

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 24.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

### Division in the Ranks

by NORMAN WEBB.

In the final section of Douglas Reed's book, *Somewhere South of Suez*, he begins by giving a précis of about 6,000 words on the rise of Zionism, which would be well worthy of publication as a separate pamphlet. It is a summing-up of that swift and brilliant political operation on the part of organised Jewry which all Gentiles, that is, White races, should read and appreciate. Here is a record of historical events, covering little more than fifty years, in no way exaggerated but grouped to some extent in accordance with subsequent knowledge. The result is most enlightening.

Later in this section Mr. Reed develops that aspect of Zionism for which there is a considerable amount to be said, which asserts that the decisive impulse behind the movement, and by far the preponderance of effective individuals in it, are not Jewish at all in the ethnical sense. It is an intriguing theme, opening up quite a number of lines of thought as regards the tactics of "Christian" states, if, indeed, Christendom can be credited with anything that might be termed tactics where its most immediate and pressing social problems are concerned. The implication is that Jewry is profoundly divided both racially and politically, and therefore *might be* divided tactically as well with the employment of a little skill. But it is a subject that requires to be approached with caution, for as far as one knows, all professing Jews are brought up on the Talmud, which is quite positively anti-Christian, and such conditioning is difficult to get rid of.

It is common knowledge, of course, that the political aims of Zionism, the consolidation of Jewish national interests in the Middle East, have brought to light definite intellectual cleavages in Jewish ranks. And that the Arabo-African Jews, the Sephardim, are by no means ardent Zionists. In the late 19th Century the old long-established Jewish families of London, with certain notable exceptions, watched the wave of immigrants from Russia and Poland and North East Europe generally, with a great deal of apprehension, and facilitated their transit across the Atlantic as quickly as they could. It is a notable fact that in the British War Cabinet that sanctioned the Balfour Declaration of Great Britain's sympathy with Zionist aims in Palestine—perhaps the blackest act of faithlessness in the foreign history of this country—the one voice that was raised in protest was that of Edwin Montague, the only Jew in the Cabinet.

Arthur Koestler, the Jewish novelist, is an exponent of this aspect of the matter. Mr. Reed also cites an article in the *Jewish Encyclopædia* by Freedman, a prominent New York Jew, which states categorically that the North-Eastern European Jew, so-called, is neither Jewish nor Semitic. It is with this type that almost all Zionist activity originates; and which constitutes ninety *per cent.* of the immigration to the United States over the last fifty years, and into Palestine in

the last twent. He quotes, besides other authorities, Professor Lothrop Stoddard, who points out that they are, in fact "a mongrel breed of minor Asiatic races, with a strong admixture of Turko-Mongol blood; in other words, Khazars." The true semitic Jews from Afro-Asia, are Sephardim, who are slender in figure, long-headed with fine-cut noses. In distinct contrast to them, are these Ashkenazim, the Yiddish-speaking type from Russia and Poland and Germany, so prevalent in all Western capitals, "who are short in stature and round-headed, with large noses of coarser shape. . . . About the seventh century *A.D.*, the king of the Khazars adopted Judaism as the state religion and the majority of the inhabitants joined him in the new allegiance. Before that date there was no such thing as a Khazar who was a Jew. Neither then, nor since was there such a thing as a Khazar whose ancestors had come from the Holy Land. There is apparently a tendency among the Zionists to treat what has been referred to as "the Khazar legend" in a manner resembling that which is used towards the *Protocols of Zion*; but it would seem to be an established fact of history that, like the total expulsion of the Jews from England by Edward I. in the thirteenth century, Gentile historians have seen fit almost to ignore.

Mr. Reed's point is that this is the origin and source of the mass-movement called Zionism; as well as of the raw material imported—and still being imported—into Palestine, where in 1948 Arthur Koestler computed that not more than 25 or 30 *per cent.* of the population were of true Jewish descent. This is the stock that has seeped into Western Europe from Russia, and across the Atlantic to the United States and Canada, without pause since the early nineteen eighties. The Judaic population of the United States today, which towards the end of last century was not more than 500,000, is now estimated to be round six millions.

Mr. Reed's theme is the decline of the young American Republic before it has come to flower; as it was somewhat maliciously put the other day—" . . . a nation that has passed from barbarism to decadence without the usual intervening period of civilization." For undoubtedly the organic structure of the American state is riddled and rotten with parasites to an extent to which even we in these lands are not accustomed. Her energy and potential creativeness are being used for external expansion and the promotion of alien policies, at the expense of organic growth.

America's great enemy is, of course, her own money system, as it is of all "free" Western nations—the so-called Christian countries. If she can find no release from it—and through it—then she looks like being forced into the rigid state-control of the Soviets by the exigencies of waging a military war in a world that is ceasing to be war-minded. For I think we must accept the "softness" of Western civilization as not all the result of rot and over-ripeness. The law of compensation must operate here as elsewhere, even if it is hard to see its workings. We must exercise restraint in our deductions. Human premises are never entirely complete and

comprehensive and therefore never strictly speaking "correct." So that to follow them out too logically is to go hopelessly astray sooner or later.

But it is obvious, I think, that temporarily at least the course of events is in the hands of a limited number of people with a well-defined objective, which is nothing less than the total control of society. The points to watch, therefore, are those touching the natural and inevitable tendencies of the main impulse. As Mr. Reed sees it—and I feel he is not far out—the two chief objectives in the World Authority programme are control of food and control of population; power of restriction of free access to material wealth and living standards, and deliberate, planned breeding, with the requirements of enforced wealth-production as the decisive factor.

To such ends is U.N.O. dedicated. And the net result of such a policy, which incidentally is the avowed objective of both Communism and Zionism, would be—according to Mr. Reed—the decimation of the White races, and their submergence under the Yellows and Blacks. The logic of this is quite easy to follow, since the control of wealth-production and of population both require central control, which can only be applied to those who already possess considerable organisation. It is just the same with the threats of atomic destruction used so freely today as an argument for consolidating U.N.O. and for centralising everything; they are threats that apply almost exclusively to organised society, which means, broadly, Western (White) civilization. Dispersed, but politically homogeneous Jewry, the geographically vast Soviet Republics, and native populations everywhere would tend to survive.

Deductively, then, that is the Big Idea. And the young, raw, uncertain and parasite-riddled United States of America is the chosen agent for its realization. Where Russia fits in is not quite so evident. Doubtless World War III, if it had to come, would settle that question without in any way impinging on the Big Idea itself, which is in the hands of the Zionists, who would, no doubt, be on the touch line.

(To be concluded).

### Another Five Hundred

The assistance of the London Douglas Social Credit Group has been obtained in extending the campaign to increase the circulation of *The Social Crediter* by "Another Five Hundred" readers before March. The plan in operation envisages the division of the country into county-areas, and volunteers of assistance are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the Social Secretariat, Mr. E. J. Pankhurst, at his home address, 38, Moor Lane, Crosby, Liverpool.

### "On Planning the Earth"

The price on publication of "On Planning the Earth" by Geoffrey Dobbs has been advanced to 6/- in order to cover the cost of binding in cloth, making the book more attractive to the general reader, for whom the publication is primarily intended. Postage will be extra.

Readers of this paper who have already ordered copies will be supplied at the previously advertised price of 5/6 post free.

It is regretted that publication has been delayed from causes beyond the control of the publishers.

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: January 25, 1951.

### Deaths, Liverpool

*Mrs. Braddock* asked the Minister of Health the number of deaths in Liverpool for the week ending 13th January, 1951; how many were over 65 years of age; and what was the number of deaths in Liverpool for the worst of the influenza epidemic in 1919.

*Mr. Marquand*: There were 949 deaths from all causes registered in Liverpool in the week ending 13th January, 1951. The information asked for in the second part of the Question is not at present available; but, of the 216 deaths for which influenza was mentioned on the death certificate, 146 were of people aged 65 and over. The greatest number of deaths from all causes in Liverpool in one week during the influenza epidemic in 1919 was 642.

*Mrs. Braddock*: Is my right hon. Friend aware that the figures for the week ending 13th January are the highest on record for the Liverpool area? Is it a fact that his Department knew of the possibility of this very virulent type of influenza in the early part of November, and in consultation with the local health authorities decided not to make any reference to it in case of interference with trade in Liverpool?

*Mr. Marquand*: That is a very long supplementary question. I should be glad if my hon. Friend would put it on the Order Paper.

### Sea Fish Industry Bill

Order for Second Reading read.

*The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries* (Mr. Thomas Williams): . . . This compact, but very important, Bill is designed to implement the undertaking given by the Prime Minister on 4th July of last year in the following terms:

"The difficulties of the white fish industry are basic, complex, and of long standing. There is, therefore, no simple solution to them. The view has often been expressed in this House that their difficulties are not likely to be overcome by the industry itself. The Government agree with this view and have decided to promote legislation to set up an Authority with adequate powers to regulate, re-organise and develop the white fish industry. It will be composed of independent members and will have statutory powers, but it will naturally work in consultation with the industry."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 14th July, 1950; Vol. 477, c. 237.]

. . . The vital points that stand out are first, that a strong independent body should be made responsible for re-organisational plans; and second, that they should be given sufficient power to ensure that the job can be done properly and successfully. That is the line that has been followed in the Bill now before the House. These two essential matters are contained in the first six Clauses of the Bill, and it is on them in particular that I propose to concentrate. Clauses 1, 2 and 3 deal with the White Fish Authority, its Scottish Committee and the joint Advisory Council; while Clauses 4, 5 and 6 deal with the powers that the Authority will be able to exercise.

Clause 1 provides for the constitution of the Authority and describes in general terms its functions. . . .

. . . The second alternative, which we have adopted, is that of a small independent and impartial body which will take advice from all but orders from none except the Ministers and Parliament. This Authority will consist of five

members appointed jointly by the Secretary of State for Scotland, the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries and the Minister of Food. It will be seen from paragraph 4 of the First Schedule, that no person may be appointed who has any such financial or commercial interest as is likely to affect him in the discharge of his duties. The chairman and members are in no sense representatives of the industry or any section of it. Sectional representation is left entirely to the Advisory Council which is to be set up under Clause 3. . . .

Clause 2 and 3 provide respectively for the Scottish Committee and the Advisory Council. . . . this Scottish Committee, which will not only be able to advise the Authority on peculiarly Scottish fishing problems, but will also be able to exercise powers delegated to them by the Authority itself.

The Advisory Council will be widely and generally representative and will form a permanent link between all sections of the white fish industry and the new Authority. . . .

The powers and duties of the Authority are set out in Clauses 4, 5 and 6, and it will be seen that they are in three general gradations. Those in Clause 4 will be exercisable as soon as the Bill becomes law. The powers in Clause 5 to make regulations will not become operative until the regulations are confirmed by the Ministers and the instrument confirming them will be subject to annulment by resolution of either House of Parliament. The powers under Clause 6 require not only the approval of the Ministers but also affirmative resolutions of both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 4 sets out a fairly wide variety of powers that the authority may exercise. Some, such as the power to carry on or support research and experiment and the power to encourage co-operation, need little explanation or justification. But there are powers in sub-section (1, c) and (1, d) the need for which may not be quite so obvious to hon. Members. . . . Hon. Members representing particularly the inshore fishery ports will recall the possibility of quite a large number of inshore fishermen but only one buyer; and where those circumstances obtain the fisherman would not necessarily get a square deal. Therefore, if the Authority felt that some competition with the one buyer for all the catches was necessary then it could, to help the fisherman, step in and do the job, perhaps even temporarily.

The powers to provide fishing vessels to be operated under charter, and to give financial assistance by way of loan for the provision of fishing vessels, set out in Clause 4 (1, e) and (1, g), and the powers described in Clause 4 (2) and Clause 4 (3) should perhaps be looked at together; and paragraph (f) is similar in principle.

. . . It is now generally recognised, as the Duncan Commission pointed out 15 years ago, that a great deal of scrapping and replacement, must be done in the near and middle water fleet if that important section of the industry is to be made efficient and economic. Over 80 per cent. of the vessels in this class are more than 30 years old; some of them are even as old as I am, and that is unfortunately too aged to be either economic or efficient. This section of the industry is of vital importance because it produces most of the prime, best quality fish on which the national taste for fish is founded.

There is virtually no chance at all of the industry itself undertaking the huge financial commitments involved without some outside help. That help might take the form of grants or loans; or it might take the form of the Authority

taking shares in fishing companies or themselves acquiring vessels and letting them out under charter. Grants for this purpose have, however, been rejected by the Government, because once the money is paid out there is an end to it. The money is gone, whether it has been used well or ill.

Alternatively, the help could be given by means of loans, but the Government came to the conclusion, on the advice of the Authority, that the best course might sometimes be either to fit out fishing vessels for charter, or—probably better still—to take shares in fishing companies; because either of those ways would provide greater security and more effective control. Let me make it abundantly clear—and I address myself particularly to the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Osborne)—that the power to take or acquire shares does not include any element of compulsion, . . . there is no possibility of compulsion in any form in any part of the Bill. There is no power for the Authority to compel anybody to sell what they do not wish to sell.

. . . Clause 5 furnishes the Authority with a further set of powers to make regulations for the purpose, broadly speaking, of improving the conditions of the fish when it reaches the consumer. . . . One of the items is to time landings, if possible—I said if possible—so as to secure as far as possible greater regularity of supply. . . .

. . . Clause 6 provides still further powers, and in more general terms. It authorises the Authority, after consultation with the industry, to prepare schemes having as their object the better organisation, development or regulation of the industry or any section of it. . . . First, in preparing any scheme the Authority are expressly required to consult with representative organisations. Secondly, a scheme must be for the purposes set out in the Clause. Thirdly, Ministers have to be satisfied, having regard to the interests of consumers as well as to those of the industry, that the scheme will have the desired effect.

Fourthly, provision is made in the Third Schedule for due notice to be given of a proposal to make a scheme, for the submission and consideration of objections and, where necessary, for an inquiry to be held. Fifthly, no scheme can come into force until it has received the approval of the Ministers, and then been approved by both Houses of Parliament. . . .

. . . The registration of persons engaged in the white fish industry and the licensing of vessels are dealt with in Clauses 7 and 8. These provisions are basic to any plan or scheme for reorganisation. There is nothing in the nature of a "closed shop" in these Clauses. Anyone who wishes to enter any branch may do so after giving full particulars and paying a small fee of 5s. Similarly with licensing a vessel, except that the fee will be £1.

The Authority will have power to refuse a licence only in one set of circumstances. Subsection (7) of Clause 8 provides that where a person is convicted of an offence under the Clause, and the court is satisfied that conditions of licences have been consistently disregarded by him, it may make an order directing that a licence need not be granted to that person as of right. Only in such a case can a licence be refused. Even then the applicant has a right to make an appeal to the Ministers. Moreover, a licence may not be withdrawn or revoked except by an order of the court, so there is little or no chance of doing an injustice to trawler owners. . . .

(Continued on page 6).

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

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

Vol. 25. No. 24.

Saturday, February 10, 1951.

### From Week to Week

The Rev. William Walton Thomas Hannah was licensed to officiate in the Diocese of Chichester from 1947. He was curate of St. James's, Piccadilly, from 1938 to 1942, curate-in-charge of St. Thomas's, Regent Street and St. Anne's, Soho, from 1942 to 1944 and Rector of Balcombe from 1944 to 1947. He is a graduate of the Faculty of Arts of Edinburgh University and studied Theology at Westcott House, Cambridge. These details are from "Crockford."

We wish Mr. Hannah God speed.

It seems that, while the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. G. F. Fisher, president of the Society for the Promotion of Christian knowledge, was "out of the country," an article was published in the Society's journal, *Theology*, over the signature of Mr. Hannah, attacking Freemasonry, and particularly the attachment of Clergy of the Church of England to Freemasonry.

*Reynolds Newspaper* is an "organ" which has adopted as its motto the slogan, "Government of the People, by the People, for the People"—a characteristically Freemasonic "form of words"—and we should as hopefully look to it for leadership against the Powers and Principalities which afflict us as H.M. King Edward VIII. did to the Freemasonic Bishop of Bradford for defence of the English throne.

Albeit, the account which headed the front page of *Reynolds Newspaper* last Sunday concerning the consequences ensuing from Mr. Hannah's article is circumstantial and may be of critical importance.

The nations of the earth are hell-bent for destruction. There is no "some are and some are not" about it. They all are.

Either their impetuous on-rush can be arrested, or it can't.

If it can, a start must be made, and the Hannah outburst looks like a genuine starter. Any other kind of starter, while not outside the range of our interest, merely invites our contempt, undiluted even by apprehension.

We say it looks like a genuine start because rather a lot is conceded. It is conceded, for example, and made known, that the Archbishop of Canterbury is himself a Freemason; that a body referred to as "the Masonic Bishops" exists; and so on. These facts (if substantiated) might of course be deemed highly complimentary to the Church of England (like the liberal opinions of the Red Dean and the Bishop of Birmingham) or damaging to its stability according to taste;

and the idea that H.M. the King, "a Past Grand Master of the Order" (*sic*) might intervene to "quash" an appeal next May to Convocation might be as well calculated to serve republicans as to intimidate the lodges.

"Is the Church of England too mortally involved with the heresy to speak her mind?" is a question which "she" might answer by speaking "its" mind.

Frankly it is what we should expect, but it is not what we hope for. Almost without a dissentient voice, Christendom speaks "its" mind, learning speaks "its" mind, statesmanship stutters its accents, and science and the arts are prostrate before it.

We are grateful to *Reynolds Newspaper* for its tiny portrait of Mr. Hannah which informs us that he does not in the least resemble in features the men whose names appear from time to time in the Honours List.

An "enquiry" is called for.

Then, of course, the identity of Lord Palmerston's living successor as Grand Patriarch of the Illuminati and "as such the ruler of all the secret societies in the world" would be made known?—Not that we particularly want to know: we wish to see the rule terminated.

The story which is going the rounds of a rhinoceros-hided Attlee rolling over a pained and purple Truman to impress upon him that the good old British Empire would not stand for an *immediate* opening of World War III. may be true. If it is it reflects either Grand Orient undermining the defensive power of the West or Communism enlarging the offensive power of the East; but which we cannot say.

"Arms and armies are not defence. A nation can spend billions, keep millions of men under arms, build atom bomb plants and Maginot Lines, but if it follows bad strategical concepts it will be defeated. Witness France in 1940. In fact a certain elephantiasis in the armed forces, a rush for more men and spending, spells military sickness, not health. . . .

"How long can Congress trust our survival as a nation to the military planning of this global colossus? The cure is simple, if Congress has the will to take hold. It must divorce the State Department from all economic and spending programmes, which are the source of its power to compel other agencies in the Administration to do its will. . . .

"Without its spending funds, State will have no power to punish members of Congress, members of the press or others who criticize its policies. Congress can then dismantle the empire which the Hopkins-Wallace-Frankfurter groups have built up behind the facade of the dignified old State Department, without fear of attack from mass organizations or the 'mocking bird columnists' who are part of State's propaganda machine.

"When the present State Department has been stripped down to the Foreign Service and a desk for the Secretary, it will be possible for the President to induce a man of courage and intelligence to take over as Secretary of State, and rebuild an American foreign policy with a single aim—the survival of our country."—(Edna Lonigan in *Human Events*).

### Baltinglass—End or Beginning?

On Saturday, January 27th, it was announced in the English Press that Miss Helen Cooke, aged 50 years, had been appointed postmistress in the village of Baltinglass, Co. Wicklow, Eire. This story really began some 70 years ago, when Miss Cooke's grandfather first became postmaster in the village. Without a break since that time some member of the Cooke family has held this office. For the past 14 years Miss Helen Cooke herself has been assistant to her aunt, the postmistress. Some 8 months ago, on the retirement of the aunt, the Department of Posts and Telegraphs decided to build a new post office, and at the same time invited applications for the new post. Despite Miss Helen Cooke's application, and qualifications, a certain Mr. Michael Farrell, a young local man of considerably less experience in postal work, but, according to local gossip, of some eminence in political circles, was appointed to the post.

The villagers felt that Miss Cooke had been hardly treated, and set up a local 'protest committee' to deal with the situation. At first attempts were made to prevent Mr. Farrell taking up his new duties by sealing and picketing the post office. This continued for some time but the authorities finally used force to install him. The villagers thereupon boycotted the post office, and arranged a rota of volunteers who carried all post, and other business, to the next village some 5 miles away. The completion of the new post office was hampered in a number of ways: workmen were prevented from laying the new telephone cable to the shop: telephone poles were mysteriously cut down during the night: a campaign of protest meetings was organized throughout the county. Finally, at Christmas time Mr. Farrell resigned his post. His letter to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and the reply of the latter were published in the Irish Press. The Minister spoke querulously and darkly of political forces which were seeking some point of advantage from which to attack the Coalition Government, but accepted the resignation. The post was advertised again, with the result which we have already noted. Since Mr. Farrell's resignation the villagers have had two loud-speaker vans touring the country for the purpose of putting the facts before the whole people.

Whether the Opposition has or has not taken advantage of the incident and supported the campaign for its own ends is immaterial. There is no doubt at all that the affair arose out of the spontaneous indignation of the population at the flouting of a tradition for no good reason. As readers of *The Social Crediter* well know Irish revolutionary movements, especially anti-British movements, have drawn much of their inspiration and most of their funds from sources outside Ireland. But, despite the fact that he has often been the tool of forces of the existence of which he remained largely unconscious, the Celt has, at times, under the stimulus of a deeply-felt anger, burst into a torrent of activity, which in the past has shaken, and may yet again, shake the world. The Baltinglass affair is perhaps the last flicker of a dying fire: it could be the first kindling of a new one. It is pleasant to speculate about what might happen if we in Great Britain should, some day, go and do likewise.

H. CARGILL.

Order the book you need from: — —

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., LIVERPOOL.

### Ten Years Ago

That the New York newspapers so exclusively quoted by the B.B.C. do not reflect all shades of American opinion is shown by the following from the *Courier-Journal* of Louisville, Kentucky. The author is James S. Pope and he wrote under the title: "America Aids Britain—For Cash."—

The phrase at the moment is "Aid to England." I for one, am sick of it. Dr. Gallup says practically all Americans favour "aid to England." Most of our columnists speak learnedly of the "aid" we already are giving Britain. Our president delivers himself of the odd observation that our "aid to England" has reached its peak. (You may be tired of those quotation marks, but so am I.)

Has there ever in the strange history of civilised men been any such colossal, such maddening, such utterly stupid and indefensible hypocrisy as that represented by the phrase "Aid to England"? In heaven's high name, how have we aided England? When? Whose sacrifice produced the aid? I'll tell you what we have done. It is very simple.

We have SOLD England an indeterminate number of military airplanes. She has paid cash. She has come and got them. We have SOLD England, I understand, some old rifles and various shipments of ammunition. She has paid cash. She came and got them. We have SOLD England, it is hinted, some tanks, especially some tanks we wanted tested on desert battlefields. We have SOLD England grain and sugar, iron and cotton, shoes and ships and sealing wax.

England must (under our law) pay cash. England must (under our helpful law) come and get them.

Finally, in a moment of benign generosity we traded England some rotting destroyers for some air and naval bases so valuable to our defence that even Mr. Churchill had difficulty justifying the deal to his parliament.

We are going (as part of our magnificent program of "aid to England") to sell her more and more planes, if our factories will just decide to produce them fast enough. We are going to sell England practically anything she wants—if we don't want it first—and we are going to let her use our own American ports to load her purchases into her own ships.

And Napoleon called England a nation of shopkeepers.—(From *The Social Crediter*, February 8, 1941.)

### PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

Price 2/- (Postage extra)

### The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 2/- (Postage extra)

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool 2.

## PARLIAMENT.

*(Continued from page 3).*

The financial provisions are contained in Clauses 15, 16 and 17. The general line taken in the Bill is that the Exchequer should bear the cost of the salaries and travelling expenses of members of the Authority and of the Scottish Committee, and should also be prepared to provide up to £1 million during the next ten years by way of grants for research and experiment. But the ordinary running expenses of the Authority and the financing of schemes for the better organisation and development of the industry will be the responsibility of the industry itself.

Clause 15 accordingly empowers the Authority to make a levy on persons engaged in the white fish industry not exceeding one penny per stone of fish landed in Great Britain each year. On last year's figures this would produce an annual income of about £450,000. They will also have power, through schemes, to make special levies for the purposes of those schemes. . . .

. . . The Authority have, . . . been given power in Clause 15, subject to certain safeguards, to borrow up to such amount as the Treasury may agree, so long as the sum outstanding does not at any given time exceed £15 million. Moreover, Clause 17 authorises the Ministers, with the approval of the Treasury, during the next 10 years to advance money for such purposes so long as the amount outstanding at any time is not more than £10 million. The £10 million is not additional to the £15 million but will be part of it, so that if the Authority choose to borrow from the Treasury in the early years they will be permitted to do so. . . .

*Major Sir Thomas Dugdale (Richmond, Yorks.): . . .*

. . . We on this side are fully aware of the fact that the fishing industry needs help. There are sections that need reorganisation and development, and there are sections to which loans are essential if they are to play their part in the future. For these reasons, we do not intend to vote against the Second Reading of this Bill this evening. But at this point I think it is my duty to tell the Government that there are provisions in the Bill which are causing much concern to many of my right hon. and hon. Friends and, indeed, to some sections of the fishing industry. We shall table Amendments during the Committee stage designed to improve the Bill, and we shall reserve our right to take what action we feel necessary during the Third Reading. . . .

*Mr. Duthie (Banff): . . .* I welcome this Bill, and I have been pleading since 1945 for the setting up of a White Fish Authority on the lines of that in the Bill. . . .

. . . I should like to put a true picture in front of hon. Members concerning the prices which fishermen have been getting for prime fish in the Scottish ports during the last week.

. . . the fish that I am talking about is fish of the very highest quality which can command the highest prices at Billingsgate, Manchester, Liverpool or any of the other central markets, because it is fish that is landed the same day as it is taken. Cod fillets were being sold at Billingsgate wholesale at 1s. 1½d. per lb. last week. Our fishermen at Moray Firth ports got 6¾d. for the same fish. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Where did the balance go?"] There are middleman's charges and so on. That is a job for the Authority to ascertain. Haddock was sold at 1s. 6½d. wholesale. The price at the portside was 11d. Whiting, 11½d. wholesale; at the portside, 4¼d. Plaice, 1s. 8½d. to 1s. 10½d. wholesale; at the portside, 1s. 5d. Soles, up to 2s. 10d, wholesale; at the portside,

1s. 7d. Herrings from the West side of Scotland were sold at 10d. per lb. wholesale in London and the price which the fishermen got was 4¼d. These are wholesale prices only. There is still the retailer's profit to come on to them.

We must consider that our fishermen are producing essential foodstuffs in competition with the subsidised foods, and I think it is true to say that the cost of production in the fishing industry is infinitely greater in recent years than that of any other food producing industry in Great Britain. . . . There is a subsidy on fish it is true, but the subsidy on inshore fish is under ¾d. per lb., and for the bulk of our fish which comes from long-distance vessels there is no subsidy at all, and that is 75 per cent. of the total quantity of fish consumed in this country.

The cost of catching has risen disastrously. Indeed, last Monday week the cost of sisal rope rose £2 per coil and the seine netting vessels have to use something like 20 coils of rope to shoot their nets. The life of these ropes is about one month, whereas in 1938 we were able to get manilla ropes at a little over £2 per coil, and their life was three times that of sisal ropes. Let us compare 1938 prices with 1950 prices.

. . . A vessel which cost £2,800 in 1938 is now costing £10,000 to £11,000. Nets have risen from £12 12s. to £55 5s. Manilla ropes cost £2 17s. 6d., and sisal now cost £11. Fuel oil cost 6½d. per gallon in 1938, and it has now risen to 1s. 1¾d.

During the last fortnight, I have been making inquiries into the working of the fishing industry which I represent. I have investigated the returns of 40 first-class seine net vessels, vessels which can be taken as good fishing vessels and pay their crew good wages for 40 weeks. All have shown a loss on their operations—that is without taking depreciation into account. It is largely due to the fact that the cost of gear and maintenance has increased so much.

Incidentally, the method of distributing the gross earnings of these vessels is perhaps the finest profit-sharing scheme in existence. The crew are all interested in the venture. The money is divided into two, after certain overhead expenses have been paid. Half goes to the vessel and gear, and the other half goes to the crew. The trouble is that the money which has been allocated for gear and upkeep has been insufficient to keep these boats going. . . .

. . . I was glad to hear what the Minister had to say about the international convention. This is one of the most serious, fundamental considerations in the fishing industry today. There are four countries which have not ratified the Convention—Belgium, Iceland, Portugal, and Spain. Let us be frank; Belgium and Spain are doing an enormous amount of damage in waters that are more or less territorial to this country. The Spaniards have very largely dissipated the hake stocks in Southern Ireland and Belgium in the North Sea and in inshore fishing grounds are doing a lot of serious damage, particularly in the Moray Firth and the Firth of Clyde.

I have come back from seeing the Belgians operating just outside the three-mile limit in the Moray Firth. What happens is that one of our local vessels just begins to fish, and indeed may be dragging its net on the sea bed, when along comes a Belgian, and without any respect for our vessel, drags his trawl right across where our vessel is fishing, hauls up our vessel's gear and then hacks it clear. If the local fisherman is fortunate he may get the number of the Belgian, when a claim for compensation will go to Ostend for con-

sideration. But that takes time. It is illegal for these trawlers to trawl in territorial waters, and it is absolutely vital that all vessels should conform to a certain standard of fishing here, and I hope be excluded from territorial waters just as British trawlers are excluded.

I hate to think of the quantity of immature fish being slaughtered even now in the Moray Firth by these foreign trawlers using a microscopic cod end mesh. That is one matter to which the Authority must apply its mind, and must dissuade these people from this action, because therein lies the future of our fishing industry. Unless something is done to preserve stocks and get uniformity of action in fishing methods, and the policing of all vessels in our territorial waters irrespective of nationality, we are going to get nowhere. . . .

*Mr. Osborne (Louth):* . . . The Bill has two aims. One is to provide cheaper fish; the other is to guarantee prosperity to the industry. When I talked to the people in Grimsby about it, they were divided as to what would be the result of these suggested regulations. Most of them, whatever section of the trade they were in, hoped they would get something out of it and would be better off. I ask the Minister this question: if the trawler owner and the merchant and the worker is each to be satisfied in his expectations of being better off, how on earth is the Minister to produce cheaper fish? I want to know that. I say that is impossible, and that in those respects the Bill will fail the expectations of those by whom it has been produced.

*Mr. Edward Evans* rose—

*Mr. Osborne:* I cannot give way.

*Mr. Hector Hughes:* May I ask the hon. Member—

*Mr. Osborne:* No. I want hon. Members opposite to apply their minds to this question. Unless the foreign-caught fish is subject to the same strict regulations as to quality, quantity and price as are the British, this scheme will fail, completely and utterly. So far the Minister has given no assurance that he will re-impose even the pre-war quotas of foreign-landed fish. Therefore, I say again, as I said in my article after having read the Bill carefully, that this is a piece of political humbug—[HON. MEMBERS: "Nonsense."] Hon. Members must listen—unless the Minister can give some guarantee that foreign-caught fish will be subject to the same rules to which British-caught fish are subject and be controlled. I know, and other hon. Members know, that the Minister is not in the position to give that guarantee. Therefore, all the provisions that follow will prove to be utterly useless.

*Mr. M. McMillan:* Nonsense.

*Mr. Edward Evans:* How much foreign fish has been landed in the last quarter?—10 per cent.

*Mr. Osborne:* Ten per cent. is sufficient to make just that difference to the price. What can the Minister tell the House and the three sections of the industry as to the promises he can give regarding foreign-caught fish?

I come now to my next question. I speak for myself, and not for my party—[An HON. MEMBER: "I am sure you do not."] This House respects men who speak for themselves.

*Mr. Manuel (Central Ayrshire):* Is the hon. Member for or against the Bill?

*Mr. Osborne:* This is what I want to ask the Minister. Can he give an assurance that when the Authority is set up,

it will not enter into direct trading, for this reason: if it is allowed to enter into any phase of direct trading it can, if it so wishes, use the taxable power of the country for a period of years to trade at an uneconomic level, to drive out of business by unfair competition—

*Mr. T. Williams indicated dissent.*

*Mr. Osborne:* I am saying that it can happen—it can do that. It could ruin the industry and take it over at any price it wishes.

*Mr. Manuel:* Filthy mind.

*Mr. Osborne:* Can I have from the Minister an assurance?

*Mr. T. Williams:* If the hon. Member wants the assurance now, let me say that the Authority can do nothing of the kind without direct Parliamentary consent.

*Mr. Osborne:* I am obliged for that assurance. I was asked for it by people in the industry who fear these things. [Interruption.] I intend to do the job for the people whom I am sent here to represent, and I am grateful to the Minister for that assurance.

The first and most important aim of the Bill, with which Members opposite, I think, would agree, is that more and cheaper and better fish shall be produced—mostly cheaper fish—to fill the gap caused by the shortage of meat. I ask hon. Members opposite whether there is any commodity that has been controlled by politics which has yet reduced prices, be it coal, gas, electricity, airways, railways or monkey nuts.

*Mr. Hoy (Leith):* Or fishing gear.

*Mr. Osborne:* In no industry which has been taken over from the men who understand it has there been a reduction in prices. I do not see why tonight we should assume that in fishing officials will be able to do what officials have been unable to do in other nationalised, semi-nationalised or controlled industries. For that reason, I am against the whole thing.

The Grimsby fish merchants asked me whether I would make on their behalf a special point, which answers, I think, many of the points raised by hon. Members opposite. Time and again reference has been made to the high cost of fish and the high prices which housewives have to pay. The inference has been that there has been profiteering by the fish merchants, which this Bill would in some ways try to control. But what are the facts? Even *The Times* seems to have got the facts wrong this morning, for in a leading article it says:

"So fish prices rose more than for most food, though the control kept the rise within moderate bounds."

It did nothing of the sort. From Grimsby, which has the biggest direct trade of any port in the country, about 70 per cent. of the trade is in cod fillets. The first control was imposed in 1942, when the price of cod fillets was 16s. 9d. per stone. When control ended in April last year, those cod fillets were 15s. 1d. per stone. Is there any other article of food, or clothing, or raw material which can compare with that fall from 16s. 9d. in 1942 to 15s. 1d. last year? I say there is none. Therefore, fish merchants at the ports, instead of being reviled, ought to be praised for what has been done.

Compare those prices with what has happened to coal under control. In 1942 the London price of coal was 62s. a ton. Today it is 95s. a ton, and if cod fillets had gone up in the same way they would be 25s. 6d. a stone, whereas the price at the end of control was 15s. 1d. In the first three days

of control there was panic and the popular Press did the industry and themselves a great dis-service by misrepresenting those panicky temporary factors. Since de-control, cod fillets from Grimsby have averaged 12s. 6d. to 15s. a stone, and today they are cheaper than that. Of course, hon. Members say that I know nothing about it, but I am advised by the fish merchants' secretary that thousands of stones came to the inland markets at shillings less than 12s. 6d. to 15s., so that de-control has reduced prices eventually.

*Mr. Edward Evans:* Nonsense.

*Mr. Osborne:* I am giving the facts as given to me and I am prepared to have them verified to the entire satisfaction of the Minister, who, when he gets facts, I know can be a reasonable and fair-minded person. Control generally not only put up prices, but de-control has actually reduced them since, and substantially. The fish merchants say, "We do not want a lot more regulations, Mr. Minister; we want the regulations which are already in existence properly applied and used well."

I will give the House and the Minister an example. Last Thursday there were landed in Grimsby 11,187 kits of fish. I would like the Minister to have something done about this matter. There is a rule that unless 12,000 kits are landed the big London fish trade will only take deliveries from the fish merchants up to 4 o'clock. Under special circumstances, only a week ago today no fewer than 185 lorry loads of fish were refused even though they had got to the train by five minutes past four and the train did not leave for London until five minutes past seven.

These 185 lorry loads of fish were sent to London a day later than they need have been. The secretary of the fish merchants' association rang up the authorities and asked whether sense could be not used in the application of these regulations and that big load got into trucks which would otherwise go to London half empty. The answer was "No," partly because there was no labour. The official was rung up again and was told there were between 150 and 200 men standing there waiting for 5 o'clock—this was at twenty minutes past four—doing nothing. They could have been transferred from one section to another to get this fish loaded for London, but the official had not the authority, or would not exercise it, to get the work done. So the fish train from Grimsby last Thursday came to London with trucks only partially filled, and it had been three hours before it pulled out—

*Mr. Slater:* What has this to do with the problem under discussion?

*Mr. Osborne:* I am trying to point out that, instead of having more regulations and more officials, we require fewer officials and fewer regulations, and that those we have ought to be more intelligently used. In support of that I am giving two concrete examples.

*Mr. Edward Evans:* What official was it?

*Mr. Osborne:* It was an official of the nationalised railways. I am saying that this fish was kept on the lorries and was refused by the railway authorities because only 11,187 kits instead of 12,000 kits had been landed that day.

*Commander Pursey:* That is in the Bill?

*Mr. Osborne:* It is a good job that the hon. and gallant Member is not in the Bill. I am saying that instead of more officials and more Government controls, we want fewer of

both, and we want those that we now have to do their work a great deal better.

I should have liked to say a great deal more, and there is one thing I must say. The *Economist* of 13th January said of the Bill, and I entirely agree with it:

"Unfortunately the Authority is also empowered—subject to the weak check of Parliamentary confirmation—to establish a"—

I should like the Minister to note this word—

"compulsory scheme of regulation for any branch of the industry. What is the purpose of these further powers? There is plenty of recent evidence to show that administrative regulation is no cure for inefficiency. Its effect is much more to ossify an industry—defects and all—and thus enable its prosperity to be guaranteed at the consumer's expense.

That brings me back to my point, that I fear that as a result of this Measure fish will be dearer and not cheaper in price. The *Economist* concludes:

"This Parliament ought not to be willing to give another doctor's mandate to another public body."

Had my party agreed, I would have liked to oppose this Bill, because I think it will disappoint the people who are expecting much of it. It will add to our costs and raise the cost of our fish.

### Agriculture (Output)

*Mr. Cooper-Key* asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he can give the relative output per man engaged in the agriculture industry on behalf of the rest of the population of Great Britain.

*Mr. T. Williams:* Home-produced food in the United Kingdom, in 1949-50 represented 39 per cent. of the total intake of calories, 53 per cent. of the protein and 34 per cent. of the fats and was produced by farmers and farm workers representing roughly 5 per cent. of the population in gainful employment.

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(Reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	6/6
The Big Idea .....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England.....	8d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism .....	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.