

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 22. No. 18.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage (home and abroad)-Id.

SATURDAY, JULY 2, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

THE FOLLOWING COMPREHENSIVE STATEMENT CONCERNING THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT HAS BEEN DRAWN UP FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION:—

The SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT was first instituted in 1933 as a Secretariat to assist Major C. H. Douglas by relieving him of as much secretarial work as possible *vis-a-vis* the growth of a movement to make his ideas in economics and politics effective, and to act as a channel through which information and advice affecting Social Credit and organisations working for Social Credit might be distributed to members of the public. It has acted continuously since its inception, and most of those individuals who are closely associated with it were connected with it then, and a high proportion of its earlier supporters form a valuable nucleus of the body of its supporters now.

The construction and Constitution of the Secretariat are at once a reflection of the situation in which its work has to be carried out and the nature and Policy of Social Credit. Support, both active and financial, is voluntary. Its first officers, termed Directors, were chosen in accordance with advice tendered by a panel of Social Crediters selected from among the then existing supporters of Groups of Social Crediters in the British Isles, by election for this purpose. In 1938, Major Douglas appointed a Deputy Chairman, while he himself continued to act in an advisory capacity as Advisory Chairman of the Secretariat. The organisation is hierarchal (*vide, The Tragedy of Human Effort*, by Major Douglas, 1936.) There have been few changes in the personnel since that time. The officers of the Secretariat are still called its Directors, who number five additionally to a Secretary and a Treasurer. Individually, the Directors of the Secretariat maintain a correspondence with Social Credit Organisations, chiefly but not entirely those affiliated to it, with individual Social Crediters in all parts of the world and with outside bodies and individuals. *Mutatis mutandis*, they communicate the advice of the Secretariat on various aspects of Social Credit opinion and action, and on matters which have any relation to these, on request. The officers of the Secretariat are unpaid.

A special work of the Secretariat is the control, supervision and preparation of its weekly organ, *The Social Crediter*, edited, at present, by the Deputy Chairman. An announcement concerning *The Social Crediter* is attached to this statement.* For the avoidance of some at least of the difficulties incidental to interaction between the general public and a community of persons within it, as much as possible of the routine work of the Secretariat (*i.e.*, matters of business *etc.*) as well as all contractual obligations is handled, on a contractual basis, by a Company, K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., formed by Social Crediters and incor-

porated under the Companies Act, 1929, on April 17, 1939. The primary function of the Company is that of a publishing business, as its name implies. The property, *The Social Crediter*, is in its ownership; but control of the policy of the paper is in the hands of the Secretariat in the persons of the Company Directorate. So far as possible, the remuneration of the Company for services rendered to the Secretariat is an annual sum estimated to be the equivalent of the remuneration of one relatively junior person employed by the Company.† The Directors are unpaid, and in this as in other respects the rule is absolute that no financial benefit to any individual shall arise from the exploitation of his services to the general body of Social Crediters. (The just source of financial support for such activities as those of Social Crediters should be the National Dividend, for an account of which the reader is referred, if necessary, to Social Credit literature. Political agitation least as a profession—would disappear from a properly constituted political society. Technical instruction and research, as well as the enrichment of society by the spread of original ideas *e.g.*, science and literature and the fine arts, are not envisaged under this heading.)

The organisation may be correctly envisaged if the movement in alliance with Major Douglas is considered as consisting, on the one hand, of a number of people convinced of the accuracy and importance of his ideas, who desire the implementation of these ideas, and who are thus able and willing themselves to contribute to the attainment of this end, and, on the other hand, the service of this body by appropriate means. The association is voluntary (*i.e.*, arising from the will) on all sides. At any moment, subject to certain simple conditions of elementary justice, the association, in so far as the individual is concerned, can be broken down by the simple expedient of contracting out. This brief statement is clearly abstract in its nature, and many practical details are by no means defined in its terms, although, if the organisation truly reflects the intention which underlies it, the application cannot in any respect contradict that intention.

Social organisation as we know it in its more ordinary manifestations is a web of contradictions and absurdities, the very familiarity of which makes it less easy than it might be for the individual to understand any structure which is, in its essentials, sound. From its origination, the Social Credit Secretariat has been continuously the object of attack by interests which are identifiable precisely with those most clearly instrumental in the war upon human society which has been waged with increasing power and determination for centuries. In endeavouring to withstand this attack, it must pay heed equally to the special dangers to which it is exposed and to the fact of experience that the universe is governed by Laws, "which cannot, in the ordinary sense

*Subscription rates, *etc.*, (see page 4). This information will be added to a reprint of this statement in pamphlet form.

†The Company does not make a profit. If at some future time it should do so, the position *vis-a-vis* the Secretariat would be reviewed.

of the words, be altered, and therefore must be ascertained." These Laws, in our understanding, which must be ascertained but which cannot be altered, comprise association for a common objective as much as anything else, and there is already a considerable literature of Social Credit origin or inspiration to suggest what they are. The present summary is hardly the place in which to review them. They are already woven into the fabric of our organisation; although, doubtless, their permanency even there will be proportional to the vigilance which accompanies their recognition.

No one who has read even half a dozen consecutive issues of *The Social Crediter* can be in great doubt whether or not it represents a body of thought and opinion, or counsels a course of action, with which he is in agreement. This statement starts from the assumption that he does agree, and that he desires to effect some closer relationship between himself and those who are addressing him. In the ordinarily accepted meaning of the term, we do not *appeal* for support. We recognise that support or otherwise for any policy of importance is a matter for individual decision, and of individual decision to which there should be attached, and to which there is attached so far as we are concerned, a very high degree of responsibility. For that reason, and the more so rather than less, it is desirable to state what, in our opinion, is the nature of the responsibility: assuming that the reader has decided that he should support the Social Credit Secretariat, what does this entail, how can his intention be implemented?

In choosing to support the Social Credit Secretariat, each individual supporter is electing to follow the advice of the Advisory Chairman, Major Douglas, and to apply it, for the realisation of Social Credit. The channel for the communication of the advice is the Secretariat, the official organ of which, *The Social Crediter*, is a weekly guide to strategy, as well as itself exerting pressure upon the opposition to Social Credit in a variety of ways. Hence its insistence upon its character as "a journal of policy, not of opinion." *The Social Crediter* is not the sole means of communication with the Secretariat's supporters. Special bulletins are, from time to time, circulated among selected groups of supporters, and direct communication with individuals is, of course, maintained.

It follows that, in our opinion, every supporter should be a regular and closely attentive reader of *The Social Crediter*, since it is there that he will find indications of the strategy which he, with others, as a self-elected supporter both desires and is desired to advance. There is further constant exhibition of the reasons determining the choice of one line rather than another, and material designed to enable the reader more thoroughly to master the realities of the situation in politics and affairs. The ideal Social Crediter would be one who had become independent of such aids: armed with an understanding of the situation in which he is acting and of the means available to him to meet it, he would work harmoniously, convergently with others, to gain the ground he desires. But this is a real world, and however well-prepared, the individual gains effectiveness through the increment of association with others.

At the present time, when the vast forces which have been generated during recent centuries seem to be moving rapidly towards a decision, the most potent force which it is within the power of a minority group to exert is the power of inherent QUALITY. No confession is easier to elicit from

most observers of good intelligence and undoubtedly deeply interested as well as involved in the political drama set before us than the confession of *confusion* of mind which paralyses action or precipitates it uselessly in a direction which serves any interest but the one the individual most truly desires to serve. The average mind seems to be in the grip of opinions which are *not clear cut*: they lack definiteness and therefore consistency and therefore truth and effectiveness.

Now, such is the spread of technical information nowadays (perhaps to an altogether undesirable extent, leading to much minding of anybody's business but the individual's own business) that most people know what chemists mean by a catalyst, *i.e.*, some substance present among reacting elements or compounds, which itself may be present in exceedingly small amount, but which, in some way, by its very presence, determines action and reaction which otherwise would not occur. The nature of the more abundant reacting substances does not seem to be affected in the slightest degree; but by this catalytic link, which itself remains unchanged, these are brought to behave in a way in which they would not otherwise behave. So THIS WIDELY DISTRIBUTED NON-CLEAR-CUT OPINION which displays itself in tragic ineffectiveness at the present time can be made *effective* by the presence everywhere of a sufficiency of CLEAR-CUT OPINION. The establishment of such a condition is particularly the objective set before the supporters of the Social Credit Secretariat. All the efforts of the Secretariat are turned for the moment upon developing QUALITY OF ACTION of this kind at its highest possible intensity. If he is truly in affiliation with us, each supporter will participate in this development as fully as he can.

Lastly, a sufficiency of income is necessary to carry on the work of the Secretariat. The total sum required annually is not a large sum, and it is well within the ability of supporters to provide. Few appeals have been made since the beginning of the recent war, and it is a matter for satisfaction that a sufficiency of income has been forthcoming, almost entirely in contributions individually small, without such appeals. But this has thrown a heavy burden upon those most active in the Secretariat through diverting to routine activities time which should have been available for more important matters. It has therefore been suggested that a flat-rate subscription of £3 3s. per annum should be asked from each subscriber. While it is hoped that existing supporters, as well as new subscribers, will find this convenient, it must be emphasised that affiliation is by no means conditional upon such payments.

The accounts of the secretariat are audited annually, and the auditors' certificate to the effect that the expenditure of the Secretariat's income is in accordance with the relevant parts of this statement is available to inspection by arrangement.

Arrangements concerning the formation of groups, as well as detailed information to meet special cases may be had on application to the Director of Organisation. Nevertheless, it seems not inappropriate to state here the attitude of the Secretariat to activities organised on a group or regional basis in affiliation with itself. Firstly, the Secretariat does *not* encourage mere organisation as an objective in itself. The time, money and effort devoted to organisation *per se* should, in all cases, be minimal. Mere arrangements to facilitate the meeting of Social Crediters with one another

without there being, as the primary objective, the attainment of some significant and clearly envisaged concrete end in view lead nowhere. It is required, before encouragement is given to supporters to form groups, that evidence be forthcoming that effectiveness in action of the individuals likely to be interested is the motive which brings them together. Assuming, then, a group of Social Crediters who are active for the advancement of Social Credit, its function is spiritual rather than organisational in any sense. It is easy to slip from a real increment of association of the kind envisaged in the subtle verses of the New Testament (Matt. XVIII. 18, 19, 20)—the unreal cannot be bound, on earth or in heaven—into a spurious relationship which makes all who participate “all one with the heathen and the publican”. The increment of association is not something added to give it a flavour, but is a necessary concomitant positive or negative in sign, of every association. The Secretariat desires the development of group activities on right lines, and will co-operate with those who will undertake action which is accordant. To test the continuing usefulness of groups, a report will in future be expected by the Director of Organisation from each group at least annually.

(Arrangements for the collection of subscriptions will be announced later.)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 1, 1949.

SUPPLY

[16th ALLOTTED DAY]

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. BOWLES in the Chair]

Civil Estimates, 1949-50

[The Debate on Supply continued: Mr. Wilfrid Roberts is speaking:—]

People will nowadays often go to quite isolated places if they can get better houses. Were this problem considered not in England but as a problem in Australia or East Africa, some sort of priority would readily be given to the housing, at least, for the workers concerned. There would be new housing, the planning of new villages, perhaps, and the planning of a new transport system. I wonder whether we could not approach this problem in that sort of way? It may be that it is not necessary for parts of England, but certainly in the Highlands and, I imagine, perhaps in parts of Wales, it would really be worth while taking a biggish area to see whether it could not be replanned, not only in respect of the size of the farm, but in respect of the layout of the whole district.

I believe that this order is only the first step. Sooner or later the country will expect to get a bigger meat ration. I do not believe that, with demand increasing in other parts of the world, we can rely on getting nearly as large a proportion from overseas as we did before the war; and I think that not only the countryside but the townspeople will demand that the Government make a really big effort to solve this problem. I say again—I have repeated it *ad nauseam* today—that this can be done: technically it can be done; there is no scientific difficulty about doing it. I do not believe there is a difficulty about doing it as a business proposition if the capital is available and if the

personnel are there who want to do it. They can be attracted to this sort of job. Eventually, I believe, the Government will have to satisfy the people that this opportunity is not being missed, and that a really big effort to provide a much bigger meat ration from our own resources—a much bigger proportion of our beef and mutton from our own resources—is being made.

Mr. Turton (Thirsk and Malton): . . . Every speaker, including the hon. Member for Taunton (Mr. Collins), has delivered critical attacks on the Government for their policy towards marginal land, but the first shot in the campaign was not fired today, but last Thursday by the Minister of Food when, in winding up the Debate on the purchase of meat he used these words:

“The meat shortage in this country is entirely accounted for by the fact that we cannot as yet produce anything like the quantity of meat at home that we were producing before the war. There is roughly about 300,000 tons less meat being produced at home than was being produced before the war.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 26th May, 1946; Vol. 465, c. 1575.]

That is the indictment they are facing today. It is because the Government have not in the last three and a half years faced up to this question of marginal land that we have got this deficiency in home-produced meat at present. It was necessary during the war to change the balance of our agricultural economy in order to concentrate more on cereals, and to let our cattle and sheep population decline. That was an inevitable result of the submarine menace, and the necessity to rely more on canned meat than on fresh meat.

That phase of agricultural economy had ended by the end of 1944. . . . My complaint against the Government is that they have allowed 3½ years to pass without taking any effective steps to deal with this problem. The main argument that the Parliamentary Secretary has to answer in this Debate is: Why is it that since the Government came into office in 1945, the number of cattle going to slaughter in this country has not increased but has decreased by 200,000, and the number of sheep and lambs going to slaughter has not increased but has decreased by 700,000? The document that has been quoted very frequently, the Exmoor Survey, and quoted not least by the hon. Member who sits for that constituency, the hon. Member for Taunton has told us that if the Government had adopted a policy of improving this marginal land there would have been an addition of 5d. to the meat ration by doubling the present contribution from home production. That is the estimate of the Exmoor Survey.

. . . I should like to quote one further passage from the Exmoor Survey which has not been quoted up to now. It states, in page 8:

“The Survey confirms the generally accepted view that the marginal land farmer is the most depressed class in British agriculture today—and next to him the hill farmer. They are depressed because of their low level of remuneration. They have run out of capital. They are often forced into dairying under unfavourable conditions, because of their need for ready income.” They go on to say that in Scotland, Northumberland and Wales economic surveys agree with the results of the Exmoor Survey.

“Two out of every three farmers on hill and marginal land are earning no more than the value of their own family labour.”

That is the problem, I am sure that the Parliamentary Secretary will agree. As he goes round the country he will see that life is uneconomic for the people on the marginal land. What good is it, as has been announced today, to throw an

(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. 22. No. 18.

Saturday, July 2, 1949.

From Week to Week

According to the *New York Herald-Tribune*, Mr. George Bernard Shaw finds Russia the most interesting country in the world, not excepting his own (we are not sure which has the honour of his ownership).

Mr. Shaw is a brilliant and interesting playwright. As a politician and political economist, he is and always has been not merely a crashing bore, but rather a repulsive *poseur*. If he feels that Russia would suit his talents, and bear with his eccentricities better than England, why in the name of common sense does he not join his friends there?

The Evening Standard of June 13 entitles its leading article "Loophole in the Ballot. It should be secret, but it is not".

It is becoming clear (a) that the one-way "secret" ballot is a masonic device essential to the d'markrazi which is the strategic framework for the policy of what it is convenient and correct to call the Sanhedrin of Satan. (b) that the fact that this has been noted outside masonic circles has caused, if not yet alarm, some concern. (c) that certain well-disposed but timid individuals realise that if you can't do more, do what you can to say "ballot, ballot, just look at the ballot".

Have you heard of the ground nuts scheme? You will when you pay your income tax, though the language of it may sound like Esperanto.

The two most powerful cartels in the world are I.C.I. which is pouring materials into East Africa, and Unilever, which hopes to pour them out. Ground-nuts for fats, you know.

The head of the United African Corporation (Unilever) is called Samuels. Lord McGowan is said to be the head of I.C.I. but if the Mond interest has lost its paramouncy, it is rather remarkable.

If the various reports on affairs in East Africa are to be taken as reasonably reliable there is a scandal in the making beside which Marconi and Stavisky were parish pump matters.

One curious feature of the situation is the superintendence of it by Mr. Strachey, the Minister of Food, instead of by the Colonial Office. While it is presented to the British taxpayer, who couldn't care less, as a food project, it is just about as much a food project, for "Britain" anyway, as the greater part of "the Export Drive".

"The root trouble is that this generation of Englishmen

understands nothing in the field of politics but political parties, and expects political parties to reflect an opposition between capital and labour.—*The Tablet*, June 18.

The position is complicated by the fact that this generation doesn't understand what is meant by capital, or labour either.

How much of the phenomenon is due to a general decline of intelligence noted in many quarters, we do not know, but it is remarkable that a rationalistic age is losing the capacity to reason.

An instance of this has been brought to our attention by a correspondent resident in the U.S. zone of Germany, where apparently an Englishman, lecturing under a U.S. licence uses something almost indistinguishable from the Social Credit approach to an appreciation of the situation. Having gained the attention of his audience, as he does, he propounds his remedy which is—steady, now—appeasement of Russia by building up by every means, technical, economic and educational, the morale of the Soviet State.

Many comments could be offered on this particular instance; but we are not sure that the most cogent would not be to direct attention once again to the growing importance of semantics—in effect, the theme song of George Orwell's latest novel "1984" (*c.f.*, the complete reversal of meaning in the first word of the well-known Collect, "Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings.")

There is a growing number of words used in current politics which in their context are completely delusive. Under the Old Order, this would have been detected immediately, because men of all classes shared a common experience. (Notice, again, the perversion of the word "feudal" to suggest that they did not). But there is no common ground between Professors Laski and Cole and the world they would like to manipulate except that they write about things they have never done.

It is quite certain that this subtle misuse of words, in combination with the equally subtle misuse of fraudulent majorities as a device for centralising power, is neither accidental nor unconscious, although the actual users may think that they understand their import. It has been grasped by our Masters that majorities will always accept a label as an explanation; that the short road to power is to popularise a label, which can always be done by an appeal to greed, and then to fill the bottle which carries it with any noxious rubbish which will achieve the downfall of the purchaser. By the aid of two or three labels, you can sell the same poison indefinitely.

We are not exactly Judophiles, but we do agree with some of our friends that there is a large body of people in this country who are not Jews who are simply asking to be ruined by anyone with nimble wits and an absence of scruple. We have ourselves heard on the "B."B.C. official statements of our "greater output," "our serious situation," our "three-year-long queue" for the home market in cars, the decline in employment in the car-factories, the fatal effect of high taxation, the necessity to increase taxation and to prevent the distribution of purchasing-power, higher wages for railwaymen, falling rail traffics *et cetera ad nauseam*.

(continued on page 8).

Lindsell and the Powers of Darkness

Cardinal Griffin, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, last December warned parents not to let the State relieve them of their responsibilities for their children, "For, if you do," he said, "it will finally relieve you of your children. . . . It will decide the future of your child and direct him to the work it considers best. You will have no say."

Within ten days of Cardinal Griffin's warning the Archbishop of York, Dr. Garbett, uttered one on the same theme. "It is a grave thing for the nation when its home life is threatened," he said, ". . . Parental responsibility has been weakened by the way in which the State now takes over the education, nutrition and health of the children. What was once the duty of the parents has become the responsibility of the State."

Eighteen months ago the Essex County Council published their education reorganisation programme under the Act, when it was seen that the village school at Lindsell was scheduled to be closed. Alarmed at this prospect the parents of Lindsell called a meeting at which their local County Councillor, a Clergyman, explained what was intended. The people didn't like it at all but were put off by the statement that the change-over would not take place for a long time. But not a year later, in the December term, last year, rumour began to say that the school would close at Christmas. There was nothing official, however. As the term progressed the news became more insistent, and detailed. The children, aged from five to ten years of age, would have to go to Stebbing, some miles away, by motor bus. But nobody *knew* anything. The parents called a meeting to discuss the situation. Unanimously they passed a resolution refusing to send their children out of the village, and they requested their Chairman, the Rev. Henry Swabey, Vicar of Lindsell, to send a copy of it to the Essex County Council.

The day before the end of term a clerk appeared and told the Head-Mistress that the school was to be closed next day. The final day of term brought a motor lorry and men who removed the whole of the school fittings and equipment, and locked the school door behind them. The Head-Mistress resigned, and went home to the other side of England. Still there was no news from the County Council. Three days before the new term was to start, Mr. Swabey received an impertinent and untruthful letter from the Divisional Officer of the Council, reproving him for inciting the parents to rebel against the authorities, complaining that the Education Committee had not been given a chance to address the parents and explain the position to them, and stating categorically that the parents would have to send their children to Stebbing, and that the bus would call at the village for them each day.

At about the same time the parents all received an order from the Education Authorities to send their children to Stebbing by the bus. Another meeting was held to reconsider the situation. It was unanimously decided to refuse to obey, and to start a school of their own so that it would not be necessary. Time was short, but volunteers were called for to clean, cook, wash-up, make latrines, provide food, fuel, books, pens, ink, pencils, and to teach. Nurseries were ransacked, and the new school was opened in the Church Hall—the village hall—on time, reasonably well equipped, fully staffed, and with every child present. It

completed its first term happily, and is now in its second. Money has come in—but not easily—from all over the place. Other villages, threatened as Lindsell was threatened, watched with interest what was happening. They sent deputations to enquire, and they subscribed money to help the cause.

The Vicar's wife, Mrs. Anne Swabey, aided by volunteers, has taken into the Vicarage and fed over sixteen children every day. Other parents have also had children every day to eat with their families. Nobody has shirked and people have come to help from as far away as London—40 miles—where the Rebel School has been, from time to time, a news feature in the evening press.

Quite recently a Catering Licence has been obtained and food supplies—subject, of course, to money restrictions—should be a little easier. It is significant that the 1944 Education Act, which was the child of a Conservative Minister of the Crown, lays it down that children attending the Authority's schools *shall* have food provided free by the Authorities; but those attending independent schools *may* be provided with free food. This seems to have been framed in an atmosphere of blackmail. It lies in the hands of the authorities to decide, and a "Rebel" school will, no doubt, receive no sympathy from a thwarted bureaucracy.

Soon after the new school was opened, in order to give every chance to the authorities, a meeting was called to hear the Director of Education and the Chairman of the Education Committee. It was a heated gathering from which all that emerged was determination on the parents' part not to yield; and two statements by the Director which lit up the gravity of the position in which British parents and their children find themselves. The Director confessed that he could not be humane in his job as he was dealing with numbers, not people: and, in answer to a protest that the freedom of the individual and the rights of parents were being attacked, he scoffed at the idea that the parents could be free as they didn't earn enough money for that!

That a system which does not permit those who operate it to be humane is a bad system did not escape his listeners; neither did the gross, and materialistic quality of the second argument.

These two remarks hardened the steel of the parents' resolve, and in spite of the Authority's bus calling each morning at Lindsell since the beginning of January—it still calls!—no child has travelled on it.

Of course there has been much effort in certain directions—such as a local Communist Parson, and the Member of Parliament for the Division in which Lindsell is situated—to effect "a compromise." In order not to be unreasonable the parents recently agreed to a deputation going from Lindsell to see the Education Committee to discuss the situation. This meeting was valuable only because it revealed the grim attitude of the authorities. A Deputy asked about the rights of parents in the education of their children, to be told emphatically that they had no rights.

FURNISHED FLAT near Earls Court and Cromwell Roads. Five guineas weekly. Two large rooms, kitchen and bathroom. Everything for three except linen. Possibility of taking on unfurnished 1950, £4. Rent quarterly in advance—Clifford, FRObisher 6590.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

odd £100 among the marginal farms in the country. That is not the way to tackle the problem. It has no imagination or drive and it may produce bad farming rather than good. Farmers may want to bring back into good cultivation by re-seeding a field of some 12 acres. Is that a problem which they can tackle under the £100 scheme? £240 would be the cost of the seeds alone. I suggest that the Government should think again on this scheme which would concentrate the round sum grants on a very small number of farms.

. . . Most of the marginal areas are not equipped with good roads. They must be so equipped. That is work of a capital nature.

I did not gather from the Parliamentary Secretary that he disagreed with my right hon. and gallant Friend when he said that this was urgently necessary. What he said was that the sum of money available imposed definite limitations. That was one part of his speech with which I agreed, and I sympathised with the Parliamentary Secretary when he had to make that remark. Imposing such a limitation is negating a solution of the problem. The danger is that by excluding work of a capital nature we are going to throw that work on to the tenant instead of on to the landlord, where it should be placed. One of the greatest mistakes in the order is that by putting in it works such as fencing and ditching, which are normally carried out by the landlord, they will be forced on to the tenants by this order. Therefore, it is important that the Government should reconsider the wording of Order No. 536. . . .

. . . The real test of the Government's agricultural policy directed to marginal land comes when one looks at the distribution between the different grasslands in the present economy. The temporary grasses have gone down in acreage since the Government went into office; the permanent grasses have increased by 400,000 acres. What about the rough grazings? They were 5,550,000 when the Government came into office; today there are 1,000 more. So the result of the agricultural policy which the hon. Member for Taunton found so hard to criticise is that 1,000 more acres have become rough grazing. . . .

Pastoral Reorganisation Measure

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Pastoral Reorganisation Measure, passed by the National Assembly of the Church of England, be presented to His Majesty for his Royal Assent in the form in which the said Measure was laid before Parliament."—[*King's Consent signified.*]

Mr. Burden (Second Church Estates Commissioner):

. . . The Measure to which I refer is submitted to the House after long and careful consideration in the Church Assembly. It was before the Assembly at each of four sessions between the Summer of 1947 and the Summer of last year, and it is the fruit of searching inquiry and examination in the Church Assembly and elsewhere for the past 17 years. It is intended to help towards a solution of two distinct but allied problems which, although by no means new, have become more and more critical and disturbing.

The first is the distribution of clergy in relation to the distribution of population. The present parochial system is, in the main, based on the territorial divisions of years ago, when the bulk of the population lived in villages. With the industrial revolution, and the migration to the towns and

industrial centres, there has been a growing lack of balance between the Church in manpower and money and the needs of the population, with the result that some clergy serve among populations of perhaps two or three hundred while in towns there is frequently one clergyman to 10,000 or 15,000 inhabitants.

The second problem is the remuneration of the clergy where the income is derived from ancient endowments. The cost of living has risen continuously, and the income of many clergy has remained stationary, while the poverty of some has seriously increased. It has always been assumed that a great deal of new money would be needed to solve this very real clerical poverty, but at the same time it is recognised that it is not reasonable to ask for voluntary gifts to the pay of the ministry if, in the existing system, there is a misuse—as some regard it—of the endowments whereby some clergy, for no obvious reason, receive large incomes while their next-door neighbours, even with a great deal more work to do, receive poor ones. . . . Under the existing law it is possible to deal with many of these problems in many ways, but only, nearly always, on a purely local scale. Now, in this Measure a diocese would be given the power and authority to deal with that problem in that diocese as a whole. . . .

Mr. Mott-Radcliffe (Windsor): I beg to second the Motion.

. . . First there is the shortage of man-power. In 1939 there were 6,000 fewer clergy than in 1910, and there are still fewer today. There are parishes of 15,000 or 20,000 inhabitants with two only clergy looking after them; there are others of only 30 or 40 with one man looking after them.

Secondly, there is the shortage of funds and funds to which the hon. Gentleman also referred.

Since 1936 we in this House—and I am making no party point because all parties are jointly responsible—have deprived the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of income to the tune of about £600,000. Moreover, sources of other income from gifts and endowments from laymen have similarly been reduced. That is the natural result of high taxation. In one diocese there are no fewer than 72 parishes with an income of less than £300 a year. Other parishes may be large either in area or in population with incomes of between £350 and £400. Others again may be small both in area and population but have incomes of between £800 and £1,000, and it is to even out those inequalities that this Measure is designed.

. . . I am certain that in present-day conditions a much wider extension of powers to unite Benefices or to hold several in plurality must be entertained.

It is not always easy to draw a hard-and-fast line between spiritual things and material things, but it is certain that if the spiritual life of any parish is to continue and grow it must be based, as far as the parish priest is concerned, on a reasonable economic standard. I believe that under this Measure the existing rights of sitting incumbents are fully safeguarded. I believe the period for appeal is adequate. I am prepared, for my part, to pool my rights of patronage, or see them in some minor ways restricted, to achieve the object which this Measure sets out to achieve. . . .

Mr. Driberg (Maldon): I do not think that even at this late hour the House should pass it without at least taking some cognisance of what the *Manchester Guardian*

has called its truly "revolutionary" character, which has not yet been fully appreciated in the country. This Measure does mark a decisive further step in the destruction of the parochial system of England. We may regard that as evil or as good, or possibly as a necessary evil, but we should at least recognise what we in this House are helping to do tonight.

The clergyman, and especially the country clergyman, has always been a distinctive figure in English social history. He has been the scholar, the poet, the gardener, *pastor in parochia*. One thinks of George Herbert, John Keble, Conrad Noel, and many others of their kind. They are passing. In the last fifty years a profound social change has come over the countryside. It is partly a matter of modern transport. The country parish is no longer an isolated and self-contained unit. The Church is no longer its unique social and cultural as well as religious centre. Churchgoing is no longer the conventional habit, the thing that has to be done, in England (as it still largely is in Wales). These changes are reflected in this Measure, which my hon. Friend who moved it has described as a planning measure to reorganise and redistribute the manpower and resources of the Church.

As he also remarked, there has been a certain amount of objection to this Measure. Hon. Members will have received propaganda against it from various organisations and from individual incumbents, whose views one must certainly hold in respect; but I am inclined to think that most of that opposition has been based on a confusion, as it were, between cause and effect, and that those who oppose the Measure think that the Church Assembly are trying to do something which has already been done irrevocably by history. . . .

. . . It has been put on previous occasions when controversial Church Assembly Measures have been before this House. It is the argument that we ought to accept these Measures more or less automatically, simply because the Church Assembly has approved them after long and full Debate; it is said that after the First World War we gave a measure of self-government to the Church and that we ought, therefore, to encourage the Church to go ahead and exercise this self-government without interference, this House to act merely as a kind of endorsing body.

I do not accept that argument. It is quite contrary to what was said and to the assurances given in debate when the Enabling Act was passed. It was then envisaged that Parliament would act as a final debating body. Unfortunately, we cannot be, like another place, a revising body, because we can only accept or reject these Measures. We are not allowed to amend them in any way. . . .

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede): . . . Of course, this is not a Measure on which the Government have any views as a Government. All Members of the House have in this matter to exercise their own individual consciences, and to give expression to their views either in speech or in vote absolutely uninfluenced by any party consideration. I would not have intervened in the Debate but for the fact that, as a Nonconformist, it seems to me really to be quite an anachronism that I should be expected to give my views in the Division Lobby on such details as those just mentioned by the hon. and learned

Gentleman the Member for Exeter (Mr. Maude) whether £750 in one case, or £500 in another, is the appropriate minimum for the stipend of a parochial clergyman. I speak as an out-sider in this matter; I am not even, in the words of Lord Melbourne, a buttress of the Church. He said that while he could not be regarded as a pillar he must be regarded as a buttress because he supported it from outside. I am not even a buttress of the Church of England; I am outside her communion, and I have suffered in my profession because I was outside her communion.

It is an anachronism that still these intimate domestic details of a spiritual entity should be subject to the approval of this House, in which sit Nonconformists, agnostics, atheists, Jews, and persons of the most diverse religious persuasions. Speaking for myself alone, and not binding any other Member of the Government, or of the House, I think this Debate tonight, with this submission of intimate domestic, administrative details of a great Church, to an assembly which no longer admits religious tests with regard to its membership, is an anachronism, and that it would be to the advantage of the Church herself, and more in keeping with modern views on these matters, if the Church were disestablished.

Colonel Gomme-Duncan (Perth and Kinross, Perth): . . . I am convinced that the step we are discussing tonight is of immense importance, although I think it should never have to come here at all. The existence of huge vicarages, or manse in Scotland, with unfortunate ministers' wives who are supposed to look after them, and ministers with very little to contribute to looking after them, cannot do anything but harm to the work of the Church, whether in Scotland or England, if these ministers are thinking all the time of how they can make ends meet. If the Church of England can follow the Church of Scotland, and get down to this problem of levelling the salaries payable to the ministers, it can do nothing but good. I would not say that I am speaking entirely without interest in the Church of England, because in addition to being an elder of the Church of Scotland I am a confirmed member of the Church of England.

I feel very strongly that there is only one Church and that is the Church of Christ. We talk about the Church of England the Church of Scotland and the Nonconformist Churches. They are all interpreting their Divine Master's doctrine in different ways, but they are all the same Church. . . .

Mr. Eric Fletcher (Islington, East): . . . I think it is of profound importance that a matter of this kind, which as has been pointed out, does not affect the Liturgy only, but affects the whole national life of our country, should be discussed in the House of Commons and not merely left to a decision of the Church Assembly. Reference has been made by more than one hon. Member to a passage in the *Manchester Guardian* of June 14, 1948, describing—

" . . . this revolutionary Pastoral Reorganisation Measure, to the implications of which the House of Clergy is slowly awakening. The parishes are not yet alive to its provisions. Indeed, for the most part they will only grasp them when they find themselves the victims. Then there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth, not that the Measure is bad in itself—there is a strong case for some such action—but because it will be enforceable upon an unprepared laity. Under its provisions no existing parish can be

sure of maintaining its separate existence."

I quote that not because I agree with the sentiments expressed, but merely to emphasise that this is a matter of very great importance to the nation. As hon. Members have pointed out, in a sense it undermines and changes the traditional parochial system on which the Church of England has through the centuries been built and grown up, in a measure which affects the whole land. However, like all other hon. Members who have studied this matter and spoken in this Debate, I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, this Measure should be supported and approved by the House. I welcome the fact that the Church of England is keeping itself abreast of the times and is not hidebound by the traditions of the past. . . .

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved:

"That the Pastoral Reorganisation Measure, passed by the National Assembly of the Church of England be presented to His Majesty for his Royal Assent in the form in which the said Measure was laid before Parliament."

House of Commons: June 2, 1949.

EGG PRODUCTION (Battery System)

Sir T. Moore asked the Minister of Agriculture what action he proposes to take to reduce or abolish the use of the battery system to induce a higher production of eggs by hens, in view of the cruelty caused by this unnatural method.

Mr. T. Williams: I have no evidence that the battery system of keeping hens is cruel and do not, therefore, propose to take any action on the lines suggested.

Sir T. Moore: The right hon. Gentleman must be aware, if he has studied this matter at all, that it is this very uncivilised system of getting our eggs which involves this artificial and inhuman method. . . .

Aliens

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Health if he will name the regulations governing the use of the National Health Service by aliens who arrive in Britain; and whether they permit every such alien to use the service.

Mr. Bevan: There are no regulations. The right of aliens to make use of the National Health Service is implied by the relevant sections of the Act which covers all aliens in England and Wales.

Di-nitro-ortav-cresol

Mr. Gooch asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he is aware of the risks to agricultural and horticultural workers arising out of the use of di-nitro-ortav-cresol; and if he will withdraw the exemption from the poison rules which permits the sale of di-nitro-ortav-cresol for use in agriculture and horticulture.

Mr. T. Williams: Preparations containing this substance are of great value in the control of weeds and certain pests of fruit trees, and I am advised that if reasonable care is taken there is little or no risk to workers using them. Advice on precautions has been given wide publicity by my Department. The poisons rules, made under the Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1933, are the responsibility of my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary.

Pound Sterling (Value)

Sir I. Fraser asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, taking the value of the pound sterling as 100 in 1914, he will state its value on April 1, 1919, 1921, 1923, 1928, 1938, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948 and 1949.

Sir S. Cripps:

July, 1914	100
Average for year, 1919	47
Average for year, 1921	44
Average for year, 1923	57
Average for year, 1928	60
Average for year, 1938	64
Average for year, 1945	42
Average for year, 1946	41
Average for year, 1947	38
Average for year, 1948	36
April 12, 1949	35

FROM WEEK TO WEEK continued from page 4.

Taken as a whole, it is the chatter of Kipling's *Bandar-log*, and all that comes out of it is what came from that chatter: "Brother, your tail hangs down behind."

How much of this all-pervading "ss-h, we can't tell you why, but the situation is simply terrible, and the impending catastrophe awful" is just another application of P.E.P.'s "Only in war, or under threat of war, etc." slightly modified to "Only under threat of collapse" will the British stand a final big steal, e.g. a capital levy? We don't know.

German Grand Lodge

The *Daily Telegraph* for June 20 announced the constitution in Frankfurt on the previous day of Germany's first United Grand Lodge of Freemasons since 1933. Dr. Theodor Vogel, who was elected Grand Master, said that only 9,000 German Freemasons, out of 70,000 before 1933, survived the Hitler regime.

According to the *New York Herald Tribune*, Dr. Vogel has been a Mason since 1925. The Grand Lodge unites 146 local Masonic chapters which have been revived in the American, British and French Occupation Zones since 1945. In Russian-occupied eastern Germany, where the organization is still banned, there are said to be 2,000 Masons. When Hitler came to power, German Freemasonry is said to have owned 200,000,000 marks' worth of property. The *Herald Tribune* says that throughout the Hitler regime Masons and Jews were linked together in Nazi propaganda. "Masons say," the correspondent states, "that seven members of their 'underground' were executed by the Nazis in connection with the July 20, 1944, plot on Hitler's life."

Palmerston and Freemasonry

In view of the resumption of Parliament on June 21, before we have completed the publication of extracts chosen from the Debates before the Adjournment, we are obliged to hold over until next week the last of the three chapters from the late Mgr. George F. Dillon's Lectures on *The War of Anti-Christ with the Church*. Dealing, as it does, with the virtual attainment of "the object of the labour of ages," through Palmerston's instrumentality, it is undesirable that the republication of this important chapter should be divided.