THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No.18. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper. Postage (home and abroad) Id. SATURDAY, JULY 3, 1948. 6d. Weekly.

Radio and Press

Mr. Jaques's Charges in Canadian Parliament

We publish the following from the Official Report of the Canadian House of Commons for May 31 because of its evidential value:—

PALESTINE—THREAT TO WORLD PEACE

Mr. Norman Jaques (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, what I am about to say I had intended to say during the debate on the budget. In order to expedite the taking of the vote last Thursday evening, I agreed to defer my remarks until a motion for the house to go into committee; otherwise I would have spoken on the budget.

Tonight I wish to discuss a situation which I think is dangerous, and becoming more dangerous. I refer to the Zionist-Communist propaganda which is general not only in the United States but in Canada, and which is strongly anti-British. I refer particularly, of course, to the Palestine question. I am not going to discuss the actual conditions in Palestine itself; that matter does not concern me at the present time. What I am concerned about is how the war between the Zionists and the Arabs is extending outside, or is likely to extend outside beyond the boundaries of Palestine and to bring about—indeed it is bringing about—a great deal of ill-feeling and hostility among nations which otherwise would be friendly and together.

In fact, if one reads the propaganda or listens to the radio, and statements made, one might believe that Great Britain is a foreign country. Canadians are being told to regard Great Britain, and those countries which agree with her foreign policies, as enemy countries.

According to the press, Zionist high command have appealed to Russia for assistance not only against the Arabs but against Great Britain and the Arabs. That is the statement which appeared in Saturday's press. Let me quote first of all a British statement dated at London May 22, which says:

Britain was reported reliably today to have told the United States preservation of Arab friendship is essential to safeguard the middle east against the march of Communism.

Again it says that the United States ambassador saw Mr. Bevin and discussed the situation, and continues:—

Though official sources refused formal comment it was learned British officials here and in Washington have told the United States Arab-British relations must be maintained as a "great barrier against the flow of Communism to the south."

Taking that as a basis, which I do—I accept it—as the soundest statement that can be made on the subject, it now appears that in the united nations organization Russia and the United States are lined up against Great Britain. That is the situation which has arisen as a consequence of Palestine policy.

I should like to read this statement by Sir Ellsworth Flavelle which was printed last week in the press:

At this point I wish to state as a warning my profound conviction concerning the Irgunists and Sternists. My feeling is shared by my colleagues of the world committee and of the Canadian Palestine committee. The future prestige, welfare and indeed survival of this modern Jewish state depends upon the success of its government in eliminating from the Palestinian Jewish community the activities of these terrorists whose operations as gunmen and assassins have been deplored and condemned by all civilized peoples.

Failure to suppress these terrorists will alienate opinion and support from the Jewish state among men of good will throughout the world, and, through them, the support of their governments.

That may be the opinion of Sir Ellsworth Flavelle, but that is certainly not a true picture so far as the situation is concerned, because these terrorists operate not only or even mainly in Palestine, but outside as well. And all those people of good will who have seen the danger of the situation for several years and who have done their level best to inform and to warn the Canadian people—not only the Canadian people but the American people and the British people—as to its dangers; those of us who have tried to inform public opinion of the dangers we saw so clearly have come under the same terrorist organization as British soldiers and officials in Palestine itself. I shall give proof of that before I take my seat. . .

Then Sir Ellsworth Flavelle says:

All the world knows that the UNO are giving final form and substance to the best legal and moral judgment of united nations.

That also I shall show is not the opinion of everybody by any means. It is all very well to say that we condemn the methods of these terrorists, but what has been done effectively?

Has anyhing effective been tried to put a stop to them?

Let me quote from an advertisement in the United States paper freely sold and circulated throughout Canada, from one side to the other. I refer to the New York paper *PM*. It states:

For the British the situation in Palestine deteriorated only when the Arabs began to run. Hagana and Irgun took over Haifa. Irgun pushed into Jaffa, took Manshiyeh quarter and turned it over to Hagana. The Arab-Nazi gangsters were thrown into panic The Arabs began to run like rats. The British were shocked. They had expected the Arab-Nazi stooges and pimps to slaughter "the Jews." By that time they expected to be well out of Palestine. Then Bevin could look the world in the eye and say: "Who, me? We weren't even there. Can we help it if the Arabs and Jews kill each other?"

I say that sort of propaganda is absolutely unfair and it is a menace to world peace. It states further:

Sanctimoniously the British will say, or are already saying, that they are sending their troops back to reinforce the truce to serve the U.N. Our state department—

That is the United States state department.

—is exerting itself to help foster this lie. It is a lie. The only truce the British will support in Palestine is a devil's truce designed to wipe out the Hebrews.

It is hardly necessary for me to mention the Zionist intimidation and terrorism, the sending of bombs and of

letters threatening death, the different methods which have been carried out in more than one instance even at the risk of innocent people being murdered. In contrast to this, I should like to quote a news release by the Canadian Arab news service which I, along with other members of the house, received last week. This is issued by Mr. Massoud, who I believe is president of the Canadian Arab friendship league:

"The hatred and propaganda dispensed by some high-pressure groups of this country and the United States has resulted in the present slaughter of thousands of innocent people in the Holy Land. Our warnings of the past five years and our appeals to the Jewish people and their fanatical supporters have not been heeded. Now that Arabs are fighting and defending their homes and while the battle is about to gain momentum, we are again appealing to all those responsible, including the members of the various governments who favoured partition of the Holy Land, to realize the implication of their action of the past.

"The Canadian Arab friendship league." Mr. Massoud said, "will have no part in the fighting. We are firstly Canadian citizens and, as such, have done our duty when we worked for peace in the Holy Land. We also know that none of the Arab countries now engaged in the struggle would ask for our military assistance. There will be no maple leaf battalion fighting on the side of the Arabs, no matter how many similar groups may be recruited by the *News*."

I quote that to show the difference in the spirit of the two sides. It cannot be said that these things are being done only by groups like the Irgun and other so-called terrorist organizations because, as I said before no effort has been made by the high command to suppress these people. In fact the terrorist groups are in the van leading the Zionist troops. It was stated officially by these Zionist terrorists that any British who were caught or captured in the war would be shot as criminals. I wonder what the reaction would have been in Canada if that threat had been made by the Arabs against the late "Buzz" Beurling. Had "Buzz" Beurling been fortunate enough to have survived and unfortunate enough to have been captured in Palestine. I have no doubt he would have been treated by the Arabs as an honourable prisoner of war. There again is the difference in the spirit of the two sides. That difference is not confined to Palestine; it extends outside Palestine.

I mentioned Zionist propaganda and their control of the radio and the press. From time to time I have made radio broadcasts based on speeches I had made in this house in an effort to throw some light on a dangerous situation. One broadcast was simply suppressed; not one word was put on the air, though I knew nothing of it until afterward. The last broadcast of a few weeks ago was censored. I shall not mention the name of the station or of the manager, because I do not think that would be fair.

I do not hold this manager responsible, because he is in fear of this same terrorist organization. That is quite obvious from what he said when he objected to certain statements which I had made in my broadcast.

In particular, I find in your speech such statements as, page 5. "And so it is with Zionism: All Zionists may not be Communists, but all Communists and fellow-travelling Socialists back Zionism."

That is a fair statement and I make it without fear of successful contradition. Then I mentioned that Henry Morgenthau is an international financier and Zionist. I had to cross out the words "and Zionist" for the same reason. Another statement to which he objected was:

In my speech I was glad to pay my humble tribute to the British soldiers and policemen in Palestine who through all these years have borne the brunt of savage Zionism gangsterism.

More than 300 British soldiers and policemen in Palestine have been murdered in cold blood by these same Zionist organizations, but I was not to be allowed to pay that tribute over the radio to our own kith and kin. The station manager went on to say:

Within the listening area of this station there are many Jews of the highest probity and reputation—some of our best and most substantial citizens are of that race. I cannot think that it is in the public interest, nor, that it is fair, for them and their race to be maligned and attacked.

In other words, I might hurt the feelings of these fine gentlemen by expressing my sympathy for the 300 British men, our kith and kin, who were murdered in Palestine by Zionists.

Mr. Blackmore: And in a Canadian broadcast.

Mr. Jaques: Have those fine citizens ever raised their voices against these murders? If they have I have never heard them. Have they ever come out and publicly condemned the terrorists in Palestine? If they have I have never heard them. I have every sympathy with the manager of this station because I know the power of this organization. He goes on to say:

I do not think that my obligation as the licensee of the station compels me to carry speeches containing quotattions such as those outlined in the quotations given.

Everybody knows today that radio is one of the greatest means of expressing public opinion. We are told that if we are to preserve our freedom we must preserve the freedom of the press at all costs. But when you want to deal with political Zionism there is no freedom in the press or on the radio, as I shall prove.

I might mention, and here I am betraying no secrets because it was made public at the time, last December, the editor of the paper run by the movement of which I am a member published a statement which I put on *Hansard* the last time I spoke, and as a result of my attempts to warn the country of the danger of this situation, the Canadian Zionist League—this is their statement, not mine—forced the resignation of the two editors of the *Canadian Social Crediter*, because of its anti-Semitism, and it went on to say that the one chiefly affected would be Norman Jaques.

I have said it until I am tired of saying it, that to criticize political Zionism is no more anti-Semitic than it would be for a Tory to critize a Socialist or a Socialist a Tory. But even if it were anti-Semitic, let me point out, that recently a case went to the high court in Great Britain in which an editor had in an editorial in his paper given vent to his feelings as a result of the outrages against his own countrymen in Palestine, and he was sued for seditious libel. That case attracted world-wide attention. It did not get too much publicity in this country; but I took the trouble to send for the evidence which I have here word for word. I am not a lawyer, of course, and I am only quoting counsel for the defence. Counsel for the defence said that subject to the ruling of the court, a man had as much right to criticize the Jews as he had to criticize anybody else. The judge, Mr. Justice Birkett, in summing up told the jury that the most vital aspect of the case was the preservation of the freedom of speech; that it was of the utmost importance that nothing should be done by the court which could in any way impair or injure freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Yet, as I say, with regard to the Palestine question, neither in the press nor on the radio in this country has one been free to make full statements other

than for the Zionist cause.

I might quote two members of congress. Speaking in the house of representatives on December 18, 1947, the Hon. Lawrence Smith said:

> Let us take a look at the record, Mr. Speaker, and see what happened in the united nations assembly meeting prior to the vote on partition. A two-thirds vote was required to pass the resolution. On two occasions the assembly was to vote and twice it was postponed. It was obvious that the delay was necessary because the proponents did not have the necessary votes. In the meantime, it is reliably reported that intense pressure was applied to the delegates of three small nations by the United States members and also by officials "at the highest levels in Washington." Now that is a serious charge. When the matter was finally considered on the 29th—

That would be September 29.

> —what happened! The decisive votes for partition were cast by Haiti, Liberia, and the Philippines. These votes were sufficient to make the two-thirds majority. Previously, these countries opposed the move. Do not forget, Mr. Speaker, that they are considered satellites of our own country.

That is of the United States, of course.

> The pressure by our delegates, by our officials, and by private citizens of the United States constitutes reprehensible conduct against them and against us... Time will tell, and this congress should authorise a full-dress investigation so that the people of this country may know that the united nations has been used in this instance as a vehicle of torture, and not as an instrument of international justice.

The fact is that faith has largely been lost in the united nations, and more on account of this Palestine question than anything else, and today we find that Moscow and New York are lining up against Great Britain. That is the situation which we face today. The people who have advocated political Zionism, which they have a perfect right to do, have gone beyond that and maligned those who have taken the other view and tried to point out the dangers of what they knew must develop. I say that all those people who have banned criticism of political Zionism will now have to rise and testify whether they are on the side of Russian communism or on the side of Canadian democracy and British freedom, or world freedom, for that matter.

I should like to quote another member of the United States Congress. Hon. Edward Gossett, speaking in the house of representatives on December 11 last, said:

> It seems to me to be ironic and tragic that we should be fighting Communism with the one hand and encouraging it with the other. I refer to what seems to me a stupid, if not a criminal, act on the part of our delegation to the united nations in the partition of Palestine and in the delivery of that part of the world to Communist influence. By that act alone we have taken a major step toward antagonising the whole Moslem world...
>
> In this Palestine partition we have played petty partisan politics on the very threshold of what should be an American century. We have jeopardized American leadership by such tactics; we may have signed the death knell of the united nations. It seems to me it might be well for the foreign affairs committee to investigate the part played by American delegates to the united nations. Not only was their action in the parttition of Palestine a great disservice to the Jews but it was also a very real service to Communism in the far east, the middle east, and in the near east.
>
> It is doubtful that all the money we have spent and will spend in Europe can offset the evil we have done in the rest of the world by our meddling with the Palestine question.

That opinion agrees with the British official statement which I quoted at the beginning of my remarks, in which they said that if communism is to be stopped spreading in the near, the middle and the far east, then we must retain the good will of the Moslem world. As I say, those who have supported the Zionist cause, which, of course, they had a right to do, could plead that, up to now they were mistaken; but they cannot say that any longer in the face of the situation as it is today. We have to choose. We have either to make a stand for British, western and world freedom or take our stand in support of world communism. That is the situation, and without being political in the least I make the statement that one reason the Communists are supporting the C.C.F. is that the C.C.F. as an organization, support and strongly support, have gone out of their way to support, political Zionism. It is a fact that not only the C.C.F., but Socialists everywhere support Zionism. I do not mean Labour when I say Socialists. The C.C.F., backed the Zionists and the Communists back both. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. Gibson (Comox-Alberni): Do the C.C.F. concur in that?

Mr. Jaques: I am quite willing to acquit them of any wrong intention. I am quite willing to believe that they did not understand just what they were doing. I am quite willing to give them that credit. I am perfectly sure that the rank and file have not the faintest idea of what it is all about.

Mr. Argue: You know it all, of course.

Mr. Jaques: I know plenty about it. Any time that anyone wants to debate it with me publicly I shall be very glad to debate it with him. I have nothing to fear.

We are now faced with this situation. The Zionist leaders have appealed to Russia for help against not only the Arabs but against the Arabs and Great Britain. That is the situation as it exists today. Those people who have, as I say, supported Zionism, and who have smeared and tried to discredit the few people who have from the first, seen the danger of this situation, and have done whatever they could to open people's eyes to it, these pro-Zionists sooner or later will be faced with making a decision whether they are going to stand and support Great Britain and freedom, Canadian freedom, western freedom, world freedom, if you like, against the threat of Communism; otherwise all this talk about the threat of Communism is so much nonsense. It is either true or it is not true. If it is true; if Communism is a threat to our way of life, then I say that Communist threat is intensified by the actions of Zionism extremists and their supporters in this country, in the United States and elsewhere.

Before I close, I might mention the recent election in South Africa, the result of which apparently came as a great shock to some people. I do not think there is any doubt as to one reason for the result. I forget how long ago it was, but shortly before the election Prime Minister Smuts, without saying anything to any other dominion, so far as I know, told the world that his government would recognize the new state in Palestine. A few days later he went to the polls and was defeated. If that recognition did not defeat him, it did not help to save him from defeat. I might say that so far as I can gather, the South African election was largely determined on the question of sovereignty. That was made clear by the new prime minister. He was asked what his ideas were with regard to a republic, and he said, "We are not bothering about a republic. Under a republic we should never have more or better freedom than we have today as a sovereign country within the British Commonwealth."

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but he has exhausted his time.

Mr. Jaques: If I might add one more sentence.

Mr. Gibson (Comox-Alberni): Go ahead.

Mr. Speaker: Unless the hon. member has unanimous

consent, he cannot proceed.

Mr. Gibson (Comox-Alberni): Let him finish.

Mr. Jaques: I merely wish to refer to a referendum in Australia, where the result was determined by a vote against the federal authorities retaining the controls formerly belonging to the states which the federal authorities had assumed during the war. This vote showed that the people of Australia do not believe in centralization. They voted to return to the states of Australia the powers which formerly had been taken from the states by the federal government.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: *June* 14, 1948.

Australian Wheat.

Mr. Stokes asked the Minister of Food whether he is aware that the Australian 1947-48 wheat crop amounted to approximately 225,000,000 bushels; what proportion of this grain will be shipped to this country; and how that compares with the amount shipped from the 1946-47 crop.

Dr. Summerskill: The answer to the first part of the Question is "Yes." Regarding the second part, I would refer my hon. Friend to the statement which my right hon. Friend made to the House on December 19, 1947. Of the 80 million mushels purchased from the 1947-48 crop it is expected that about 52 million bushels grain equivalent of wheat and flour will come to this country. Regarding the third part of the Question, no wheat and only 101,000 tons of flour (approximately 5.4 million bushels grain equivalent) were shipped to the United Kingdom from the 1946-47 crop.

British Sugar Corporation.

Mr. Sharp asked the Minister of Food what proportion of the production of British Sugar Corporation Limited, is bought by his Department; what was the total production during the last year for which figures are available; and what was the average subsidy per cwt.

Dr. Summerskill: During the year 1947-48 the British Sugar Corporation produced the equivalent of 429,000 tons of refined sugar, all of which was bought by my Department. During this year the subsidy to the British Sugar Corporation, which takes the form of a deficiency payment based upon the difference between cost of production and revenue from sugar and by-products, is estimated to have been approximately 1s. 4d. per cwt.

Education Act, 1944 (Section 76).

Mr. K. Lindsay asked the Minister of Education how he proposes to interpret Section 76 of the Education Act, 1944, relating to consideration of parents' wishes in the provision of education; and whether a large majority of parents' wishes, combined with the majority vote of a local divisional executive, will be treated as a sufficient reason for invoking Ministerial discretion.

Mr. Tomlinson: In the event of disputes between parents and local education authorities arising out of parents' wishes for the education of their children I should have to determine the question in the light of the considerations set out in Section 76 of the Education Act, 1944, and of all the circumstances of the particular case. I cannot answer hypothetical questions.

House of Commons: *June* 15, 1948.

Retirement and Widows' Pensions.

Mr. Tiffany asked the Minister of National Insurance what will be the position, after July 5, of widows aged 55-60 years of age who at present are in receipt of a 10s. pension.

Mr. J. Griffiths: As my hon. Friend explained in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for Chelsea (Commander Noble) on June 8, such widow pensioners, if they do not qualify for increased widows' pensions from July 5, 1948, by reason of having children or being incapable of self-support, will be liable to contribute under the new National Insurance scheme in their appropriate class. For retirement pension purposes they will be given an initial credit of contributions from their 55th birthday to July 5, 1948, and the ordinary contribution conditions will be modified in their favour so that they can qualify from age 60 for the full rate of retirement pension by paying contributions for the balance of the period from July 5, 1948, to their 60th birthday. I am arranging for an explanatory letter to be issued shortly to each widow pensioner affected by these special arrangements.

Mr. Tiffany: While recognising that the credits give some concession, is it not true nevertheless that there is some inequality between the widow who is 60 before July 5 and the widow who becomes 60 after July 5; and in view of this fact, cannot the right hon. Gentleman, in his customary humane manner, go a little further in this matter?

Mr. Griffiths: We have provided pensions for widows who were 60 in October, 1946, and for those who reach 60 before July 5. By the terms of the Act, women of 60 and over on July 5 cannot come into the scheme. There will probably be some inequality, but every effort is being made to reduce it to the lowest possible quota.

Miss Bacon: Is the Minister aware that many of these widows are in receipt of only 10s. a week and are living with sons and daughters, and does he not realise that it will be an added hardship to the sons and daughters to pay 3s. 8d. a week? Will he not consider, in cases of non-employed widows aged 50 to 60, waiving the contributions?

Mr. Griffiths: We have provided that if these widows are incapable of self-support, their pension is immediately raised to 26s. The others will have to contribute for about

(*continued on page 6*)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

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

Vol. 20. *No.* 17. *Saturday, July* 3, 1948.

From Week to Week

"It was a devil's carmagnole that began in the Thirties, when the mob gathered round the flags of anti-Christendom. Swastika; sickle-and-hammer; it was no accident, but part of 'the design', that both were in the shape of a broken or distorted cross, and this revealed their common origin.

"Once the cross was in all the flags of Europe, of France, Prussia, Russia, Austria, and the others. Now it remains only in that of this country, the Scandinavian ones, Switzerland, and Greece.,"—*From Smoke to Smother,* Douglas Reed, p. 49.

• • •

"Nothing in the whole history of UN discloses better the forces that dominate it and that probably called it into being. For just one group was interested in forcing through this Palestine project, namely those political Jews who are the backbone of the Zionist Movement.

"We think that most American Jews know little about this question, and care little. They are American first, just as the vast majority of Americans of other origins are Americans first. Those who forced this project through UN are Jews first.

"Drew Pearson, who claims to be on the inside of many things asserted in his column of December 3, that President Truman had 'cracked down harder on his State Department than ever before to swing UN votes for the partition of Palestine.' And he proceeded to tell in detail just what Mr. Truman did to put it across. Apparently the international Jewish organization left no stone unturned to bring pressure on Mr. Truman, and Mr. Truman went all out to carry out the desires of this group.

"This makes it pretty clear that the Truman Administration is in the hands of this group. Taken in connection with the bitter fight to land three Jews in the membership of the vitally important five-member Atomic Energy Commission; the aggressive efforts to force through the Communist-inspired FEPC law, as well as the so-called anti-discrimination laws that have been passed in two or three States; the violent efforts to force a modification of our immigration laws to permit the bringing in indiscriminately of more Jews from Europe; the studied abandonment by the federal government after 1941 of keeping records of Jewish immigration; the fact that both this and the preceding Administration of Mr. Roosevelt were infested on almost all levels with Jewish appointees, many of them Communistic: read in conjunction with all of these facts, it becomes apparent what force has been molding the policy of the United States in recent years, involving it in war, and making well-nigh treasonable concessions to Soviet Russia. It explains why, after a century and a half of closely following American tradition, the United States has become repeatedly involved, at whatever cost, in events all over the world, in most of which she has not the slightest vital interest but which, if persisted in, will surely lead the American Republic to destruction.

"The Truman Administration has been greatly influenced by this group. So, we believe, to a large extent, was the Republican Party in its campaign of 1936, and especially in its campaigns of 1940 and 1944. The grave question before the American people is whether in 1948 the Republican Party will permit itself to be dictated to, both with respect to its platform and its candidate, as in the recent past."
—Economic Council Letter No. 181 (U.S.A.) Empire State Building, New York.

The major item in the Policy Speech at the opening of the Republican Convention in Philadelphia on June 21, 1948, reads:

"We welcome Israel into the family of nations, and take pride in the fact that the Republican Party was the first to call for the establishment of a free and independent Jewish commonwealth."

• • •

On June 24, the "B."B.C. announced that the Argentine had relaxed its regulations to permit of the import (export from "Britain") of British manufactures, provided that *they are paid for from sterling balances in London, i.e.* are nearly given away. (If you don't agree, consider how long it took to convert our credits into debts). In the same bulletin, it was announced that a loan which had been given to the Fiji Government of £2,000,000 for defence purposes during the war had been converted into a free gift. The Big Idea, of course in both cases, is to distribute money without goods *in this country* so as to counteract the effect disclosed by the A + B Theorem.

These One-Way Street Policies are evidently as immune from criticism as the rest of our national book-keeping.

• • •

At the General Election in 1945 the aggregate voting was:—

For Socialists (assuming that all Labour is Socialist)	11,992,292
The Rest (anti-Socialist)	12,981,006
Total of electorate which voted ...	24,973,298
Total electorate	33,064,704
Did not vote	8,091,406

So you aren't even under majority democracy.

• • •

The nomination of Mr. Thomas Dewey as Republican candidate for the Presidency, which by common consent is almost certain to go to the Republicans next November, removes any doubt which might exist in regard to Jewish control of U.S. politics. Mr. Dewey is for all practical purposes a Jewish nominee; he has been Governor of New York State during a period in which the Presidency has been "Democratic," "New Deal" and almost openly Jew-controlled and New York City, which politically controls New York State, is the largest Jewish colony in the world.

The situation is grave in the extreme; both in the United Kingdom and the United States we are confronted with a mock bi-partisan electoral system in which both parties are powerless to elect their chief executives against the will of an alien minority. This minority in both countries has openly declared war against "Britain"; it regards no interest but its own and the interests of either "America" or "Britain" are purely incidental to their usefulness as tools to an external end.

The Movement to Contract-Out

With four dissentients, the following resolution was passed at a large meeting (about 600 were present) called by the British Housewives' League in Kingsway Hall, London, on June 21:—

> This meeting protests that both the Members of the Opposition and His Majesty's Government have, in fact, supported the imposition of the totalitarian Insurance and Health Service, and demands that the National Health Act be postponed until the rights of individuals to contract out be entirely re-established.

The resolution has been sent to the Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, and the Leader of H.M. Opposition, Mr. Winston Churchill.

Social Credit Secretariat

Examination for Associate's Certificate (British Isles)

An examination for the certificate of Associate will be held in November, 1948. The set books will be *Social Credit* and the *Realistic Position of the Church of England*, both by C. H. Douglas.

Intending candidates should apply to the Director of Lectures and Studies, c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. N.B. It is necessary that this address should be given on the envelope in full.

PARLIAMENT (*continued from page* 3)

six months only, and they will then get the full pension. I wish that it had been possible to do more within the limits of the insurance scheme, but that is not possible.

Mr. Chetwynd: In cases where hardship does arise, can the widow apply to the Assistance Board for a supplementary pension to meet the contribution?

Mr. Griffiths: As from July 5, they will be able to apply for national assistance. If the hon. Member will look at the scale he will see that we have made provision for that.

Mr. George Thomas: Will those widows who are incapable of working have to submit to a medical examination by officers of the Minister's Department?

Mr. Griffiths: No. We have invited all those widows to submit their applications, and at the same time to submit a report by their own doctor that will satisfy us and enable us to pay the pension.

Representation of the People Bill

CLAUSE 3.—(*Adaptation of* 7 *and* 8 *Geo.* 6 *c.* 41.)

Mr. Peake: I beg to move, in page 4, line 4, to leave out '613," and to insert, "618."

This Amendment although very important is, in a nature, consequential. It is consequential upon the Government Amendment, at the same place in the Bill, which we discussed in Committee. That increased the figure in the Bill as originally drafted from 591 to 613. My Amendment is necessitated in order to remove some of the most glaring anomalies resulting from the Government's action in adding 17 seats to the English representation. The Final Report of the Boundary Commission embodying their proposals was published on October 24, and their proposals were included in full in the Bill when it was printed just before Christmas. The Boundary Commissioners recommended for England 489 seats, instead of the 485 or thereabouts laid down in the Act of 1944.

It was not until March 19, two days after we had concluded the Committee discussions on the universities and the City of London, that the Government announced that they proposed to add 17 additional seats to the English representation. That announcement was made *ex parte* without any previous consultation with the Opposition, and it was made entirely upon the responsibility of the Government. We still do not know and have never been told at what date the Government referred to the Boundary Commissioners, acting in an unofficial capacity, their suggestion that one seat should be added to each of the nine large cities. These were the Government's proposals to add 17 seats to the English representation. They told us that they had consulted the Commission upon them, and they published a White Paper embodying the Commission's recommendations as to how these extra 17 seats which the Government had decided should be granted should be demarcated in detail. . . .

Mr. J. S. C. Reid: It was agreed on all sides of the House at one time that it was proper to remit a problem of redistribution to the Boundary Commission. Even when that was done we never got a solution which satisfied everybody. Though the solution to be got in that way did not satisfy everybody there were only two proper things to do. The first was to take the rough with the smooth and accept the Boundary Commission's proposals although we did not like them. That was what we were prepared to do after the last Boundary Commission's Report. The other was to make a remit to the Boundary Commission, the remit being, of course, of a width sufficient to deal with the objection.

What happened in this case? There was a first examination by the Boundary Commission which was found to be un-satisfactory because it was thought that the rules were too tight. The rules were relaxed, and obviously when rules are relaxed there is a great likelihood that the result will be to give more representation to the scattered county areas and rather less to the borough areas. That was implicit in the change of instructions which were made at the instance of the Government nearly two years ago. Last October the Boundary Commission produced their report. That report did not please us, but apparently it pleased the Government, or at any rate sufficiently so for them to state that they were willing to take the rough with the smooth from their point of view, just as we were willing to take the rough with the smooth from our point of view. That attitude persisted through the time of the drafting of the Bill and the Second Reading, and it was only on March 19 that we were made aware that the Government had discovered an objection. It is true that they had apparently discovered it in private and had taken steps accordingly, but there is a long time from October to March.

What was the precise objection which the Government discovered? If it was a general objection that the Boundary Commission Report was wrong because the average county quota as too far below the average borough quota, then the proper course was to make a remit appropriate to that objection. That meant a very extensive if not complete re-examination of the whole position. That was not what the right hon. Gentleman did. He picked out 17 particular

instances. The only reason for picking out 17 particular instances is because there is some more limited principle which affects that 17. We were a little sceptical, but we thought that if this were really genuine, though the Government had taken rather a long time to discover the so-called new principle. we would accept it. However, the objection was not a general one obviously at that stage. Their objection appeared to be a particular one, and we were very loath to come to the conclusion that the real reason that induced the Government to act was not one of principle at all but one of party advantage.

Therefore, we took the Government at their word and we said, "Very well, if you have chosen these 17 constituencies because there is a principle of limited application which you want to introduce, that principle, if it is a principle at all, cannot be limited in its application to 17 constituencies . . . we have discovered seven instances which apparently are covered by this new principle and we put them forward with this new proposal in view."

We went to the Boundary Commission and the Commission were not enthusiastic with regard to two of them We said then, "Very well, being practical people, practical considerations must prevail over theoretical ideas. We will drop these two." In regard to the other five, however, the Boundary Commission were entirely on our side. If the details, which have been put to this House during the last hour or two, are looked at, it will be found that there is no more splitting of local government areas or no more geographical difficulties than there are in the 100 other constituencies which the Boundary Commission have passed. The Boundary Commission applied their ordinary criteria to these seven cases and five passed while two did not. It is no good the Home Secretary saying that there are certain practical objections to these five constituencies. These objections did not prevail with the Boundary Commission and if, indeed, objections of a like character were taken they would upset 100 of the new constituencies.

Therefore, I am entitled to say that if the right hon. Gentleman's principle justifies nine new seats in the cities it justifies even more the five cases which we are now discussing, that is, of course, if it is a principle at all. I go even further. If we look at the figures—I will not weary the House with them—in the nine cities, there are averages of 52,000 and 53,000; in these five constituencies the average is the same. It is true that in one or two of the cities, the average is higher, but there are a number of the cities where the average is almost identical with the average of the five constituencies which have passed the Boundary Commission.

That having been demonstrated, the right hon. Gentleman has not, apart from these detailed objections of which the Boundary Commission have already disposed, met the case. I am not sure what he meant to tell us a little time ago, but I understood that he did tell us that the so-called principle which he enunciated when he was justifying the nine new city constituencies was not the real point at all. The point was quite a different one. The point was, "I am determined to get more representations for the boroughs and I do not care how I do it." I have said that the right hon. Gentleman did not care how he did it, because if he did care he would have had a general remit to the Boundary Commission after consultation with this House, away back last November to deal with this new point of principle. . . .

Mr. Ede: . . . Nothing I have heard alters in my mind the view I took of them when I spoke earlier. I therefore cannot commend this Amendment to the House. I think that, merely by taking corners of counties to deal with, the Opposition have not, in fact, followed the same procedure as did the Government, where we took the whole of large units. For this reason, in addition to those which I gave in detail when I spoke previously, I am not prepared to accept the Amendment.

Mr. Nigel Birch (Flint): I think that my hon. Friends, though disappointed by the answer of the Home Secretary, will not really be very much surprised by it, because what we have known throughout about this proposal was that it was a racket, in order to get 17 extra seats for the Government. It had no other reason of any sort whatever behind it. The right hon. Gentleman said just now, in answer to the right hon. and learned Member for Hillhead (Mr. J. S. C. Reid) that he stated his views on March 24. But, of course, that was after he had been forced to take that position by his own back benchers. There is no great merit in confessing his failure to preserve his honour by saying that he only did it when he had capitulated.

There is a very clear principle involved in all this, which is that the boundaries of constituencies should be laid down by an impartial Boundary Commission, acting in accordance with legislation, if possible agreed by this House, but in any case acting impartially according to Acts passed by this House. That is what has always happened hitherto. What happened in this case was, as the hon. Member for Dagenham (Mr. Parker) said, simply a piece of log rolling. The right hon. Member for Bishop Auckland (Mr. Dalton) saw a chance of getting the rabble together. He got them together, and the right hon. Gentleman was forced to do something which he knows is wholly dishonourable.

We had an interesting instance last night of how hon. Members opposite look upon these matters. When the hon. Member for East Coventry (Mr. Crossman) was speaking on the subject of university representation he said that the honour of Ministers is a side issue. That is how he thinks of them. Surely, the simple answer to these things is that if Ministers are pledged to do things, and if they think it is dishonourable to break those pledges, they should resign. What the right hon. Gentleman has said was, "They have voted me down." Many Ministers have been voted down in the past on a question of principle, but those who have some regard to what is right, and to their own honour, have said, "If I am voted down I will go." The lesson here is that no Socialist Minister ever resigns unless he is thrown out of the window however much dirt he has to swallow.

Question put, "That '613' stand part of the Bill."

The House divided: Ayes, 278; Noes, 127.

House of Commons: *June* 16, 1948.

Palestine:
British Information Services, U.S.A.

Brigadier Rayner asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what special steps have been taken by the British Information Services in America to explain the British case in regard to Palestine; and what results it has achieved.

Mr. Bevin: British Information Services have put out a steady stream of material explaining the British point of view on Palestine. The statement issued by His Majesty's Office on the termination of the Mandate has been given wide dis-

tribution; factual papers have been issued at frequent intervals, covering both the general case and various particular points. Since Sir A. Cadogan's statement in the Security Council on May 27 there has been a noticeable relaxation of tension even in New York, where it was acute.

Mr. Blackburn: Will the Foreign Secretary make sure that the British Information Services in America give proper publicity to the fact that this country has taken proportionately more Jews in the last five years than any other country in the world, including the United States?

Mr. Bevin: We have done that.

Major Tufton Beamish: Is the Foreign Secretary aware of the totally inadequate funds available for the use of the British Information Services in America, which make it impossible to defend the British case on Palestine or on anything else?

Mr. Speaker: That does not arise out of the Question.

Mr. Nally: Is the Foreign Secretary aware that some three months ago I addressed a Question to him asking if he were confident that the British Information Services in the United States were adequate on this subject? Can he give some details as to what extent in the Briiish Press the case for Britain in Palestine compares statistically with the case put forward by the highly organised and unscrupulous Zionist elements in the Uunited States?

Mr. Bevin: I ought to have notice of that Question.

Points Food Survey.

Colonel Gomme-Duncan asked the Minister of Food how many women are employed by his Department for the purpose of visiting housewives in their homes, asking them how they use their points and impressing upon them the merits of his Department's recipes; and what, in a full year, will be the cost of these activities to the taxpayer.

Mr. Strachey: No one from my Department is engaged on this work. The market research agency which conducts the Points Food Survey on our behalf employs some 25 investigators. The cost in a full year, including clerical salaries and overhead expenses, is estimated at £29,000. The investigators are asked to find out whether housewives read our recipes, not to comment on them.

The Whisky Racket

The following "news of the whisky you cannot buy" appeared in the *Evening Standard* of June 18:—

"In the first three months of 1948, imports of spirits into the United States totalled 3,000,000 gallons—an increase of 22 *per cent.* This was almost entirely Scotch.

"Increase was due to the fact that America reduced the import duty on Scotch from January 1.

"But now even greater quantities of Scotch are going to America. Home market supplies were cut 20 *per cent.* on May 1 in order to step up exports to dollar countries.

"My New York reporter describes this latest cut as unnecessary. There is plenty of Scotch, he says, in the U.S. Twice this year, in March and April, Britain sent more than the average 327,805 proof gallons a month the Americans asked for in 1938.

"Neither will the new cuts for home drinkers affect U.S. demand or consumption. They may only overflood the market.

"New York shops are selling forty types of Scotch: prices, £1 8s. 4d. to £2 15s. a bottle. This is five shillings a bottle less than Kentucky bourbon whisky. Supplies exceed demand.

"Even in prosperous districts, where there is most demand for imported liquors, dealers report a buyer's market, with stocks of Scotch unsold on their shelves.

So it seems all wrong that Britons should go thirsty."

Centralised Publicity for 'Science'

It appears from later correspondence in *The Times* that the author of the proposal to centralise scientific publication, referred to on page 4 of *The Social Crediter* last week, was Dr. J. D. Bernal, F.R.S., Professor of Physics at Birkbeck College, London.

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