From Week to Week

Mr. Philip Noel-Baker has gone to the Mediterranean on important Government business. This ensures luxurious travel, and the kind of accommodation the proletariat expect. As we see it, austerity in "Britain" need not present any serious problem, if properly handled, as our Cabinet Ministers handle it.

Mr. Strachey is stated to be a quarter Jew, and whether this be so or not, only a small section of the population would be prepared to regard him as a representative Englishman or Scot, or whatever his formal nationality may be. But no one can deny him at least one outstanding quality—an effrontery almost bordering on genius. A man who will justify bread rationing on the grounds of (a) world wheat shortage, proved to be non-existent; (b) Coal strike in U.S., called off before it started; (c) Failure of U.S. transport, which, on the contrary, was actually improved by reduction of mineral traffic; (d) Lack of dollars, when we are paying dollars for supplies to U.N.R.R.A. for distribution to people who are killing and wounding British soldiers in Palestine and elsewhere, and paying royalties, not subject to tax, on Hollywood films whose general culture and tone is that of a Chicago ghetto, is not inconsistent; he is a romantic artist.

We cannot be accused of undue admiration for Mr. Churchill, although if we have to choose between buccaneers, we prefer his type. But it has always been a mystery to us why a hard-headed constituency such as Dundee would reject him, and yet elect a Mr. Strachey.

Most of us will recall the ingenious theory that the only essential distinction between a horse-chestnut and a chestnut horse was that the horse was turned round the other way, an argument which seems to lie at the root of equalitarianism.

It might be urged that anyone who could see no other difference, and was sane, could not have seen both a horse and a horse chestnut, and equally, that to suppose that there is no essential difference between individuals merely shows incapacity to see, i.e., is a subjective opinion, not an objective fact.

We are inspired to this utterance by the debate on India in the House of Commons, extracted from Hansard in The Social Crediter of January 4. India is much too large a subject to deal with adequately in these columns, but the observation by Mr. Godfrey Nicholson, M.P. (Farnham) that "It is becoming a by-word all over the world that British Administrations are breaking down. We have it in Germany, we have it in India . . .", with which we agree both in form and content, seems to afford an opportunity to comment on the curious reluctance to refer to the obvious and incontrovertible explanation—that British administrators are now a different type to those of the nineteenth century, and they are in the main unsuccessful in India. It is not their fault; they may have many virtues, but not the right ones. It is our opinion that this change of type has been fostered in every way for fifty years from New York and Washington as being one of the surest methods to break British prestige, a prestige bitterly resented, and replaced where possible by what can be described as gadget culture. Dollar diplomacy and majority-democracy have played their part; and the tragedy of it is, as all the speakers who had any knowledge of the subject emphasised, that it is not the British, but the poorest classes of Indians, who will be the sufferers. We have direct evidence from several sources that the departure of the British is regarded with the greatest apprehension by Indians other than the schemers of the Congress Party, their millionaire backers, and the careerist politicians.

There is no going back; the British Raj, one of the most amazing achievements of all history, and on balance, one of the most creditable, is passing; and not the least of the reasons which threaten the loss of many of its benefits is that a horse-chestnut has been found to differ noticeably from a chestnut horse.

All sober critics of the present Administration recognise that its true begetter was the unspeakable Baldwin "National" Government. One of the more vicious policies and propaganda of that period was called "reflation" and was accompanied by the mass circulation of rising price rumours. M. Blum, the French Premier, has so alarmed the London School of Economics—P.E.P. by his lower price level policy, that the "B."B.C. in its bulletin of 6 p.m. January 5 makes its New York reporter comment on the fall of prices in the U.S. in the words "Are we decontrolling ourselves out of prosperity?" Waal, waal, waal, wouldn't it be awful if our incomes bought us twice as much? And just look at the prosperity of Britons—are-slaves.

"It is evident that to-day Socialism and Communism are losing all along the line."—Christopher Hollis, M.P.

Broadcasts from Hobart

Mr. James Guthrie writes to The New Times, Melbourne, saying that December would see the end of ten years' continuous broadcasting from 7HO, Hobart, to which he and Mrs. Guthrie have given so much time, energy and money. Several of the broadcasts have been published in The Social Crediter, and these and others have been incorporated in a booklet, "Our Sham Democracy", a supply of which will be made available to readers by the publishers of The Social Crediter. If the financial cost can be met, the broadcasts may be resumed. In the meantime the fund is in debt.


P AR LIAMENT

House of Commons: December 17, 1946.

British Army

6th Airborne Division (Libel Charge)

Mr. William Shepherd asked the Secretary of State for War who authorised the articles written by Lieutenant Gourlay, who was recently acquitted on a charge of libelling grades, namely, administrative, executive, clerical, typing, convenient date.

Wing-Commander Roland Robinson asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the numbers of non-industrial civil servants distinguishing men and women in the several technical and scientific and minor and manipulative in June, 1939, June, 1945, and September, 1946, or the nearest convenient date.

Mr. Dalton: As the reply contain a number of figures, I will, with permission, circulate it in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Civil Service (Statistics)

Mr. Osborne: In view of the great shortage of labour in most industries, will the Chancellor take steps to reduce the number of these non-producers employed by Government Departments?

Mr. Dalton: It has already been stated that the Government are giving careful attention just now to the desirability of reducing staffs in the aggregate.

Mr. Dalton: I would say that is undoubtedly so, and ask all the staffs in all the Departments to undertake an elaborate piece of research. We want to reduce the staff; we do not want to put upon them a lot of needless research inquiries. If my hon. Friend has any particular cases, I will look into them, but a general snoop into past records would, in my view, be a waste of time of officials.

Lieu-t.-Commander Braithwaite: In view of the implication contained in this Question, will the right hon. Gentleman make it clear to the House that, so far as the established Civil Service is concerned, there is little or no ground for it?

Mr. Dalton: I would say that is undoubtedly so, and it is up to my hon. Friend to produce evidence.

Mr. Cooper: Will my right hon. Friend look into the system of recruitment—that is the important point—to prevent this sort of thing happening? The established civil servants are most anxious that this should be cleared up.

Mr. Dalton: That is a completely different matter; recruitment does not arise on this Question.

Part-time staff cannot be analysed in this way as similarly detailed figures for part-time staff are not held centrally.

The numbers of part-time staff were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>1st April, 1939</th>
<th>1st July, 1945</th>
<th>1st October, 1946</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>18,276</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>38,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Sub-Clerical</td>
<td>77,540</td>
<td>35,513</td>
<td>90,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15,273</td>
<td>30,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Technical and Scientific</td>
<td>10,906</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>33,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor and Manipulative</td>
<td>127,420</td>
<td>35,192</td>
<td>126,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Ancillary Staff</td>
<td>24,151</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>23,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectorate</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messengers, Porters, etc.</td>
<td>13,669</td>
<td>5,707</td>
<td>14,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279,353</td>
<td>94,948</td>
<td>319,889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Industrial Civil Servants—Whole Time: Analysed by Staff Groups.

Prosecutions

Mr. Cooper asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the total number of civil servants of all ranks and grades who have been brought before the courts in Great Britain for offences in any way connected with their employment during the last three years.

Mr. Dalton: This information could be obtained only at the expense of a disproportionate amount of time and labour, especially in Departments with large regional and local staffs.

Mr. Cooper: Is my right hon. Friend aware that careful analysis of newspaper reports during the last few years shows a rather serious increase in the number of convictions? Is he further aware that the judges in these cases have made unfavourable comments on the fact that men who already have existing criminal records have been engaged by the Civil Service, and would he undertake to look into this rather serious matter?

Mr. Dalton: The one thing I have declined to do is to
Illegal Jewish Immigrants (Cost)

Sir R. Glynn asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies the cost of providing accommodation and services in Cyprus of illegal Jewish immigrants; and whether the Colonial Office Vote will be increased, or in what manner and how soon will the revised estimate be prepared to cover present and future expenditure.

Mr. Creech Jones: The total estimated expenditure on the Cyprus camps for illegal Jewish immigrants from the date of their opening in August until the end of the current financial year is some £1,900,000. Of this figure, £1,160,000 is the estimated capital expenditure on the preparation and erection of the camps; and the balance is the cost of maintenance and other services. This expenditure will be met by the Government of Palestine.

House of Commons: December 18, 1946.

Jamaica (Chain Stores)

Mr. Skimmard asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that in March, 1946, the Jamaica House of Representatives passed a resolution requesting the introduction of legislation to prevent the expansion of chain stores and the entry of wholesale merchants into retail trade; and what action the Government of Jamaica have taken to introduce legislation for this purpose.

Mr. Creech Jones: Yes, Sir. The Governor of Jamaica has appointed a committee to consider this resolution and to submit concrete proposals as to what action, if any, it may be possible or desirable to take in the matter. The committee has not yet submitted a report.

Lieu.-Commander Gurney Brathwaite: Does this mean that there has been an extension of the Co-operative societies in Jamaica?

Question of Privilege

Mr. Kirkwood: I wish to bring to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, and seek your guidance upon a telegram I received last night and which I believe brings into question the Privileges of hon. Members of this House. I therefore think it is my duty to take this, the earliest opportunity, of raising the matter.

Hon. Members: What is it?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Member will bring the telegram to the Table.

Telegram handed in and read as follows:

"D. Kirkwood, M.P., House of Commons, London. Directors, staff mechanics and drivers unanimously regret Transport Bill all support in future will be denied you if you vote in favour—George Davie and Sons Ltd. Roman Bridge Duntocher."

Mr. Hector Hughes: I also, Mr. Speaker, desire to bring to your attention three telegrams which, in my submission, amount to a breach of Privilege of the House. May I, with respect, refer you to page 122 of Erskine May where there are two Rulings, both of which in my submission, refer to the telegrams which, with permission, I shall read to the House.

The first Ruling is "that an attempt to influence Members in their conduct by threats is also a breach of privilege" and, under that Ruling, there is a case given. It is briefly "sending a letter to hon. Members setting out . . . questions referring to proposed legislation . . . and intimating that if the writer does not hear from such Members, he will be justified in letting their constituents know that they had no objection to" the particular kind of thing involved. The second Ruling is on the same page and goes a little further, "Conduct not amounting to a direct"—

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the hon. Member is right in trying to teach me my own business.

Mr. Hughes: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I was citing it for your convenience. May I hand in the telegrams?

Telegrams handed in, and read as follows:

"Hector Hughes, House of Commons, Westminster. Unless you support public inquiry for transport nationalisation my support will be withdrawn.—John R. Ross and Son, 31/55, Princes Street, Aberdeen."

"The right hon. Hector Hughes, Member for North Aberdeen, Houses of Parliament, Westminster, London. Strongly resent annexation of business built up after years of work. No further support if you proceed with strangulating Transport Bill.—Elrick and Hutcheon, 3/7, Pittodrie Lane, Aberdeen."

"Hughes, M.P., House of Commons, London.—Cannot continue support if you encourage Transport Bill.—A. King, 2, Rosochill Avenue, Aberdeen."

Mr. Gallacher: Before you give your decision on this, Mr. Speaker, might I be allowed to inform the House that this intimidatory campaign has not been organised by the Communist Party?

Mr. Speaker: It appears to me that I have four telegrams to deal with. I will take the last three first. I really think there is no prima facie case of any kind in regard to the last three. Anybody, surely, can write to his Member and say, "Look here, if you vote for this, I will not support you at the next Election." That is not intimidation. The hon. Member for Dumbarton Burghs (Mr. Kirkwood), I think was quite right in bringing his telegram to the notice of the House. That was a more serious one, because it was a collective one, and there was a kind of intimidatory threat in it. But, even there, I do not think there was a prima facie case, because it was not quite definite enough. I would reinforce the warning that this House does not like collective intimidatory messages. Members are free to vote as their consciences think best. I know that in times of great controversy rash telegrams may be sent, but I think we are more dignified if we ignore them.

Sir William Darling: On a point of Order—I seek your guidance—would it be my duty to bring before the House a number of telegrams I have received in which political supporters of the Government now recant their former political allegiance?

Mr. Speaker: That, I think, has nothing to do with the House.

Mr. Medland: We will believe that when the party opposite win a by-election.

House of Commons: December 19, 1946.

Jewish Publication (Cartoon)

Sir Stanley Reed asked the Attorney-General whether his attention has been directed to "Jewish Struggle, Jewish Fighting Organ" No. 7, September, 1946, with a cartoon, "Palestine 1921-29-36 Pogroms," incited by the British; and (continued on page 6)
Whiggism Under Judgment

One of the most important, and one of the most difficult, ideas to get into the general public mind in this country at the present time, is that, bad and dangerous as is the present Administration, the election of, or coalition with, an unreformed titular Conservative Party could quite easily prove fatal.

We are not in the confidence of Lord Woolton or Mr. Churchill, and do not ever expect or desire to be, but we have no particular difficulty in stating their policy. It is Whiggism with modern improvements, and the period of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff’s (Marks and Spencer’s) Departmental Store mentality as the reigning inspiration of 1931-39, which succeeded Alfred Moritz Mond’s reign 1918-30, is to be continued and expanded by Lord Woolton’s (Lewis—Cohen’s—Departmental Store) mentality in 1947? If great nations were even mainly Departmental Stores (we have no doubt Lord Woolton believes that is the case), there might be encouragement in the prospect. But, in fact, rationing and the departmental store mentality go together, and, we trust, prove fatal.

We believe that the Election of 1945 was an arranged birth of Social Credit as a body of doctrine and Government outlook which recalls the moving spirit of the Gadarene swine. The first article of the long series which led to the work and economy will save us” —is paralleled by Lord Inchcape in 1919—“we are a poor Nation, only hard secrets and celerity as might be. The horrors of the Industrial Revolution, the “French” Revolution (travestied by the Pilgrim Fathers; and we founded the Bank of "England", under typically false pretences, with as much secrecy and celerity as might be. The horrors of the

There is a desperate fatalism associated with the Whig outlook which recalls the moving spirit of the Gadarene swine. The first article of the long series which led to the birth of Social Credit as a body of doctrine and Government in Alberta, appeared in The English Review in 1918 under the title of “The Delusion of Super-Production.” Every word of it is applicable to the present situation.

To anyone who was sufficiently involved in industrial and departmental policy at the First Armistice, it will be obvious that we have learnt nothing and forgotten nothing, and are heading straight for a repetition on possibly a final scale of every disaster of the last twenty-five years. "Increased production" is replaced by "More Exports"; Lord Inchcape in 1919—"we are a poor Nation, only hard work and economy will save us"—is paralleled by Lord Woolton—"we are impoverished, everyone must work harder"—-and our "Statesmen" agree on only one slogan, that of 1920, “ Produce more and consume less.”

We are now convinced of what we have long suspected, that we have no longer a Party system of Government in this country, but a permanent and concealed coalition with substantially an agreed policy. One slight evidence of the correctness of this opinion is the payment of practically a Cabinet Minister’s salary to the Leader of the Opposition. We believe that the Election of 1945 was an arranged election; that American troops, with their hatred of “Tories” who, they believed to a man, lived on taxes ground out of “the Colonies”, were kept in this country as unofficial canvassers; and that the three months’ interval between the poll and the declaration of the result, together with the identification marks on the ballot papers, outrage any belief in d’markrazi.

The 1931-39 P.E.P. Government differs only from the present P.E.P. Administration in having as titular head Mr. Attlee instead of the Whig Baldwin (Mr. Chamberlain had only one duty, either to avoid or prepare for war). And both of them, Messrs. Attlee and Baldwin, have been grafted on this desperate Whig mentality which has been the curse of this country from Cromwell’s day to the present.

There is a peculiar blindness associated with obsessions of any nature, which appears to ensure their failure even to achieve more than temporary success in their narrow objective.

The people of Great Britain were far better traders, manufacturers, and farmers when their standards were set entirely outside trading, manufacturing and even farming. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God [Reality]" is not merely a moral sentiment: it is a discovery much more important than "business" than atomic power. Once, we appear to have had it, at least to a limited extent, in our possession, and those were the days of Merrie England. Then we began to whine about it in the nasal tones of Praise God, Barebones and the Pilgrim Fathers; and we founded the Bank of “England”, under typically false pretences, with as much secrecy and celerity as might be. The horrors of the

Over a sufficient period of time, it is simply beyond discussion that belief, (faith) is conclusively formative—that it is the matrix of events. It does not appear to be essential that it is “correct” belief in order that it shall be formative; but when it appears in the world of events, it appears to come under “judgment” by some absolute standard, “the Kingdom of God.”

Whiggism is now under Judgment.

Letter from Antwerp

“Everybody here is talking of the coming trade depression, which is grotesque when you think about it. Fancy talking of a trade depression when soap, oil, milk, sugar, etc., is almost unobtainable. What will happen when there is plenty again? We feel as though we had just walked out of prosperity.

“Both here in Belgium and in Holland, the German dictatorship has been exchanged for what might be called the Foreign Exchange dictatorship . . .

“The Banque Nationale refuses to grant any money for reconstruction. It is now two years since the liberation but those who suffered war damage have not received a penny; some have been granted a loan at 2 per cent. Those whose property was destroyed by the German and Allied armies and those whose property was damaged by by-lenting, etc., remain without any form of compensation. The British government say that the Belgian government must pay for it by Lend-Lease. The Belgian government replies that it has no money.” —(December 22).
The Union of Electors and the Institute of Political Action

The following article, published by Vers Demain a month before the Richelieu-Verchères election to the Federal Parliament, indicates the methods and arguments of the Union des Electeurs which won the signal Pontiac victory earlier in the year and, although beaten in a traditionally "Liberal" stronghold (Richelieu-Verchères) secured the "near eclipse" (vide The Times) of the "Progressive Conservatives":

A MEANS, NOT AN END—The Union of Electors is not an end in itself, but simply a means towards the attainment of a goal.

The goal is to put politics at the service of the citizen, and by means of politics to correct certain major vices which prevent production from being at the service of the consumer.

Political and economic health, the common good, is therefore the end; the Union of Electors the political means employed to reach it.

It would be idle to take the trouble to establish a Union of Electors and then leave it to sleep and grow rusty.

When a group is founded in a parish, a county or a province, the task is not ended. It remains to make the group function—the means must not be used in order to arrive at the end. And if the means prove too weak it has to be strengthened to make it more effective. It grows stronger as it grows in size and as it is used. It is an organism: exercise does it good.

That is why, if we insist on the multiplication and development of local, regional and provincial groups of the Union of Electors, we insist equally on their use, on their being put into operation.

A POTENTIALLY PRODIGIOUS FORCE—In building the Union of Electors we are setting up a political strength of incomparable power. Few people realise it yet, because it is something new, because nobody has yet seen a whole people united and organised to demand the fulfilment of desires which are in everyone's mind and heart.

The Union of Electors of the Province of Quebec, although the first and largest in the world, is still nearer to its birth than to its maturity.

But it is easy to understand that in a town where the great majority of the citizens are always watching the facts of their town's administration and where they openly band together to demand some possible thing in connection with their town, not one municipal council would be able to resist such a demand or it would be condemned to disappearance; it would have to resign to give place to another at the earliest opportunity.

If we extend this state of affairs to a whole province, with the majority of electors thus organised, alive and prompt to express together and clearly their common will, what parliament, what government could ignore such a strength with impunity? And the same would hold good on the Federal scale.

THE CONTROL OF REPRESENTATIVES—The Member of Parliament knows he is dependent on two forces—that of finance which grants his election expenses, and that of the vote without which he can neither obtain nor keep his seat. When the first strength is sufficient to bring the second in its train, it is the first which chiefly guides him in his decisions. When the second force is independent of the first, the M.P. necessarily becomes more attentive to his electors than to those who provide the election funds. When both, the money and the votes come from the same men, as in the case of M. Caouette, the M.P. is 100 per cent. his electors' man.

The Pontiac election demonstrated that the same men who vote are able to finance their candidate's campaign. And the expenses are then ten times, twenty times, thirty times less than if the candidate draws on heavily mortgaged interests to sway an electorate which can be influenced by stunts dependent on money.

Corruption, direct or indirect, by money, will disappear as a Union of well-informed electors checks that corruption.

THE CHANCES WHICH REMAIN TO US—In spite of the dictatorship of money, in spite of the tyranny of political patronage which can, at its will, heap tables high with good things or lay them bare, we still fortunately have in our officially democratic countries the right to speak, to write, to meet and associate together.

If we lived in Russia, we would have to proceed in the dark, and develop secretly a powerful maquis, before dreaming of freeing citizens or of breaking tyranny. Thank God, we are in Canada, where we can proceed openly. Let us take advantage of our situation. In spite of lesser obstacles, let us raise a huge Union of Electors, to break the dictatorial network which is enmeshing us more and more, economically and politically. Quickly before it is too late.

A GUIDING FORCE—The Union of Electors, still young, is therefore a force for the future, the most formidable, potentially, that the democratic world has known.

But, because it is a formidable strength, this strength must always be used for good. It would be a disaster to see it one day serving against Order for the promotion of anarchy.

It would then be merely a travesty of a Union of Electors. Intrinsically, one cannot see how electors would seek, collectively, things which would be detrimental to them individually. But history teaches us that these travesties do occur, that the spirit of evil can take over institutions which are good in themselves and use them in an entirely opposite direction from that of the ideal which presided at their birth. A classic example is that of the Order of Templars, which became the instrument of Freemasonry and Cabalistic Jewry. There are others.

The Union of Electors, called to become a great force, must never become a blind force. That is why, not only are its members required to instruct themselves even before organising themselves, but the Institute of Political Action also retains the mission of guiding the Union of Electors after it has been established.

THE INSTITUTE OF POLITICAL ACTION—The Institute of Political Action is essentially an educating and directing organism. The Institute is not simply a collection of people, it consists of selected men and women who have definite qualifications. To recruit them, the Institute appeals to all those who feel they have conviction and courage. The only condition is that they must be ready to do voluntary work for the movement, according to the directions they receive from the officers responsible.

Once they have entered the group of active people who make up the Institute, these men come in contact with others...
who are in better training and with the directors. They read
the paper more carefully because they have to find in it
intellectual stores with which they may engage in discussion
with the electors. Thus they form their minds.

They also form their hearts, become accustomed to
sacrifices, to devotion, to self-denial. They also meet many
opportunities of moulding themselves to a precious state of
humility which in no way lessens the conquering spirit.

As they perfect themselves, if they persevere, they are
given responsible functions in the Institute, in which they
develop their personality even more.

It is thus that, little by little, those who have willingly
answered a first call and who have had the courage to stand
firm, become infected with a spirit which is the spirit of the
Institute of Political Action.

Their objectives are pure, and as it is not their own
well-being, but order and the common good which they seek,
they are markedly equipped to unite and to give political
guidance to the electors.

It is thanks to the existence of this Institute of Political
Action that we may hope to see the great force of a Union of
Electors remaining at the service of order.

Certainly the members of the Institute are fallible, as
other men; they too are capable of erring and following the
wrong track. But they themselves have a guide—the paper
Vers Demain. And Vers Demain is not published secretly;
it is not circulated by stealth. Any moralist or priest may
examine it. If we consider the fighting spirit of Vers
Demain and the daring line it takes in denouncing politicians
of prestige and powerful influence, we may be sure that the
slightest deviation, the slightest breach of principles of which
it might be guilty, would be sharply reprimanded. Is this not
a sort of safeguard for the doctrinal organ of the
Institute of Political Action and of the Union of Electors?

All this takes away our fears and gives us ardent vigour
to set up as quickly as possible the formidable strength of the
Union of Electors.

Members of the Institute of Political Action, because you
have the light with you, and because you desire what is good,
move forward without fear. Set up the Union of Electors
everywhere. But do not abandon it when it is founded.
Do not abandon it to die of weakness. And do not abandon
it to fall into the hands of wrong-minded men, of revolution-
ary elements or cunning politicians.

---

PARIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

whether action will be taken against the printers and publish-
ers.

The Solicitor-General: I am aware of the publication
to which the hon. Gentleman refers. I am at present giving
this matter consideration.

Mr. H. Hynd: Can the Solicitor-General say whether
the allegations attached to this cartoon are being officially
investigated?

The Solicitor-General: The whole matter is under
review.

---

Exchange Control Bill

Colonel Crosthwaite-Eyre (New Forest and Christ-
church): . . . The position is very simple. The House is
faced with a Measure which is capable of intolerable abuse
by anyone who may not have the particular philosophy of the
present Government. The Solicitor-General told us a couple
of hours ago that it was the desire of H.M. Government to
enforce upon a company the nomination of a particular
director if it will do anything to help the Government to
enforce their policy on a foreign subsidiary. Could anything
be more utterly ludicrous than that a directorship should be
at the disposal of the Government at any time to help their
policy? That surely, at the best, is contrary to the best
commercial practice and at the worst is nepotism of the
worst order. That is the only possible answer that could be
given by anyone who tried to uphold the commercial
traditions of this country.

We come now to the great Clause about which the
Chancellor of the Exchequer said so much, namely, Clause
31—the Clause that is to make everything smooth and
pleasant the Clause which is going to make this Bill work.
The first thing about it is that the right hon. Gentleman
refused to accept an Amendment, whereby he would under-
take, not only on the part of the present Government but on
the part of any future Government, that there should not be
any distinctions made between classes of people, or between
any two subjects of this country. He refuses to allow this
elementary safeguard to be given as to distinctions between
classes. In other words, he leaves it open to himself or his
successor at any time, to make a distinction between those
people whom he may generally favour and those whom he
may not. What he is inclined to do is the fulfilling of that
which we on this side of the House have said so often would
be done—providing jobs for the boys.

At the moment the Government have taken the power
to prevent anything going out of the country. Equally they
have taken power to decide who lives where, and although I
have heard glowing tributes from this side of the House to
the Meteorological Office, I have never heard the Chancellor
of the Exchequer described as a pathfinder. No doubt he
will qualify for that later. The only reasons given by the
Government for the powers they are now taking are, first,
that these powers were used during the war; secondly, that
they will be used with discretion; and, thirdly, that they do
not mean to use them at all. These are the three bells which
have been rung; these are the changes which have been pealed.
As to the question of these powers being used during the
war. I should like to say a word or two and I am glad to
see the Leader of the House present. During the war we
had regulation 18b, and no one suggests that we should start
it again now. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, the
Solicitor-General and the Financial Secretary to the Treasury
got up, time and again during the proceedings on this Bill,
and said no one objected to these powers being used during the
war. No one objected to the use of Regulation 18b
during the war. [HON. MEMBERS: "Yes they did."] I
apologise; certain Members did, but the country generally did
not make any objection. The country never objected to
these powers during the war either, but if the Chancellor
comes down to this House and says, that because no one
during the war objected to the use of these powers, we ought
therefore to use them now, I say it is perfectly ludicrous.
The next argument is that the Chancellor is going to use discretion in the application of these powers. We all know the moods of the right hon. Gentleman. He moves from sun to temper, and back again to sun. Now he is conciliatory, now he is turning and rending his supporters behind him. Now he is smiling his approval on this side of the House. Yes, we all know his moods. The other day he said that this was the 22nd year that he had sat in the House of Commons. May I say to him, "Time marches on." Let us not assume that he will be here for ever.

Mr. Oliver Stanley (Bristol, West): The House has listened to discussions in Committee and on Report upon the various absurdities and anomalies which arise under the Clauses of the Bill as now drafted. Hon. Members must have made their own choice as to which of these Clauses they award the prize. I have hesitated about it a very considerable time. There is Clause 1, which enables the Chancellor of the Exchequer to throw one of our Dominions out of the sterling area, and gives Parliament less opportunity to discuss it. That tremendous economic fact was given last night. There is also Clause 22, under which the Financial Secretary to the Treasury—a man I had always regarded hitherto as being of blameless character—had to admit that he had committed a crime. He had broken the law and laid himself open to prosecution, and it was only thanks to a junior clerk in the Treasury that he was still able to take his place on the Treasury Bench. However, I decided to give the prize to Clause 41. Clause 41, as hon. Members will recollect, is the one which gives the Treasury power to declare that somebody is or is not resident in this country, apparently with no regard whatever to the actual facts of the case. Under this Clause, it is possible for the innocent Eskimo, feeling himself secure in his igloo, which hitherto had been regarded as the Eskimo's castle, to find that the Treasury or the Bank of England has suddenly declared that he is resident in this country, and that unless he hastens to deposit his exiguous stock of blubber and fish-hooks—with, of course, a recognised depositary—he will be guilty of an offence.

We could multiply cases of that kind a hundredfold; in fact it has been done during the Debate. I shall press the point no further.

House of Commons: December 20, 1946.

BILLS PRESENTED

Electricity Bill

"to provide for the establishment of a British Electricity Authority and Area Electricity Boards and for the exercise and performance by that Authority and those Boards and the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board of functions relating to the supply of electricity and certain other matters; for the transfer to the said Authority or any such Board as aforesaid of property, rights, obligations and liabilities of electricity undertakers and other bodies; to amend the law relating to the supply of electricity; to make certain consequential provision as to income tax; and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid," presented by Mr. Shinwell; supported by Mr. Herbert Morrison, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Westwood, the Attorney-General and Mr. Gaitskell; to be read a Second time upon Tuesday, 21st January, and to be printed. [Bill 25.]

Town and Country Planning Bill

"to make fresh provision for planning the development and use of land, for the grant of permission to develop land and for others powers of control over the use of land; to confer on public authorities additional powers in respect of the acquisition and development of land for planning and other purposes, and to amend the law relating to compensation in respect of the compulsory acquisition of land; to provide for payments out of central funds in respect of depreciation occasioned by planning restrictions; to secure the recovery for the benefit of the community for development charges in respect of certain new development; to provide for the payment of grants out of central funds in respect of expenses of local authorities in connection with the matters aforesaid; and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid," presented by Mr. Silkin; supported by Mr. Herbert Morrison, Mr. Arthur Greenwood, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Westwood, the Attorney-General and Mr. Fred Marshall; to be read a Second time upon Tuesday, 21st January, and to be printed. [Bill 26.]

Public Social Services (Cost)

Mr. Benson asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury whether he will give the figure of expenditure on public social services in 1944-45 and 1945-46.

Mr. Glynne Hall: Yes, Sir. Following is a statement giving the figures for 1944-45 (or the latest available year) and 1945-46. These are comparable with the figures published in the OFFICIAL REPORT for 13th December, 1945, in respect of 1943-44 and 1944-45.

(See Table, page 8)

Questions

Sir Ernest Graham-Little has submitted the following questions which he intends to ask in the House of Commons:

"To ask the Minister of Food to name the medical advisers who directly intervened to withdraw from a patient under the care of certain doctors in Birmingham of special distinction in their profession, an allowance of fat essential to the maintenance of their patient's life, the withdrawal of which was followed by his death within a few days; when and in what circumstances was this advice given; and whether as it is a statutory offence punishable by removal from the Register for medical practitioners to offer medical advice or treatment without having seen the patient concerned, he will take steps to prevent a recurrence of this abuse, two recent instances of which have been submitted to him."

"To ask the Minister of Education whether she is aware that several more local authorities whose names have been given to her have imposed or propose to enforce membership of a Trade Union upon teachers in their employ as a condition of employment, and whether in view of regulation 11 S.R.O. May, 1945, the Minister will now ensure that the regulations are observed by local authorities the carrying out of which are her ultimate responsibility."
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**PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES.**

Total Expenditure under Certain Acts of Parliament (other than expenditure out of loans for capital purposes or out of capital receipts).

**Note—** This Statement gives the expenditure on Public Social Services in 1944-45 and 1945-46, the latest years for which details are available, which would have been included in Part 1 of the return to be published in continuation of Command 5906 of November, 1938. Reference should be made to Command 5906 for comparable expenditure in earlier years and for information as to the basis on which the return is compiled, but it should be observed that the explanatory notes given in that return are not now accurate in all respects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>England and Wales</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Total number of persons directly benefiting from the expenditure included in Column 5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Year commencing 1st April</td>
<td>Financial Year commencing 1st April</td>
<td>1944-45 (or latest available year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1944 (or latest available year)</td>
<td>1945 (estimated)</td>
<td>1944 (or latest available year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Unemployment Insurance and Unemployment Assistance Acts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Unemployment Benefit, etc., General Scheme</td>
<td>4,939</td>
<td>13,441</td>
<td>1,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Unemployment Benefit, etc., Agricultural Scheme</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Unemployment Allowances</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Prevention &amp; Relief of Distress</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) National Health Insurance Acts</td>
<td>47,409†</td>
<td>50,875†</td>
<td>5,590†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Widows', Orphans' and Old Age Contributory Pensions Acts</td>
<td>56,285§</td>
<td>57,368§</td>
<td>6,555§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Old Age Pensions Acts</td>
<td>50,510</td>
<td>52,396</td>
<td>5,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Old Age and Widows' Pensions Act, 1940, etc.: Supplementary Pensions</td>
<td>52,815</td>
<td>56,896</td>
<td>5,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Pensions (Navy, Army, Air Force and Mercantile Marine) Act, 1939; Personal Injuries (Emergency Provisions) Act, 1939; Military Training Act, 1939; Reserve and Auxiliary Forces Act, 1939 (War of 1939-45)</td>
<td>38,954</td>
<td>43,131</td>
<td>4,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Education Acts</td>
<td>136,557</td>
<td>169,209</td>
<td>19,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Physical Training and Recreation Act</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Acts relating to Approved Schools</td>
<td>1,732§</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Public Health Acts so far as they relate to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Hospitals and Treatment of Disease</td>
<td>19,657</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>22,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Maternity and Child Welfare Work</td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Midwives Acts</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>4,572</td>
<td>55,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) Housing Acts</td>
<td>46,077</td>
<td>9,141</td>
<td>40,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) Acts relating to the Relief of the Poor</td>
<td>35,944</td>
<td>4,752</td>
<td>570,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) Lunacy and Mental Treatment Acts</td>
<td>3,267</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>127,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p) Mental Deficiency Acts</td>
<td>4,669</td>
<td>10,219</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** | 537,064 | 72,716 | 609,780 |

**Notes.**

* Numbers given are those of insured persons at 3rd July, 1944 (Unemployment) and 31st December, 1945 (Health). See paragraph 6 on page (?) of Command 5906. [Page not given—Editor, T.S.C.]

† The figures given in columns 1 and 3 and columns 2 and 4 relate to the calendar years 1945 and 1946, respectively.

‡ These figures refer to expenditure from the Pensions Account, the Special Pensions Account, the Pensions (Scotland) Account and the Special Pensions (Scotland) Account. Surpluses and deficits in these Accounts are dealt with by transfers to and from the Treasury Pensions Account and the Treasury Special Pensions Account, which cover both England and Wales and Scotland and into which annual contributions are paid by the Exchequer. For the financial year 1944-45 the amount of the Exchequer contribution was £22,525,000.

§ Of this figure £284,000, representing expenditure by local authorities, relates to the financial year 1942-43, the latest year for which figures are available.