . For thousands and thousands who are half-awaken'd life is no more than that. But for us . . . do we not know that whatever is saved from this present civilisation will be saved by ourselves alone? Whatever we have loved and made our own; the thing that we only, under heaven, can re-create and carry forward, or die with it, the treasure that means more than life to each of us—this will be ours again with infinite enrichment when we know beyond all doubting that its safeguarding is entrusted to ourselves alone. Or if to die, then to die; for who would wish to live if the battle be lost?

That some should have been heard to say "No one is indispensable, the Social Credit Movement can get on very well without you or me, or any one of us" seems to me a complete negation of all that Social Credit means, simply another form of the heresy that the group is greater than the individual. Everybody is indispensable in varying degree, since no two of us is exactly alike; and "the effective man is moulded by his pursuits."

The choice of the word "pursuits" is, I think, of outstanding importance. A man is not moulded by his "occupation" or "profession", except insofar as he *pursues* it, and it is the tragedy of the present that for so many the pursuit of most occupations in the real way has become impossible. As a woman I cannot run my house as it should be run, unless I spend the whole of every available moment searching the shops for scarce foods, cleaning or washing articles that should be undertaken by professionals, or mending old clothes. I could pursue this occupation, and should, I suppose, become an "effective" housekeeper in the eyes of Strachey, but I passionately deny that I should become an effective woman. Ten years ago I might have been a home-maker whose hobby was banker-strafting; but to-day I believe that thousands of women like myself are about to realise that if we ourselves do not save our homes, there will soon be no homes to save. We have piled our household gods behind us, and standing in defence of them, the very exigencies of the situation we shall be called upon to deal with will help us to grow into effective women. All of us, men or women, are confronted with a similar choice, for many far more arduous; and yet it may be that most of us are tackling the problem at the wrong end. For it seems to me that the sentence quoted above from "The Brief for the Prosecution" is simply the engineer's way of saying: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." The "effective man" knows that the world is his and everything that's in it. Most of us start off with too much ballast; it is surprising what can go overboard when we realise that our task of re-creation is the only thing which will be required of us in the end. Then God and the Devil assume their rightful places; we may still

have to deal with the Devil in the process of getting a living, but no longer will his service "mould us." At last we are free in the only possible sense today: the sense of strain has gone, and each new step brings added strength. For there is only one career now outside the Party—the career of the Social Crediter.

B. M. PALMER.

Arms in Palestine

The following from the *Vancouver News-Herald* of August 1, is stated to have been broadcast in America. The telegram was omitted from later editions of the *News-Herald* of the same day:—

Tel Aviv, Palestine, Aug. 1.

The attempt of a young English chaplain to insure the safety of this Jewish city's central synagog from depredations during the British army's continuing house-to-house hunt for terrorists resulted in a startling discovery Wednesday. In the basement of the synagog, the most important Hebrew religious institution in Tel Aviv, the chaplain discovered quantities of British uniforms, guns, and explosives, and several false walls which authorities believe may conceal large arms caches.

Meanwhile, throughout the city 20,000 English soldiers and Palestine police were examining every one of the 200,000 inhabitants and every store and dwelling place in the hope of rounding up members of the Stern and Irgun Zvai Leumi terrorist gangs. Some 50,000 Jews and approximately one-third of the city's eight square miles had been screened, with 280 men and eight women suspects removed to detention camps for further investigation.

The Sixth-Sensed

"If the 'Conservative' newspapers nearly fell over backwards, in 1933, trying to prove that Hitler was a peace-loving man, the 'Socialist', 'Liberal' and 'Communist' newspapers in 1943, fell over quite in demonstrating that the Russian dictatorship was democratic; and the 'Independent National' *Times* led the others on both occasions. The voice of the working journalist on all these newspapers, who knew the truth, was not heard.

"How has this come about? We could never trace the trouble to its source, but we saw how it could be remedied. That giant of old, The Editor, has in our times become a vague, featureless person, usually quite unknown to the public, while behind him looms some higher, shapeless Thing from which the unspoken orders and 'directives' come. Sometimes the workaday journalist thinks of it as the proprietor, sometimes as the proprietor's confidential man, sometimes as a board or college of directors. It is always intangible yet powerful, and the unhappy Fleet Street journalist develops a sixth sense, without explicitly being told, for that which had better not be said. . . . A question in which *all* newspapers appear to the journalists to submit to hidden influence is (or was until recently) that of Zionism. . . ."—Douglas Reed in *Tidings*.

Common-sense in Politics

"Common-sense may very well suggest that it is better not to play cards for money with perfect strangers in a railway-carriage: it is unlikely to suggest the best method of winning money from card-sharpers."—W. L. Burn.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons, July 29, 1946.

European Coal Organisation (Privileges and Immunities)

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (1) to how many British subjects, normally resident in the United Kingdom, it is intended to grant privileges and immunities under S.R. & O. 895 of 1946 and by orders made thereunder;

(2) to how many persons, other than British subjects normally resident in the United Kingdom, it is intended to grant privileges and immunities under S.R. & O. 895 of 1946 and by orders made thereunder.

Mr. Noel-Baker: I am informed that the European Coal Organisation intend to ask for privileges and immunities under Statutory Rules and Orders 895 of 1946 to be granted to 17 British subjects normally resident in the United Kingdom and to 20 persons other than British subjects normally resident in the United Kingdom. I will communicate the details of the privileges and immunities which are granted to the hon. Member.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: Is the right hon. Gentleman really satisfied that it is necessary for the efficient working of this organisation that this very substantial number of people should be so privileged?

Mr. Noel-Baker: Yes, Sir, I think it is; 11 of them are representatives of foreign governments, the British—all of them—only receive the minimum immunity from legal suit in respect of their official actions; and I think only two of the officials, both foreigners, receive the wider diplomatic immunity.

Supply: Germany and Austria

Mr. Oliver Lyttelton (Aldershot): . . . The Chancellor of the Exchequer, as long ago as 9th April, used very much the same language as I am now using. He said,

"the British taxpayers cannot, and should not, much longer be expected to go on paying, on this scale, what are, in effect, reparations to Germany."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th April, 1946; Vol. 421, c. 1818.]

A long time has elapsed since 9th April, yet nothing has been said, and as far as I know, nothing has been done to reverse, or to attempt to reverse, this intolerable situation, because that is what it is. I think that the best way to describe the nature of the great paradox is to say that this country is now spending a little under £2 per head of the population per annum on the direct support of the German people who fought against it with such ferocity and such cruelty, and a little over 5s. per head of the population per annum on the support of its Colonial Empire and the Colonial subjects of the Crown, who fought for us during the war. . . .

The dense industrial population of the Rhineland and the Ruhr were fed in peace-time by the agricultural surpluses of those countries which are now in Russian occupation. I was very glad to see that the Select Committee, I think for the first time, have given authoritative although admittedly not complete figures on this subject. They are given on page 12 of the Report and I must quote the words:

"It is known that in 1936 Eastern Germany exported 2,100,000 metric tons of 'bread grains,' and that 1,800,000 metric tons were imported into North-West Germany."

It goes on to give the comparable figures for potatoes and sugar, and it ends with these words:

"Thus Eastern Germany could in normal times have supplied the import requirements of these foodstuffs for North-West Germany. Today the food movement from East to West is virtually non-existent."

In the words of my right hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition, "We have the mouths, and the Russians have the food." Having touched upon the difficulties of the subject—I think they do not require over-emphasis—and having said that the burden on the British taxpayer is intolerable, I feel the argument would be futile, unless I make some attempt to suggest how the situation could be remedied. I would like to carry the House with me in stating some conclusions to which our reason appears to direct us. First, I do not believe that we have the correct concept of how Germany should be administered, and I think this is partly due to hesitancy and muddle or faulty organisation at the top. This is brought out very clearly in the Report itself. Reading between the lines, I think we are trying to do too much with too many people in Germany.

I will make a comparison between our present concept of the administration of Germany and our one-time concept of the administration of India. I think it will illustrate what I mean. When we really governed India, the British element in the Indian Civil Service amounted to about 1,500. There were, in addition, a few police officers and personnel in the Forestry Department, and so forth. At the time of which I am speaking, India had a population of about 300 million, speaking over 300 different languages, and spread over a vast area; whereas the area which we are now attempting to administer in Germany is only a little bigger than Great Britain and the population we have to deal with is about 22 million. We have 26,000 administrators doing this job. . . .

There are 5,000 or more officers in the trade and industry division. Again, it is surely quite unnecessary to teach the Germans how to run factories. I have sometimes thought they run them rather too well. That is an unnecessarily large number of officers to deal with that subject. I think our attitude upon certain cultural matters verges on the hubristic. It is hardly necessary to teach the Germans how to love Beethoven, but we have that kind of thing going on as well. . . .

. . . At present, the effect of our over-administration is to delay the formation of responsible public opinion in Germany. . . .

I would like to say something about the cognate problem of what we are pleased to call the de-Nazification of Germany—the purge of Nazi elements. No one, I suppose, will deny that our objective is clear and unexceptionable. It is to build up a democratic Germany with a respect for democratic institutions and the democratic system of Government. In pursuit of this aim, we have, according to the Select Committee, no less than 40,000 persons in concentration camps, none of whom have been subjected to any process of legal trial. . . .

. . . The amount of money which aid to Germany is now estimated to cost is £130 million, out of which £50 million, it is estimated, will be recouped from the proceeds of German

exports. Therefore, if the equation is to balance, or, rather, if the two sides of the account are to balance, we should have the objective of building up German exports to £130 million, which cannot possibly be achieved if the indiscriminate destruction of German industry is taking place.

Mr. Stokes: Why, then, did the right hon. Gentleman back the Morgenthau plan?

Mr. Lyttelton: I never backed the Morgenthau plan; the answer to that question is very simple. There are certain key industries—and I always held this line of thought in the Coalition Government—which should be completely destroyed, . . . there is one industry which brings out the point which I have been making rather sharply, namely, that concerned with the production of oil from coal. It is, broadly, true to say that oil derived from coal will always be more expensive than the natural product. I am quite aware that the plants are now destroyed, and I am now discussing the question whether that is an industry which ought to be allowed to revive in Germany. I say "No," because oil from coal will always be more expensive than the natural product, and, provided that Germany has the means of getting foreign exchange, then the production of oil by one of the two processes will not add to the economic strength of Germany but will detract from it. It seems to me, therefore, that this is one of the industries which we ought to prohibit.

I must devote a few words to Germany's foreign exchange position because that is the root of the whole subject which we are discussing this afternoon. If we destroy her industries and she cannot export, Germany will become our permanent pensioner. . . . I imagine that life in the Western zones of Germany would be tolerable on exports of, say, £200 million. Adjusted to to-day's prices, German exports before the war would amount to £700 million, so that, on examination, if those figures are correct, our anxieties need not be too intense.

Then there is the matter of coal. The production of the Ruhr and the Saar amounted to over 150,000,000 tons a year, and it is not too much to say that this production represented the motive force—the prime mover—of the whole of the industries of Western Europe. If my memory serves me aright, I think that that production had fallen just after the Armistice to a rate equivalent of 6,000,000 tons a year. . . .

The Minister of State (Mr. Philip Noel-Baker): . . . I am not going to deal in detail with the staff which my hon. Friend now controls in Germany—the 26,000 of whom the right hon. Gentleman spoke. I will leave that to the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. . . . I do not suppose that I would find myself in complete accord with the right hon. Gentleman on the whole history of the Weimar Republic. I have never believed that the Weimar Republic was destined to fail before it was born, as some people did.

I have never believed that the members of the Government of the Weimar Republic were all traitors and liars who were saying one thing to us, and doing another thing behind our backs. However, I venture to think that the Weimar Republic and its history have much to teach us. Among other things which it must teach us is this, that we must not repeat the mistakes we made over Germany last time; mistakes of many kinds, of being too harsh in some directions and too lenient in others. . . .

I now wish to deal, at not too great length, with five of
(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. 24.

Saturday, August 17, 1946.

From Week to Week

Solomon Abramovitch Lozovsky, without whom no "B."B.C. petting party was complete some years ago, has been "relieved" of his post of Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs in Moscow, and so far as we are aware this only leaves one Jew, Kaganovitch, Stalin's brother-in-law, in a position to influence Russian policy directly. It is difficult to judge what this means; but it certainly does not look as though New York were gaining ground.

In the immediate-post-1918 Armistice Government of Lloyd George, only one M.P., Colonel Meyler, South African, Member for North Blackpool (Nat. Liberal), attacked the financial system. He lost his seat at the next election, and "committed suicide."

Only two members of the first Labour Cabinet spoke against the return to the Gold Standard. They were Colonel Wedgewood and Mr. John Wheatley. Neither of them was ever given Office again. Mr. Wheatley was by far the most capable Minister in the Government of which he was a member, and his complete disappearance from politics, and early death were not easy to foresee.

In the second Labour Government, only one member of the Cabinet resigned as a protest against the financial policy of the Government. It was Sir Oswald Mosley.

Delegates to the Paris Conference and their hangers-on can obtain luxury meals in any quantity at prices ranging from 2/6 to 6/-.

Few people appear to realise clearly how immoral, in the strict sense of the word, are the various measures which the Socialist Government has passed into "Law."

We are not, at the moment concerned with any specific action, but with the underlying principle which is blatantly evident in the attitude adopted to private property and interests. This exceeds in totalitarianism anything ever conceded to Royalty since the days of King John. A story for which we do not vouch is current that a representative of the British Medical Association approached Mr. Aneurin Bevan with a view to finding out whether any basis of agreement on a Medical Service could be found. The answer he received was that Mr. Bevan was not greatly interested; he had the necessary Parliamentary votes.

The curious point is that no pirate of the Spanish Main was half as predatory as the Socialist Cabinet, nor was able to do himself one tenth so well at the public expense; yet there are millions who cannot see that Captain Kidd possessed all

the essential qualities of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, together with an equally engaging personality.

In considering this situation, it must be remembered that "the Divine Right of Kings" which, with improvements, has been taken over by the Socialists, was strictly derivative and contingent on the agreement of the Church. That this had a real validity is amply proven by the success of European civilisation in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, during which period the balance of spiritual and temporal powers was a living organism.

The modern Socialist totalitarianism has no doctrinal basis to which to appeal, although covertly Judaic, and in the political sense is monotheistic (we do not waste time in discussing the "control" of the electorate). "Absolute power corrupts absolutely." In the event of a triumph of Judaism, we revert to the morals of Babylon; and in the more likely disappearance of any fixed principles, it is a race between social disintegration and the atomic bomb.

Possibly by reason of their contempt for, and disregard of, logic, the English have a genius for making systems which are fundamentally indefensible work quite tolerably, just so long as they are left to their own devices. Monopoly is no more—perhaps less—defensible when it is applied to the labour factor in industry, than to the product, and monopoly is the fundamental idea of Trades Unionism. Ignoring the decisive controlling factors which modified monopoly in the mediaeval trade guilds, the Guild Socialists seized on the superficial likeness of the Trades Union to them, and based their rather infantile constitution-making on organisations fundamentally dissimilar. Alien influence was already working to mould and capture Labour monopoly and it recognised in the National Guilds propaganda exactly what it required (A. R. Orage saw the danger when he dissociated himself from Guild Socialism). The Mond-Turner Conference, the Corporative Fascist State in Italy, and National Socialism in Germany, are all organically related to this strategy. That is history; and like all genuine history, there is a vital lesson to be learnt from it. The Trades Unions have become a public danger, together with the other cartels, and they require drastic modification.

"Britain" is to be kept just breathing, so that "she" can sustain the major shock of the next war. There is nothing mysterious whatever about Mr. Molotov's tactics; his orders are to fish in troubled waters, and keep them troubled.

"The Coercion of Events"

"The first, fatal choice having been made, the consequential plans were based on the existence of the 'Big Three.' Very few people asked themselves the simple, common-sense questions—'What makes them big? . . .' In the case of Britain, . . . To retrace her steps back to the beginning through the multitude of false paths is a moral and intellectual task of supreme difficulty. Even yet the way of doing it is not understood. What is beginning to be understood is the necessity of doing it probably by a short cut. The teacher, here, is not the coercion of argument (we have largely incapacitated ourselves for argument), but the coercion of events."—W. L. Burn in *The Nineteenth Century*.

THE REALITY OF PALESTINE

By A. SHABEN,

(Secretary: The Canadian Arab Friendship League).

If a survey of the present Jewish population of Europe should be made, Jews should be asked individually as to each one's choice of the country he would like to migrate to.

How are these refugees going to exist once they are in Palestine? There isn't enough land for them to settle on. There aren't enough jobs for them to work at. If this is supposed to be a humane act, why on God's earth should these people be sent to Palestine when there is hardly enough room in the country for its present population?

The density of the population is 200 persons per square mile. Palestine cannot take care of its present inhabitants, as shown by her exports and imports; and that is how every nation lives today. These are the figures for 1942: Exports, \$252,000,000; Imports, \$840,000,000. Even the tax-free money sent from Canada and the United States cannot hope to offset this deficit. Since world war one, the population tripled, the national wealth decreased and the national consumption became six times what it was at the end of world war one.

The government in its statistical abstract of 1943 stated that agriculture is still the most important industry in Palestine. It is worthy of notice that the Arabs still own 80 *per cent.* of agricultural industry. Seventy *per cent.* of the requirement of the Jewish settlement is being brought from outside.

Even if the progress of the Zionists in Palestine were real and their economic condition healthy, what benefits would it bring the Arabs? Very few if any Arabs benefit from the health, educational, or other social service activities of the Zionists. All the lands bought by the Jewish fund are lost to the Arabs forever, for according to Article 3 of the Constitution of the Jewish agency, such lands will be held as the inalienable property of the Jewish people. No Arab at any time in the future will be able to re-buy it, at no matter what price. The same inability of the Arabs to benefit from Jewish projects is true of the Jewish industry built in Palestine and public utilities whose stocks are all in the hands of the Zionists and are complete Zionist monopolies.

The support of Jewish immigration on the basis that it brings progress into the country, even though this progress may be real, seems to evade the essential problem involved. If we accept this thesis, namely that the people who have the money and the technique and the industrial ability have the right to colonize undeveloped areas, we are not very far from the policies of the nineteenth century or from the position of Mussolini in Eritrea or from Hitler's policies with regard to the Nordic race of Europe.

The Zionists are trying to impose a new Nationalism on a land which is beginning to rebuild its own Arab Nationalism. The two Nationalisms absolutely conflict and two such opposing Nationalisms cannot be built in the same land. This is the crux of the problem, and no amount of agricultural improvement or of influx of capital or of technique can solve it.

The Jew has no claim to Palestine. The land is not his. He settled there around 1,200 B.C. by conquest, and was driven out about 700 B.C. by another conquest, and has been out ever since. One can truthfully say that one

conquest nullified another. He has no more claim to Palestine than the Arabs have to Spain.

The country is Arab even if it is undeveloped due to centuries of oppression and suppression. Personal property rights should be respected by every one, especially by Canadians. The world has not reached a state of communal ownership whereby one group may be relegated to another area. Here we are told that state rights should be respected. Don't these rights apply to people outside Canada? It seems that it is different when the shoe is on the other foot.

The records show that 140,000 Arabs took part in the North African Campaign, not as Arabs, but as allied soldiers, in fact the North African Goons, the first Allied troops to enter Germany, were Arabs.

So there was a Jewish army of 40,000 strong in the near East to help the Allies. Undoubtedly the Arab proved to be a good fighter and helped win the war. The Arab would have been justified if he did not lift a finger. He did his share in world war one and received broken promises in return. Isn't it enough to be fooled once? Or maybe you never heard of Lawrence and the *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*?

As for the Balfour Declaration and its approval by fifty-two nations, I presume it's the League of Nations which is referred to. I wonder if we are as dumb as they take us to be! Who were the two people who wrote the Peace Treaty of Versailles? Were they the fifty-two nations? How could Balfour offer something in Palestine which was not his to offer and without the knowledge or consent of the people it belongs to? At the writing of the Balfour letter, the Allies were far from winning the war. It promised to establish *in* Palestine (remember the *in*) "a National home for the Jews", whatever that may mean, with a big proviso "That nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities." Yet during the past twenty-five years the Jews have risen from eight to thirty-three *per cent.* of the population.

It is inconceivable the tremendous pressure which is being exerted to get more Jews into Palestine, under the pretence of refugees. Who are these people refugees from? The war has been over for over a year. Why should they seek refuge? The persecution is over. We have made Europe safe for all the people to live in? Why should this false impression be continued? The Jew is just another human being like the rest of the population of Europe. If Europe is not fit for him to live in, it is not fit for the rest of the inhabitants. Why not take them all out of Europe? The Poles have lost their property and their homes, the Greeks, the Yugoslavs, the French, the Czechs, *etc.*, have been persecuted in the same sense as the Jews, being victims of war; and why must all the Jews be settled in tiny Palestine, a country of ten thousand square miles? Half of it is not even fit or could be lived in. Why should all the nations of the world be coerced by this group of people to obtain their wishes? The Arabs were subject to the Turks for four centuries. No one ever said they were persecuted and that Spain should be given them as their National Home. They conquered and ruled Spain for a number of centuries. No one ever said 'the poor downtrodden Arab,' and this applies to a number of races and nations all over the globe, who have been oppressed and persecuted.

Must we always be the servants of finance and be dictated to? If the U.S.A. feels so deeply for these people, why does she not open her arms and doors to them? No one can deny that she is more able to absorb and take in these so called refugees, than tiny Palestine.

Why should pressure and public opinion in this country, as elsewhere in the world, be directed against Great Britain, to compel her by sheer force and the threat of finance to implement the wishes of the Zionist Society?

We are told the Jews are more able to govern than the Arabs. If we are to believe that, the whole of the British Empire might as well throw up their hands and give the reins of government to the Jews, as Palestine is under British mandate today.

Britain today is fighting for her very existence. Even her wartime minister gives her the standing of a junior partner of the United States and propaganda is so directed that, we (yes I can safely say that), the majority of Britishers and British subjects are turning against Britain, against themselves, so subtly the guns of propaganda are being used.

Reflect for yourself: England has been the best friend the Jewish race has had in the last four hundred years, they have given them refuge, hospitality, freedom, and tolerance, and have come to their physical aid in many instances. Yet today, with all the means of propaganda at their disposal, they have turned against Great Britain, in order not only to get Palestine, that's only secondary, but to bring about the fall of the Empire, as it is an obstacle in their plan of world domination.

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3)

the major recommendations made in the Report. I take first one mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman in opening the Debate, namely, the number of Germans who are still held in detention camps in the British zone—40,000. These men, who were members of the S.S., the S.D., the Gestapo and other organs of the Nazi Party, which enslaved Germany and nearly destroyed the world—

Mr. Paget (Northampton): Would the right hon. Gentleman say whether they include children from 15 to 18 years of age in considerable numbers?

Mr. Noel-Baker: The Chancellor of the Duchy assures me that is not so. He will, of course, deal with that and other points which my hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (*Mr. Paget*) may raise in the Debate. The Chancellor of the Duchy will deal with it in greater detail later. He assures me that is not true.

Mr. Paget: I have signed statements from two commandants to that effect.

Mr. Noel-Baker: I will leave that to my hon. Friend when he replies. . . .

Mr. Stokes: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer this question, which is referred to in the Report? . . .

Mr. Noel-Baker: I am sure my hon. Friend will recognise that there is in Germany, in effect, an 18(B) situation. We are not yet through the danger. I am assured by the Chancellor of the Duchy that it is, in fact, not true to say that the men are held without examination.

Wing-Commander Hulbert (Stockport): Would the right hon. Gentleman make one point clear? He referred to the figure of 40,000, and its percentage of 67 million. Will he make it clear that the 40,000 are only those in the British zone? Presumably there are other concentration camps in other zones.

Mr. Noel-Baker: Yes, it refers only to the British zone. Of course, in the British zone we have something like one-third of the population of Germany. I say again, in view of the vast membership of these organisations and their stupendous, their unchallenged power in Germany, I do not think it is a very large number.

Mr. Zilliacus (Gateshead): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, at least on this side of the House, and I think on both sides of the House, there is every support for the policy of putting into concentration camps members of the S.S. and other organisations? [HON. MEMBERS: "No."] If any hon. Members feel sympathy for them let them say so. . . .

Mr. Arthur Allen (Bosworth): . . . The Germans themselves are beginning to lose faith in us. Indeed, they are beginning to say we are taking food out of the country. Because of the criticism being levelled at the administration owing to the lack of food, the Germans themselves are becoming unwilling to co-operate with us in the administration of the country. We were told that when we went in there we were hailed as liberators; now they are thinking something quite different about us. This lack of food seems to be the one thing that overshadows all in Germany, and we were told that the situation is being aggravated by the propaganda that comes over from the Eastern side. I have noticed in the Press—I have here a copy of the "Anglo-Russian News" and I could quote from it—that if we were to adopt in the Western zone agrarian reform we would be able to obtain more food. . . . German farms will suffer much more from lack of fertilisers than they are ever likely to suffer from the lack of reform. As a matter of fact, there are very few large estates in the Western zone. Generally speaking Germany is a country of small holdings.

As one goes through Germany one is struck by the ridiculous character of the zoning. There might have been a case for zoning when we first went into Germany and the boundaries may have been fixed in accordance with military operations, but, as the Select Committee reports, these zones have now become economic barriers. It is not more barriers that Europe needs; it is far fewer. . . . It seems to me that what we require from the Eastern zone is less criticism and more cooperation. I dare not say any more on that. . . .

Major Bramall (Bexley): . . . I am afraid that Nazism is undoubtedly gaining ground in Germany today. It sounds a hard thing to say that, but I am afraid it is true. We started off after the occupation with a tremendous opportunity. The German people were disillusioned with the Nazis because they had lost the war. I will put it on no higher a plane. We also started with wonderful opportunities because of the excellent behaviour of the British soldier in contrast both with our enemies and with our Allies. The British soldier in Germany today is still—to use a hackneyed phrase—our best ambassador. His conduct has won universal respect. If only other people who are carrying Britain's name in Germany today behaved half as well as the ordinary British soldier, I should not have had to make the remark that Nazism is gaining ground.

The Germans have heard so much from our lips about democracy that they say, "Let us see something of it." They expect to see from us some of the enthusiasm for carrying out democracy that they showed in conquering countries for carrying out their own barbaric creed. They find not that, but corruption, cynicism and bureaucratic inefficiency. They see not an understanding of the problems which have to be solved but a complete failure to solve them. They do not see houses being built. No houses are being built. They see more and more families being evicted to make way for greater British requirements, and this again leads them to no sense of democracy as a better creed than that which they have perforce abandoned. They say, "At least under Hitler we did not hunger." . . .

The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Hynd): . . . In the coal mines alone, the average age today is 43, which is considerably higher than it was before the war or than it is in this country.

Someone may ask about the direction of labour. We have a law which makes it permissible to direct labour to the coal mines or to any other industry, but direction is of very little use when you are dealing with unfit men, when you are dealing with men for whom you cannot provide accommodation or any of the amenities of the coal mines or any other industry. The result has been a desertion rate of something like 60 per cent. or 50 per cent. at the very least, amongst these directed people.

Wages themselves are of no value, or very little value, because there is nothing to buy with them. There is no accommodation, and no amenities. Prices have been fixed at, I believe, 1936 levels. The result of that, taken together with the worn-out equipment and slow rate of production, the condition of manpower, and the absence of commodity goods, together with fixed prices, is that the production of anything is entirely uneconomic. The fact is that some of the commodity industries have gone out of production altogether, and we are unable to produce commodity goods that will make wages of more value. Before coming to the question of food, I should like—

Mr. Lyttelton: May I ask if this is the statement on the industrial policy His Majesty's Government are going to pursue in Germany? If so, it seems very inadequate.

Mr. Hynd: I think it will be recognised that throughout the Debate a large number of statements have been made, and I have been asked to reply to them. Every statement I have made up to date has been in reply to one or other of these questions, and I still have a little time—

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay: The Minister of State clearly said that various questions were going to be answered by the hon. Gentleman. I listened carefully, and heard him say that the Control Commission will be run with very much fewer people. But we still have to hear whether these 26,000 are necessary or not.

Mr. Hynd: If everyone who has spoken invites me to answer his particular point, I am afraid I cannot do it. What I propose to do is to justify the policy which is being pursued, and the policy we are now pursuing. It is necessary we should retain the 26,000 at the present time. . . .

. . . I am only sorry that time does not permit of my replying to the very many questions which have been asked,

but I hope that I have dealt with the outstanding ones.

Sir G. Jeffreys rose—

Mr. Hynd: It will be clear to the House that, in endeavouring to deal with a confused mass of injustices, it is not possible to give justice to everyone. Therefore, I appreciate all the more the work done by the Select Committee and the very concise and admirable way in which they have presented both the problems and the directions in which we are to seek their solution.

Sir G. Jeffreys: Will not the Chancellor deal with the very specific allegations made by me regarding the conduct and failure of the personnel of the Control Commission?

It being half-past Nine o'Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, pursuant to Standing Order No. 14, as modified by the Order of the House of 12th April, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the Resolution under consideration.

Cumberland Development Area (Furness)

Sir Ian Fraser (Lonsdale): . . . My constituency contains many people who work in Barrow, and when there is serious unemployment in Barrow they are gravely affected. It is because I apprehend that those who live in this district are likely to suffer serious unemployment in the next few years that I venture to raise this matter now. The point is that we are exactly the kind of area which has an unbalanced economy. The part of the constituency called the Furness district depends for employment very largely on the heavy industries of Barrow, particularly in the dockyards. There are no light industries to mitigate the severity of severe unemployment when it comes.

We have asked the President of the Board of Trade to bring the Furness district into the Cumberland district which adjoins. He has resolutely refused and that is why we have brought the matter to the House. The West Cumberland depressed area contains a population of 200,000 persons. The Furness district contains a population of 100,000. Unemployment in the Cumberland area is 2,800-odd, and in the Furness district 1,600-odd, and a higher number relatively among women. . . .

. . . If the Government wait until there is a set-back in the heavy industries, if they take a chance of that and then say that now there is plenty of unemployment they will make it into a development area and help it by sending industries to that area or encouraging industries to go there, it will be too late. It will take two or three years to get a few light industries into this district, and if we wait until there is unemployment it will be too late. We in Furness, and especially in Dalton, suffered 25 to 30 per cent. unemployment in years gone by. It is not enough to say that we have a policy for full employment; we have yet to see how it works out. . . .

Mr. Marquand (Secretary, Overseas Trade): . . . To sum up: it seems to the Board of Trade that the long-term prospects for the basic industry of this area are good; that the total of unemployment is, after all, not large; that some success has already attended our efforts; and we have no intention of relaxing those efforts. The Board of Trade is definitely striving at this moment to try to increase the number of industries and diversify the character of the industrial make-up of that area, bringing into it firms which will employ the female labour.

House of Commons, July 30, 1946.

Coal Industry Opencast Workings (Land Restoration)

Major Guy Lloyd asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what is the average amount per acre offered to assist in the restoration of farm land that has been used for getting opencast coal; and how many complaints of the scale of recompense have been received.

Mr. Shinwell: The process of converting restored agricultural land to beneficial use after the replacement of the soil by the opencast coal contractor is undertaken by the local War Agricultural Executive Committee at a cost which normally does not exceed £15 an acre. No complaints have reached me that expenditure of this order, which is met by my Department, is inadequate.

Major Lloyd: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in West Fife, for instance, where £15 an acre is given, the actual cost of replacement of land for anything like decent use is £70, and it was a member of the agricultural committee who actually mentioned this, and said that it could not be done for less than £70? . . .

Industrial Negotiations (Government Consultation)

Mr. Williamson asked the Minister of Labour whether he will make a statement on the arrangements for consultation between the Government and the two sides of industry on the matters that are of common interest to employers and workpeople.

Mr. Ness Edwards: Yes, Sir. The Government have been giving considerable thought to this subject. It is the declared policy of the Government to entrust the responsibility for the determination of terms and conditions of employment to the joint machinery of negotiation between employers' and work people's organisations. There is no intention of departing from that policy, but the Government consider that it will assist and reinforce this machinery of joint negotiation if there is the closest possible contact between the two sides and the Government. . . .

Accordingly, it is proposed to establish a regular system of consultation on such matters between the Government and the two sides of industry responsible for the machinery of collective bargaining. . . .

Employment: Trade Union Membership

Mr. W. J. Brown asked the Minister of Labour whether he has reconsidered the case of the 12 L.P.T.B. tramwaymen who, while drawing their pay regularly, are not allowed by the L.P.T.B. to take out their tramcars on the ground that they are members of one union and not members of another; and whether he will make a statement of his intentions on this matter. . . .

Mr. Brown: . . . May I now ask him whether he is aware that one of these men is the holder of the V.C., and does he not think it an outrage that 12 men should be denied the privilege of work merely because they prefer to be members of one union rather than of another?

Mr. Ness Edwards: Neither should the Minister of Labour become the protector of a scab union.

Mr. Quantin Hogg: Where the right of free association is inconsistent with discipline, is the policy of the Government to stamp out that right?

Mr. Edwards: If this concerned only the right of free association, there might be some point in the supplementary question, but this is an attempt apparently to destroy the right of men to organise.

Mr. Brown: Is it not the inalienable right of every Englishman who is dissatisfied with one union to join another, and if he does so decide does that constitute the other union a scab union and result in the kind of position we are discussing today?

Mr. Edwards: It is an inalienable right on the part of the workers in industry to decide with whom they will work. They have that freedom and these men have decided that unless the other men concerned join their union they will withdraw their labour, as they are perfectly entitled to do if they so desire.

[After Question 43]

Questions to Ministers

Mr. Churchill: May I draw your attention, Sir, to the fact that we have not even reached the Prime Minister's questions today?

Mr. Speaker: I have noticed it. I was letting them run, and we had a lot of supplementaries. We cannot have both. Either we have lots of supplementaries and very few Questions, or more Questions and fewer supplementaries. I change from one to the other sometimes.

Mr. Churchill: Would it not be really more in accordance with the needs of the House if a quarter of an hour were added to Question time?

Mr. Speaker: That is not a matter for me to decide. It is a matter for the Government and the House itself.

(Extracts from the Debates on Housing and Palestine will appear next week.)

Salesmen in Search of a Product?

According to the *Evening Standard* of August 1, :—
NEW NAME FOR TORIES?

Mr. Churchill has addressed Conservative-bench members as a preliminary to the recess. He told them that the Conservative Party is an Empire party. He said that at the next meeting of the National Union of Conservative Associations he would move a resolution to dissociate the Opposition from the Government decision on India.

Mr. Churchill then threw out a suggestion about an alternative name for the party. He mentioned the names Unionist Party, or Democratic Party; but he showed no preference.

The Conservative leader stressed that the party must try to embrace anti-Socialist elements from every section of the community.