

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol 22. No. 3.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 19, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

FAGIN

By BORGE JENSEN.

Almost a century ago a lady belonging to the Imperial Jewish family of Rothschild wrote a letter of remonstrance to the author of *Oliver Twist* taking him to task for having chosen as his arch villain a member of the race to which she belonged. Charles Dickens wrote politely back explaining that much as he regretted that his choice of scoundrel did not find favour with Madame de Rothschild this choice was natural, nay inevitable as (I quote from memory) everybody acquainted with the criminal world of the East End of London of the period knew that the Jewish element predominated there.

The shocking conditions prevailing in the late 18th century in London Ghetto are described by Patrick Colquhoun, a London magistrate, in his *Treatise on the Police Force of the Metropolis*. The horrors of the Frankfurt Ghetto of the same period are vividly depicted by Jens Bachesen, the Danish romantic traveller, in his *Labyrinth*, while the mechanism of frustration which rendered these and all other "Jewries" stagnant social pools productive of the kind of social misfits, which were let loose on the Gentile populations in successive waves from the "French" revolution onwards, are searchingly analysed in Jacob Brafmann's *The Book of the Kahal*. Brafmann lists a large number of *Protocols*, or *Edicts* of the Russo-Polish Kahal of the late 18th century, when the Kahal (*i.e.*, the oligarchy in control of a local Jewish community) was almost completely independent and invariably intensely unpopular with their own people. Every Protocol or Edict was designed either to create a 'problem', or prevent one from being solved. The Kahal legislator is the prototype of every "Socialist" politician of the 19th and 20th century.

The London Ghetto of Colquhoun's times was at the mercy of gangsters of the identical Russo-Polish (*i.e.* Tartar Mongol) type which broke into the Berlin theatre to prevent the figure of Fagin (note the "Russian" ring of the name) from reminding the Berliners of those qualities of the *Ostjude* (Eastern Jew) with which they are all too familiar.

Colquhoun's revelations disturbed the London Jewish oligarchy, and Abraham Goldsmid detailed one of his public relations officers, Joshua van Oven, honorary physician to the Great London Synagogue to "look into the matter." His findings "shocked" the leaders of the synagogue, but they had an explanation ready to hand. Jewish "explanations" do not vary much from century to century: the root trouble was that the Jewish masses were prevented by Gentile regulations from acquiring skilled trades, and they were

necessarily driven to make shift for money as best they could, and were inevitably implicated in the wave of crime which spread over London in the third quarter of the eighteenth century.

This statement from Paul H. Emden's *Jews of Britain* (pp. 94-95) merely re-echoes the official explanation.

Messrs. Goldsmid and Co. then offered their services in the solution of the 'problem' of London poverty. Van Oven contacted Colquhoun. The Jewish savant and the Gentile magistrate proceeded to draft a comprehensive scheme aiming at "diffusing knowledge of trades" among the Jewish poor. The scheme was submitted to, and approved by Goldsmid (*op. cit.* p. 95),

who placed a Bill in the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, supported by a petition in its favour. The scheme if duly carried out, would have done an immense amount of good; but owing to opposition, including some from Jewish ranks, Goldsmid found himself compelled to withdraw the application to Parliament.

The Jews remained as trade-less and proletarian as ever. But it is an interesting reflection that it was the same Colquhoun, who had collaborated so closely with the London Kahal who was later to work out the plans on which Sir Robert Peel formed his Metropolitan Police in 1829. So we see that "Fagin" corresponds to an historical fact, and that the coming into the country of the Russo-Polish Tartar Jews produced that "general lawlessness" which "justified" the formation of a regular Police Force, the strength of which grew in exact proportion as the Jews were emancipated from the Ghetto and freed from their Civic disabilities.

The fight for the Political Emancipation of English Jews was led by Baron de Rothschild, the pillar of 'Change and Synagogue, whose vast charities were bestowed in such a way that the greater number of his East End co-racialists remained submerged in the shocking conditions of 'spivery' and lawlessness described by Dickens and analysed by Colquhoun and Van Oven. Nor were Rothschild's descendants any more successful in abolishing the East End Ghetto world from which have emerged many of the leading social reformers of our own day. The various vast schemes for liquidating the Ghetto, as often as not drafted by Gentile reformers and sentimentalists, invariably foundered on the disunity among the leading Jewish families (the Kahal) who, *vis à vis* the Gentile world, always preserved so impressively united a front. In 1889 Nathan Meyer, first Lord Rothschild

became a member of a parliamentary commission appointed to report on the congestion in the population of London. He urged the London Jewish community to unite on what was known as the "East End Scheme", a plan for improving the spiritual and social life of Jewish East London. Though Lord Rothschild offered £20,000 toward the expenses, the plan was vigorously opposed by Sir Samuel Montagu, and others, and nothing came of it . . .

and the 'congestion' in the East End remained much as it was in Fagin's days. Note that it is always the leading Jew who takes the reformer's role, while the 'opposition', to which the leader 'reluctantly' yields, emanates from a member of a less conspicuous family.* But even so it should have

* In this way a vague impression is conveyed that Jewish leadership has tried its best and been foiled in its efforts to reach a solution by the inherent difficulties of the 'problem.' The

struck Lord Rothschild's contemporaries as odd that only relatively small sums were offered by their Royal family to solve the internal problems of Jewry while hundreds of thousands and even millions were given to any Gentile project anywhere which promised a safe return in terms of Rothschild control of the Gentile enterprise. They might have asked themselves: How much of the world must the Rothschilds control before they begin to remove the worst sores from the social-racial unit of which they are the supreme arbiters?

But Rothschild's contemporaries might be excused for averting their glances from the central plague spot of their fast growing Empire, and for leaving to bloodless 'reformers' the task of finding a way out. There were so many exciting things to do. So many new worlds to conquer. It was the hey-day of British Power and Prestige. Not one person in a thousand questioned the dogma of the inevitability of Progress, and only a very few, like Trollope, noticed that there had set in a subtle decay of manners and morals, spreading from the top downwards. The period marked the culmination of Gentile tolerance towards the Jews, and of Jewish 'assimilation' among the Gentiles. They had penetrated every circle, married into half the Peerage, gained key positions at Court. Well could the late Victorian and the Edwardian Jews afford to allow their fellow citizens a few harmless jokes about Jewish peculiarities. "Oliver Twist" had been reprinted in scores of editions and scores of different languages, and "Fagin" had become one of the favourite scoundrels of the British juvenile readers, without any Jewish "Defence" Committee having deemed it necessary to "take any appropriate steps" in the matter.

Then came the first Great War in which, as we now know, the Rothschilds and their colleagues on both sides of the firing lines held all the important cards. Every chronicler and every novelist has told you that 1914 marked the end of an epoch and that 'things' were never the same again. Nor were they. If the Jews in English-speaking countries were not as yet under suspicion, as a collectivity, they were no longer implicitly trusted. Some Gentiles had observed certain phenomena which they were unable to forget. Mr. Hilaire Belloc was one of them. His findings can be seen in *The Jews*. Mr. Cameron, the brilliant Scottish-American writer attached to Ford's *Dearborn Independent*, was another. Mr. Cameron's striking revelations of Jewish penetration into American political and cultural life are collected under the title of *The International Jew*, and constitute a major contribution to Gentile enlightenment on the true nature of the Fagins of this world. He reveals that *The Merchant of Venice* had, in many cases, been banned by Jewish blackmail from the curricula of colleges and the repertoires of theatres in the U.S.A. (During a chance conversation in a Scottish hotel, recently the writer learnt that the rigorous methods of enforcing a racial policy in the realm of culture described by Cameron in 1921 are not unknown in this country: the experts connected with the English and Scottish Drama Leagues received from time to time pointed injunctions to withdraw "the Merchant" from their season's repertoires.)

It is true that there was much planning and talk of slum-clearance during the brittle, "collective-security"-conditioned twenties, and the depressed "poverty-amidst-plenty"-dominated thirties, but judging from writers like

curiosity of the Gentiles was, until recently, always easily satisfied in matters of internal Jewish administration—they could not care less.

Colonel Lane (*The Alien Menace*) one would not expect that Fagin and Co., if transplanted to the London of the early 20th century would have to experience any difficulty in "finding" their feet in the New and Municipal Ghetto of that period. The Ghetto-slum was 'cleared' only in the sense that it was allowed to spill over into new tenement houses which soon acquired that look of disreputable squalor which is the hallmark of Jew-quarters in every part of the globe. A study of Col. Lane's book reveals that Ghetto-land was still dominated by the "Russian" variety of Jew and bears out the statement made by Captain W. Stanley Shaw, of the London Police Court Mission, in the *Daily Mail*, April 16, 1928, that:

the master crooks in this country are mostly aliens; so are master crooks in the United States. The British and the Irish races are on the whole naturally honest. With thousands of the aliens who settled in Britain and the United States during the past thirty-five years the reverse is the truth. Their instincts are predatory.

The newspapers of the period referred to these aliens, when they mentioned their nationality at all, as "Russians" and "Poles", and their editors should be thankful that no native Russian or Polish politician had ever thought of passing legislation to render libellous statements made against sections of the earth's population a criminal offence, for these criminals were, in fact, the blood brothers of Fagin, born in Ghetto-land, with Yiddish as their mother tongue.

Nor should it be overlooked that the Municipal Ghetto of the long Armistice period was increasingly under control of people born in the Ghetto. A perusal of the names of the councillors of the L.C.C. of the time makes it clear it was, once again, the "Russo-Polish" element that predominated. The L.C.C. became recognised as a training ground for the members of future "Labour" Governments, and it is therefore only natural that its present Chairman should be Lady Nathan, née Stettauer.

The London and the New York, or Chicago Ghettoes were the habitual setting of the murder-detective novels and crime-and-sex plays which became all the rage after the first world war, and which are still much in vogue. Some of our leading political planners, (like Mr. Cole), spend much of their leisure in writing detective stories with a large circulation. When, during the second world war, the Internationally-imposed Black-Out (Russia was an exception, in Moscow, it was found that a Light-out was more effective!) prevented film-fans from wallowing in their weekly orgy of blood and murder, the B.B.C. came to the rescue and did its utmost to supply the ever-growing volume of demand for bloody murder at one remove. The second world war ended and, once again, it was felt that things could never be the same again. In Great Britain, a "Labour" Government came to power, and the planning of Britain's Towns and Countryside was taken over by Mr. Silkin, son of an East-End Talmudist born in the Russo-Polish Ghetto-land. Lord Rothschild, who joined the "Labour" party, and who, during the war, had assisted in the Government's scientific (chemical) programme, as well as in its internment policy (18b), no longer, as was formerly the rule with the head of the House of Rothschild, found it necessary to guide the destinies of world Jewry from the City of London offices of N. M. Rothschild and Sons. But he remained, like his forbears, much interested in sociology and continues to mingle his chemistry (like Dr. Weizmann in Palestine) with efforts to advance large-scale social planning. He is, with a Mr. Samuel, a member of the Government's Overseas Corporation which is in charge of

Mr. Strachey's African Ground Nut Scheme.

In the U.S.A. there became visible a new awareness (but not, as yet reflected in the official U.S.A. press) of the racial origins of most of the world's discontents. The Committee of Un-American activities chose to direct their investigations towards the Communist aspect of the Hollywood "amusement" industry. It was found that Hollywood was, in fact, a hotbed of Communism, and the fate of the many Jewish portrayals of Gentile criminals (this is, in fact, a favourite trick: a Jewish actor plays the bad boy of the piece, simply because that is the best part; but he is surrounded, on the screen, by an obviously Gentile family and carries a Gentile name, as does the actor himself, although born in the Russo-Polish Ghetto) hangs in the balance at the time of writing. This, and related phenomena, have made it imperative to strengthen Jewish "Defence" Committees and to explore for new techniques of "combating anti-semitism."

Now, the Jewish World Congress is the body which looks after Jewish cultural and other interests throughout the world. When, after World War II, a Swede by the name of Einar Aaberg by his pamphleteering efforts caused too much attention to be drawn to the Jewish contribution to the Soviet Menace, the World Jewish Congress sent one of their most experienced people to Sweden, whose Minister of Justice happened to be married to a Jewess, and a series of proceedings were instituted against the delinquent. While the Swedish authorities, making use of their finest experts in psychiatry, did not succeed in having Aaberg declared insane, and interned in a lunatic asylum, they managed to have put on the Swedish Statute Book a law making mass-libel a criminal offence. The jovial Swedes have nicknamed the law *Lex Aaberg*.

In the latter part of 1948 a British film version of "Oliver Twist" was given its opening run in London. The first night was attended by Her Majesty Queen Mary, and the film was well received by critics and public. In the U.S.A., however, "Oliver" immediately ran into heavy weather. Jewish guttersnipes formed 'picket' lines and Jewish Rabbis wrote letters of indignant protest to the New York press. The World Jewish Congress (which had just published a substantial report: "Unity in Dispersion", which set forth in detail the nature of Jewish International Defence-activities, which should be studied with care) got busy. They made representations to the American authorities in Germany, and General Clay obediently had the film banished from the American Zone. The British authorities were, of course, also approached but the issue remained in the balance until the other day, "When hundreds of Jews, for the second day in succession broke into the Kurbel Cinema, in the British sector, armed German police were stoned. One Briton was hit on the head with a club when trying to break up the fight . . ."—(*The Scotsman*, February 22, 1949).

The attacking Jews were of the usual Russo-Polish (Tartar-Mongol) variety which stands out, and takes the leadership, in "Communist" disturbances everywhere. They shouted that "no anti-semitic films must be seen in Germany." The Germans themselves looked on passively, as did also the British Police and Military. The agents of the Company declared that they would stand firm and carry on if assured of British Police protection. But the Chief of the British authorities, like Pilate, washed his hands of the affair declaring that *the British would not interfere*. The following day

came the announcement that the British had surrendered unconditionally to the Yiddish bandits; the film would not be shown in the British sector of Germany.

In war, nothing is more instructive than to observe the reactions of your enemy to the successive phases of the battle, and the caption announcing the massed attack of the "Polish" Jews on the Berlin Cinema is illuminating: "*Oliver Twist*": *Jews hurt in Berlin*. The attack was carefully planned, openly threatened in advance, and carried out to schedule. The Jewish mob is referred to as "demonstrators.": "The demonstrations ceased only when a Jewish spokesman announced that the film would not be shown", says the *Jewish Chronicle* of February 25. The 'incident' is treated as a major victory deserving of a leader-article. In this we read:

The events which occurred in Berlin this week as a result of the showing of the film "Oliver Twist" have a far wider significance than the immediate setting and contain certain implications which would seem to need clarifying.

We are told that a tripartite film committee set up by the Western occupation Powers to "vet" films had not approved the showing of "Oliver."

It was a matter for regret that the authorities had not followed the Committee's advice and taken the line adopted at Frankfurt, two years ago, when the performance of *The Merchant of Venice* was postponed indefinitely until the time when Germany becomes sane again.

It is notorious that mad people have a habit of accusing their fellows of having taken leave of their senses. On the political plane, we have noticed the Communists' 'tactic' of accusing their opponents of committing the very crimes that they have, or are about to, commit themselves. We have Jewish authority for the statement that the Jews are more liable to suffer from various mental diseases than any other racial group. In the light of this, let us ponder this complementary passage from the leading article (*Anti-semitism in Germany*) which precedes the one already quoted in the same issue of the *Jewish Chronicle*:

Startling proofs of widespread anti-semitic activity are coming out of Germany . . . in the British Zone of Germany, says a recent report submitted to the American Institute of International Learning of which Mr. Herbert Lehman and Mr. Sumner Welles are directors, former Nazis have a better chance of gaining British goodwill than Jews. The Americans, who, like the British, were at first friendly to the Jews, have with some exceptions, themselves been influenced by the growing impact of anti-Jewish propaganda.

In other words, Gentile British and American administrators find the Gentile Germans more congenial and easier to deal with than the semi-demented "refugees" who have "returned" to Germany from the East or the West and the impact of the "democratic" behaviour of the Jews is beginning to tell against them. Where then, can a leader-writer of a Jewish journal look for a haven of rest for his eternally persecuted brethren-in-race on the Continent? Well, if you did not know that Sovietland now contains more Jews than any other country outside the United States, and that more than a third of the Soviet-Jewish population are directly or indirectly part of the Soviet Governmental set-up, and that the World Jewish Congress in its 1948 report recommended its members to take up an attitude of strict neutrality in the growing East-West conflict of Communism versus the World, the answer might surprise you:

In the Russian Zone, the few Jews who still remain there, if they happen to be Communists, are safe, and any manifestations of anti-Semitism are, as in the Soviet Union, punishable by Law. But

(Continued on page 4, col. 2.)

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. 3.

Saturday, March 19, 1949.

From Week to Week

"More and more we are coming to realise the fundamental importance of race in human affairs. More and more we see that the racial factor lies behind most of the world's problems . . . it is about the most practical subject that can engage the attention of thinking men and women today."

The foregoing quotation from p.3 of *Racial Realities in Europe* was written by Dr. Lothrop Stoddard in 1924. Naturally, it is just as true today as it was when it was written. But the whole Synagogue of Satan, with its press, its "B".B.C.'s and its films, is endeavouring to suppress the consciousness of this factor of "fundamental importance." Mongrelisation is a primary item in its policy.

Are we, forever, to be forced to form our opinions of events on the basis of censored data?

It may be a coincidence that the *Evening Standard* of February, 24 in "The Londoners Diary," prints a comment on Mr. Paul Warburg, of Kuhn Loeb & Co., "assisting" Mr. Lewis Douglas, the American Ambassador in London, alongside a thinly veiled warning note in reference to Lord Mountbatten. (Lady Mountbatten is the granddaughter and part heiress of Sir Ernest Cassel whose connection with Kuhn Loeb, although undefined, was close).

We hope that it is not a coincidence; there is ample room for a patriotic press in this country.

The steady and not very slow decline in the intelligence standard of these islands has many indications. Perhaps one of them is the suggestion that the mass conversion of the Jews to Christianity is imminent, which appears in a systematically "plugged" monthly news-letter, taken quite seriously by some of its readers.

We should be prepared to agree that the mass conversion of the Jews to Christianity, Buddhism, B'hai, or what-have-you might be expected at any moment if it simplified the control of the mineral wealth of Palestine and the Dead Sea.

But that is not exactly what it is intended to convey. With a disregard for "background" ("Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?") which disarms comment, we are introduced to a small dose in matter-of-fact surroundings, of the British-Israel-cum-Pyramid-cum-Dr. Grattan Guinness prophecies as data on which to base foreign policy. At least, that is the only sense which can be attached to their mention.

No doubt M.I.5 ponders these matters.

"The obvious retort is that the United Nations, as our

diplomatists set it up, has even less meaning. Only Americans are fooled by our feverish effort to build an alliance against Russia "within the framework of the United Nations."

—Felix Morley (U.S.A.) in *Human Events*.

Mr. Mayhew, speaking at Lake Success in fevered admiration of President Truman's policy of exploiting the Hottentots, referred to the concurrence, with enthusiasm, of "the Government of the United Kingdom"—not as we were wont to hear it phrased "His Majesty's Government."

No-one troubles to enquire when, and on whose authority, the style was changed.

To anyone whose eyes are even partly opened to the underlying Forces struggling for dominion today, it will be clear that the idea of automatic progress, with its associated fallacy, evolution (as generally understood), is one of a group of disruptive heresies.

In the past 150 years we have "discovered" (*i.e.* "uncovered") a great deal of interesting information about the nature of things viewed as mechanisms, and this has enabled us to produce mechanisms. It is quite probable that this mechanistic view of the universe, which our best brains (they are not very many) are discarding, represents an actual retrogression—that, in fact, man was on a surer, if apparently less spectacular, path to happiness three hundred years ago. Because what man desperately needs is not knowledge, learning, but what used to be called "wisdom," but is perhaps more clearly expressed by the country word "judgement"—a perception of values. Not only is "wisdom" far less widespread than it was, but it is most conspicuously absent where it is most urgently necessary. Because "wisdom" is the only foundation for Policy which is not inevitably disastrous.

FAGIN—continued from page 3.

in the other sectors it appears that even German Communists are free to insult the Jews . . .

The only territory where sanity reigns supreme must therefore (if we adopt that syllogistic method of reasoning so beloved by Jewish intellectuals) be that dominated by Soviet Law.

It may seem a far cry from the gentle hint to Dickens contained in the Rothschild letter of almost a century ago, to the massed assault by the Tartar-Mongol or Jew rabble on the Berlin cinema the other day. But we should do well to recognise the family likeness between the slightly impertinent intolerance of Madame de Rothschild and the madly fanatical intolerance of the Russo-Polish Ghetto-Jew who hit a British subject on the head with a club because of his burning belief in his "divine mission" to decide the suitability or otherwise of which *British* film versions of which *British* classics should be performed for the amusement of the predominantly *German* inhabitants of the *British* sector of *Germany*.

Intolerance is in its effect invariably obstructive of national culture, and no culture can flourish except in an atmosphere of gentleness and tolerance: "The quality of mercy is not strained . . ." but it is equally true that no culture has a hope of surviving unless its 'bearers' are prepared to fight to the death in defence of the concrete embodiment of their 'cultural inheritance.'

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 2, 1949.

British North America Bill

Order for Second Reading read.

The Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations (Mr. Noel-Baker): I have it in Command from His Majesty to acquaint the House that He places His Prerogative and interest so far as concerns the matters dealt with by this Bill at the disposal of Parliament.

I beg to move, "That this Bill be now read a Second time."

The purpose of the Bill is to give the force of law to the Terms of Union agreed upon by the representatives of Canada and Newfoundland. As the Preamble shows, these Terms have been approved by the Parliament of Canada and by the Government of Newfoundland. The Canadian Parliament have submitted an Address to His Majesty praying that a Bill to confirm them may be laid before our Parliament here. The Terms of Union are set out in the Schedule to the Bill. Under these terms, Newfoundland will become a province of Canada, with representation in the Senate and the House of Commons of the Dominion, and with its own Provincial Legislature. At the date of Union, the Newfoundland Constitution, as it existed in 1933, will be revised, with two changes. First, there will be a Lieutenant-Governor instead of a Governor; and the Legislative Council, that is to say, the Upper Chamber, will disappear, unless the province otherwise decides.

Term 15 provides for the first election of the Provincial Legislature, and for the extension of the franchise to include women over 21. Under the Terms, financial measures are laid down and grants are provided by Canada to enable Newfoundland to adjust itself to the status of a province and to develop services that will give it revenue. Term 29 provides that, within eight years, a Royal Commission will review the financial position of the province, and will recommend whether further financial assistance will be required.

Clause 2 of the Bill repeals the Newfoundland Act of 1933, by which the present Commission of Government was set up, but Section 3 of that Act is still to stand; it provides our Treasury guarantee for the existing 3 per cent. stock of Newfoundland. The guarantee, of course, continues, but, by the Terms of Union, Canada will service and amortise the loan. That, in the barest outline, is the Bill . . .

Sir Alan Herbert (Oxford University): I beg to move, to leave out from "That" to the end of the Question, and to add:

"this House, without prejudice to the merits of the proposed union of the Dominions of Canada and Newfoundland, is not satisfied that the procedure preliminary to the introduction of this Bill has been constitutionally correct and just, is not persuaded that the will of Newfoundland has been established as clearly and unmistakably as is necessary for a surrender of sovereignty and a lasting change of status, and, observing that the terms of union have been debated in the Canadian Parliament for a fortnight but have not been debated in Newfoundland at all, declines to approve the Agreement until it has been considered and approved in the Legislature of Newfoundland and an Address presented to His Majesty in accordance with Section one hundred and forty-six of the British North America Act, 1867."

I must congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on his very statesmanlike speech, with not all of which I agree. First let me say that I have the greatest sympathy with the

Secretary of State, partly because Newfoundland has always presented a very difficult problem and partly because I think he has inherited a policy which he had to follow, though I have not always by any means agreed with the way in which he has followed it. I am genuinely reluctant and regretful to find myself at issue with the Government in this affair, because ever since our present Prime Minister sent me to Newfoundland in 1943 with, as he now is, Lord Ammon and Sir Derrick Gunston—and I wish he were with us—I have tried to be co-operative and helpful towards the Government in this affair.

I have very often kept quiet when I wanted to be noisy. Perhaps I was wrong—perhaps the right hon. Gentleman has mentioned one example—but I thought my job on the whole was to be on the Government side. Lord Cranborne, as he then was, used to send for us and tell us what he wanted to do, and if the right hon. Gentleman had followed that procedure things might have been a bit easier. It was only last autumn that, satisfied at last that the Government would consult nobody and listen to nobody, I reluctantly acceded to the request of the Newfoundland Self-Government League, which represents about half the population, to do what I could to defend their rights and liberties.

I wish, as the right hon. Gentleman has said, that all this could be settled in harmony in this House and in the Parliaments of Canada and Newfoundland, but let the House observe that not even in Canada has there been complete harmony. Although there was unanimity for Confederation, Mr. Drew, Leader of the Canadian Conservative Opposition, was so much opposed to the procedure of which I complain, that he led 74 members of the Canadian House of Commons into the Opposition Lobby against the final resolution. He said that not merely had the procedure been improper, but that it had "the taste of an unholy deal." That is not the wild member for Oxford University speaking, but the Leader of the Opposition in the Canadian Parliament. Several Canadian papers agreed with him, and the *Toronto Globe and Mail* said long ago:

"The procedure by which it is now proposed to unite Canada violates the North America Act, the 1934 agreement between Britain and the Island, and ignores or at any rate treats as of no consequence the sovereignty of Newfoundland."

That is not the wild and irresponsible Member for Oxford University, but one of the principal papers of Canada. They agree with the points which are the basis of the appeal. I know perfectly well that it is in order for the Government to charge ahead ignoring an appeal to the highest judicial authority in the Empire. I know that Parliament can do anything, but surely there are some things Parliament does not do. This appeal was the Newfoundlanders' very last hope. It was started last October. After all, the courts do not sit very often in August and September, and they were held up in the lower courts and by lack of funds. It was quite by accident, I believe, that the appeal arrived in London at the same time as the Government introduced their Bill.

I shall not go as far as the Secretary of State in entering into the merits of this appeal, but may I give a summary of the points, prepared by learned counsel who may be engaged in the case, that will be raised? I think that the right hon. Gentleman is belittling the effect of this appeal. I am probably no better a lawyer than he is, but, as I understand it, if this appeal were successful, then this Bill would be nonsense. They claim that it would not be binding, because these terms we are asked to approve would have been nego-

tiated by unauthorised persons, and that therefore they do not exist. However, I am not trying to argue the matter, but for the purposes of the record, this is the summary of the points for the appeal:

(a) Confederation can be brought about only in accordance with a law which is binding on the people of Newfoundland.

(b) Section 146 of the British North America Act, 1867, is such a law. But Confederation is not to take place under the provisions of that Section. That is so for the reason that under that Section Confederation could come about only upon an Address from the Houses of the Legislature of Newfoundland, and no such Address can be presented while the provisions of the Old Letters Patent are suspended.

(c) Therefore it is proposed to establish Confederation under a new Imperial Act, which in effect repeals Section 146 of the 1867 Act. It provides that the Agreement 'shall have the force of law notwithstanding anything in the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1946.'

(d) But the Imperial Act will not be binding on the people of Newfoundland because (a) the Imperial Parliament has no power to make a law binding the people of Newfoundland except at the request and with the consent of a Parliament of that Dominion, and there has been no request and consent of such a Parliament, alternatively (b) if the request and consent can be given by the people upon a referendum, the referendum must be held under a valid law, and the Referendum Act was invalid."

That may be complete legal nonsense, for all I know, and it may be turned down, but it is very seriously believed in by the people making this appeal. An appeal is a very expensive matter, and one does not make one to the Privy Council just for fun. They have a right to be heard.

The attitude of the Government to this appeal must have astonished many Members who heard what has been said about the people of Newfoundland having made "no request" for self-government. The phrase "at the request of" the people always struck me as very surprising, because no one in their senses would take away from Newfoundland all forms of machinery for self-expression and then say: "You have to ask for them back again." That phrase was not in the original constitutional paragraph of the Royal Commission's report. They merely said "self-supporting." It certainly was not in the Letters Patent, and it was certainly not in the speech of Mr. Allardice, Prime Minister of Newfoundland, because all he said was:

"We trust implicitly in their honorable intentions"—that is the honorable intentions of His Majesty's Ministers—"feeling confident that a full measure of responsible government will be restored to the Island when we have again been placed upon a self-supporting basis."

I do not want to argue about that too much; but, goodness me, every time they have tried to make a request they have been thwarted. At the end of 1945 they started to circulate a petition for self-government in the island, and that is a long and difficult business in the remote parts of that rocky island. But that was knocked on the head by the announcement of the election of the Convention. But the matter did not stop there, because the Convention, by a majority vote, said that they wanted only two questions to be put to the people, responsible government or self-government. If that had gone through there is not the smallest doubt that there would have been a request, but it was thwarted by the Secretary of State because he insisted on putting in Canada. Another fact is that on the first Referendum responsible Government was on the top of the bill.

Next it has been rather forgotten that a petition was presented to this House by myself signed by 50,000 people. That was rather an astonishing thing. Anybody who knows

the island will understand that to go round it—and remember it is a quarter as large again as Ireland—and collect 50,000 signatures from fishermen and foresters and farmers all over the place involves some work. When the petition was being organised, the Commission of Government refused to allow the organisers to use the radio, although two members of the Commission of Government had previously used the radio for the purposes of advocating confederation. Finally, we have this appeal to the Privy Council. After all that history and all the serious efforts that have been made in this matter, to hear the right hon. Gentleman say that never was a request made for self-government seems to me to be the oddest thing I have ever heard from the Government Front Bench.

In regard to the Referendum, it is perfectly true that not only I but Lord Ammon, chairman of the Parliamentary Commission, recommended that there should be a Referendum, and we had two main things in mind. One was that we wanted to get the political machinery going—it had been dead for many years—and the other was that in those days there was doubt if the prosperity in the island was going to continue after the war, and the people might very well have liked the Commission of Government to continue for a period so that they could see how things would shape. . . .

Now we come to the announcement which the right hon. Gentleman has read out. I read it for the first time yesterday only. Nothing could be clearer and I agree with him. I did not know about it at that time. My vigilance was relaxed, I suppose. But this is one point where I wish the right hon. Gentleman had done some consulting. If he had asked me, I should have said, "Don't include Federation with Canada"; I would have said that not only is it not constitutional, but that is not the sort of thing to put before the people: in a Referendum. How in the world could it possibly be said that there was any real sense that the Terms, as their preamble said, were before the people? I do not understand the half of them, and I am a distinguished Oxford man.

Quite apart from the Constitution, it is wrong to put such a question before the people as a Referendum because that is not the sort of machinery to use and I suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that if he wanted—and perhaps he was right—to put Confederation before the people at a Referendum there were one or two things he should have done. One was to say, "We want to know what you think, but we are not going to exclude the proper constitutional machinery. Afterwards there shall be a Parliament in which your decision could be confirmed"; or alternatively he could have said, "We must have a two-thirds majority in order to support such a vital change of status as the giving up of Newfoundland's sovereignty."

. . . . Let us look at this Bill in relation to our constitutional practice. Let us first look at the Preamble. All the constitutional safeguards which our ancestors erected are not mere verbal formulae, but are designed to produce statesmanlike results. If we look at the Preamble to this Bill we see what an impossible position we get into when we avoid them. The long Title is very grand,

"A Bill to confirm and give effect to Terms of Union agreed between Canada and Newfoundland."
Then it goes on:

"Whereas by means of a referendum the people of Newfoundland have by a majority signified their wish to enter into confederation with Canada."

For "the people" we should read "44½ per cent. of the regis-

tered electorate." I have those figures from the Secretary of State. Look at line 2 where it says:
"have by a majority . . ."

The majority was 4 per cent. of those who voted. Does the right hon. Gentleman say that that is a proper majority whereby a Dominion surrenders its sovereignty?

Mr. George Thomas (Cardiff, Central): Will the right hon. Gentleman say what he thinks would be a proper majority?

Sir A. Herbert: If there is to be a majority at all it should be two-thirds. Not one comma of the American constitution can be changed unless there is a two-thirds majority, and by the wise rules of the M.C.C. even the rules of cricket cannot be altered without a two-thirds majority.

Mr. P. Noel-Baker: Does the right hon. Gentleman think it worked well?

Sir A. Herbert: In line 8 we find that Canada has "requested and consented" to the enactment of this Bill. That is because Canada comes under the Statute of Westminster. These words do not appear in any reference to Newfoundland. The Secretary of State mentioned that the Dominion of Newfoundland has never adopted Section 4 of the Statute of Westminster. It has never had a chance, because the Act came into operation in 1931, and almost immediately afterwards Newfoundland found itself in difficulty and has never had a Government since. That is one of the points perhaps for the Privy Council, but there is the answer to the right hon. Gentleman.

Towards the end of the second paragraph we read that the agreement containing the Terms of Union

"has been duly approved by the Parliament of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland."

That is rather a descent after the great phrase in the long Title. The Parliament of Canada discussed these Terms, comma by comma and Clause by Clause for more than a fortnight, and at the end there was a wonderful scene, which I should have liked to see. Members rose in their places and sang "God save the King" and that fine song "Oh Canada." What has happened in Newfoundland? The Terms there have been approved by the Government of Newfoundland, which consists of seven people appointed by the Crown, four of whom are Englishmen. There is not even a majority of Newfoundlanders in the Government of Newfoundland, which approved of the terms by which that Dominion loses its sovereignty. Is that democracy? Is that what we understand by the traditional practices of this country and Commonwealth?

When I went to Newfoundland along with others I went into the old Parliament House. It was not even empty. It was full of civil servants. When we asked where was the Speaker's Chair we were told it was in some stable covered with dustproof wrappings. They did not even know where the stable was. These things are remembered against us in this country. They are going on being remembered. I do not want to cause trouble, but the trouble is there, and I only want to put it right.

Nobody realises over here the feeling there is in Newfoundland against this country. It comes out clearly in letters that are written. I do not mean letters from politicians or the sort of letter that we see in newspapers. I mean letters from ordinary men and women, people who write gossip letters to friends over here. This is one, talking about the political situation:

"That all looks completely hopeless, and how people are learning to hate! It's not so much actual Confederation which hurts but it's the dirty way the Home Government have sold us." It may be wrong but that is what they feel.

"This morning in church people refused to stand for the National Anthem—elderly, steady and staid people, normally patriotic to the core. Everywhere, one hears of outport people taking down the inevitable picture of the King and Queen, and one man the other day said he had taken down his Union Jack for the last time."

One man, writing to me the other day— . . . said that our name would

"stink in the nostrils of a people who are as British as the lions in Trafalgar Square."

He repeated the story of the National Anthem incident.

I did not start the petitions and I did not lodge the appeal to the King. I say, let us do this thing in the right way. I am tired of hearing people say that we are doing the right thing in the wrong way. If we are doing it in the wrong way, it cannot be the right thing. We do not say that about a forced marriage or a rape. We do not say: "The young lady must go to bed one day. What does it matter what the arrangements are?" We take good care to be sure that she knows what she is doing, that she is willing and that she is to be properly provided for. Let us do this thing also in the right way.

Even now, let us forget all the arguments about whether the past was right or wrong, and about the constitutionalities. Let us see whether we can make sure. We still have an opportunity of saying to Newfoundland: "Here is your liberty, do with it what you will." There could be a general election in May. There cannot be such a very great hurry about the Bill. What the magic of 31st March may be nobody has yet explained, and after all, the people of Newfoundland have waited for 15 years. They would have an election in May, presumably when the snows are cleared. There will presumably be some candidates for Confederation and others, perhaps fewer, for responsible government. Suppose that the Federationists are returned. Then, with all the might, majesty and power of Parliamentary authority, Newfoundland will go over to Ottawa, and come back and approve the terms. No doubt there will then be another glorious scene, this time in the Newfoundland Parliament, with the singing of "God save the King," "O, Canada," and perhaps that fine old Newfoundland song "We'll rant and we'll roar like true Newfoundlanders."

On the other hand, suppose that the Federationists do not win—I believe that the fear that that might happen is at the root of the Bill—and I should not be surprised. Then responsible government will win, and Newfoundland will show that she is capable of running herself for ever. So far as I know, her dollar situation is a damned sight better than ours. She has a secure market for her forest products and her fisheries. Labrador may become another Alaska, because it has the largest iron ore deposits in the world waiting to be exploited, and they will be a terrific thing. Whoever runs them Labrador will be an old age pension for Newfoundland for a very long time. That is what I suggest. For the life of me, I cannot understand why even now the Government cannot say that this is the best way to do the business and why they cannot do the simple, honourable and constitutional thing. However, I know that I am talking to deaf ears.

Let me now glance at the terms. According to the Preamble, the original terms were before the people in the form of a Referendum. It is impossible for any forester or

fisherman, even if the effort had been made—and I do not think it was—to explain the terms to them, to get terms like this sufficiently into his head to be able to produce a sober judgment on them. The original terms may have been better or they may have been worse. Some people tell me that these are worse. First of all, Canada takes over the 1933 Loan, which is held in London and which amounts in all to about 72 million dollars. There is a sinking fund of nine million dollars on them. Canada will pay us 61 million dollars for taking over that loan. That sounds very good, but we have to reflect and to remember that the national debt in Canada amounts to 1,500 dollars per head while in Newfoundland it is only about 200 dollars per head. Newfoundland will take over for ever a debt about seven times her present national debt, in addition to the 61 million dollars which Canada is taking from England. This is the kind of thing which would be discussed very properly in a Newfoundland Parliament.

Secondly, all this talk of subsidies sounds very good. I gather that most of them represent rentals from the taxes which used to go to Newfoundland will now go to Canada. I saw a rather angry letter or leading article in a Newfoundland newspaper the other day pointing out that over the whole range of the Provinces we find that they receive 76 million dollars by way of subsidy, but that Canada takes 342 million dollars. That does not sound a very profitable transaction, the paper said, and we should know more. This again is the kind of thing which ought to be discussed in a Newfoundland Parliament.

There is the question of balanced Budgets. At the moment, and ever since 1944, this island has had a balance on her Budget. It is surprising to find that since the war it has been even better. I make the prediction that under the proposed terms Newfoundland is going to show a loss. I will tell the Minister the authority upon which I make that prediction. I have several documents, one from a politician who, some people think, is rather wild, and so I will not quote him. There is also the Ministry Report of a gentleman named Crosbie who was a delegate to Ottawa. He refused to sign these terms. He is a prominent business man. He said that they were financial suicide. He said that Canada was sitting in the driver's seat and was driving a hard bargain. A document on which I rely even more is a report from a celebrated firm of Canadian chartered accountants, who suggest that under these Terms—the original Terms which the right hon. Gentleman says have been before the people—Newfoundland will have a deficit of four million dollars every year, and up to 12 years, a loss of about 50 million dollars in all. She will have exhausted her surplus by that time.

I have had that report by this chartered accountant brought up to date by a man who is rather experienced in these matters—that is to say, in making adjustments to bring in the increased transitional grants and so on—and, to my astonishment, he comes out with a worse result. He predicts a loss of 6 million dollars a year on the Newfoundland Budget, and a total loss after 12 years of 70 million dollars. I am prepared to go half way and predict a loss of 5 million dollars. It is all very well for noble Lords in another place and for some hon. Members in this House to say that the terms are generous and favourable. How do they know? The only people who know are the Newfoundlanders. The only people who have said a good word for the terms—I have never heard a good word from the Newfoundlanders—

and who have approved them, are the people who negotiated them, and they were appointed by the Newfoundland Government not half of whom are Newfoundlanders. As the man in the story said, "That seems to be a hell of a way to run a railway."

. . . I will now say a few words on the American bases. During the war we had a curious habit of giving away other people's property. We leased important bases to America for nothing for 99 years. The Newfoundlanders did not mind that during the war, but there was a clause which stated that after the war there should be some new negotiations. Since those bases are very strong bargaining points, we may be sure that a self-governing Newfoundland would have got some material benefit from the United States in exchange. We may be sure that Canada will do so. Hardly had the Debate been finished than the Canadian Prime Minister went quite rightly to Washington to discuss these matters. There ought to be some mention of this in these Terms. I may be talking nonsense, but I think I know more about this matter than some people on the Government Front Bench.

I ask the House to remember two things. One is the speech of the Prime Minister of Newfoundland which I have already quoted:

"We trust implicitly their honourable intentions."

After all the arguments and quibbles, I do not believe that our pledge has been fulfilled, although I know we have the best intentions in the world. Secondly, I would remind the House that at the present moment there is in this building a petition signed by 50,000 Newfoundlanders to this House asking for consideration. Do not let hon. Members opposite think, as I have heard people say, that the people behind this movement are all wealthy merchants of St. John's. There are not 70,000 merchants in Newfoundland; I do not suppose there are more than seven. I wish hon. Members had seen the names on the pages of the petition; I have some pages here. There are good old English names like Tarrant, Turpin, Blake, Drake—

Professor Savory (Queen's University of Belfast): And some good Ulster names.

Sir A. Herbert:—a Samuel Butler and a William Churchill who made his mark. There are no Vyshinskys, although there might, I dare say, be a few Stanleys. They are simple and sometimes even illiterate people—not wealthy merchants, but people who are passionately attached to the English idea, who speak words now which we have forgotten but which can be found in our dictionaries—people who look about the world and see us giving Parliaments and liberties to black, brown and yellow men, and who say "All we want is to be able to determine our own future in our own Parliament instead of being chucked across the counter in a tied-up parcel as if we did not matter and as if we had not been governing ourselves since 1855." They are people whose families have been there for 400 years, since Sir Humphrey Gilbert gathered the sailors around him, planted the White Ensign and sang the English songs, especially the National Anthem.

I have done my best for these people, and I can do no more, but I do say this: if the policy of this Bill prevails, I for one shall not be sorry to go out from a Parliament which can so affront a proud, dignified, loyal white people, and the good name and honour of my own beloved country.