

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 22 No. 19.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 9, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"No doubt there will be the usual contribution from Mr. Norman Smith, Socialist M.P. for South Nottingham. He is a remarkable character who always takes in good part the roars of laughter which greet his financial speeches.

"His money schemes are on the lines of the Douglas Social Credit scheme, the process by which everybody lives by taking in everybody else's washing.

"In matters of finance Mr. Norman Smith is blandly satisfied that all M.Ps. are crazy except Mr. Norman Smith. He may well be right. . . ." —*The Sunday Chronicle*.

To anyone unacquainted with the "freedom of the Press" as practised, the foregoing commentary on Mr. Norman Smith, M.P., and his views, might appear to be an attack.

We should judge that it was, on the contrary, the work of someone who, like ourselves, would wish to congratulate Mr. Smith on his courage and intelligence.

• • •

"FRANKFURT, JUNE 19. Freemasonry was revived in Western Germany today on a national scale for the first time since the Masons were banned and forced underground by Adolf Hitler in 1933 . . . Unanimously chosen as Germany's Masonic Grand Master was Dr. Theodore Vogel . . . Headquarters of the Grand Lodge will be in Frankfurt." —*Herald Tribune*, N.Y., June 20.

All very informative.

• • •

OUR LOVING COUSINS. "Many American buyers are, in view of the pressure being exercised by Washington for devaluation of sterling, either delaying the placing of orders for British goods, or postponing payment on recent transactions in the hope that their bills will be reduced by devaluation." —*New York Herald Tribune*, Paris edition, June 20.

But as for the British, they couldn't care less. The so-called pound, under the manipulation of the choicest products of the Fabian Society, P.E.P., and the London School of Economics ("a place to train and raise the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State") is worth less than a quarter of its pre-war value (because we are exporting all the goods we pay wages for) and will buy a range of products not one third as varied. As the ordinary individual, in place of keeping his accounts in a unit which was accepted the world over, now calculates in "funny-money which failed in Alberta" which he can't use abroad and isn't allowed to take anyway, he very properly leaves the dirty game to the *charlatanerie* who are running it. After all, he clamoured for nationalisation of banking, didn't he, and it's just too bad if he didn't know what it meant, although Mr. Montagu Norman welcomed it.

• • •

Simply as a political party, it is not necessary to take the Liberals seriously. But a specimen copy of *The Liberal News*,

the official organ of the Liberal Central Office which has come to us, carries a portrait of Lord Samuel on its front page and one of Lady Abrahams on its back page, as its only embellishments, and that places electoral Liberalism in quite a different category.

While it is probably quite true that anti-Jewish feeling in this country does not at this time amount to anything of much importance, it is widespread, and is growing. *Prima facie*, a party which was appealing for *British-born* support would not regard philo-Judaism as a short cut to a parliamentary majority.

It would appear, therefore, that it is below the surface to which we must look for the explanation of what may be an important factor in the immediate future—below, for instance, the well-known affiliations of Liberal-Whiggism and Jewish finance and policy all through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, until the Party was wrecked by the Zionist Lloyd-George, and North America became the Finance G.H.Q.

The first point may be that the alien and almost solidly Jewish population which has poured into the country during the past fifteen years may be of much larger dimensions than most people think (hence the "fair shares for all" racket at native expense); that this alien horde can probably be provided with votes and will use them as the Jewish leadership decides; and that by arranging its registration in favourable circumstances, quite a considerable number of seats could be split from the anti-Socialist bloc.

It is also possible—quite likely—that the back-bench Labourites are getting tired of their masters, and a solidly Jewish Party, even of moderate numbers, could crack the whip over them.

The primary strategy of Jewish politics is to capitalise and assist an erroneous explanation of, and remedy for, a real cause of discontent (*cf* "we must know how to apply an idea whenever it appears necessary to attract the masses of the people to one's party for the purpose of crushing another who is in authority"). Every major "plan" which has been forced through British politics, whether in war or "peace", for the last fifty years has been fallacious in design and conception from the point of view of the British; but in every case highly advantageous to either a section, or the whole race, of the Jews, and their immediate interest and tool, the U.S.A.

To a considerable extent, this has been facilitated by the dispersion of powerful Jewish interests in every political party, which tossed the ball, under cover, to whichever quarter seemed most suitable. It may be that we are now going to see a widely-recognised Jewish Party, with a few Gentile dupes who will be well rewarded. If so, nothing could be better in the long run, although the immediate consequences may be disastrous.

Having exterminated the Red Indian, and employed its sob-sisters to assist in the drive against the British in India, so that while the Moslems are exterminating the Hindus, the Americans can re-conquer the sub-continent, Washington and Wall Street are playing-in with the French Colonial Empire in North Africa with the obvious intention of imitating the cuckoo when they have learnt the local tricks. The Rothschild interests have been so predominant in France for many years that it is unlikely that they are not getting their rake-off.

We learn from the Press of June 27 that the *Daily Mirror* Newspapers, Ltd., of London, which has been widely credited with being under the control of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff has purchased a large block of shares in The Argus and Australian Ltd., the owners of the Melbourne *Argus*.

The *Argus* is one of the most influential papers in Australia, and has recently been giving wide publicity to the political and economic views of the best type of Australian Social Crediters and publishing articles by Mr. Eric Butler. Obviously, this must be stopped.

House of Commons: June 2, 1949.

PARLIAMENT

Council of Europe (British Representation)

The Prime Minister (Mr. Attlee): I desire, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, to make a statement.

The House will recollect that on May 5 my right hon. Friend the Lord President of the Council said in answer to a Question that the British representation to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe would consist of Members of one or other House of Parliament and would include Members of His Majesty's Opposition.

I am now able to announce the names of the Members of this delegation. The representatives from the Government Benches are:

My right hon. Friend the Lord President of the Council.

My right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

My right hon. Friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury, and

My hon. Friends the Members for Broxtowe (Mr. Cocks), Buckingham (Mr. Crawley), Coventry, West (Mr. Edelman), Lanark, North (Miss Herbison), Hulme (Mr. Lee), Hull, North-West (Mr. R. Mackay), Bilston (Mr. Nally), and my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Llandaff and Barry (Mr. Ungood-Thomas).

The representatives of His Majesty's Opposition are:

The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition the Member for Woodford (Mr. Churchill).

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bromley (Mr. Harold Macmillan).

The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Liverpool (West Derby) (Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe), and

The hon. Gentlemen the Members for Aberdeen, East (Mr. Boothby), and Chippenham (Mr. Eccles), and the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Londonderry (Sir R. Ross).

The remaining member of the delegation who is not a member either of the Government or Conservative Opposition parties will be from another place. The noble Lord, Lord Layton, has accepted my invitation to join the delegation

in this capacity. These appointments are for the first session of the Assembly, which, it is expected, will be held in Strasbourg at a date yet to be fixed in August.

According to the Statute of the Council of Europe, it will be in Order to appoint substitutes for representatives who may sit, speak and vote in their places. Invitations have been extended to certain hon. Members to act in this capacity, should their services be required, although it is not expected that it will be necessary for all of them to attend the Session of the Assembly.

Mr. Gallacher: On a point of Order. I should like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference, if it will be in Order for me at this stage to lead the House in singing the "Red Flag"?

House of Commons: June 23, 1949.

FINANCE BILL

Considered in Committee.

Clause 14. (CHARGE OF INCOME TAX FOR 1949-50.)

Mr. David Eccles (Chippenham): I beg leave to move, in page 8, line 4, to leave out "nine shillings," and to insert "eight shillings and sixpence."

. . . My right hon. and hon. Friends have put down this Amendment to reduce the standard rate of Income Tax as a declaration of war against the burden of Socialist taxation. I wonder what hon. Gentlemen would have replied if, four years ago, when peace and Socialism arrived together, they had been asked what they expected the rate of Income Tax to be in the financial year 1949-50? I wonder if a single one of us imagined that we should still be paying 9s. in the £? Certainly that was not the view of His Majesty's Ministers, for it is well known that they instructed the Service Departments to work out the post-war scale of pay and allowances upon the basis of an Income Tax of 7s. 6d. in the £.

An Income Tax of 7s. 6d. in the £ after four years of peace was a reasonable expectation and until this last Budget it was possible to go on hoping that one day it would be fulfilled. Now, however, those hopes are dead, for all who heard the Chancellor's Budget speech must have realised that so long as the Socialists do the spending there can be no more significant reductions in taxation. While their fingers are in the national till, the rates of tax falling upon personal incomes and upon the earnings of industry must remain unaltered.

The Conservative Party utterly refuse to accept this kind of penal servitude as part of the British way of life. When we take our stand on that, we are thinking of everybody, for the effort of carrying our present burdens must destroy the prosperity of all classes, whether they pay Income Tax or not. The Committee is well aware just how heavy those burdens are. The combined demands of the rates, taxes and insurance stamps now claim over 40 per cent. of the national income. That is extortion without parallel in time of peace, and if we look round the world we find in no country where freedom is valued are the people asked to carry anything like the British burden.

I can speak only roughly, but to the best of my information the comparable rates are about 5s. in the £ in the United States, and in such different countries as Sweden, South Africa and France they are between 4s. and 5s. in the £. That compares with our 8s. [HON. MEMBERS: "Nine

shillings."] That compares with our 8s., taking the whole range of taxation of a proportion of the national income. The system of taxation by which we succeed in extracting this tremendous and unique proportion of the national income is as complex as any torture invented by the ancient Chinese, but the Committee will agree that among all these wealth-destroying instruments the centrepiece is the Income Tax.

It is the Income Tax which is the heaviest stroke of all. That is why my right hon. and hon. Friends, when they were considering how best to make a plain protest against the gross weight of Socialist taxation, decided to move a reduction in the standard rate of Income Tax. . . .

Mr. Crossman (Coventry, East): . . . It is interesting to notice what it is that the Conservatives have taken as their token Amendment. One could have selected many tokens to indicate one's desire to find a way to cut Government expenditure. If one were interested in the working class one could have a token reduction of indirect taxation, which clearly affects the living standards of the working class. But, clearly, that does not interest hon. Gentlemen opposite. If one were interested in the middle class one could have a token Amendment concerned with increasing children's and family allowances, according to the Report of the Royal Commission on Population. But hon. Gentlemen opposite are not interested in the middle class either. They have chosen a token Amendment whose overwhelming benefit is to one small class—the wealthy. . . .

. . . One quarter of the population will not be concerned with this Amendment at all, because one quarter of the population are members of families who do not pay any Income Tax at all.

Mr. Godfrey Nicholson (Farnham): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that every member of the community is profoundly affected by the level of Income Tax?

Mr. Crossman: We are all concerned with the level of Income Tax, and we here now are discussing which level of Income Tax pays us best. What I am indicating is that the reduction in the standard rate of Income Tax primarily benefits not the working class, not the middle class, but the wealthy class; and that is an indisputable fact.

Viscount Hinchinbrooke (Dorset, Southern): Does the hon. Gentleman really think that a married couple with £400 a year do not belong to the middle class, and that they will not benefit by this Amendment?

Mr. Crossman: I think the gain for such a family is 3½d. a month under this Amendment. I would suggest—and I should think that it is incontestable—that a reduction in the standard rate of Income Tax, compared with increases in wives' allowances or in family allowances, primarily benefits the rich and not the poor. . . .

. . . It is said we have to base our fiscal policy here on the winning of confidence. I have heard that before. It was said before the 1931 crisis. We were told that the important thing was to do something which really hurt the working class. That would restore the confidence of these important "consumers." We would regain their confidence by slashing the social services. And now this great, new, rejuvenated Tory Party has tabled this symbolic token Amendment. It means back to 1931, back to the whole of the old system of "curing" a slump, which is to say that when we are in a slump, or before we are in a slump we should cut the Government expenditure and thereby increase the nature and the evils of the slump. . . .

. . . Strangely enough, we are told that the crushing bur-

den of Government expenditure here is destroying our power of recovery. Our recovery as evaluated by E.C.E.—an anonymous and objective body—is greater than that of France, and greater than that of Italy. The astonishing achievement of carrying through a programme of social services and capital investment, combined with a record export drive, has done one thing at least. It has given us a social stability which not one other of the European countries possesses. We are a bulwark against Communism, because it is not worth while for the British worker to be a Communist. But on the Continent of Europe Communism is a permanent menace because the old society has been reconstructed by men whose confidence the Tories want to win.

Let me turn again to the situation across the Atlantic. One of the most outrageous suggestions of the Opposition is that the present drain on our gold reserves has something to do with the weight of taxation here. Let us be perfectly clear what the present crisis is about. Is it really as a result of the amount of money we are spending on social services that the Americans have ceased buying Malayan rubber? What is the real crisis? The Americans, threatened with a slump, are cutting expenditure on wool, rubber, tin and cocoa, thus ruining West Africa and Malaya. I am now told that it is something to do with the weight of taxation in this country. Let us be clear. The crisis which is approaching is the tornado of the American slump spreading over to Europe, and is nothing to do with the issue of taxation in this country. It is a far wider and profounder issue than that. Again I make the point: Study those gentlemen in Congress and it will be found that the speeches made here—fortunately only by the Opposition—are today dominating American policy: "Cut expenditure. Cut Marshall aid if possible. Things are getting difficult therefore cut Government expenditure."

If we get a slump now it will be because the mentality of this Amendment is the mentality of Congress in America. It creates the slump by its own psychology. Blind confidence in the capitalist system, refusal to plan, refusal to fight unemployment, refusal to learn from John Maynard Keynes. Refusal to learn any of the lessons of planning—that is what will precipitate the world into a crisis. And now hon. Members opposite are asking us to introduce the crisis here by legislation.

. . . We are faced with a crisis today. We are faced with a crisis which within six months may make it essential to cut and cut ruthlessly our imports. The real things we have to cut are not the social services but unessential imports. They are the luxuries, and they are the things we cannot afford. We can and must afford education, but there are certain imports which may have to go. We may have to eat less. [HON. MEMBERS: "Oh."] I would rather see food cuts than raw materials cut which would destroy full employment.

Mr. Osborne: In other words, advocating lower rations.

Mr. Crossman: I am taking the words of the hon. Members for Scarborough and Whitby and Chippenham, who both say we are facing a serious crisis but believe we can meet it by reducing Income Tax. We have to meet it by seeing that our exports and imports balance. We cannot face the crisis by the method of giving to those who have and taking away from those who have not. It cannot be done. If we are to tighten our belts, it must be by an austerity of fair shares for all and it will have to be a

(continued on page 7.)

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. 19.

Saturday, July 9, 1949.

The Mechanical Brain

We have been a little surprised to notice how often, in the past few days, unprovoked question has arisen in private conversations we have overheard concerning the press-boasted 'thinking machine' which some unthinking persons in Manchester or some such place, have claimed (or perhaps they haven't) to have set up. Quite a lot of 'common men' have been set thinking, whether the machine has been set 'thinking' or not. The notion that it has is very generally repudiated, not with scorn and envy but with a definite degree of certainty.

We are not concerned here with the oft repeated objections printed in this journal to the widespread homage paid to the more mechanical of the mental processes, the pathetic belief of planners in plans and logicians in logic, and so on; but with certain signs of revolt, instinctive in the first place and critical in the second, which may well be, and we hope they are, a first sign of a revival of the instinctive in social life. "Intelligence is not the Englishman's long suit, but instinct," and to trick him into playing the wrong hand is to get the better of him. Conversely, any sign of a reviving ability to distinguish one hand from another is a hopeful sign. We agree that there aren't many.

Opposition to Legal Aid Bill

Mr. John J. Campbell is continuing the campaign against the Legal Aid and Solicitors Bill and is reported at length in the *Aberdeen Press and Journal* for June 18, having addressed the annual meeting of the Scottish Law Agents' Society on the day before.

"We are not supposed," he said, "to be political, but there comes a stage when politics infringe on our liberty and we must come into the ring."

He suggested that the other professional bodies had not collaborated with them over this matter. He was perturbed that the Faculty of Advocates in Edinburgh had not come out fighting. To his view they were taking a very shortsighted view of matters.

There was one bright feature and that was the attitude of the Scottish Press, which had given their fight every encouragement.

The splendid figures of the plebiscite given by the chairman were the absolute answer to the Lord Advocate, denying his parrot-like cry in the House of Commons—"I have consulted the profession and have got their approval."

"The history of this Bill," said Mr. Campbell, "has been one of subterfuge and mendacity, and now they are down to threats that if we don't agree to this a public aid society will be thrust upon us."

Appealing to lawyers to come out and fight, he said,

"I feel the liberties of the whole people are in our hands today, including our own, and I suggest that in order that the House of Lords may be certain of the feeling in Scotland we should prepare a brochure of Scottish opinion on this Bill, giving both sides of the question."

A famous poet had said, "Only the Gael can make laws for the Gael." He felt in connection with the laws of Scotland that they were not going to take them either from the Kremlin or from the Marxist group at Westminster.

Mr. D. Stanley Dickson, Glasgow, chairman, said there were two points in the Bill they had been strenuously opposing. One was the vexed question of lists. According to the Bill, the new Council was directed to prepare lists of people who were willing to act.

"If you go on that list you go on for any case sent to you," he said. "You have no option. We are of the opinion that will not work. Our suggestion is that the whole question of the operation of the Act should be left to the new Council. . . ."

"We have issued a plebiscite asking members if they approve of the system of lists provided in the Bill."

The figures to date showed that of 1282 votes returned 69 approved of the system of lists and 1183 disapproved and said it should be left in the hands of the profession.

"The majority is such there is no gainsaying that we represent the profession in our contentions," he said.

Masonic Statistics

According to *Vers Demain, Van Dolen's Kalender* of Leipzig gives the number of Freemasons in North America in 1932 as 3,509,000, or just over three-quarters of the world's total of 4,539,235. The *Montreal Masonic News* gives Canada 165,609 Freemasons a year later, leaving the United States with just under three-quarters of the world total. Other figures given by the *Kalender* are:—

	Lodges	Members
Europe	8,357	741,735
Asia	102	7,000
Africa	86	4,500
Central America	314	35,000
South America	639	50,000
Australia	2,020	192,000
Total (with the three and a half million in North America's 18,000 lodges).	29,518	4,539,235

It is, perhaps, unnecessary to point out that even Freemasons have no means of checking the accuracy of such figures as are given concerning their numbers. That the figures available to *Vers Demain* (or to any other earnest enquirer?) are themselves seventeen years old is in itself curious.

Among the 'Smalls'

The *Daily Graphic* prints among the small paragraphs, without comment, a report that a resolution "calling for abolition of partition of Ireland was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives." Thus opening the way to the comment we are not printing either.

Palmerston and Freemasonry

Chapters from Dr. Dillon's "War of Anti-Christ with the Church."

(Continued)

We conclude below the republication of the three chapters dealing with Lord Palmerston in the late Mgr. George F. Dillon's Edinburgh Lectures of 1884. At a later date, we may have opportunity to cite other passages from this important work, and, for this purpose photostatic copies have been made of some parts. In the meantime, as a precaution against the suppression of such copies as may be found in libraries, and to make the work accessible to many enquirers, will readers please inform us concerning the whereabouts of any copy known to them? When available a list will be published.

THE WAR PARTY UNDER PALMERSTON

Father Deschamps, on the authority of Eckert and Mislav, gives an interesting description of all that Freemasonry, under the direction of Lord Palmerston, attempted and effected after the failure of the revolutionary movements, conducted by the party of action, under Mazzini, in 1848. These were fomented to a large extent by British diplomacy and secret service money manipulated by Lord Palmerston. Under his guidance and assistance, Mazzini had organized all his revolutionary sects. Young Italy, Young Poland, Young Europe, and the rest sprang as much from the one as from the other. But after years of close union, Mazzini, who was probably hated by Palmerston, and dreaded as the murderer of Nubius, began to wane in influence. He and his party felt, of course, the inevitable effects of failure; and the leader subsided without, however, losing any of his utility for the sect. Napoleon III. appears to have supplanted him in the esteem of Palmerston, and would, if he dared, not follow the Carbonari. Mazzini accordingly hated Napoleon III. with a deadly hatred, which he lived to be able to gratify signally when Palmerston was no more. As he was the principal means of raising Palmerston to power in the *Alta Vendita*, so, after Palmerston had passed away, he introduced another great statesman to the high conductors, if not into the high conduct itself, of the whole conspiracy; and caused a fatal blow to be given to France and to the dynasty of Napoleon. Meanwhile, from 1849 to the end of the life of Palmerston, the designs formed by the high council of secret Atheism, were carried out with a perfection, a vigour, and a success never previously known in their history. Nothing was precipitated; yet everything marched rapidly to realisation. The plan of Palmerston—or the plan of the deadly council which plotted under him—was to separate the two great conservative empires of Russia and Austria, while, at the same time, dealing a deadly blow at both. It was easy for Palmerston to make England see the utility of weakening Russia, which threatened her Indian possessions. France could be made join in the fray, by her ruler, and the powerful Masonic influence at his command: Therefore, the Russian campaign of 1852. But it was necessary for this war to keep Prussia and Austria quiet. Prussia was bribed by a promise to get, in time, the Empire of United Germany. Austria was frightened by the resolution of England and France to bring war to the Danube, and so form a projected Kingdom in Poland and Hungary. The joint power of England, France, and Turkey

could easily, then, with the aid of the populations interested, form the new kingdom, and so effectually curb Russia and Austria. But it was of more importance for the designs of the sect upon the temporal power of the Pope, and upon Austria herself, to separate the Empires. Palmerston succeeded with Austria, who withdrew from her alliance with Russia. The forces, therefore, of England and France, were ordered from the Danube to the barren Crimea, as payment for her neutrality. This bribe proved the ruin of Austrian influence. As soon as Russia was separated from her, and weakened beyond the power of assisting her, if she would, France, countenanced by England, dealt a deadly blow at Austrian rule in Italy, united Italy, and placed the temporal power of the Pope in the last stage of decay. On the other hand, Prussia was permitted to deal a blow soon after at Austria. This finished the prestige of the latter as the leading power in Germany, and confined her to her original territory, with the loss of Venice, her remaining Italian province. After this war, Palmerston passed away, and Mazzini came, once more, into authority in the sect. He remembered his grudge against Napoleon, and at once used his influence with the high direction of Masonry to abandon France and assist Germany; and, on the promise of Bismark—a promise fulfilled by the May laws—that Germany should persecute the Church as it was persecuted in Italy, Masonry went over to Germany, and Masons urged on Napoleon to that insane expedition which ended in placing Germany as the arbiter of Europe, and France and the dynasty of Napoleon in ruins. In the authorities I have quoted for you, there is abundant proof that Masonry, just as it had assisted the French Revolution and Napoleon I., now assisted the Germans. It placed treason on the side of the French, and sold in fact the unfortunate country and her unscrupulous ruler. Mazzini forced Italy not to assist Napoleon, and was gratified to find before his death, that the liar and traitor, who, in the hope of getting assistance he did not get from Masonry, had dealt his last blow at the Vicar of Christ, and placed Rome and the remnant of the States of the Church in the hands of the King of Italy, had lost the throne and gained the unenviable character of a coward and a fool.

This is necessarily but a brief glance at the programme, which Atheism has both planned and carried out since the rule of Palmerston commenced. Wherever it prevailed, the worst form of persecution of the Church at once began to rage. In Sardinia, as soon as it obtained hold of the King and Government, the designs of the French Revolution were at once carried out against religion. The State itself employed the horrible and impure contrivances of the *Alta Vendita* for the corruption and demoralisation of every class of the people. The flood gates of hell were opened. Education was at once made completely secular. Religious teachers were banished. The goods of the religious orders were confiscated. Their convents, their land, their very churches were sold, and they themselves were forced to starve on a miserable pension, while a succession was rigorously prohibited. All recognition of the spiritual power of Bishops was put an end to. The priesthood was systematically despised and degraded. The whole ministry of the Church was harassed in a hundred vexatious ways. Taxes of a crushing character were levied on the administration of the sacraments, on masses, and on the slender incomes of the parish clergy. Matrimony was made secular, divorce legalised, the privileges of the clerical state abrogated. Worse

than all, the *leva* or conscription was rigorously enforced. Candidates for the priesthood at the most trying season of their career, were compelled to join the army for a number of years, and exposed to all the snares which the *Alta Vendita* had astutely prepared to destroy their purity, and with it, of course, their vocations; "make vicious hearts, and you will have no more Catholics." Besides these measures made and provided by public authority, every favour of the State, its power of giving honours, patronage and place, was constantly denied to Catholics. To get any situation of value in the army, navy, civil service, police, revenue, on the railways, in the telegraph offices, to be a physician to the smallest municipality, to be employed almost anywhere, it was necessary to be a Freemason, or to have powerful Masonic influence. The press, the larger mercantile firms, important manufactories, depending as such institutions mostly do on State patronage and interest, were also in the hands of the Sectaries. To Catholics was left the lot of slaves. If permitted to exist at all, it was as the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. The lands which those amongst them held, who did not forsake religion, were taxed to an unbearable extent. The condition of the faithful Catholic peasants became wretched from the load of fiscal burdens placed upon them. The triumph of Atheism could not be more complete, so far as having all that the world could give on its side, and leaving to the Church scarcely more than covered her Divine Founder upon the Cross.

Bismarck, though assisted in his wars against France by the brave Catholic soldiers of the Rhine, and of the Fatherland generally, no sooner had his rival crushed, and his victory secured, than he hastened to pay to Freemasonry his promised persecution of the Church. The Freemasons in the German Parliament, and the Ministers of the sect, aided him to prepare measures against the Catholic religion as drastic as those in operation in Italy, even worse in many respects. The religious orders of men and women were rigorously suppressed or banished, as a first instalment. Then fell Catholic education to make way for an Infidel propaganda. Next came harassing decrees against the clergy by which Bishops were banished or imprisoned and parishes were deprived in hundreds of their priests. All the bad, immoral influences, invented and propagated by the sectaries, were permitted to run riot in the land. A schism was attempted in the Church. Ecclesiastical education was corrupted in the very bud, and all but the existence of Catholics was proscribed.

Wherever we find the dark sect triumphant we find the same results. In the Republics of South America, where Freemasonry holds the highest places, the condition of the Church is that of normal persecution and vexation of every kind. It has been so for many years in Spain and Portugal, in Switzerland, and to whatever extent Freemasons can accomplish it, in Belgium and in Austria. I need not say what it has been in France since the Freemason Parliament and Government have come into power. The dark Directory succeeding Weishaupt, the *Alta Vendita*, and Palmerston, sits in Paris and in Berlin almost openly, and prepares at leisure its measures, which are nothing short of, first, the speedy weakening of the Church, and then, I am certain, a bloody attempt at her extermination. If it goes on slower than it did during the French Revolution, it is in order to go on surer. Past experience too, and the determinations of the sect already arrived at, show but too clearly that a single final consummation is kept steadily in view. The impure assassins

who conduct the conspiracy have had no scruple to imbrue their hands in the blood of Christians in the past, and they never will have a scruple to do so, whenever there is hope of success. In fact, from what I have seen and studied on the Continent, an attempt at this ultimate means of getting rid at least of the clergy and principal lay readers amongst Catholics, might take place in France and even in Italy at any moment. In France, some new measure of persecution is introduced every day. The Concordat is broken openly. The honour of the country is despised. Subventions belonging by contract to the clergy are withdrawn. The insolence of the Atheistical Government, relying on the strength of the army and on the unaccountable apathy or cowardice of the French Catholic laity, progresses so fast, that no act of the Revolution of '89 or of the Commune, can be thought improbable within the present decade; and Italy would be sure to follow any example set by France in this or in any other method of exterminating the Church.

There are sure signs in all the countries where the Atheistic Revolution has made decided progress, that this final catastrophe is planned already, and that its instruments are in course of preparation. These instruments are something the same as were devised by the illuminated lodges, when the power of the French Revolution began to pass from the National Assembly to the clubs. The clubs were the open and ultimate expression of the destructive, anti-Christianity of Atheism; and when the lodges reached so far, there was no further need for secrecy. That which in the jargon of the sect is called "the object of the labour of ages," was attained. Man was without God or Faith, King or Law. He had reached the level aimed at by the Commune, which is itself the ultimate end of all Masonry, and all that secret Atheistic plotting which since the rise of Atheism, has filled the world.

In our day, if Masonry does not found Jacobite or other clubs, it originates and cherishes movements fully as satanic and as dangerous. Communism, just like Carbonarism, is but a form of the illuminated Masonry of Weishaupt. "Our end," said the *Alta Vendita*, "is that of Voltaire and the French Revolution." Names and methods are varied, but that end is ever the same. The clubs at the period of the French Revolution were, after all, local. Masonry now endeavours to generalise their principles and their powers of destructive activity on a vastly more extended scale. We therefore no longer hear of Jacobins or Girondins; but we hear of movements destined to be for all countries what the Jacobins and the Girondins were for Paris and for France. As surely, and for the same purpose, as the clubs proceeded from the lodges in 1789, so, in this latter half of the nineteenth century, the lodges send out upon the whole civilised world; for the very same intent, the terrible Socialist *organizations*, all founded upon the lines of Communism, and called, according to the exigencies of time, place, and condition, the association of the brethren of [*] the International, the Nihilists, the Black Hand, etc.

I am well aware that there are multitudes in Freemasonry—even in the most "advanced" Freemasonry of Italy and France—who have no real wish to see the principles of these anarchists predominate. Those, for instance, who in advocating the theories of Voltaire, and embracing for their realisation the organization of Weishaupt, saw only a

[*] At this point we run on into the heading and first sentences of Mgr. Dillon's Chapter XX, the sole departure we have made from the literal text.

means to get for themselves honours, power, and riches, which they could never otherwise obtain but by Freemasonry, would be well pleased enough to advance no further, once the good things they loved had been gained. "*Nous voulons, Messieurs,*" said Thiers, "*la republique, mais la republique conservatrice.*"

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

great deal fairer than it is today. Members opposite who are proposing symbolic Amendments to benefit the rich—[HON. MEMBERS: "Oh."] Surely we are all agreed on that. Let us realise that, when the crisis hits us we are not only going to have to balance our exports and imports but have a greater levelling of personal incomes than we have at present if we are to keep our people loyal and working. But to ask the nation in this crisis to accept a cut in the standard rate of Income Tax is an insult to its intelligence, whose recklessness shows that nothing has been learnt by Members opposite since 1931.

Mr. Boothby (Aberdeen and Kincardine, Eastern): . . . Nevertheless, a major factor in our difficulties is the present crushing burden of taxation, which makes itself felt on every section of industry, and which impinges on the life, livelihood and standard of living of every family in this country, from the poorest to the richest.

It is no good hon. Gentlemen opposite saying that we are out to champion only the very well-to-do. Another of the reckless observations of the hon. Member for East Coventry was that we did not even care about the middle class. We know jolly well that the middle class count a lot in this country, and that they are, to a large extent, the backbone of the country. We also know that they are now largely merged with the working class. The hon. Gentleman drew a sharp distinction; but I am not clear which is working class and which is middle class. Perhaps one has to be a Wykehamist in order to distinguish between these two classes.

The Government of this country have explicitly laid the responsibility for production and for the maintenance of our export trade, as to 80 per cent., upon private enterprise and private industry. They cannot do that, and at the same time tax it indefinitely at the rate of 9s. in the £. That is our simple proposition, on which we shall stand and which I believe will be accepted in the country. It is a proposition on which I hope that we shall vote in a few minutes.

Viscount Hinchinbrooke (Dorset, Southern): . . . Our object here is to centralise our whole complaint against the burden of taxation and Government expenditure in what has rightly been called this token or symbolic Amendment. It is symbolic of the desire of the Conservative Party steadily to get away from the planned economy, the regulations and controls backed by the force of the police—[HON. MEMBERS: "Oh."]—from the great Cripps freeze upon wages, profits, dividends, rents and currency and upon the passage of goods into and out of the country. This Amendment states in legislative terms our desire to restore what we understand by the progressive free society of Britain.

We have moved to reduce the Income Tax by 6d. this year. I hope that next year it will be 1s., and 1s. more after that. This is not a class or particular income group Amendment. [HON. MEMBERS: "Oh."] As we have repeatedly explained, it symbolises our main theme. Hon. Gentlemen will find on the Order Paper various Amendments designed, in association with this, to assist other

sections of the community. I have one relating to dependants' allowances. The hon. Member for East Coventry chided us with doing nothing for the lower income groups. The Chancellor has removed that possibility by not allowing any reductions in Purchase Tax to be moved, which we should have liked to do. In my Budget speech I said I hoped that we would be able to put down an Amendment to reduce the duty on beer by 2d. instead of 1d. and on cigarettes by 6d. There is every kind of disposition on this side of the Committee to do things to reduce the pressure on all sections of society.

We must do everything we can at this very grave time for the future of the country to break the power of the collectivist State before it breaks us and ruins the spirit and individuality of everyone in the country. We should do it traditionally and constitutionally by refusing Supply and refusing Ways and Means. We ought now to reverse some of our thinking. The war taught us to do a lot of things first and to pay for them afterwards, and bureaucracy has done nothing but inherit the mood of the Armed Forces of the Crown in the war. I serve on the Estimates Committee with other hon. Members on both sides of this main Committee. We all know how impossible it is adequately to cover the whole field of Government expenditure. When we are able to bite upon any single item, we reveal most disturbing figures and trends. Hon. Members opposite know it and say it not only privately but now, fortunately, publicly in no uncertain terms, as the Reports come out.

What we are finding out is that, in spite of the period which has gone by since the end of the war, when there ought to have been a gradual decentralisation and demobilisation of the whole collectivist bureaucratic machine, the tendency in departments is still to proliferate in expenditure and still to branch out with new items and new designs of thought. No one under the Socialist Government is working within a strict budget. All down the line staff are being taken on Departments at home, sub-departments, the British Council, the Arts Council, Embassies, and Colonial establishments are now filled with people who are doing jobs which were never done before in peacetime. [HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear."] Those jobs are not comparable with any jobs done by other States which are much more frugal and at the same time much livelier than we are.

The taxpayer exerts absolutely no control over the trend of events. On the contrary, control is exercised exactly in the reverse direction. The Treasury is much too weak to resist the spending Departments of the State, and the taxpayer is too weak to resist the Treasury. The taxpayer today is at the complete mercy of every bureaucrat with an idea, just as during the war, with much greater justification, the taxpayer was at the mercy of every engineer or every soldier with an invention. The secrecy and complexity of government are used today by the Socialist Government as a deliberate shield to prevent the taxpayer, who is, after all, the author of all fiscal power, from seeing whether what he is writing is making any kind of sense. As I said before, the only organisation that we have in this House which can touch upon these events in passing, the Estimates Committee, is quite incapable of lifting the veil of secrecy adequately, so that our constituents may see what is going on.

I should therefore plead that this Committee should make a conscious decision to vote on this Amendment in

order to resist the trend of events, to limit the growth of expenditure and to give deliberate instructions to the Treasury that they are to budget Departments strictly and restore to the taxpayer some of the power of which he has been deprived. If we do not do that, I suggest to the Committee that we face a very serious precipice, just as every country behind the Iron Curtain is facing it today and as even the United States faced it in the days of prohibition. That precipice is a very grave change in the moral character of our people.

I am very seriously concerned, as every hon. Member must be, at the widespread evasion of the law. There must be countless thousands of persons in this country, all the way down from high financiers to lowly traders, who are evading Income Tax illegally. Many more people again are suffering a moral deterioration of character through using their capital savings, whether earned or inherited, as income without any thought at all of future generations and their welfare. Excessive taxation leads them to do this. The great economist, Mr. Colin Clark, has referred to that trend and has also stated that excessive taxation actively promotes inflation. I will quote a short passage from his letter to the *Economist*:

"Excessive taxation acts on real income through an economic process of disincentives with which we are familiar, and at the same time"—

here is the point about the deterioration of moral character—"expands money incomes through the less familiar socio-political process of weakening those forces . . . which can normally be relied on to resist inflationary pressure."

So from that we see that economics and sociology combine in this period of Socialism to destroy personal standards. It is a grave charge against the Government that it should actively teach its citizens to explore the techniques of moral collapse, and that is what the Chancellor of the Exchequer is doing. He is, I believe, a good man and a Christian, but if he thinks that by austerity and high taxation he can compel people to be good and Christian he is terribly wrong. What he is compelling them to do is to turn their thoughts away from their work and their normal way of life towards devising by every means possible ways of overcoming him and his legislation; in other words, society in a period of excessive taxation turns introvertedly upon itself and becomes self-destroying. A generation ago, and again now, Europe experienced their terrible process.

The Population Report shows that classes of persons of great value to society today are being denied the means to express themselves and to give their lives and activities to the State out of the comfort and grace of home life. It is quite true that there are certain classes which the Socialists have actively aided. The coal miner, the engineer and other sections of society have risen in status but other sections have fallen severely in the last few years—clergymen, teachers, retired Service officers, elderly spinsters, widows and university professors. These and many others are in poor circumstances today, and the mother of children is the most harshly hit of all. There never has been a Government which has acted with so little restraint against liberal-minded and educated people. [HON. MEMBERS: "Oh!"] Oh, yes, and the very people on whom we most rely to preserve and exemplify the moral force and stature of the country.

. . . Again there never has been a Government which has aided quite so blatantly as this Government have their own friends, most of them strong materialists. We see these prototypes rising today above the general standard, singled

out by the Socialist Government for special treatment—the scientist, the electrician, the engineer, the coal miner, the nationalised board executive and the trade union boss.

Mr. Hughes: If the noble Lord will allow me, since he has mentioned education, he may or may not be aware that this Government is spending far greater amounts on university development than ever before in peacetime in this country; that is, expenditure on scholarships and allowances at the universities is some 13 times what it was in the 1930's.

Viscount Hinchinbrooke: I am not at this moment talking about how many people are being paid by the Government for undergoing a course. I am not talking about whether the standard of education is low or high, and on the whole I believe it to be deteriorating. What I am talking about is the quality of living of some of these people—not necessarily what they are doing in paid work, but in their leisure hours and holidays in the home and out of the home.

. . . The point may well be made that the whole community pays Income Tax on the general scale laid down, but I believe that the principle of equal burden for all is being vitiated by the generous allowances and benefits given to selected classes of society; allowances and benefits ranging from canteens for coal miners and engineers to travelling, living and entertaining expenses of those whom Socialism thinks ought to be privileged.

I have a number of family budgets here of people who fall just outside the class covered by this Amendment. Because it might be said that a number of them do not pay Income Tax—though they suffer terribly from indirect taxation—I do not propose to detail them to the Committee. However, there are comments made upon them such as "We have drawn out all our savings to help us." "We cannot afford anything like football pools, dog racing, the cinema and other entertainments"—comments of that kind throughout this correspondence make most distressing reading. Indeed I sympathise at times with the hon. Member for Central Bradford (Mr. Webb) when he wants to make conditions of living much easier for these people, for these weekly budgets, with the letters accompanying them, tell heartrending stories.

I ask what is to become of the life and power of Britain if, through Socialism, every single private reserve of energy is taxed to the full? . . .

The Economic Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Douglas Jay): We have had an instructive and wide-ranging Debate, including a number of imaginative references to both ancient and modern Rome. However, what this Amendment proposes is a reduction in the standard rate of Income Tax from 9s. to 8s. 6d. That would cost £73 million in the present financial year and £83 million in a full year. Some of the reductions in taxation suggested by the noble Lord, running several years ahead, would cost nearer £800 million than £80 million.

Viscount Hinchinbrooke: No, exactly £200 million.

Mr. Jay: But even £80 million would convert the overall surplus of £14 million, for which we have budgeted this year, into a deficit, with all the injurious and inflationary consequences that we would have unless, of course, at the same time hon. Members opposite proposed to make large reductions in food subsidies and social services or other expenditure. . . .