

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 17. No. 16.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Squadron-Leader Hollis, M.P. for Devizes, is reported as saying that the difference between Communism and Fascism is the difference between Al Capone and Dutch Schultz, and that, while they quarrel, the Managerial State is getting away with the loot.

Strachey's Hi-jackers, in fact.

“New Austerity for Britain.” Headline in Scottish Newspaper.

But after all these years of luxurious living and unbridled freedom, a little more austerity won't do us any harm.

Dr. Ashley Weston, Medical Officer of Health for Bath, ridicules the Ministry of Health statistics which endeavour to prove that our New World is improving our health. He observes that it is common knowledge amongst doctors that there is ample evidence of a general lowering of physical condition amongst adults, which is not shown in statistics. It is revealed by increased irritability, and other signs of nervous strain.

Certain aspects of “Socialism over Sixty Years” by Fenner Brockway (George Allen & Unwin) are probably unpremeditated by the author, although one of them is recognised by Mr. J. B. Priestley who writes a preface to it. Speaking of Bradford and the West Riding and its inhabitants, round whom the book is written, Mr. Priestley remarks “We are very conceited . . . always a bit too pleased with ourselves.” Anyone reading this book without a background would be justified in assuming (a) that Socialism was invented in Bradford; (b) that Bradford is not merely the chief city of England but is representative of all the rest, and for practical purposes, is England. At first sight, this might be taken as an amusing but not very important foible. But there is more to it than that. The “conceit” of which Mr. Priestley speaks is not an ordinary conceit, and it is not confined to the West Riding. It is common to Manchester, which with Leeds and Bradford has some of the worst slums in England, while Liverpool, which is in the same county as Manchester, is free from it. But, as well as foetid slums, Bradford, Leeds and Manchester have a common characteristic.

An important, if not absolutely dominant section of their population during the nineteenth century was Jewish. And the “conceit” which has infected their Gentile neighbours is that peculiar irrational, “Chosen People” mentality which triumphs over the obvious fact that it has created the slums and is invariably found where they are worst, whether in Europe or America. The formative force leaps to the eye

... “there was a distinct section [of Bradford—*Editor, T.S.C.*] known . . . as ‘Little Germany’ . . . like a German town, judging by the name signs on the big warehouses, Schuster, Steinthal, Blumenthal, Edelstein, Heilbron, Rothenstein, [Notice, the *warehouses*, the tool of the *trader*, not the mills, the manufacturer—*Editor, T.S.C.*] They were prosperous, and amassed great fortunes . . . Jewish immigrants from Germany contributed generously to . . . charities and *public* welfare [Our emphasis] . . . But these well-to-do Bradfordians were at the same time oblivious of the miserable conditions in which the working-class . . . of their own town lived. They applied a low standard of labour conditions, including extensive employment of children, at a time when they had the power, if they had had the will, to establish the woollen industry on a decent basis. *With the exception of Sir Titus Salt . . .*”—Foreword by F. W. Jowett.

Sir Titus Salt was a genuine Yorkshireman of good ancestry and family.

You see?—the ‘cahmon’ good. Just like Russia.

There is a good deal of information to be obtained from (a) During the nineteenth century Vicars of Leeds were practically assured of Bishoprics; (b) the opening gun of the constitutional crisis culminating in the “abdication” of King Edward VIII. was fired by the Bishop of Bradford.

The Rev. A. S. Reeve, the present Vicar of Leeds said in London on December 4: “Something drastic must be done. The present trend in Leeds, where there is a large Jewish population, is most dangerous.” Bang went a good bishopric—perhaps.

The deadly competence of the wreckers of Society is nowhere better exemplified than in their systematic destruction of “goodwill”. A trading concern of the mid-nineteenth century quite properly regarded its “goodwill” as its primary asset and millions of pounds were spent in building up such goodwill as “Pears Soap.” The local grocer cultivated the friendship of his customers as a solid asset, and goodwill was a saleable commodity in every business. He is fast transferring this “goodwill” to the bureaucracy.

The first symptom of the occult policy which aims at leaving the individual with no personal assets, is perhaps the sudden aversion of auditors, who are Publicity Agents and Intelligence Corps of the Financial Sanhedrim, to the appearance of good will on the assets side of a balance sheet. If you built up a goodwill, you were not to be allowed to say so in figures.

Nowadays, the local tradesman, significantly referred to as a “distributor”, does not value his goodwill, and does not want customers, who are merely a nuisance. Anything he has “for sale” is at fixed, exorbitant prices (not Just Prices),

of poor and deteriorating quality, and without private competition. He is up against only one genuine competitor, who is camouflaged as "the Co-op." and is selectively financed to drive him out of business, and, alone, will pay fantastic sums (practically anything asked) to buy out and extinguish otherwise unsaleable good will, "just in case." We all know what is going to happen when all competition for goodwill has ceased. How do you like pool petrol? Is your Central Electricity Board treating you better than it treats I.C.I.?

Would you like a telephone?

The *Saturday Evening Post* publishes an article which confirms our suspicion that we are entering the bumping-off era, which is another way of saying that we are adopting the age old Asiatic technique of poison, bomb, and dagger, perhaps with modern improvements, but identical in principle.

According to this article, which is written by a naturalised "British" subject, Mr. Werner Knop, there existed in 1938 "under the guise of a Press agency" (we quote) "one of the most powerful influences at work in the bitter struggle which preceded the shooting war." Its headquarters were apparently "in the fountain yard of an ancient court of law in London" and there seems to be little doubt that it was Jewish controlled.

However that may be, "a member of Parliament [Jewish name and present Cabinet rank given in full in the article] one of the financiers of the organisation, agreed to finance a lady known as Hilda Monte in assassinating Hitler." If a few dozen others were killed, it would be just too bad. After various preliminary canthers, including blowing up the North German Lloyd S.S. "Berlin", just to see that bombs worked, etc., the gang blew up the Munich Beer-cellar from which Hitler and the National Socialist leaders escaped by six minutes. The actual explosion occurred in November, after outbreak of war. *But the agreement to finance the mass assassination was made in May, and did not depend on the outbreak of war, while Neville Chamberlain was straining every nerve to avert war.* And there is every suggestion in the course of events that Hitler knew of the source, and possibly the exact time, of the murderous attempt. Nothing could have made war more certain.

We were under the impression that plotting and financing murder had its penalties, but, apparently, not.

Rather curiously, Fountain Court, in the Temple, was in one of the worst bombed and most frequently bombed areas of London, and, having a personal interest in the Temple, we have often wondered why. After three successive raids early in the war, a land mine was dropped in Middle Temple Lane, which razed Crown Office Row, Fountain Court and Fig Tree Court to heaps of rubble. It is true that, so far as we are aware, the Temple was never "an ancient court of law", but the description is near enough for a "British" subject such as Mr. Werner Knop.

"These mobs will rush delightedly to shed the blood of those whom, in the simplicity of their ignorance, they have envied from their cradles, whose property they will then be able to loot. Ours they will not touch, because the moment of attack will be known to us, and we shall take measures to protect our own."

"The Cahmon Man" is just about as true to life as Dickens's characters are representative of nineteenth (or any) century Englishmen, and the propaganda regarding him comes from the same source as that which idealises Dickens, Darwin and Marx.

The Song of the Troubadour:

- (1) Save Europe Now. Buy food with dollars, and send it to U.N.R.R.A., for Jugoslavia.
- (2) World Shortage of Cereal. Bread Rationing Necessary.
- (3) No shortage of cereal, but shortage of dollars.
- (4) Exports exceed pre-war, but still less dollars.
- (5) Transport the real difficulty. American Coal Strike means bread cuts.
- (6) Coal Strike off. I must consider the matter.
- (7) Well, what the h——l do I care what you think?

Professor E. H. Carr

The council of the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, announces the resignation of Professor E. H. Carr, who has held the Wilson Chair of International Politics at the college since 1936. He is taking up research work on Russia.—*The Times*, December 11.

ODLUM v. STRATTON JUDGMENT

(Royal Courts of Justice, July 29, 1946.)

Before:

Mr. JUSTICE ATKINSON.

(continued)

At the top of the next page I say to him: "You have been giving a very interesting description of sheer bad farming and neglect, have you not? (A) Yes." Lower down the page Mr. Price says at line E: "If you have anybody, to be quite blunt, like Mr. Odlum who as a live-stock farmer, a grass land farmer, and he was asked like all the other farmers in the county to turn his farm into a mixed farm, in those cases we had more or less to teach the farmers and help the farmers to do it. But Mr. Odlum had had three years in which to do it, and had not done it, and had not attempted to take advice from the Committee and the advisers, and so on, and then I think by that stage one must say that it is either neglect or is due to the fact that he would not take advice. I mean I do not want to have to give reasons why the individual failed."

To my mind that is just a malicious falsehood—that Mr. Odlum had had three years to do it, and instead of the output of that farm improving it had steadily deteriorated, and that Mr. Odlum was a farmer who simply would not take advice. There is not a particle of evidence to support anything of the kind. There is no dispute that the plaintiff had ploughed up every field he was asked to plough up and that he sowed every field in the way he was asked to sow it. There is no dispute at all that his crops were good, that in 1941 and 1942 they were good—and we have Mr. Price's statement in his own letter how well the crops were looking in 1942. And yet he really has the temerity to say that for three years, instead of the output of that farm improving it was steadily

deteriorating and suggesting that Mr. Odium was one of the farmers who would not do what he was asked to do, that he would not attempt to take the advice of the Committee and the advisers, and so on.

On page 22, at B, he says this: "I want to make it perfectly clear that as far as we were concerned in Wiltshire, Mr. Hudson was Farmer Hudson; the fact that he was Minister of Agriculture did not matter at all." What sheer humbug that turned out to be! The moment Mr. Hudson got that farm the Catchment Board cleaned out the river, lowering the bed of it; the Agricultural Committee themselves cleaned out the drains and lowered them; they ploughed his land for him; they did everything they could for Mr. Hudson—and they let him grow as much fodder as he wanted.

A very interesting document was put in (Exhibit P. 55) which gives in various columns the numbers of acres under arable and grass in 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1945 and 1946—arable, forage, grass. In 1939 as I have said when war broke out there were 53 acres arable, 667 acres grass. In 1940 it was 224 acres arable and 497 acres grass. In 1941 it was 418 acres arable and 302 acres grass. In 1942 it was 457 acres arable and 264 grass. It will be observed how the arable figures have increased year by year in order to test the question whether the output of the farm was getting worse and worse year by year—from 53 acres in 1939 and 224 acres in 1940 to 418 acres arable in 1941 and 457 acres in 1942. And what were they in 1945? The arable had sunk to 403 acres and in this year 1946 to 400 acres. The grass which had been 667 acres in 1939 had become 139 acres in 1945 and 132 acres in 1946, and forage 139 acres in 1945 and 149 acres in 1946.

Mr. Price was then asked about the attack which he had made on Mr. Odium in the letter on 22 April, 1942, after these fields had been reploughed and resown: "It was reported to my Committee at their recent meeting that you had made excellent progress in the replanting of land which had unfortunately failed to wheat, rye and winter oats." I think I read that before but I want to read it again in connection with this allegation that Mr. Odium's farm was going from bad to worse and that he would not follow the advice of the Committee or do what they told him. Mr. Price was asked in what way Mr. Odium was an obstructionist and at page 46. B. on Day 5 he said he did not refer to Mr. Odium's letters at all. He said that Mr. Odium wrote long letters and very interesting letters. "I did not suggest that the

letters were obstructionist—I use the term 'obstructionist' as against the action of the Committee, and I might use the term interest of the State, if you like, not as an obstructionist to me personally." "(Q) What was it based on? (A) On his actions and conduct in connection with the production of the farm over a period of years." Well, that is just a lie; it is no use mincing words; it was quite untrue and Mr. Price knows it was untrue.

Then he went one better still at page 47 B. when he was being asked about the orders and one thing and another: "No, it is not like that on the question of obstruction. For instance the dispersal of the herd in 1942 was a direct obstruction to the policy of the Committee and that of the nation." Mr. Price there refers to the dispersal of the herd in 1942 which in fact was due to the policy forced upon Mr. Odium. There is a very simple way of testing that, and I look at the cross-examination before the adjournment, because the evidence given by some of these officials since the adjournment was: "Oh no, they had always been keen on milk production first, which was directly contrary to what Mr. Odium had said.

(To be continued)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 28, 1946.

Government Stock (Bank Holdings)

Colonel Crosthwaite-Eyre asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is in conformity with the policy of His Majesty's Government that the big five banks have doubled their holdings of Government obligations from the pre-war level.

Mr. Dalton: This is in no way contrary to Government policy.

Colonel Crosthwaite-Eyre: Does not the Chancellor consider that, possibly under some less enlightened leadership, the high percentage of between 70 per cent. and 80 per cent. is very dangerous to national credit?

Mr. Dalton: National credit is steadily improving under this Government.

Lieut.-Commander Braithwaite: Can the Chancellor say whether he has been making use of his powers under the Bank of England Act in this matter?

Mr. Dalton: No, Sir.

National Debt

Sir W. Smithers asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the National Debt in terms per head of the population for the years 1900, 1913, 1939 and at the latest available date, respectively.

Mr. Dalton: The figures are:

(1) At 31st March	(2) Principal Outstanding	(3) Interest paid in previous years	(4) Population.	(5) Average per head Principal.	(6) Average per head Interest
	£000	£000		£	£
1900 ...	628,979	17,415	40,774,000	15	0.4
1913 ...	656,474	17,221	46,026,000	14	0.4
1939 ...	7,130,753	218,727	47,700,000	149	4.6
1946 ...	23,636,520	474,890	49,000,000	482	9.7

(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. 17. No. 16.

Saturday, December 21, 1946.

The Future of the B.M.A.

"As everyone knows, the medical profession has stated plainly through its Negotiating Committee that the National Health Service Act as passed is in conflict with the principles of the profession . . ." So said Dr. Guy Dain, Chairman of the Council of the B.M.A. on December 12. On January 28 a special meeting of the 'Representative Body' will consider the result of the plebiscite just announced in the newspapers, that of 56,671 doctors who were addressed 18,972 said 'yes' and 23,110 said 'no' to the question, should the B.M.A. negotiate with the Minister concerning the Regulations to be made under an Act disapproved by the Medical Profession.

At last, the body claiming to represent a large proportion of the doctors whose names are on the British Register has been forced to a clear and uncomplicated position. It was planned otherwise, and the degree of illumination which has spread since the Medical Policy Association began its work has secured the defeat of the design in full. How much more it may have done remains to be seen. There should never have been a "Negotiating Committee." Now that its compromising activities are brought, willy-nilly, to an end, the way is open to the British Medical Association completely to implement the policy of those whose support alone constitutes its power. Forces within and over it may still manoeuvre to outwit or to compromise a clear case of representation of a sectional policy; but the chances of their being overcome are increased.

The "One World" Racket

At least two main factors in the present wrecker administration are becoming fairly clear. The first is that its members recognise that at all costs, the illusion of scarcity is their sheet anchor—that a continual state of crisis paralyses public opinion so effectively with the assistance of a supine press, that it will stand anything. And the second is that out of the real abundance available they are systematically and capably building and maintaining a bribed majority whose intelligence is that of the lowest stratum of society—that stratum to which one doctor after another has drawn attention and given warning of large families and declining intelligence. Most of the component individuals neither know nor care that they are being led to certain and inevitable slaughter.

The "One World" Party is insisting on our growing more food (because it is an excuse to control land); it is insisting on more of us working (and just observe how we do it) because wages are now nothing but a Trades Union license;

it is promoting civil war in India because the United States wants to exploit it; and it is making an outbreak of war in the Middle East certain by fomenting, without controlling, disturbance in Palestine, while withdrawing our troops from Egypt. This is the Party of Free Trade, no indirect taxation (inflation is so much more subtle) and Peace. No wonder General Smuts is becoming an enthusiastic supporter of the Government.

The sudden calling-off of the American soft-coal strike by John L. Lewis would no doubt have annoyed Mr. Strachey, who found it convenient in explaining why rationing must go on for ever and ever, if it were not fairly obvious that he propounds his excuses and reasons on the principle that anything will do, and, if the public believes him, it just shows what the public amounts to.

What is so amazing is that no-one seems to point out that the system is so vulnerable that one man can, or is alleged to be able to, dislocate it, and, even when working, works far worse than any other, is so bad a system that it ought not to be tolerated. The "One World" "racket" is exactly like the conveyor belt system in a factory, on which conception it is modelled, and it is attractive to people whose practical ability is chiefly directed to avoiding employment in it. It is mechanically efficient when everything is subordinated to it. It demands endless repetition and kills initiative; and it breaks down quite decisively if one single link fails. Only the peculiar type of power-maniac now dominant in world affairs would suppose that even this supine world in which we now exist will tolerate its indefinite extension. The big Labour Unions are only the specialised form of the big Cartels—just as vicious and just as anti-social; and both of them are going to be broken up unless the world breaks up first.

Monopoly

The key-word to the Great Plan is of course Monopoly, and the object of Monopoly is Profit—not necessarily in money, but usually beginning with a money profit of excessive dimensions. It is quite in accordance with type that the Labour Party which has carried on a vicious propaganda against profit, is by long odds the greatest profiteer and monopoly-monger in all history.

Quite a typical racket is the artificial whisky shortage, accompanied by a fantastic price and a black market—copied no doubt from the U.S. Prohibition period, which was engineered from the same quarters.

Mr. Strachey suggests that he has to restrict whisky distilling because he cannot spare the barley. There is at this moment 20,000 quarters of barley lying rotting in bags because the Food Ministry will neither allow the distillers to buy it, nor buy it themselves. Mr. Strachey says the barley should go to the cows, and the issue is milk or whisky, but at the same time sends 35,000 tons of barley to Eire. And the farmers, who might be supposed to know, say the greatest need for milk-production this winter is the "draff" normally available as a by-product of distilling.

As for milk production, it is far higher than before the war. Where the milk is going, and why we are importing milk powder from overseas, are mysteries which State trading appears to be designed to conceal.

“The Poor”

A clergyman, invited to preside at the yearly meeting of a charitable organisation society, after congratulating the members on their efforts, remarked that, nevertheless, what he hoped for and desired to see was the abolition of poverty itself. He was rebuked for this at the end of the meeting by a member of the Society, who rose and asked him if he had forgotten our Lord's gracious promise that the poor we should have always with us.* This is not a funny story; it is the account of an incident that really happened. The ignoble use of these words of Jesus would be almost incredible but for the fact that they represent an attitude of mind by no means obsolete today, though not generally so unfortunately expressed. The incident was called to mind by a sentence that occurred in an article entitled “Treachery Through Taxation”, (published in a recent number of *The Social Crediter*). The sentence read as follows: “The current political robbery is a process of ruining ultimately the Poor for whose welfare all men of real good will must ever think and work for.”

Leaving aside for the moment the question of whether a condition of poverty is, in reality, justified today, the statement does not make sense because you cannot ultimately ruin an already ruined state like poverty. The Poor, therefore, having nothing to lose, have no reason for being impressed by this particular concern on their behalf. It is true, as the author of the article says, that: “There is a great moral difference between giving and allowing oneself to be robbed.” Nevertheless, surely the point of view of the Poor themselves should be first considered, since a question of choice arises which, though of vital concern to others, concerns them primarily, and one can well imagine the Poor saying something like this: “Of two evils we think the lesser is to be dependent on State charity rather than on that of men of good will. For one thing we know where we are with the State, and can calculate accordingly, whereas private charity is too precarious and uncertain for calculation. Also there might not be enough men of good will to go round, and they might not be rich enough to be of much help anyway. Then, although impersonal, there is not the same possibility of invidiousness with State assistance; we are all in the same boat and know exactly what we have to do. what rules and regulations we must obey to be considered deserving of help in the form of Health Service, Family Allowances, Unemployment Relief, or whatever euphemistic title is given to the Dole.” Of course, there might, and probably would, be a difference of opinion, a divergence of taste amongst the Poor; for the Poor are not just an undifferentiated mass with a collective mind. they are individuals, with minds of their own, although the devotees of the mass and the collective, this, that and the other, would hate to think so. Therefore some amongst the Poor might prefer to be the objects of personal solicitude, might like to feel that men of good will were for ever thinking and working for them; in which case, and if possible, it would seem that a choice might be offered them.

It is astonishing, disheartening, and lamentable, to find that the relative merits of public and private charity, of whether the individual should decide what he can afford to

give the Poor and do the dispensing himself, or whether the State should make the decision and do the dispensing for him, should be considered a subject meriting serious consideration today, and one having any bearing on reality. Conditions existing before the war of abundance, ‘burdensome surpluses’, ‘the malignant bounty of nature’, in addition to the scandals of wealth destruction and restriction of production, should by now have made it plain that the scourge of poverty has no longer any *raison d'être*. The fear that this obvious fact could not much longer be concealed alarmed the powers that be for whom poverty is a necessary factor in their plan to achieve world control. A war entailing spectacular destruction was, therefore, deemed to be expedient so that scarcity, or at any rate the illusion of scarcity could be made to replace the former embarrassing state of plenty.

The feature of poverty, however, indispensable to the world planners is not its misery, nor its want, but its state of absolute dependence. The misery and want are necessary to engender the discontents and conflicts that can be used to promote wars and revolutions by means of which the Planners increase and extend their powers. Once they have succeeded in achieving complete and absolute control the want and misery may be dispensed with, *but the absolute dependence must be preserved and established.*

The old battle cry, “*Work or Maintenance*”, has played straight into the hands of those who relentlessly pursue their aim of world power. It is the cry of the dispossessed, of those, who, as it were, have nothing to fall back on should work fail them. There is no being more vulnerable than the man who must depend on his work for a living, for should he become ‘unemployed’ he is at the mercy, and subject to the dictates, of those upon whom he is then dependent for his maintenance. A policy of dispossession, therefore, of which taxation is the most potent and efficient instrument, must continue to be stealthily pursued till all are dispossessed, made vulnerable, and dependent. Not till then will the world be made safe for total dictatorship.

This last war has made things much easier in this respect for the planners to reach their goal. ‘Planned Scarcity’ can be seen as an instrument excellent for their purpose. A generation is growing up for whom ration books, coupons, points, are becoming to appear more important than money. “How many coupons does it take?” “What points have I got left?” “Can I have this without docket?”—are questions preparing us for the advent of a rationed community. Broadcast statements announcing that we are to be allowed more of this, or shall have to do with less of that are conditioning the mind to accept the idea of what one may call the permissive State. This will be one in which the conditions of our lives will be regulated by the Government and, provided we obey the rules laid down for us, we may look forward to being, within limits, well clothed, well housed, and well fed. The spectacular features of poverty, its want, its wretchedness, its misery, its squalor, those features which, as suggested, are useful to further the plans of the world controllers, yet have no permanent value for them will be abolished. It will appear then as though poverty itself has been abolished; but its essential feature, the dependence, the dispossession, will be retained and extended to include all. In no other way can universal control be consolidated, for freedom and independence in any degree, or in any sphere, are inimical to the controllers, and constitute a menace to their absolute authority. The signs are manifest that we are being shepherded, manoeuvred, cajoled, directed,

*Poverty may have been justified by the facts when these words were spoken, or it is conceivable they were spoken in irony.

forced along this road to the World State and World Dictatorship.

In face of this danger, surely one may say that the task of men of good will is not to think and work for the Poor, but to think and work for the abolition of poverty itself; and this *not* by fiat of the State which leads to man's enslavement, but in accordance with the laws and facts of nature, or, as some might say, in accordance with the will of God, which will lead to man's deliverance. For these 'laws' and 'facts', in conjunction with man's intelligence, have progressively resulted in the abundance, the 'gluts', the 'surpluses', 'nature's malignant bounty' in short, along with the ensuing potential leisure, which last has been perverted and turned into unemployment. This surplus, this abundance, is manifestly in the nature of an inheritance, and cannot properly be distributed at the discretion of the State, through the agency of endless plans and controls. Moreover, an inheritance is a matter of right, not of concessions, and must be claimed as a right, and distributed as such, in this case in the only possible way, that is, by means of a National Dividend.

There is no third alternative, either poverty must be abolished by the entry of mankind into his inheritance of wealth and leisure, *and into the freedom to decide for himself how he will make use of these*, or it will be abolished by man's entry into the World Slave State in which, according to the will and direction of that state, man's body will be cared for, but his spirit must inevitably decline and perish.

Can it therefore be questioned that we should be able to look to all men of goodwill for help in this, which appears to be man's final battle in his fight for real freedom? Otherwise the words, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done, in earth as it is in heaven" are seen to be words of mere vain repetition and, in view of the prospect before us, it would be more seemly if they were altogether discarded.

—BEATRICE C. BEST.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

Trade Union Membership (Teachers)

Mr. Byers asked the Minister of Education how many local education authorities have so far decided that it shall be a condition of employment for teachers to belong to a trade union or recognised professional association.

Mr. Hardman: Only one such case has come to my notice.

House of Commons: November 29, 1946.

Secondary Schools (Graduate Teachers)

Sir E. Graham-Little asked the Minister of Education what is the present number of secondary schools, classed, respectively, as grammar schools, technical schools and modern schools; and what is the proportion in each of these categories of graduate teachers.

Miss Wilkinson: In January, 1946, there were 4,366 maintained secondary schools in England and Wales. 1,199 of these were classed as grammar schools, 324 as technical schools and 2,843 as modern schools. The percentage of graduate teachers in the three groups of schools at March 31, 1946, was 79 per cent., 49 per cent. and 15 per cent. respectively. These figures are provisional.

Army Bureau of Current Affairs (Publications)

Major Legge-Bourke asked the Secretary of State for War how much is spent by his Department annually in purchasing copies of the publications of the Bureau of Current Affairs; how this cost compares with that of the publications of the former Army Bureau of Current Affairs; how many copies per issue are being acquired; who decides on their distribution and who gets them; and what assessment is made of the demand of recipients to get them.

Mr. Bellenger: The cost is at present at the rate of about £24,000 a year and is paid from Stationery Office not Army Funds. No strict comparison can be made since the former staff of A.B.C.A. were responsible for other duties besides the production of these publications and they provided also for the requirements of the Air Ministry, but the cost under the present arrangement is certainly less than it was. About 53,000 copies of *Current Affairs* and 20,000 of *Map Review* are acquired at present. They are distributed on a scale sufficient to allow the material in the publication to be communicated to, and discussed by, all ranks in training or working hours, as laid down in Army Council Instructions.

House of Commons: December 3, 1946.

Requisitioned Land, Islay

Major McCallum asked the Secretary of State for Scotland in what circumstances the holding of Mrs. Flora Shaw, Gartachrossan, Bridgend, Isle of Islay, was taken over for cultivation by the local A.E.C. on behalf of the Department of Agriculture for Scotland; what has been the result of such cultivation; and how it comes about that Mrs. Shaw is now being asked to meet the financial losses incurred by the Department of Agriculture as a result of their farming operations on her holding.

Mr. Westwood: The holding of Gartachrossan, Islay, was not taken over by the agricultural executive committee. In 1943, the holding was without crop or implements and was semi-derelict. The tenant was unable to comply with the cultivation directions issued by the committee for 1944 and voluntarily entered into a formal agreement with them, under which they undertook to carry out, on her behalf, the required cropping. On the same understanding, the committee carried out cropping in 1945. The holding was in grass in 1946. The results of the committee's operations under the agreement have been the production of crops yielding a return of £533 6s. 11d., the improvement of grazing and the restoration of the land to a reasonable state of cleanliness and fertility. There had been a gross profit of £90 18s. 6d. which, after deduction of a small management charge, still to be agreed with the tenant, and of interest charges, will be paid to the tenant in terms of the agreement. I regret that an earlier, but incomplete, statement sent by the committee to the tenant showed a deficit of £2 19s. An amended statement has now been issued to her.

Major McCallum: Is the Minister aware that it was not until my Question was put down that the amending statement was issued, showing a profit instead of a loss? Does not he agree that it would be fairer to the small landowners if they were allowed some form of appeal against this system of collection by the committee on behalf of the Department?

Mr. Westwood: An entirely different question is contained in the last part of the hon. and gallant Member's supplementary question.

Commander Galbraith: Will the right hon. Gentleman say exactly what he means by "a gross profit"?

Mr. Westwood: I mean exactly what English conveys to anyone who understands it.

Colonel Gomme-Duncan: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what steps he is taking about this gross inefficiency on the part of his Department?

Mr. Stokes: What does the hon. and gallant Member mean by "gross inefficiency"?

Mr. Westwood: I can assure the hon. Gentleman that there is no inefficiency, and I will not bring in the word "gross" as far as my Department is concerned.

Colonel Gomme-Duncan: Was not the difference between £8 and £90 discovered almost overnight?

Commander Galbraith: In view of the fact that the gross profit was £49, can the Minister tell us what was the net profit?

Mr. Westwood: Not without notice. I did not give the figure of £49 but the figure of £90 18s. 6d., so that there is evidence that inaccuracies can arise in this House, as well as in the operations of my Department.

Social Survey (Expenditure)

Mr. Wyatt asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury how the annual budget of £63,000 for the Social Survey is expended in detail.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: The following are the figures:

	£
Salaries and wages of staff	33,888
Fees to part-time field investigators	7,250
Travelling, etc., expenses	12,000
Accommodation, etc.	5,000
Assistance in tabulating and other work and miscellaneous	4,862
	£63,000

Building Operatives (Questioning)

Major Lloyd asked the Lord President of the Council how many women are being employed by his Department in putting questions to building operatives; if he will give a list of these questions and state their purpose and the annual cost of this procedure.

Mr. Herbert Morrison: Two women psychologists are being employed by the Medical Research Council, for the purpose referred to by the hon. and gallant Member, at a total approximate cost of £1,000 per annum, as part of an investigation undertaken at the request of the Ministry of Works. The purpose is to ascertain facts likely to be helpful in promoting the well-being and efficiency of workers in the building industry. The questions may be in any form considered suitable for eliciting the required information about work and working conditions and the effect of these on the men. The inquiries are made only after full consultation and with the approval of representatives of the industry, including both management and workers and have been very well received.

Major Lloyd: Is the House to understand from the right hon. Gentleman that the human efficiency panel of the Ministry of Works consists only of two women? If so, would the right hon. Gentleman say what are the qualifications of those women for those highly competitive posts?

Mr. Morrison: These ladies do not constitute the human efficiency panel. The methods used by the investigators are approved by the human efficiency panel. I am informed that the ladies concerned are competent for this work.

Major Lloyd: Would the right hon. Gentleman say whether it is really necessary to have a human efficiency panel at all?

Mr. Morrison: Yes, Sir. The more I look at hon. Gentlemen opposite the more I think so.

Mr. Churchill: We were worthy of the right hon. Gentleman when he was at his best.

Lieut.-Commander Braithwaite: Will the right hon. Gentleman also glance to his right, and inform the House whether the psychological processes will be applied to the Minister of Health?

Mr. Morrison: I can assure the hon. and gallant Gentleman that these processes will be applied to everybody.

House of Commons: December 4, 1946.

Poland (British Press Representatives)

Major Beamish asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will give the names and nationalities of the representatives of British newspapers and periodicals now in Poland, showing in each case the publication which he, or she, represents.

Mr. McNeil: As it is long, I will circulate the answer in the OFFICIAL REPORT. . . .

Following is the answer:

There are now no staff correspondents of any British newspaper or agency in Poland. I understand that correspondents who regularly send despatches to British newspapers and agencies are Mr. Joel Cang (polish citizen), for *The Times*, *Manchester Guardian*, and *Jewish Chronicle*; Miss Ruth Lloyd (United States citizen) for the British United Press; Mrs. Flora Grusen (United States citizen by birth, married to a Canadian) for the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Observer*. In addition Mrs. Rhoda Miller (United States citizen) and Mr. John de Silva (British Indian subject), who are working for Telepress, are understood to write occasionally for the *Economist* and *Reynold's News* respectively. News agencies are represented by Mr. Larry Allen (United States citizen), who is a staff correspondent of the Associated Press.

His Majesty's Government are anxious to see an increased number of British journalists in Poland before and during the elections.

Exchange Control Bill

Considered in Committee.

[An Amendment to Clause 1]:

Mr. Birch: . . . The Bill inevitably gives great powers to the Treasury and the Government, and it has been accepted on Second Reading, and therefore, we cannot question the fact that these great powers are given; but I believe it is the duty of the Committee to see that no more powers are given

to the Treasury than are absolutely necessary for them to carry out the intentions of the Bill. As the Bill is now drawn, it appears that the Treasury have the power of life and death over a great many individual businesses, because it is laid down in the Bill that dealings in gold and foreign exchange must take place only through authorised dealers . . .

The Treasury has a complete option as to who should be allowed, and who should be forbidden to carry on this type of business. Further, if hon. Members look at the Sixth Schedule they will find that Orders specifying who are and who are not to be authorised dealers need not be laid before the House of Commons, and, therefore, are not subject to debate. It is doubtful, whether any Government should be given powers of life and death over other people's business, without opportunity being allowed for discussion. We have had many similar cases and the Government answer has been: "Trust us." . . .

What this Amendment seeks to do is to give protection and also to define what an "authorised dealer" is. . . .

Mr. Solley (Thurrock): . . . Much has been said about the fact that there is no remedy on the part of any dealer whose name is not accepted by the Treasury in the proposed Orders. That is complete and utter nonsense. I can imagine what would happen if any reputable dealer found that his name was not in such an Order. He would immediately get in touch with some of his friends on the other side of the House. . . .

Hon. Members: Why?

Mr. Stanley: Because he is a reputable dealer?

Mr. Solley: I am assuming that, on the whole, dealers are reputable. Otherwise . . . questions could be asked in this House in certain circumstances, and the matter could be raised on the Adjournment and in other ways . . .

Mr. Pickthorn: I think we might ask the right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Bench opposite to make some endeavour to educate some of their followers on this kind of point. There is a particularly striking case here. We have had, over and over again, this argument that some extreme extension of coercive policy is really harmless because there are opportunities of raising it either by Parliamentary Questions or on the Adjournment, or otherwise. I think that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen on the Front Bench opposite know by now, that that is really not a fair argument, and that this continual pouring of more and more indispensable work into the Parliamentary vessel has got far beyond tolerable limits. . . .

Since the point has been put to me, may I say—I am within the recollection of the Committee—that the . . . The argument was put . . . that the Government is asking for a power which it said it would be extremely improper for any Government to use. The Government's action in so asking is defended by its supporters, upon the ground that there might be a Parliamentary Question or a short Debate on the Adjournment. I say that would be reducing Parliamentary procedure beneath the point of contempt and derision and that it is really time that argument was dropped.

[*The Amendment was rejected: Ayes, 107; Noes, 259*].

[*Discussing Clause 15*]:

Mr. Birch: . . . This is very much the same point as that which was dealt with on the second Amendment discussed today, because the effect of this Clause again is to put it

within the power of the Treasury to put anybody out of business who is, in the ordinary way, a banker—[HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear."]—I am grateful for the support from the opposite side of the Committee—because securities can only be deposited with an authorised depository. If one looks at Clause 42, one finds that an authorised depository is a person authorised, for the time being, by the Treasury. No definition of any sort is given. The object of moving this Amendment is to ensure that no arbitrary action is taken by the Treasury, and that no one is deprived of his livelihood unless he has committed some crime. . . .

Mr. Eccles: I wish to support the Amendment. The definition of "authorised depository" is difficult. It is quite clear that those who undertake this duty will be put to a good deal of cost which they have not had to bear before. I wonder whether the Chancellor will not follow the precedent set in France, where, as I understand it, a similar Measure has resulted in the French Government having to set up a national depository, because of the cost involved. I hope that that will not be the case here. If it is not to be the case here, then the Government will require to have a wide list of depositories. It is stated in paragraph 16 of the White Paper:

"Arrangements will be made to meet the reasonable requirements of brokers, solicitors and others who may need temporarily to hold such documents."

I ask the Chancellor exactly what that sentence means? Does it mean that the time-honoured practice of a solicitor holding some securities for his client, or a stockbroker for his customer, is, after a short period, to end; and that, in fact, the intention of the Treasury is to concentrate on the big banks the duty of being depositing agents? I would like to know what the Chancellor has to say on that point.

The Solicitor-General: As the hon. Gentleman will have noticed, Clause 15 deals only with bearer certificates and certificates not registered on the United Kingdom register. I suppose that a great majority of persons already keep not only their registered certificates, but also such bearer certificates as they have and certificates on non-British registers, at their bank. In practice, little difference will take place, because the authorised depository will again be the bank.

Mr. Stanley: Just the banks?

The Solicitor-General: Yes. In regard to the question about solicitors, in fact, in a large number of cases they retain custody of certificates on behalf of their clients. In the case of bearer certificates these will have to be deposited with banks, who will be the authorised depositories. The Clause makes provision that solicitors and brokers can have temporary possession of the bearer and other certificates for various purposes—collecting dividends if required or effecting transfers, or similar normal business transactions. When the certificates have been deposited with the authorised depository, there is nothing to prevent their being transferred from one owner to another, provided that the transfer is one which is permitted under Clauses 8, 9, and 10 of the Bill. . . . The owner of the certificate is given the right to choose the authorised depository. He can indicate what authorised depository he wishes to be the custodian of his certificates. . . .