

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 18. No. 5.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

Communist Control of Canadian Trade Union

The President of the Canadian Seamen's Union MR. J. A. SULLIVAN, on March 15 resigned from his office as three months earlier he had resigned from the Communist Party, because he was convinced that "the interests of organised labour are being subverted by the agents of Communism to their own ends."

The following is the substance of the statement he made to the press:—

"In 1935, when I first had the idea of starting a seaman's union, it was with the idea of building a seaman's organisation run by seamen and for the good of the seamen. The first few months this was done; however, in the Spring of 1936, Jack Munroe became active and brought in a few of his friends and within a year he was holding an executive position and, in the meantime, I had found out that he was the organizer for the Communist party in District 2, in the City of Montreal. Through him I was introduced to another chap who showed a keen interest and a desire to help to organize the seamen. I later discovered that he had a different name than the one he gave me and that he really was Fred Rose—late member of Parliament. He, in turn, was the party who made connections in the City of Toronto with D. Ferguson and brought about a later meeting between Ferguson and myself. This amalgamation took place in the Communist party headquarters on Adelaide Street, Toronto.

"Later on Munroe got himself into trouble with the Communist party in Quebec and was let out of the union within a year for shortage of funds. In 1937 the entire labour faction of the party was thrown into action to raise funds in preparation of putting a strike against the lake ship-owners. During the strike both I and some of the other executive were responsible for receiving these funds from Alderman J. B. Salsberg. Receipts, etc., of course, were given under various names and the money was repaid by the union to the Communist party prior to an audit being made of the union's books. From then on, as the union opened additional offices, it became the policy to make sure that any additional personnel was either a party man or was at least sympathetic. This policy was carried out even in the national office and party branches established in each of the lake ports. During this period, of course, we had to support the war policy, the Spanish question, and any other popular issue that the national executive of the party decided to support.

"In 1939 the party placed a Miss Freida Lenden, alias Linton, in our office as secretary, however, in the Spring of 1940 I refused to take political directives of her. She later became private secretary to the head of the National Film

Board in Ottawa. She was one of the ones charged under the Royal Commission but, however, left the country and was never brought to trial. During the Spring of 1940, of course, I was arrested and was interned until March 22, 1942. However, the work inside the Union had been carried on but to a lesser degree.

"I became quite active again in the fight for the opening of a second front. In 1942, I was, of course, elected vice-president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada and, as such, was expected to carry on the work of the party within the executive. For example, there was the meeting in Toronto when the Russian students were visiting the North American continent, five organisations, including the seamen sponsored a meeting in the Maple Leaf Gardens. But, as they were making no headway, I was called in by phone in order to throw the influence of the Congress behind the organisational drive to make it a success. In this campaign A. A. McLeod was working with me. Following this, of course, the fight started for a Labour Code in Ontario and again I was drafted to rouse the unions in Ontario to hold a special conference and to appear before the select committee of the Ontario House. The following month, as the secretary of the Congress had resigned, I was moved to Ottawa and became more identified in the national field and, as such, only came in touch with national figureheads when they arrived in Ottawa.

"In the Spring of 1945, when it became known that I was attending the World Trade Union Conference, I was asked by J. B. Salsberg to take a report of the Communist Party work in this country. This I agreed to do, providing that such a report would only be verbal. This was agreed to, and during my stay in London I spent two hours with Harry Pollitt, head of the Communist Party in England, in delivering the report. I was, later, to meet him prior to coming back, but owing to visiting the battlefields on the continent, I did not have the opportunity.

"In the period from 1943 onward the executive of the seamen, the same as lots of other unions had been, gradually, in the process of taking into their ranks, either knowingly or unknowingly, members of the Communist Party—for instance, in Halifax, C. H. Meade, who was an American seaman, but who never sailed in Canada, was drafted in from the N.M.U. [the National Maritime Union of the United States], and who is now in complete charge of the east coast for the seamen and the general secretary for the fishermen; whose wife, at the same time, is the provincial secretary for the Communist Party. Also, on the east coast, Bill Tonner was replaced by Eddie Reid, and then he, in turn, was replaced by A. Penhill, who was a former N.M.U. member, and who also was transferred from the Communist Party in the States. Reid was then moved to Montreal to take over that port, and was given the assistance of Daniels,

whom the party considered a valuable asset, as he can speak both languages fluently, and whose work consists of recruiting members among the young French-Canadians. . . .

"In the National Office, the Communist party, of course, has taken full control, where they have placed Jerry McManus in as secretary but actually his work is to direct all political activities within the organisation.

"Prior to the Seamen's convention, which was held in Montreal in February 1946, out of less than 100 delegates in attendance there was a Communist party fraction held of over 30 members. At that meeting, which was held in the Windsor Hotel, and at which there was present, also, J. B. Salsberg from Toronto and Harry Binder who is in charge of all Communist party work in Quebec, I charged that there was too much party interference in the ranks of the organisation and also that I was fed up with people who were not seamen being brought into the Union. I also stated that I was undecided whether or not I was going to run for re-election. However, I was quickly told by J. B. Salsberg that it wasn't a case of whether or not I wanted to run as they, the Communist party, had made the decision. Communist party discipline does not allow for individual thought and party orders must be obeyed.

"Since the convention and following our strike for the eight-hour day, things have gone from bad to worse, where, every month new people are being placed on the payroll without consulting anyone. . . . The only work that McManus was doing was floating money from the N.M.U. into this country and laying the groundwork for the N.M.U. coming into this country in order that they could take the C.S.U. over. The same thing applies to the Longshoremen and Freight Handlers and the move is, there, to switch them into Harry Bridge's organisation so that in any future strikes, one organisation will control the whole water-front industry in the Dominion of Canada. In this connection, during 1946, \$16,000 in American funds was transmitted from the National Maritime Union of America, C.I.O., to the Canadian Seamen's Union. One of the cheques, number N. 12702, issued on June 18, 1946, was for the sum of \$10,000 and with the American rate of exchange made a total in all of \$11,000.

"While on the question of union funds—control of which passed from me on my election as secretary-treasurer of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada—I would point out that, despite audits, the present executives in charge of finance for the Canadian Seamen's Union have failed to issue a statement to the membership since March, 1946.

"Then there was the Trade Union School at which 60 hand-picked seamen were brought in, the teacher in English being Mr. Leo Huberman. Mr. Huberman was the one who taught educational classes for the National Maritime Union in the United States. The French teacher was Miss Danielle Cuisinier who was the editor of the Communist party paper in Quebec, namely: the *La Victoire*. This class was confined to lake seamen in order to extend and develop Communist party organisers, so that in the near future another fight can be developed. This is a new development and it is proposed that if it is successful, other trade unions, where the Communist party has any influence, will carry on similar schemes. Jerry McManus was the political director during the school in order to see that the proper political facts were placed before the men.

"The same apparatus is in existence in quite a large

number of unions throughout the country. However, I am confining this to the one which is known to be in full control of the Communist party. At the present moment all available forces of the C.S.U. in Montreal are being thrown into the work of campaigning for the L.P.P. candidate in the Cartier riding in Montreal. At least 50 members of the C.S.U. have been ordered into the county. They are doing the work they are told to do by the Communist party directors. They are paid by the C.S.U. It certainly is not in the interest of the union or of seamen to have anything to do with the Communist attempt to have another Communist succeed Fred Rose.

"I am making this document public for my own protection as I know that if I just tender my resignation with my reasons for resigning to the Canadian Seamen's Union, an unavoidable accident might occur to myself as, throughout the country, there are so many Communist party people that one does not know who to trust.

"In closing I can give a few examples:

"A certain trade union leader in Montreal phoned Vancouver to a seamen's organiser concerning bringing in another organisation from the States. Within a week I received copies of the telephone conversation, both the questions and replies were in my hands from Fred Rose. The seamen's leader in Vancouver then telephoned his international in San Francisco on two consecutive days. Within a week or ten days, verbatim reports of both these calls were in my hands and were given to me by Sam Carr here in Ottawa.

"The policemen's strike in Montreal was secretly financed by the Communist party. That party furnished \$9,000 to carry on the policemen's strike.

"As I said before, one does not know who to trust. The Communist party has many secret agents in different places, including the Government service.

"When trust is repaid with treachery, it is time for decent people to beware. I would like to do what I can to arouse the people of Canada and especially the honest, decent men who compose the overwhelming majority of the labour movement in Canada, to the danger of the situation, before it is too late. . . ."

THE AMERICAN AWAKENING

"The Americans have made many mistakes in the last few years through unfamiliarity with the European scene and through prejudice. . . . But this very lack of familiarity has also helped them, for they have not imagined that they knew and understood, were not set in their categories, and have been the quicker to tumble to the truth that they and all of us are confronted with a novel kind of enemy, something that does not fit any previous history or classification. If at the moment the American public is much ahead of the British public, it is because there has been so much vanity as well as intellectual indolence among the politicians and publicists of Britain, who have persisted in translating the new and far-reaching ambitions and tactics of the Communists into language they could understand without effort, the old imperial ambitions of the Tsars. This has led to a profoundly false diagnosis, not least misleading in making the extent of the hostile penetration in our own country underrated."

—*The Tablet*, March 29, 1947.

FROM THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT

Sessional Paper No. 208

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

MOVER:—M. Pouliot, M.P.

QUESTION:—

What are the names of the persons who made joint or individual representations to the Government in favour of the accused persons in the Gouzenko espionage investigation.

The attached information has been received by the Secretary of State of Canada from the Department of Justice and the Office of the Prime Minister.

ANSWER OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mrs. David Shugar [*]
Mrs. D. G. Lunan.
A. M. Davidson.

ANSWER OF THE OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

(a) (i) Persons who made representations before charges were laid:

The Executive of the Ottawa Branch of the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers.
Mrs. David Shugar.
Mrs. D. G. Lunan.

(ii) Persons who made representations after charges were laid but before decisions were handed down:

Olive Nightingale
Florence Nightingale
Janice Nightingale
Edythe Nightingale Sykes
W. E. Sykes
Paul A. Gardner
Ottawa Civil Liberties Association
Edgar J. Baker
Labour Progressive Club, Namsack, Saskatchewan
J. R. Holroyd
Tom Leicho
Glen Bowers
George M. Bezansoff, Labour Progressive Club,
Stoney Creek, Saskatchewan
Labour Progressive Club, Arran, Saskatchewan
Alan Kuznitsov
Joseph Konkin
John Kezimo
Prince Rupert Labour Progressive Council, Bruce
Mickleburgh
Jim Valalos
Labour Progressive Party, St. Catharines, Ontario
Labour Progressive Party, Regina, Saskatchewan
Labour Progressive Party Pelly Club, Pelly,
Saskatchewan.
Mrs. Lillian Wylde

(iii) Persons who made representations after decisions were handed down:

Labour Progressive Party, Brandon, Manitoba
Labour Progressive Party, British Columbia,
Maurice Rush, Provincial Organizer
Mrs. Fred Rose

Fred Rose Defence Committee, Alex Gould, Chairman, Michael Buhay, Secretary

K. A. Smith
International Union of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, British Columbia District, Vancouver, B.C.

O. Valliers,
Secretary, Joint Board Montreal Fur Workers Union

R. Lyons
T. Ribbel
Arthur Dumaresq
Rita Dumaresq

Civil Liberties Association of Manitoba

(b) The following persons from the United States of America made representations in favour of Professor Israel Halperin [*] after charges were laid but before a decision was handed down. All are scientists and appear to have taken part in an organised campaign on Professor Halperin's behalf.

Oswald Veblen
Deane Montgomery
Irving Segal
Valentine Bargmann
James W. Alexander
Herman H. Goldstine
Paul R. Halmos
L. P. Eisenhart
John Von Neumann
Frank Aydelotte
Albert Einstein
Hermann Weyl
A. H. Taub
Marston Morse
S. Lefschetz
E. P. Wigner
Albert Tucker
Solomon Bochner
Norbert Wiener
Norman Levinson
Henry Wallman
Wilota Hurewicz
Hassler Whitney
L. H. Loomis
Garrett Birkhoff
Hugh Dowker

Miss Agatha Chapman

The *Vancouver Daily Province* of March 15, 1947, has the following passage subscribing a photograph:—

“Agatha Chapman, former bank economist who was acquitted of a charge of conspiracy to communicate secret information to Russia as part of the Canadian espionage trials, has just accepted a two-year position with the Department of Applied Economics at Cambridge University, England.

“Miss Chapman will do research work in connection with the United Kingdom national income. She will leave on the Cunard liner “Cavinia” from Halifax about March 25. Her mother, Mrs. E. P. Chapman resides in Vernon.”

[*] Shugar was acquitted.—Ed., *The Social Crediter*.

[*] Professor Halperin was acquitted.—Ed., *The Social Crediter*.

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. 18. No. 5.

Saturday, April 5, 1947.

From Week to Week

A Press report of an election speech by a Jew, Mr. Maurice Hartt, in a Canadian bye-election (probably Montreal-Cartier, rendered vacant by the imprisonment of the Jew "Fred Rose," but not specifically mentioned) stated that Mr. Mackenzie King would announce within a few days "the greatest immigration policy ever conceived."

"When the policy is announced, its greatness will astound the country, and we Jews will have something to be thankful for."

Mr. Hartt said he knew the details having helped in the planning.

One of the many astounding examples of political degeneracy which Great Britain is offering to a contemptuous world is contained in the apathetic acceptance of the "man-power shortage" racket. There is, of course, no such shortage. Merely numerically, there are half a million more workers than in 1939. The density of the population of these islands, in spite of large thinly populated areas, is 504 per sq. mile, the density of Canada is 3 per sq. mile, of the States 36 per sq. mile, and Australia 2 per sq. mile. On the basis of these figures, it is actually argued that we could support ourselves better if we allowed practically unrestricted immigration of the throwouts of Europe, mostly ghetto Jews, all of whom would instantly gravitate to the towns: including the new ones being built for them by Mr. Silkin.

While both Australia and Canada are with some reluctance taking emigrants, who, so far as they can avoid pressure, are selected from picked British stock, the States immigration laws are more stringent than they have ever been; although they are being evaded.

We have little doubt that any one of thousands of medium sized businesses in these islands could provide a critic who would diagnose with general accuracy the main causes of economic disaster in national affairs. The hundreds of thousands of useless bureaucrats, with their overhead charges in buildings, transport and equipment; the complete absence of what an ordinary business man would call a coherent policy, and the blocking of such policies as do emerge by Departmental jealousies, intrigues, and sheer incompetence; the London-School-of-Economics type of Minister and Higher Civil Servant, with their peculiar and fatal inability to keep away from collective nouns, and its complementary vice of mistaking quantity for quality; and the subordination of policy to elective bribery, are enough to wreck any undertaking, however fundamentally practicable.

Stern measures will be necessary if the wreck is not to be final and complete.

General Sir Gifford Martel was the Chief of the British Military Mission to Russia during the most critical phase of the war, and is generally credited by experts as having averted the fall of Stalingrad and the collapse of Moscow. His book, *The Russian Outlook*, just published, confirms what anyone who has contacted the Russians knows—that they are attractive people to meet casually, but absolutely impossible to deal with in serious business. It is no doubt the former characteristic which has been so valuable in converting various fellow-travellers to the beauties of Communism, as presented in cock-tail parties in the Kremlin.

General Martel arrives at the conclusion common to everyone who deals with Asiatics in matters of importance—that there is nothing so fatal as compromise and that toughness is the only attribute to which they respond. We have always considered that a considerable responsibility for the abject failure of our Russian policy before the last outbreak of war rested on Mr. Anthony Eden, and we have no doubt at all that Mr. Ernest Bevin is a better negotiator with Molotov and his cohorts. Mr. Eden is the simulacrum of a type which was once the best diplomatic material in the world; but it was a different world, just as the Kremlin has different occupants.

The Recorder of March 22 brings into prominence a fact which is known to the majority of the inhabitants of these Isles, but is blacked out from all forms of large scale publicity, most of all the incorruptible "B."B.C. (whiskey and cigars as ordered).

The fact is that "we are living in a world of our own, exactly like the people of Russia." Our charming rulers state plainly that they are internationalists if not formally anti-British; but they are determined that the less we know of the comforts available in every land except Russia and the parts of Germany ruled from London and Moscow, the greater will be our admiration for their transcendent virtues. They err.

The Stevenage Case

The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal by the Minister of Town and Country Planning from the decision of Mr. Justice Henn Collins whereby he quashed the Stevenage New Town (Designation) Order, 1946, made by the Minister on November 11, 1946.

In the course of his judgment Lord Oaksey, L. J., expressed no opinion on the policy of the Act. That was not a matter for the Court. The evidence relied on by Mr. Justice Henn Collins was in his (Lord Oaksey's) opinion no evidence of bias, in view of the affidavit of the Minister as to what he had considered and of his letter written in November, 1946, setting out the considerations which led him to make the order. Consequently the objectors, as applicants under the Act, had not discharged the onus lying on them of showing that the Minister was biased when he made the order. The appeal would be allowed.

LORD JUSTICE MORTON and LORD JUSTICE TUCKER gave judgments agreeing.

Leave to appeal to the House of Lords was given on terms that the petition of appeal was lodged within four weeks.

An Introduction to Social Credit*

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

Part III.—POLITICS.

(2)

To have a *policy* is to take action to achieve some chosen objective.

Administration, on the other hand, is much more nearly synonymous with "means." It concerns the technical arrangements necessary to carry a policy into effect. It is not the action taken to achieve an objective, but the methods which that action makes use of.

For example, a bank may have a policy of contracting credit, the immediate objective being to reduce the advances made by the bank. This policy will be initiated by some sort of directive, and carried through by supervision and further directives. The policy is *administered*, however, by the technical staff of the bank. Administration involves specialised knowledge of book-keeping methods, law, and expediency, as well as of specific banking procedure.

With this distinction in mind, we must examine the nature of the policy administered by and through the banking system. As we have already seen, the banking system is, through the central banks, integrated into a world banking system; the system is a world organisation, and clearly that organisation must have some general over-riding policy.

One way to describe that policy is to say that it is to maintain and secure the predominance of the banking system; and this means, of course, the power of those ultimately in control of the system to impose policy on—to issue directives to—the industry and Governments of the world.

The banking system is, in fact, a system of world government, and when this fact is realised it is easy to see that it constitutes a form of world dictatorship. And what might be called the derived policies arising from this situation comprise the practical policies of the banking system. These are policies designed to secure the predominance of an international medium of monetary exchange; to maintain the "value" of money in the commodity sense; and to facilitate the administration of banking policy.

This latter policy is expressed in the promotion of centralisation in every sphere: the amalgamation of businesses into combines or cartels, the union of autonomous political areas into federations, the strengthening of the federal government at the expense of its constituent parts; and the organisation of populations into trades and professional unions, and the "federalisation" of these.

In short, the policy promoted by those in control of the banking system is centralisation of everything: the promotion of a pyramidal form of world organisation with the banking system at the apex. The policy is, in fact, the centralisation of the control of policy: *totalitarianism*.

Money-power was used in the first place to secure a monopoly of money-power; and the monopoly of money-power—the monopoly of credit—was used to bring about a monopoly of political power.

*Now appearing in *The Australian Social Crediter*. The commencement of Dr. Monahan's essay, publication of which has been interrupted, appeared in *The Social Crediter* on January 25.

Anticipating the early republication of Dr. Monahan's work in more permanent form, we have omitted his admirable treatment of the economics of Social Credit which occupies Part II.

We are witnessing today the consolidation of political monopoly. The number of *effective* autonomous governments in the world is being reduced: we are at the stage of the Big Five, Big Four, Big Three, or Big Two-and-a-half, according to the context. And at the same time, the administrative agencies of a single world government are being brought into being.

Another aspect of the construction of a world monopoly of control is the "nationalisation" of banking. What this means is, of course, the amalgamation of banking and government. It would be too much to ask public opinion to swallow anything which might be called the "bankisation" of government, so that it is essential, if the process is to be got away with, that it should be called by a name which would at the least not antagonise public opinion. But it is a matter of observation that the control of banking policy remains in the same hands; and the combination of banking and political power is rendered independent of the public as regards obtaining money for government purposes.

And in just the same way, "socialism" is a political technique to reconcile public opinion to the final stages of the construction of monopoly. Socialism is centralisation, the policy of the bankers. The objective—and we can see the steps to its consummation day by day and week by week—is world government dominated by those at the head of the international banking system, and supported by a world police force and control of food supplies and essential raw materials by the agencies of that government.

This is a bare outline of the politics of banking control; it is unnecessary to fill it out, since it is the subject matter of contemporary Social Credit literature. Apart from the theoretical approach we have adopted, there is abundant evidence.

But one further point of extreme importance must be mentioned. For some years it was an open question whether the policy pursued by the banking system was merely a natural consequence of its structure; that is to say, whether the accident of the development of the system had thrown certain men to the top, who more or less unconsciously protected their position and its privileges. On the other hand was the possibility that the whole situation was the result of conscious intention.

In 1935 a Government was elected in Alberta, Canada, with a mandate to put into effect certain Social Credit technical proposals. *Every attempt to carry out this mandate was "disallowed" by the Federal authorities*, and a tremendous campaign of publicity was put into operation to discredit the Government. In this campaign quite obviously deliberate and conscious lies and misrepresentation were made use of, and the conscious intention behind the disallowances and publicity were perfectly evident. In any case, if Social Credit theories were fallacious, the quickest way of disposing of them would be to allow them a trial under circumscribed conditions; and nobody can miss the significance of the fact that that trial has up to the present been prevented by agencies outside Alberta, although the people of Alberta have three times voted for that trial.

For the wider evidence of conscious intention behind the policy of the banking system—evidence which establishes the deliberate intention to make use of world war and other catastrophes in the pursuit of the ultimate objective—readers are referred to *The Brief for the Prosecution* by C. H. Douglas.

(To be continued).

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 19, 1947.

Royal Navy, U-Boats (Generating Plant)

Mr. Grimston asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty (1) if diesel engine generating plant and batteries were removed from captured German U-boats before these vessels were sunk;

(2) how many diesel engines and generating sets have been salvaged from German U-boats; and how many have been disposed of.

The Parliamentary and Financial Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. John Dugdale): Diesel engine generating plant and batteries were not removed from captured German U-boats before they were sunk. As stated by the First Lord of the Admiralty, in reply to the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetlands (Sir B. Neven-Spence) on 23rd January, 1946, these U-boats were sunk in accordance with our international obligations. This equipment formed an integral part of the U-boats and it would not have been possible to remove it within the time set for carrying out these obligations. Salvage operations would not be possible.

Mr. Grimston: Were no efforts made to change the arrangements when it was becoming apparent that this generating plant would be extremely valuable?

Mr. Dugdale: The U-boats had to be sunk within two months of the time of the settlement of the agreement, and the two months included the time necessary for them to be taken to a place where they were to be sunk, and that was over 15 months ago.

Sir Ronald Ross: Have all the submarines been sunk within the two months, including those allotted to other Powers?

Mr. Dugdale: That is quite another question.

Supply—Report: Manpower Distribution

Mr. Jack Jones (Bolton): I welcome the opportunity of taking part in this Debate. I do not intend to indulge in reiteration about things that happened in the past or to scratch old sores. I hope the Debate will develop on lines which are constructive and that we will gain at least some advantages. I wish to speak as one who is critical of the Government's position, and I hope that will not be taken amiss. This is a serious position which requires very careful consideration and practical commonsense must be applied by people who understand the various industries. I speak in this Debate as one of the very few men in this House who never in his life has earned a penny piece except under an incentive system which paid on results. I come from an industry which has a specialised set-up in regard to payment. It is an industry which does not publicise itself sufficiently. Our men get on with their jobs. They get results. They are paid accordingly and they cause very little trouble. The industry, I refer to is the steel industry, and we are proud of it.

We have made a contribution in the past and we want to make a contribution to the future prosperity of our nation. We have gone into this matter very carefully. I believe in all that is said in, "Let us face the future," and I make no apology for that. But at the same time we must always

remember that in addition to facing the future we must face the facts as they exist today. I want to put forward some constructive proposals. The question of the numerical strength of manpower is one thing; the correct use of our manpower is another. I ask the Government whether they are satisfied that the manpower available to this country—be it ever so small—is being used correctly. I question that. I want to quote from my own personal experience of working for 32 years on a production basis, never receiving a like wage from one week to another. My wage always altered according to what was produced. No man in this House can tell me that it is impossible to devise a system inside Britain's industries which will give, first and foremost, a decent minimum standard of life and, in addition, the incentive which will create output and get things moving.

I will refer to one figure which goes to prove my point. On the 7th of last month we in our industry brought into being a new national agreement. They are not talk, not hot air, but actual agreements to deal with potential increases in production. Here is a figure which may stagger the House. Men working on a basic open hearth furnace producing 1,130 tons a week, and who now go on to the new method of the continuous working week, in the interest of the State—not a reduced number of hours: the plant is working all through the week for 168 hours—will be paid at the rate of one shilling and 4.2362 pence per ton. That makes hon. Members opposite smile, but it proves how very careful we have been to assess the value of a man producing a ton of steel. We have gone to the extent of two tenths of a thousand of a penny. That is a hint to those people, for instance, in the building industry who say that they cannot work on an incentive basis. The steel industry has had its troubles. We asked for more food. If there is an industry in this country where men slog, sweat, slave, and lose weight, just like the miner, it is the steel industry. We asked for more food, but we did not get it, but our men have not unduly cried out about this fact.

I suggest that the Government should have applied themselves in the last 12 months to what the Trades' Union Congress and the leaders of the trade unions have been thinking. This is my personal opinion. I do not know the opinion of the Government. I am not satisfied that His Majesty's Government, of whom we are proud, have done all that they might have done to find out what the leaders of the various trade unions have been up to during the last 12 or 18 months. They may have done that, but there appears to me to have been no real concerted action on the part of the various trade unions with the Government. We get all manner of lack of concerted action. Coal goes on to a five-day week, the engineers ask for a 44-hour week, and the textile industry are asked to work a two-shift system, or so the President of the Board of Trade says in my constituency, the biggest textile constituency in the country. He tells us that we should have a two-shift system, and the people in the industry tell him that they have not sufficient fuel to work a two and a half day week. We must face this position. There are too many contradictory statements. It would be a good thing when the President of the Board of Trade goes into industrial areas, if he would acquaint the hon. Members who represent those areas with the fact that he intends to go. We can be helpful to him: if we cannot, we have no right to be in this House. We must put up with visits by people stating the Government's case on paper, but I want to state what the Government's case should be in fact. We get all

sorts of anomalies, with trade unions making different agreements not in conformity with each other. They do not dovetail in the way in which they should into a proper industrial economy.

Let us take the position of the miners. I do not want to scratch old sores. In fact I want to compliment the miners on what they have achieved. They have achieved a five-day week. Whether that is in the best interests of the country in its present desperate position remains to be seen. They have achieved better wages. They were long overdue. They have achieved more food and more clothes. That was also long overdue. But I ought to say that that extra food and those extra clothes can only come out of the restricted minimum economy which this country now has. It can only come out of the common pool at the expense of those who have to do without them, and therefore some statesmanship should be shown by the miners' leaders and something should be given in return. The miners have achieved no conscription. I am all for that. I would it were possible to live in a world where there is not even a policeman in uniform, let alone a soldier, but that is not yet. The miners are entitled to these things; they should have had them 40 years ago. I did not move about in the mining villages when a boy without seeing what was wrong. But when the miners are given these things, the nation has a perfect right to ask something in return.

I have a question for the miners—not the miners' leaders but the miner himself—the rank and file, the honest-to-God fellow who slogs and slaves nearly every day of his life: are you satisfied that you will by working a five-day week bring this country to an economic state which you yourself would desire, and having got these advantages, are you not prepared to see that the rest of your brothers in other industries get that better life you will now get? I do not say it is too good—or good enough—it could be better, but at the moment every miner has a perfect right to do what he can to get for others all that he himself has gained.

Mr. D. J. Williams: Does the hon. Member realise that all these privileges for coalminers simply have to be accepted by the coalminers because they cannot enter another industry?

Mr. Jones: I agree. The Essential Work Order still applies to the miner. I am not trying to belittle the right of the miner to the things he is getting. I made that very clear to the House. I would that all industries were getting the same. It was suggested in a very able speech by the right hon. Member for the City of London (Sir A. Duncan) last week that we should go ahead and purchase something like 10 million tons of coal from America this year. I have been going into the question of what that might cost, and I am assured that it would mean the expenditure out of a very restricted dollar purse of something between 150 million to 200 million dollars. I respectfully suggest that no thinking miner would want to see 200 million dollars' worth of coal coming from America if it could be got by our own miners. The question of shipping space is also concerned in that. The miner would prefer to see 200 million dollars' worth of goods other than coal coming into this country every year so that a better standard of life could be brought about.

I ask the Front Bench, the Cabinet, or even the Prime Minister himself to make one last appeal and to ask those grand men in the mines to give us the extra tonnage we so desperately need, at all events for the remainder of this year. I believe it can be done, especially if the request is made to

the younger miners, if not to the older miners. If we ask the young, lusty, able, efficient younger miners for some extra shifts for some weeks, we might get a reply to astonish this House. I believe we should make that effort, and at all events we should ask for the absolute maximum output because of this agreement which has been reached inside the steel industry. We say that on a seven-day continuous working week this country can be given 750,000 to one million tons more steel under the present plan, but that cannot possibly be achieved unless we get the coal to do it. That is the point. One million tons extra of steel means one million tons of steel going out partly into light engineering and partly to the Argentine and elsewhere where we can build up our dollar reserves and thereby get better food.

I make my appeal to the miners, even if it is only an individual appeal. It may meet with opposition, but I care not about that because I am speaking with a conscience that tells me that this can be done and ought to be done. All other workers are watching this position. Nothing has been said by other trade unions about this extra food and clothes, but do not let the House think that the position is not being carefully watched by every trade union in the country. Do not let the House make that mistake. The miners are fully entitled to have these advantages, but do not let us misunderstand the position. The other unions—the men in the foundries, on the railways, in agriculture and in the heavy industries—are saying, "If it can be given to them, why can it not be given to us, particularly to those of us who will increase our hours of production as against those who are decreasing them?"

It is no use this House burying its head in the sand and blinding itself to the facts. The Opposition are well versed in what is going on in various parts of the country. Of course, there are restrictive practices in certain pockets among certain people arising from lack of co-ordination and understanding. They will only be found in the great masses of persons who believe it is right to try to get back some of the things they lost in the past. They should be swept away. There is no such thing as "something for nothing." This House should today concern itself with problems of this description. In this Debate we can make a very useful contribution, if every hon. Member of the House will search his soul and speak the truth. There has been talk from the other side of the House about restriction of this, that and the other. If there was time to discuss it there would be scope to speak of the need for restriction in profits. But the time has arrived for all concerned to get right down to brass tacks and to the survival of this nation as such—[HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear."—if we do not get down to that we shall have lost this fine opportunity to make a contribution which history will say was worthy of this occasion.

Palestine (Illegal Immigration)

Mr. M. Lindsay asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is satisfied that U.N.R.R.A. is not being used as a cover for the organisation of illegal immigrants to Palestine.

Mr. McNeil: I am satisfied that the U.N.R.R.A. organisation as a whole is not being used as a cover for the organisation of illegal immigration to Palestine.

House of Commons: March 17, 1947.

Human Rights Commission (British Representative)

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs who was the British representative on the Human Rights Commission, and what were the names of the advisers who travelled to New York for the occasion.

Mr. McNeil: The United Kingdom representative was Mr. Charles Dukes. He was assisted as adviser by Mr. Geoffrey Wilson, and by an official from the Foreign Office.

Mr. W. J. Brown: As Mr. Charles Dukes is a strong protagonist of the closed shop principle, does the right hon. Gentleman regard him as a suitable member to serve upon the Human Rights Commission?

Mr. McNeil: As the hon. Gentleman, at least, used to know, there is probably no institution in the world other than the British trade union which has taken such an interest in the matter.

Mr. Lindsay: Will the right hon. Gentleman say why no woman sits on this Commission?

Mr. McNeil: As the hon. Gentleman knows, we were entitled to have only one representative on the Commission, and naturally we have placed a woman on the Commission dealing with women's rights.

Mr. W. J. Brown's Case

On March 26, the Speaker of the House of Commons ruled that a *prima facie* case had been made out for reference to the Committee of Privileges of allegations that pressure had been brought to bear on Mr. W. J. Brown, Independent member for Rugby, by an outside body.

The case was raised by Mr. Byers, as Mr. Brown had temporarily lost his voice, and after the Speaker had given his ruling, the House decided to refer the matter of the complaint to the Committee of Privileges.

Mr. Byers said that when, on his election to the House, Mr. Brown agreed to act as parliamentary secretary to the Civil Service Clerical Association it was made clear, in an agreement drawn up between Mr. Brown and the association, that on general political matters he was to be completely free to speak and vote as he thought right. After the association became affiliated to the T.U.C. the executive committee of the association brought strong pressure to bear on Mr. Brown not to speak or write in a sense contrary to the policies of the T.U.C. or the Labour Party, but Mr. Brown refused to accept such limitation of his freedom.

Later, said Mr. Byers, officers of the executive offered Mr. Brown certain financial compensation if he would end his agreement with the association, but he replied that it was a matter for the annual conference to determine. He had also warned the executive that a question of privilege might arise out of the proceedings.

At its last meeting yesterday the executive committee decided to table a motion for the annual conference to the effect that it was desirable that the agreement should be brought to an end. Was it proper, asked Mr. Byers, that pressure should be brought to bear on a member of the House by an outside body to compel him to take a certain political line; and that when he refused to comply the executive committee of the body should attempt to terminate the agreement with the member for his services as an employee of the association?

1848 BLUE PRINT 1947

Few would now venture seriously to uphold Karl Marx's philosophy or economics in detail. The Marxian system, as one of Marx's biographers has pointed out, is pictorial representation, not proof. It was a picture in 1848: it is something grimmer today.

The following summary of THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO is quoted from E. H. CARR'S Karl Marx, cited by H. A. L. FISHER in A History of Europe, p. 1231:

The immediate reforms advocated in the Communist manifesto are:

1. The expropriation of landed property and the use of rent from land to cover state expenditure.
2. A high and progressively graded income tax.
3. The abolition of the right of inheritance.
4. The confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. The centralisation of credit for the needs of the state by the establishment of a state bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. The centralisation of transport in the hands of the state.
7. An increase in the state ownership of factories and instruments of production and the redistribution and amelioration of agricultural land on a general plan.
8. Universal obligation to work and the creation of labour armies especially for agriculture.
9. The unification of agriculture with industrial labour and the gradual abolition of the difference between town and country.
10. The public education of all children. Abolition of factory labour for children in its present form. Unification of education with economic production.

Then after detailed criticism of contemporary socialist movements, which now possesses only an historical interest, the Manifesto proceeds to its famous peroration, ending with the slogan which had already figured on the title page of the *Kommunistische Zeitschrift*:

"The communists consider it superfluous to conceal their opinions and their intentions. They openly declare that their aims can only be achieved by the violent overthrow of the whole contemporary social order.

"Let the governing classes tremble before the communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose in it but their chains. They have the whole world to gain.

"Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

THE RULERS OF RUSSIA

BY

Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.

New and enlarged edition.

PRICE: 1/6. (POSTAGE EXTRA).

FROM

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.