

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 28. No. 10.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, MAY 10, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The address quoted on page 4 was delivered five days after the General Election and three days after Mr. Churchill had filled the key positions in his Cabinet, but before the 'Conservative' Prime Minister had declared his intention of betraying his undertaking to restore the University Constituencies as an integral part of the electoral system. Possibly a report appeared in Scottish newspapers. We did not see one. The speaker was the Scottish Nationalist candidate elected by the students of Glasgow University. His Rectorial Address was marked by a disorder of an exceptionally offensive kind—in contrast with the studiously-planned decorum at a neighbouring university, when a popular broadcaster, its students choice, 'filled the bill.'

Dr. MacCormick does not attempt a 'close definition' of what he means and in a parenthesis passes lightly over the problem set before modern (and perhaps ancient) communities because verbal symbols fail of their symbolism—a poisonous feature which nourishes rogues, particularly political rogues; or, perhaps it is that political rogues being of all rogues the greatest rogues, the phenomenon is more impressive in their case. For our part, we are not painfully aware that we owe to the community something "better than we can define it." Definition to a *sufficient degree* (a *sufficient degree*) is one necessary condition to any adjustment of the Constitution; and, consciously or unconsciously, Dr. MacCormick is concerned with the Constitution, and particularly with that aspect of it which involves the integrity of the First Foot. Like the Church (of which it is a function) Education belongs to that not-entirely-mystical element of the Trinitarian Constitution known as "The King." What has the London School of Economics and all that stems from it to do with that? Are lies about money, and lies about the nature of human society appropriate to any kind of spiritual Lordship? "To cling only to truth": that indeed is a reasonably precise statement of the true function of a seminary of any description. At all events there is someone besides ourselves who deems it possible to "bring the nation" to something which "is the expression of true democracy"—or who did so before Mr. Churchill ratted.

• • •

Thomas Jones, C.H., LL.D., was Secretary to the Pilgrim Trust from 1930 to 1945 and Deputy Secretary to the Cabinet during a significant period. He contributes a front-page review of *The History of The Times.*, Vol. IV., to *The Times Literary Supplement*. Among the features of this review are mention of the fact that the General Strike "is not dealt with, but the Abdication is" and an account of the "worthy hands" into which *The Times* came to reside after recovery from those of Lord Northcliffe in 1922. We

quote the passage:—"Meanwhile negotiations had been proceeding for the sale of the Walter shares in *The Times*. Rich friends of Lloyd George were interested in the future of the paper and in his future, among them Lord Rothermere and David (later Lord) Davies, Sir John Ellerman and Lord Inverforth. There was reason to think that the Prime Minister would like to resign, 'after the settlement of the Irish crisis, and might himself be ready to edit *The Times*' in the hope of helping the pacification of Europe. There were four schemes, all known to the Prime Minister but only his own known to each of the participants. Nothing came of these very private conversations, and in the sequel the Walter interest was retained and his option to purchase was exercised with the co-operation of Colonel Astor. A committee was established for the special purpose of safeguarding future transfers of the controlling shares in *The Times* so as to ensure that so far as is humanly possible the ownership shall not fall into unworthy hands. This committee is composed of holders of high non-political offices: The Lord Chief Justice of England; the Warden of All Souls College, Oxford; the President of the Royal Society; the President of the Institute of Chartered Accountants; the Governor of the Bank of England."

The Archbishop of Canterbury, whose office we have seen mentioned in this association, is not included here. *The Scotsman's* reviewer, dealing with this episode in greater detail, gives *inter alia* the policy of the appointment, namely to ensure "so far as is humanly possible, that the ownership of the *Times* shall never be regarded as a mere matter of commerce to be transferred without regard to any other circumstances to the highest bidder, or fall, so far as can be foreseen into unworthy hands."

Also, the price paid for control by Colonel Astor (with Mr. John Walter, who had an option to buy) is given: £1,580,000. Lord Rothermere was competing. "Then, by an extraordinary hazard, the then managing director of *The Times*, Sir Campbell Stuart, who had charge of the negotiations for the purchase, attended a dinner party at which his host, unnamed, had a telephone conversation with one of Rothermere's representatives. He left the door open and everybody could hear what he said, though only Sir Campbell Stuart realised the import of what was said. It was that Rothermere was likely to offer a sum in excess of £1,250,000.

"The matter had to be decided before a Judge in chambers, and the climax came one afternoon when Rothermere's bid was made. It was for £1,350,000 for Northcliffe's shares alone. But by that time Colonel Astor had decided not to lose the paper. Mr. Walter exercised his option to buy, and as the sum offered by Rothermere was 'the best price,' the Judge approved the contract between the administrators of the Northcliffe estate and Mr. Walter."

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: April 1, 1952.

North Wales Hydro-Electric Power Bill

(The Debate continued: Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd is speaking):

... I think we must accept the view of the technicians who, at any rate, advise me that there is a perfectly good business proposition involved in these schemes, as was, indeed, the view not only of the British Electricity Authority but of the North Wales Power Company before, so that we have here an extraordinary measure of agreement between private enterprise, a nationalised industry, and a famous firm of engineering consultants who have made electric power stations and hydro-electric schemes in other parts of the world, and also, incidentally, erected the Sydney Bridge.

This House has a reasonable technical basis to go on, and we ought to regard this as a reasonably business-like scheme, but it is the amenity questions which are the important and practical ones. Here I should like to say at once that my right hon. Friend the Minister of Housing and Local Government has been in touch with the British Electricity Authority and with my Department, and the result is that the Authority wish to put back—there is no question of them being forced—into the Bill the ordinary planning Clause, which is the standard form for planning in Private Bills. . . .

The order, in terms, permits all forms of development authorised by a private Act and specified both as to their nature and the land on which they are to take place in the Act. But it restores control, which operates in respect of the erection, construction, alteration or extension of any building, including any bridge, aqueduct, pier, or dam, or the formation, laying out or alteration of a means of access to any road used by traffic and so on. The local planning authority would thus come back into the picture. We think that some further safeguards are necessary beyond what would be specified in some of the instructions and beyond what would follow naturally from the reinsertion in the Bill of this standard planning Clause. We think it should be obligatory on the British Electricity Authority to consult the Royal Fine Arts Commission and the National Parks Commission about building and other works, and they ought to employ a landscape consultant, whose advice ought to be available not only to the British Electricity Authority but also to the National Parks Commission.

... Another matter which we consider to be of considerable importance is the treatment of spoil arising from the excavations and the treatment of the banks of leats, fences, walls, and so on. Then, in the last resort, if there was a dispute between the British Electricity Authority and the local planning authority we think that proper provision should be made for reference of the whole dispute to my right hon. Friend the Minister of Housing and Local Government and myself for final decision which would give to this House a status in connection with the matter.

... Perhaps I may finish by referring to the question of water. . . . There is a Standing Order, No. 160, which I will not quote because I do not think the House would want me to go into that degree of detail, which gives very special

powers and instructions to the Committee to deal with the question of water and to see that the matter is properly dealt with in the Committee.

There, also, we thought—when I say “we” I mean that the British Electricity Authority have agreed partly as a result of representations which we thought fit to make—that in the last resort in some of these cases there should again be references in regard to any dispute to the Ministers whom I have previously mentioned.

... In all the circumstances, having regard to the fact that the Bill is really what we all want to see, if the the amenity objections are fully met in Committee—because this is one of the great national shrines of Wales and indeed of all our islands—I advise the House to agree to the Second Reading of the Bill.

Dr. Stross rose in his place, and claimed to move, “That the Question be now put.”

Question, “That the Question be now put,” put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, “That the Bill be now read a Second time.”

The House divided: Ayes, 200; Noes, 40.

[Mr. Nabarro was teller for the Noes...All the other Members who spoke critically of the Bill, voted in favour of it.—Ed. T.S.C.]

Private Industries and Agriculture (Subsidies)

Mr. Sparks asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will give a list of subsidies paid to private industries and agriculture for 1951-52; and to what extent he estimates that they will be varied for 1952-53.

Mr. R. A. Butler: Subsidies to private industries and agriculture for the financial year 1951-52 and 1952-53 are as follows:

	1951-52	1952-53
	£	£
Iron and steel	7,900,000	4,500,000
Watchmaking and jewel manufacturing	12,000	25,000
Motor industry (racing cars)	25,000	40,000
Cotton spinning	700,000	800,000
Hotels	175,000	375,000
Crafts	45,000	45,000
Harbours	9,000	350
Agriculture	31,214,000	36,975,000
Fishing	2,011,000	1,871,000

1. The above list shows the amounts included in the Estimates which have been presented to Parliament for subsidies to particular industries. It does not include losses on trading by Government Departments; nor does it include expenditure provided under general policies such as housing, social services, cost-of-living; the training, resettlement and transference of labour distribution of industry, improvement of design or research.

2. The total amount voted in 1951-52 in respect of iron and steel for both subsidy and trading loss was £8,840,000. There will be no trading loss in 1952-53.

3. The payments to the motor industry, hotels and craftsmen are in relief of Purchase Tax. Articles such as certain types of jewellery, gold and silverware, furniture and musical instruments qualify for this relief under the scheme for assistance to craftsmen, administered by the Board of Trade (Class VI Vote I Subhead 0, 1951-52 Estimate).

4. The figures for agriculture include crop acreage payments and the general fertiliser subsidy, which together total £520,000 for 1951-52 and £13,002,000 for 1952-53; these are part of the

food subsidies, and for statistical purposes have not been included in previous agricultural subsidy figures. The attested herds scheme bonuses, which also rank as food subsidies, are included.

5. The figures for the fishing industry include £1,546,000 in each year for the white fish subsidy, which is counted as a food subsidy.

House of Commons: April 2, 1952.

Ships (Design)

Dr. Bennett asked the First Lord of the Admiralty if he is aware of the increasing ugliness of naval ships designed since the "Dido" and "Town" class cruisers and the war-time fleet and "Hunt" class destroyers, culminating in the haphazard profile of the new "Daring" class destroyer; and if he will direct attention to the practicability of designing pleasant-looking ships without detracting from their fighting efficiency.

Mr. J. P. L. Thomas: Her Majesty's ships are designed to be fit for their purpose, namely, to fight with the maximum efficiency, and I can assure my hon. Friend that our latest warships will not be found wanting in this respect.

Dr. Bennett: In spite of a number of innovations having taken place since sail gave way to steam, it has never yet been impossible to design handsome ships. Will my right hon. Friend bear in mind that the fighting efficiency of a ship is contributed to substantially by the keenness and fondness of the sailors in her for that ship, because of their appreciation of good lines in these as in other circumstances?

Mr. Thomas: I assure my hon. and gallant Friend that I was on the "Diamond" only on Monday last, when I found that the men had a great affection for their ship. If he has any better or more attractive design himself, perhaps he will let me know.

Mr. I. Mikardo: Does the right hon. Gentleman consider that anybody at the receiving end of a naval shell is more reconciled to the effect of it if he knows it comes from a beautiful battleship?

Mr. Thomas: I must say that I rather doubt it.

Post Office:

Road and Petrol Taxes

Mr. Arthur Lewis asked the Assistant Postmaster-General if he will state, for the latest convenient date, the cost to his Department for road tax and petrol charges; and what increase is anticipated resulting from the Budget changes.

Mr. Gammans: The Post Office is not liable for Road Fund Tax on its vehicles. It is estimated that the expenditure on petrol in 1951-52 will be about £2,500,000 and that the recent increase in the price of petrol will raise Post Office direct costs in 1952-53 by £565,000.

Mr. Lewis: Can the Assistant Postmaster-General tell me whether this is the means whereby the Tories are to implement their promise to bring down the cost of living?

Australian Citizens (U.K. Passports)

Mr. Thomas Price asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is aware that an Australian citizen

domiciled in this country and married to an English wife is unable to obtain a British passport to accompany his family on foreign journeys without surrendering his Australian nationality; and if he will take steps to remove this anomaly which gives pain to loyal Commonwealth subjects domiciled in this country.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Anthony Eden): An Australian citizen who has been ordinarily resident in this country for one year can apply for registration as a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies and so become eligible to hold a United Kingdom passport.

The Australian Citizenship Act, however, provides that an Australian citizen who acquires the nationality or citizenship of a country other than Australia shall thereupon cease to be an Australian citizen. This applies to the United Kingdom, in which case an Australian's status as a British subject is not, however, affected.

The hon. Gentleman will therefore see that it is Australian and not United Kingdom law which lays down the circumstances in which Australian citizenship is lost.

Mr. Price: May I take it from the very courteous answer given by the right hon. Gentleman that he recognises that this is a matter of particular difficulty in our relationship with the Australian Commonwealth, and will he try to devise, in consultation with the Australian authorities, some machinery under which our Commonwealth friends can at least have the appearance of some preference when living in this country, as compared with aliens who have no ties of blood with us?

Mr. Eden: I feel exactly as the hon. Gentleman feels, which is why I revised the original draft of this reply. It really is not a matter in which we are the authority. This is Australian law, and all I can do for the hon. Gentleman is to expound Australian law. What we can say, and what I have said, is that in any event the status of Australians in this country as British subjects is not in any circumstances affected.

Mr. Shinwell: I merely wish to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman is aware that his appearance at the Box is the first display of good temper we have had from the Front Bench opposite today.

Mr. Eden: I am sorry I was not here yesterday.

Cheese Ration

Mrs. Mann asked the Minister of Food how long the cheese ration will remain at one ounce; and what alternative to the rationed cheese is available to the housewife.

Dr. Hill: My right hon. and gallant Friend cannot hold out hope of a bigger ration for some months. Among the alternatives to rationed cheese are milk and fish as well as bacon and eggs which have recently become more plentiful.

NATIONAL FINANCE

U.S.A. Securities (U.K. Holdings)

Mr. J. Morrison asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury the present total of British investments in the United States of America.

(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. 28. No. 10.

Saturday, May 3, 1952.

The Constitution in S. Africa

Commenting on events in South Africa last week we said the Opposition might release forces it could not control—a remark of Dr. Dönges's. He has since introduced a Bill to establish a High Court of Parliament as a final court of appeal on constitutional issues, which *The Times* deems to invite the 'plausible' defence that it is 'nothing very startling' "since the new court will merely fill the void left when appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London were abolished." *The Times* (April 25) admits that a step such as that proposed "certainly makes a deep inroad upon the independence of the judiciary and the traditional doctrine of the rule of law." It recognises the revolutionary character of the proposal. The Second Reading of Dr. Dönges's Bill occurs after we go to press, and we cannot record the course of debate.

With the text of the Bill before it, the *Cape Times* described the fundamental issue as that of the survival of constitutionalism, which, it says, "demands respect for an unwritten body of rules far vaster than the written." On the surface, this appears to be a quite appropriate introduction of the notion of a Common Law. We prefer, nevertheless, the formula of *The Times*, that "to attempt to legislate in this sense is to use the forms of law to evade its spirit, and can be fairly described as unconstitutional."

University Rector Condemns Rule by Function

"... The Chancellor, Lord Boyd-Orr, is absent in Pakistan, and the Principal is absent in London. . . .

"There is no doubt . . . that we meet to-day as members of the General Council in what might well be the calm before the storm. We may shortly become the centre of a very heated controversy. I need not say why, because I am sure that the reason is present in all your minds[*]. The mere fact that we may become the centre of a controversy seems to me to make it desirable that, as members of the General Council and, in the best and widest sense members of the University, we should ask ourselves what is our place within the community.

"I have recently seen it suggested that members of a University, simply because they have succeeded in passing

[*] Not in ours. We presume that Dr. MacCormick, who thus addressed the General Council of Glasgow University last October, was referring to the possibility of the restoration, according to Mr. Churchill's promise, of the universities to constituency status in the parliamentary electoral system, the so-called 'University Vote.'

examinations, are entitled to no privileges over and above the members of any other trade or profession. It may be our own fault that membership of the University has come to mean in many minds nothing more than the possession of a Degree or a qualification for some profession. That may be our own fault, but whether it is our own fault or not there is something wrong with our society and something wrong with ourselves if to be members of the General Council of this or any other University can be regarded as nothing more than a professional qualification to do some job.

"As members of a University, as persons who have had the privilege of becoming members of this community within the community, surely, in whatever way we give it we have something to give to the nation as a whole which no other body of people can give. We can only give what we have to give if we give it as members of our University community. So long as we think of ourselves only as doctors or lawyers, teachers or engineers, or scientists, so long as we think of ourselves vocationally, then we have no claim to be considered as different from those of any other vocation. We are merely plumbers, tradesmen, builders, or what you will.

"But when we think of ourselves as knit together in all our varying occupations, knit together not only by the experience of our youth in our University community but knit together in our common understanding of the things which transcend party division and class war; if we think of ourselves as knit together in our duty to maintain the standards of Western civilisation, of the liberal outlook to which we owe all that we have; if we so regard ourselves knit together in one community with one understanding and for one common purpose then, as I see it, however it may be expressed politically, we have a right to see that as graduates of this or any other University we play a distinct and unique part in the life of the nation.

"It would be difficult indeed to define in a few words exactly what I mean, or what anyone else might mean, by speaking of our place as a body of graduates within the nation. I think that, without any attempt at close definition, we can feel what we owe to the community better than we can define it. We owe it to the community to bring to every problem a sense of balance in our judgment. We owe it to the community to look upon every question presented to us—political or otherwise—without the bias of class or vocation, and without prejudice of any kind.

"We have, after all, been trained, or should have been trained, to weigh the evidence and only in the light of the evidence to come to our conclusion.

"We have seen to what an impasse our affairs can come when all decisions are made in terms either of real or of fancied self-interest. If we as members of a University, as the persons who have in the most real sense inherited the great traditions of Free Europe, if we, not only in this hall—we are but a small representation of the graduates of Great Britain—but if we as a whole, whenever we work in the community, can bring to the community a new capacity to judge upon the evidence, to discard prejudice, and to cling only to truth, then I think we may be the people who will resolve the impasse and bring the nation out of the conflict of class into the unity of purpose which is the expression of true democracy." (Dr. John MacDonald MacCormick, Rector of Glasgow University, October 31, 1951.)

Monarchy

by NORMAN F. WEBB.

The best reason why Monarchy is strong government, is that it is an intelligible government. The mass of mankind understand it, and they hardly anywhere in the world understand any other. Walter Bagehot.

The problem posed by this eminently well-written and useful document* is the problem of Constitutional Monarchy and its soundness as an institution. Institutions that refuse to move and adjust themselves will be attacked and ultimately destroyed. Institutions that do move in an attempt at adjustment will also be attacked, but may avoid ultimate destruction. It is, no doubt, a matter of degree.

Considering this not inconsiderable "slice of history" at a time when the monarchial emotions of the nation have been so stirred by the sudden passing away of its symbolical head, it is impossible to avoid speculation as to what would have happened—or happened differently—if circumstances had permitted Edward VIII to find a compromise, and a way out of the emotional difficulties that confronted him in 1936. It is arguable that the Monarchy exists to uphold the institution of the family unit, and that Domesticity, with a capital, is the basis of British culture and the Common-wealth. Napoleon, who was a bourgeois himself, saw us as a nation of shop-keepers. If that is so, it would seem that the change in 1936 was for the better. But it would appear as a rather restricted and over-simplified view to take of the Crown's function; a trifle too bourgeois. . . . As events turned out, that was the school that triumphed. If it was really inevitable that in those years representing the last reign the theme of 'Rule Britannia' was to change to Britain Can Take It, then on that limited front nothing could have been finer or more admirable as a personal example of resignation than George VI's sixteen years reign. For it one can have nothing but admiration tinged with awe at such almost superhuman constitutional correctitude and dignity and fortitude, in conjunction with an obviously happy family life, so human and domestic that it gives the impression of only just stopping short of wheeling the perambulator.

For Edward, however, admiration is replaced by sympathy for the man and his immense dilemma, sympathy which grows as one reads this book, and it is not lessened by the fact that in failing as a king, which in effect was what he did, he failed to no real purpose, as his story indirectly discloses. The tone and morale of the book palpably deteriorates in its final chapters, as the net closed in on its victim, and he displays—not blatantly, but unmistakably—a somewhat bitter, personal spirit. With that exception, it is all remarkably chivalrous and discreet. Undoubtedly the early part of the book, perhaps two thirds of it, is valuable and brilliantly documentary—the childhood and education of a prince, and the subsequent training and experience of an heir to a great throne,—it is all excellently conveyed; the consciousness of not being in the conventional mould of kingship or the spirit of those about him; the differences and lack of a common view of things between his father and himself, is all told candidly and impersonally and without a trace of bitterness, as well as with considerable wit.

**A King's Story*—The Memoirs of the Duke of Windsor.

No doubt, in exile, the Duke has had overmuch time to ponder and idealize the stages leading up to his brief kingship; but he certainly makes out a good case for his special preparedness to be the head of a great commercial empire, and the practical merits of his training. "It has been said," he writes, "that my education was completed on the trade routes of the world. That strikes me as a happy judgment. As I travelled the vast imperial hinterlands, with their wheat-laden prairies and forests, and rubber plantations, the rich mines, and the raw, half-finished cities, and the harbours everywhere filled with British shipping, I was astonished to discover how much of the world's work was being done by a relatively small handful of my countrymen. It used to depress me on my return home to find this magnificent effort and sacrifice was by all too many being taken for granted."

There can have been few at that time with more opportunity of weighing up the size and scope of that British achievement which, at least since the Liberal victory in 1905 and the rise of Lloyd-George and the Little Englanders, had begun to be the especial target of world or international criticism and abuse. "And so" he writes, "the 1920's spun for me their bright magic. Austerity is now the rule of the day in Britain. . . . Nowadays I note with regret a tendency to write off the Twenties as a lost and decadent decade. On the contrary, I remember them as a bright era in which the Royal Navy still ruled the seas and the pound sterling was still the world's unit of exchange. It was I think the last time in this tortured century that a man could enjoy himself in a good conscience; the last time that princes could circulate easily and without embarrassment through all levels of society."

There is a distinct note of special pleading to be detected there. None-the-less, that requires to be said, and Edward himself was not taken in by the mere glitter of his world. He says in his Introduction: "This is the story of the life of a man brought up in a special way, as a prince trained in manners and maxims of the Nineteenth Century, for a life that had all but disappeared by the end of his youth. . . . At fifty-six a man is not inclined to call himself old. Yet to a generation that takes for granted nuclear fission, radar and television, psychiatry, and God knows what else, someone who was dandled on Queen Victoria's knee must appear an old fogey, a relic to be classed with square-rigged ships, kerosene lamps, and the Prince Albert coat." Yet, strangely enough, that very statement contains a subtle note of petulance that is of the essence of mental old age—the impulse to give one's world up as a bad job. And this story contains other hints of the same nature, sad, but under the circumstances, not surprising.

It can be said, however, that the Edward who succeeded his father in 1936 was potentially a well-equipped man for his Imperial job, uniquely combining a national outlook with a genuinely cosmopolitan education. That he had nothing of the "internationalist" about him is clearly shown in his brush with Mr. Herbert Morrison and the London County Council over the Kennington Housing Estate, which is described with a good deal of wit and insight.

"It was . . . suggested," he writes again, "that because of my obvious concern with the under-privileged I aspired to be the first Radical King. As a matter of fact had the assessment been made at that time of my private views . . .

it would have revealed, I am sure, what would have been classed as a distinctly conservative outlook. . . I believed in private enterprise, a strong Navy. . . And at the risk of inviting a shower of brickbats, I must admit I was never a supporter of the League of Nations. It was not that I opposed the dreams of a universal society wherein mankind should learn to live in unity. On the contrary, as a man who knew the horrors of war, I shared that dream. But as a realist with some knowledge of international politics, I could not but look upon it as a will-o-the-wisp in pursuit of which my country could neglect the strength that has been its sure recourse in the past against aggression. . . . I was all for Mr. Churchill and his campaign to rearm Britain."

All that is past history, of course. World War Two has come and gone, and the devotees of unintelligent anticipation are all agog for Number Three. There were others of us who felt the same at that time as Edward Windsor, from whom he might have got some useful information. And we work still, as we worked then, not only to oppose, but in the hope of deflecting the course of events. Mere opposition can lead only to defeat; a fact of the truth of which this book is only another proof. The text of "I told you so" is of all texts the most fatally undynamic, both to the preacher and his audience, if any. But the oppression of these apparently missed opportunities lies heavily over this story of an exceptionally active-minded man, who has missed the chance of exercising his true vocation, whatever it may have been, in exchange for a shadow. For no matter how cynical it may sound, no man can be a happy and successful husband and nothing more. That is the tragedy of merely human love.

They make a dark and disturbing and murky picture, those last three weeks or so of fevered negotiation, behind the thin curtain of press censorship. This coming and going between Fort Belvedere and Buckingham Palace, and 10, Downing Street and Lambeth Palace. He writes: "A bombardment seemed imminent. And because of the intimate association between Mr. Baldwin, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Mr. Geoffrey Dawson of *The Times*, we had instinctively braced ourselves . . . However, the shelling, when it did start, came from just about the last place in the world we expected. . . . On the forenoon of December 1 the Bishop of Bradford, the Rt. Rev. A. W. F. Blunt . . . was moved at this tense moment to express regret that the King had not shewn more positive evidence of his awareness of the need of divine guidance in the discharge of his high office. There was a veiled suggestion of a want of sustained habit in my Church-going. Until that moment I had never heard of Dr. Blunt, and in the light of the historical consequences of his sudden action, it is perhaps worthy of note that I was not to hear of him again till the Spring of 1951. On this last occasion I read that he had been attacked in the House of Lords as a leading personality in a strange organisation known as "The Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership," which was said to be an instrument of Communist infiltration into the Church. Of such material is history made.

The question that such a document—this story of Edward Windsor—seems to beg is of the very essence of Monarchy as a method of social organisation. Is there a point—or is there none at all?—at which a Constitutional monarch may intervene? Does strict protocol demand of

His Imperial Majesty that he does not bat an eyelid even when His Empire is being knocked down to the lowest bidder, and his subjects' capital assets are being confiscated, or forcibly exchanged for depreciating paper money? Is His Majesty, in duty, forced to sanction the whittling down of H.M. Forces? Is he purely the holder-of-the-ring in which "events" may unfold, regardless of who, or what, is the decisive impulse behind those events?

I think the answer to that question is exactly the same for the monarch as for the individual-in-association, whom he typifies. As long as one does not understand—is not prepared to understand—the situation, one must perforce acquiesce. To do anything else is to lay oneself open to the accusation—and the conviction—of rebellion, of being unconstitutional. Unenlightened action is worse than no action at all. It is negative, retrogressive action, where one's resources are no more than equal to positive in-action. Edward guessed a lot; but it was no more than guessing.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

Sir A. Salter: I am not yet in a position to give this information beyond the end of 1950, when the nominal capital value of United Kingdom holdings of quoted U.S. domestic securities (including those pledged with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) was, it is now estimated, £124 million. This figure continues a series of estimates for the years 1938 to 1949 published by the Bank of England.

Democratic Government

Mr. Geoffrey de Freitas (Lincoln): I beg to move,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to ensure that at least two out of three Members of the Cabinet shall be Members of the Commons House of Parliament."

Mr. J. Enoch Powell (Wolverhampton, South-West): May I put to you, Mr. Speaker, a point of order of which I gave you notice earlier, and of which I have given notice to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Lincoln (Mr. de Freitas); namely, that it is out of order for the House to proceed further upon this Motion until Her Majesty's consent to the proceedings has been signified to the House by a Privy Councillor?

I respectfully base this submission upon two considerations, which I will put to you as briefly as I can. First, that this Bill, on the face of it, trenches upon the exercise of the Royal Prerogative, and, second, that this is the appropriate occasion upon which Her Majesty's consent should be signified.

As to the first point, the selection of the Ministers and advisers of the Crown is, beyond doubt or dispute, a matter of the Royal Prerogative, and any Bill which seeks to ensure that the advisers of the Crown shall be selected from a specific range of persons is, upon the face of it, a limitation of that Prerogative.

I am aware that there have been Acts of Parliament, namely, the Re-election of Ministers Act, 1919, and the Ministers of the Crown Act, 1937, which have made certain enactments regarding Ministers of the Crown sitting in this

House, but I submit to you, Sir, that these Acts, to which the consent of the Crown was not signified, differ *toto cælo* from the Bill to introduce which leave is now sought, in that they deal with disqualifications from sitting in this House.

The qualification to sit in this House has always been a matter within the jurisdiction of this House, and not a matter of the Royal Prerogative. On the other hand, the selection of Ministers of the Crown is a matter which cannot be regulated by this House unless Her Majesty's Prerogative is placed at our disposal for the purpose.

I have not overlooked the fact that the Bill relates to Cabinet Ministers, and not to Ministers as such. Nevertheless, I do not believe that my point is thereby invalidated. The Cabinet is an unofficial Committee of the Privy Council, and to say that such-and-such persons shall be Cabinet Ministers is to say that Her Majesty shall summon such-and-such persons to advise her and not such-and-such other persons. Upon the face of it, this is a matter which concerns the Royal Prerogative.

Now, as to the question whether consent should be signified at this stage, the House will be aware that the Royal consent is given from time to time at all stages of Bills, right from leave being given to bring in a Bill up to the Third Reading. Quite evidently, where the Royal Prerogative is only incidentally affected, it is convenient that the consent should be signified at a later stage. Let me bring to your attention, however, Mr. Speaker, the statement of Erskine May on this subject:

"But if the matters affecting the Royal interests form the main or a very important part of a Bill, it would be courting waste of time, if the permission of the Crown to proceed with the Bill were not ascertained at the outset. In such cases, accordingly, the communication from the Queen is signified at the beginning of the earliest stage of the debate."

This, Sir, is the earliest stage of the debate upon this Bill, and I therefore submit that it would be out of order for the House to proceed further until Her Majesty's consent to our proceedings has been duly signified.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member was good enough to give me notice that he wanted to raise this point of order, and I have given careful consideration to the matters which he has put before me.

I am satisfied that the precedents of modern practice do not require the Queen's consent to be signified to the provisions of the proposed Bill. These provisions are of a type which has not, by practice, required a Prerogative consent. Several Acts, some of which have been mentioned by the hon. Member, such as the Re-election of Ministers Act, 1919, and the Ministers of the Crown Act, 1937, have laid it down that not more than a certain number of Ministers of the Crown shall sit in the House of Commons. To none of these was the Royal consent given at any stage.

This Bill proposes that at least two out of three Members of the Cabinet must be Members of this House. In my opinion, after careful consideration, the proposal that a certain proportion of the Cabinet must sit in this House does not need the Queen's consent any more than a proposal that not more than a certain number of Ministers may sit in this House. It is true, as the hon. Member points out, that the Acts in the former group had the effect of relaxing an existing disqualification, whereas the proposed Bill imposes

a disqualification which is new, but I do not think that that affects the decision.

Mr. de Freitas: As has been pointed out, the Prime Minister of the day is not free to choose his Government as he likes, and the composition of the Government is regulated by certain Acts, especially the Ministers of the Crown Act, 1937.

In moving the Second Reading of the Ministers of the Crown Bill, the then Home Secretary, Sir John Simon, as he then was, referred to one of its provisions in these words, and I quote:

"... Parliament this year, for the first time, takes upon itself to define what a Cabinet Minister is."

It is because this Bill defined a Cabinet Minister that my Bill is so short. Later in his speech, Lord Simon, as he now is, referred to the provisions as to the offices which must be held by peers, and asked the House of Commons to support them in these words:

"The House of Lords should have its fair allowance of Ministers."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, April 12, 1937; Vol. 322, c. 645-52.]

Lord Simon was pleading, somewhat in advance of his time, for fair shares—fair shares for peers. The House listened to his plea, found it just and agreed to tie the hands of Prime Ministers by providing, for example, that in future peers must hold at least three out of 17 named Ministerial offices, and at least two out of 23 named junior Ministerial offices.

So it can be seen that my proposal today follows from the precedent set in 1937 and is, in fact, far less restrictive than the proposals of Lord Simon and accepted by the House at that time...

... Instead of Lord Simon's elaborate restrictions I prefer a simple method of ensuring fair shares by laying down this proportion of two-thirds. In 1937, when the Ministers of the Crown Bill was considered, it was never thought it would ever be necessary to legislate to ensure a fair share of Members of the Commons...

One of the characteristics of our system of parliamentary government is that the leading members of the administration are also members of the legislature and pass much of their lives in this House together with men and women who are elected to Parliament. I submit that it weakens our parliamentary democracy to have in a Cabinet too many men who know nothing of the atmosphere of the House of Commons of the day—whether in the Chamber or in the Tea Room or in the Lobby. Further, it could be really dangerous to have too many men in the Cabinet who have never served as members of an elected political body where men and women learn to live on equal terms and in friendship with political opponents. My Bill is to prevent any Prime Minister in the future subordinating parliamentary democracy to the rule of appointed peers.

Since I gave notice of my intention to seek to introduce this Bill I have had helpful suggestions from all parts of the House. I have met hostility only from hon. Members who fear that this Bill would strengthen, by implication, the constitutional position of the present House of Lords and thus of the peers by inheritance. These hon. Members maintain that they are against the hereditary principle and they

claim that it is no answer to that point when it is argued that peers by inheritance, whether of the second or twenty-second generation seldom attend the House of Lords and figure less in HANSARD than in "The Tatler."

But I remind these hon. Members that times have changed since the present Prime Minister called for battle to be joined against aristocratic rule, as he did in 1910. That is not the battle today. That is why I am asking that this Bill be considered rather as a protection of parliamentary democracy in the future not against aristocratic rule but against the appointed peers of this so-called "managerial revolution." In effect, my Bill merely seeks to amend the 1937 Act to ensure that two-thirds of the Cabinet are men and women elected to Parliament. Lord Simon said of the 1937 Bill that it gave a deeper foundation to the essentials of our British system and I hope that the House will agree that those words are even more appropriate when applied to my modest Bill.

Sir Herbert Williams (Croydon, East): I am sorry to disappoint the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. de Freitas), but I am not very much impressed by his Bill. When I saw the notice on the Order Paper I speculated on its purpose and I have only discovered it from the hon. Member's speech. He does not like the fact that the Prime Minister, in forming the Government, decided to have a certain number of people, not too pre-occupied with departmental duties to have supervisory control over groups of Departments.

Going back to 1918, hon. Members might care to peruse Cmd. 9230, commonly known as "The Machinery of Government Committee" presided over by Lord Haldane who, of course, was the first Lord Chancellor of a Socialist Government. He was assisted by Mr. E. S. Montague, a Liberal M.P., Sir Robert Morant, a most outstanding civil servant, Sir George Murray, Sir Alan Sykes, a Conservative M.P., Mr. J. H. Thomas, an outstanding leader of the Labour Party, and Mrs. Sidney Webb. They expressed the view that these co-ordinating Ministers were a good idea and it is rather a pity that the hon. Member for Lincoln did not read other things in the Library besides the Statute to which he referred.

... I have been trying to do a little arithmetic. Once a month, or thereabouts, a document is available in the Vote Office which includes a list of all Government Ministers and officials of the House. It is very interesting. I tried to

count how many there were now in the Cabinet, and I counted 18. For some peculiar reason, although the Prime Minister holds two jobs he is scheduled as only one person. The Home Secretary holds two jobs, but is down in the list as only one. The name of the Marquess of Salisbury, who holds two jobs, is repeated and that is why the Cabinet appears to be 18. Out of 17 now in the Cabinet six are in the House of Lords and only one of those six is a hereditary peer—Lord Salisbury—who used to sit in this House. All the others are number one of their generation, which rather upsets the hon. Member's argument.

If the Bill becomes law the problem is quite easy of solution. The Prime Minister will look round the House. His eye might fall on my hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh, South (Sir. W. Darling) or it might even fall on me, and he has only to promote one of us and the problem is solved. This Bill is silly in saying to the Prime Minister that he will be debarred from the choice of certain people whom he thinks are really fitted for the job.

I know it was done in the days of Queen Anne, which the hon. Member loves and adores, but in her day things were different because she had courage. She said, "La Reine s'avisera" and turned down the Scottish Militia Bill, for example. That method is now rather out of date. Charles II had a very much better method of dealing with Bills of this kind before they became Acts, because when the Bill proved awkward he just shoved it under the table. But that method is also out of date. I do not see why one should circumscribe the choice of the Prime Minister in his attempt, in peace-time, to give effect to the recommendations of the Haldane Committee. I think it is absolutely wrong that the Prime Minister should be denied the opportunity of giving effect to something recommended by the first Socialist Lord Chancellor, though I cannot tell from outside how it is working.

Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 12 (Motions for leave to bring in Bills and Nomination of Select Committees at commencement of Public Business).

The House divided: Ayes, 208; Noes, 246.

THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By

C. H. DOUGLAS:

(Postage 1d.)

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, LIVERPOOL.

THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

By

C. H. DOUGLAS.

The Revised and Enlarged Edition published in 1937
is again on sale.

12/- net.

"The standard literary instrument for the correct
information of the public concerning the technical
aspects of Social Credit"—*The Social Crediter*.

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

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