

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 29. No. 16.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

If it is true that "The Muslim world is kicking itself because it handed the formulae for the Industrial Revolution to the West on a plate and did nothing about it itself," we are sorry to hear it, and wonder whether the *Sunday Express* feature-writer who expresses the opinion is

- (a) Enticing the Muslim world into participation in Mond-Turnerism, or
- (b) Trying to establish a new fashion in anti-Semitism, or,
- (c) Merely writing engagingly on the old topic of the alleged benefits of the factory system.

He quotes the poet Iqbal:—

Science was not brought into being by the West;

In essence it is nothing but the delight that lies in creation;

If you ponder well, it is the Muslims who gave it life:

It is a pearl we dropped from our hands
When the Arabs spread over Europe
They laid new foundations of learning and science.

The seed was sown by these dwellers of the desert;

But the harvest was reaped by the West.

This spirit is from the flask of our own ancestors;
Bring this fairy back.

However, there is something which rings true about the picture drawn of the consequences which might result from the return of "the fairy": "I trust the Minister is under no illusion about the general reaction to these potential benefits when they are achieved. If by 2050 the standard of living in Pakistan and Afghanistan has been raised fourfold, there will be a Mohammed Ali Attlee summing up the whole process as the mess of a century. There will be an Abdul Hassan Dalton dismissing all the textile factories and power stations as a poor bag of physical assets, and there will be an Abou Ben Bevan (may his size decrease) going about with a small band of followers denouncing everyone else as infidels. And in the market-places of Karachi and Kabul the orators will be thundering forth 'Chums. you've been robbed.'"

• • •

Mr. Legge-Burke has written to the *Daily Telegraph*: "Sir, What is Mr. Michael Lubbock, the treasurer of the United Nations Association, trying to do with the English language? To describe as a 'less complete but not less real success in the political sphere' what the United Nations have done in Palestine is as good as saying that Buchenwald

was a beanfeast laid on by Hitler for the entertainment of German Jews.

"If the 'vision' of United Nations is to be interpreted as a 'crusade' to drive about 900,000 Arabs out of their homes and leave them to rot in neighbouring territory then I suppose success can justly be attributed to their efforts. I wonder what Richard Cœur de Lion is doing in his grave meanwhile." We wonder, too.

Social Credit Secretariat Lectures and Studies Section

OFFICE OF THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,

LIVERPOOL.

December 5, 1952.

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*,
Sir,

An Examination for the Diploma of Associate of the Social Credit Secretariat will be held in *Canada early next year*, and elsewhere later if other candidates apply for Examination before March 1, 1953.

Candidates for award of the Diploma of Fellow of the Social Credit Secretariat will be admitted to examination after consultation with the Director of Information (see Syllabus, obtainable from me).

I am desired to emphasise the wide difference of standard between the two Diplomas. The Associate standard corresponds to a university matriculation standard, while the award of a fellow's certificate implies as thorough competency in the economics and politics of Social Credit as an examination can test. The institution, of a *Member's Diploma*, of intermediate standard, is under consideration.

A proposal to publish "model answers" to questions set in the Examination for the Diploma of Associate has been considered but has been rejected as unlikely to promote the objectives presumed to recommend the practice. Percentage marks gained in this Examination will be published with the names of successful candidates only. This does not apply to the Fellowship Examination, concerning which marks gained will not be published.

Yours faithfully

(Signed) J. Hyatt,

REGISTRAR.

Professor Pirie and Conception-control

The paragraph quoted here last week concerning the above was *The Lancet's* comment, and not, we understand, Professor Pirie's own words.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 20, 1952.

Supplies and Services (Transitional Powers)

(The Debate continued: The Home Secretary is speaking):

... Regulation 54B is revoked so far as regards community feeding centres and the heat treatment of milk; 55, so far as first of all, the restriction on the jurisdiction of summary and quarter sessions courts and the control of undertakings; 55AB, so far as regards restriction on jurisdiction; 56 so far as concerns the control of undertakings; 56A, so far as regards restriction on jurisdiction. I will come back to 58A, because I consider it most important. I will deal with that after I have read the list. I have already mentioned 62, and I will come back to it again. Then 62A is revoked so far as regards a local authority cultivating land.

... Regulations 68A and 68AA are revoked except in relation to houses in respect of which licences are already in force; the same applies to the revocation of 68B and 68BB; 68CB will be revoked except in relation to accommodation already registered or in respect of which an application for registration has been made; 72, so far as regards Section 77 of the Road Traffic Act, 1930, Section 10 of the London Hackney Carriages Act, 1843, and Section 8 of the Metropolitan Public Carriage Act, 1869; 85, so far as regards Regulations 62; 90, so far as regards the words

"or does any act preparatory to the commission of";

93, so far as regards words which have ceased to have effect; 99, so far as regards the exercise of powers of the Attorney-General and a chief officer of police; and 100, 101, and 102 so far as regards certain provisions which have become of no effect.

Perhaps I might then turn to certain codes. The Defence (Price Control) Regulations, 1945, Nos. 6, 18 and 19 are revoked so far as regards the restrictions on the jurisdiction of summary courts and courts of quarter sessions.

... The Defence (Recovery of Fines) Regulations, 1942, Nos. 12 and 14, so far as regards certain provisions which have become of no effect; because of the revocation of other Regulations, these provisions have become of no effect. Then there are two more which I should have mentioned earlier. Regulation 52 paragraph (4), relating to the Minister of Supply's power to make byelaws under the Military Lands Acts, and No. 72 paragraph (1C), allowing persons under 21 to drive agricultural tractors.

... I did think, and I still think—although I have tried to meet hon. and right hon. Gentlemen—that there were some five matters which deserved comment on these partial revocations. I had dealt with No. 62, which I consider is important because of the effect of the paragraphs I have mentioned. I think it is also important—and I drew attention to it in giving the list—that we propose to abrogate the power of the Minister of Labour under Regulation 58A to regulate the duration and situation of the employment of workers, and to require compulsory registration of particulars of employers and employees. These are important matters.

Thirdly, there is Regulation 62A under which, among other things, local authorities who hold land—including requisitioned land—occupied by them have been empowered to cultivate it even if the cultivation would otherwise be illegal

and constitute a breach of trust or covenant. That power is now to be discontinued.

Then, where several of the Regulations are concerned—Regulations 55, 55AB, 56A and the Defence (Price Control) Regulations—the Director of Public Prosecutions or the other prosecuting authority will lose the right to require that the case should not be tried by a court of summary jurisdiction. As hon. Members of the legal profession will remember, trial by jury has the effect of exposing offenders to much heavier penalties than those which might be awarded by a court of summary jurisdiction.

I would draw the attention of the House to Regulation 90, where it is proposed to delete the words:

"... or does any act preparatory to the commission of ..."

The deletion of those words will mean that it is no longer possible to prosecute for acts which are held to be preparatory to the commission of an offence under the Regulations. This surrender of a power is one which I am sure will be welcomed on both sides of the House. . . .

... I have dealt with the first category and the second possibility was that when we undertook our review of these emergency powers we might find it possible and desirable to embody some of them in legislation requiring annual renewal by Parliament. The powers in question here are probably the most complex of all the powers with which we are concerned in this debate today. I am not going to quote individual Regulations, but I am merely giving examples. They cover the fields of requisition of land, of price control, of the control of industry, of the control of labour and employment—

Mr. C. Davies: Is that Regulation still in existence? I thought that the Minister of Labour in the late Government had actually withdrawn it at that Box.

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: I think the right hon. and learned Gentleman has in mind—speaking from memory—an undertaking not to use it, which was given by the penultimate Minister of Labour in a debate in which both the right hon. and learned Gentleman and I took part.

I was indicating to the House that the Regulations which are left cover all the field of economic control. I mentioned three and I give two other examples, building and agriculture, to show the immense complexity of the law which they now govern. I want to assure hon. Members that the possibility which the Government had in mind a year ago of ultimately including these wide economic controls in legislation renewable annually has received, and is continuing to receive, the most careful consideration in order that the Government may prepare such legislation of this kind as may appear to them to be desirable when the opportunity for legislation on the subject should occur. . . .

... I now want to turn to the powers embodied in permanent legislation. The third possibility in the mind of the Government in carrying out its review was that of embodying in permanent legislation emergency powers which could be seen to be permanently required. Hon. Members will no doubt now have studied the Bill for that purpose, which the Government have introduced in another place.

... The right hon. Member will appreciate that this is the category of those powers which are going to be embodied not only in permanent form but for permanent use. They

are matters which have shown themselves to be useful although they were introduced for emergency purposes.

That is the change that has been made and it seemed to me that the earlier that change was made the better and the arrangements as to time which I had in mind will be apparent to everyone. Of course this is not the occasion—and it would be wrong for me—to comment in detail on the contents of that Bill. There will be an ample opportunity for me to do so in the future, and for hon. Members to express their views.

Today, the matter that is relevant is that, as the White Paper says, this Bill will make possible the discontinuance of six further Regulations which subsist by virtue of the Supplies and Services Act, 1945. In the meantime, these Regulations must continue in force and this is provided for in the second Motion at present before the House.

The fourth possibility which the Government always foresaw was that, whatever might be the results of the review, a number of the powers would have to be continued for a further period in their present form. On the question of their continuance, I hardly need to remind the House in detail of the nature of the powers or the effect that their discontinuance would have, because they are needed for defence purposes, for economic purposes and also for the winding up of war-time and immediately post-war problems which is still going on.

If I may turn for a moment to the question of the period for which Parliament should be asked to renew these emergency powers, I should like to remind the House that the regulations can be revoked at any time and it is certainly the intention of the Government to exercise a continuous and vigilant review of this field of emergency powers and to lose no opportunity of relinquishing further powers where this is justified by the circumstances.

I think that some real progress has been made with the process of dispensing with war-time powers. After all, it is quite a considerable achievement that 24 Regulations and six codes of Regulations should have gone since the Government took over. Numerically, and I only put it numerically, they are more than a quarter of the existing Regulations. But I ask the House to consider that these that are left have a double quality which has made my task difficult. First, they are of the utmost importance in the machinery of Government at the present time, and, secondly, they are the most difficult to prepare and draft in legislative form. . .

There is one other matter which is not unconnected with the Motions before the House. Hon. Members from all quarters of the House have shown a great interest in it—and I should like simply to sum up the results of our action up to the present time—and that is the question of the power of entry without warrant. I am sure that hon. Gentlemen in all quarters of the House would want to know where we stand.

Hon. Members will remember that on 15th July last my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer informed the House that the total number of officials possessing such powers was 16,744, including 3,887 empowered with a warrant to enter private houses used exclusively as such. These numbers represent a reduction since June, 1951, of 2,451 in the total number and 2,101 in those having power to enter private houses.

This matter has continued to receive close attention and I can now inform the House that the number of officials with power of entry will shortly be reduced to about 14,450, of whom 3,083 will be empowered to enter private premises. That is, there has been another reduction of about 2,300. These figures represent reductions since 1st June, 1951, of 4,745 in the total number of officials with powers of entry and 2,905 in the number of those empowered to enter private premises. . . .

. . . This will be a convenient time to deal with the very important question of how Parliament can best be enabled to exercise proper control not only over these Orders under emergency Regulations but under delegated legislation generally. This is a matter on which we on this side of the House have made our attitude clear on more than one occasion. Right hon. and hon. Members opposite have also shown their readiness to consider how the supremacy of Parliament should be observed amid the changing conditions of modern life that add so enormously to the complications of Parliament and the need for quick action, which is one justification of delegated legislation in certain circumstances.

The Government are very willing that an inquiry should be held into the procedures for exercising Parliamentary control over delegated legislation. I have used the word "inquiry" because I want to make it clear that the Government are not wedded to any form, for the very good reason that this is a matter that concerns the House and that it ought to be the kind of inquiry which the House as a whole would like. It is a House of Commons matter. It is a duty on all of us to see that this is done. . . .

Major H. Legge-Bourke (Isle of Ely): . . . Perhaps I may return to a more general issue, the question which I think Disraeli would have described as "domiciliary visiting by officials." I find it very hard to applaud the right hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment for the Opposition as heartily as I would have done in normal circumstances, because I recollected that some of the arguments which he put forward when he was a Member of the Government are those which we on this side now put, whereas we were then putting an argument very similar to the one which he used today against the retention of so many officials with power to enter without a warrant.

I suppose that that will always happen until we have wiped away all the powers which were given during the war, or which go with a Socialist State. We shall always have such powers with us if there should be—disastrously enough—a return to Socialism in this country, and we shall have the same thing happening when the Conservatives come back again—exactly the same interchange of argument always coming from the same side of the House.

I feel that all of us do not like, in our heart of hearts, the idea of people being able to come into our homes without very good reason for doing so. All of us are to some extent anarchists. We all have a streak of anarchy in us, in that we do not like to be ordered about by anybody, and the last thing we want to have is the official who enforces the Orders invading our own homes. In fact, some of us might even go so far as wanting to put up notices outside, "Any Civil Servant found on this land will be shot on sight." That probably would be undemocratic, and criminal also, but

(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. 29. No. 16.

Saturday, December 13, 1952.

Crime and Punishment

A man undergoing seven years' preventive detention in Oxford gaol sued the Home Office for damages for injuries received when he was on remand at Winchester prison in July, 1949. Mr. Justice Devlin said if he had been called upon to assess damages, he would have fixed them at £300; but it seems the man lost his case.

According to *The Times* report on a news page of that newspaper on December 6, the Judge expressed his "uneasy feeling that justice may not have been done because the material before me was not complete." Every litigant against a Government department was, he said, denied, as a matter of course, the elementary right of checking the evidence of Government witnesses against contemporary documents. No doubt daily reports would have been prepared while Hammill was in the prison hospital, but the Judge did not know what they were. This meant that the opinion of the prison medical officer could not be tested in cross-examination in the way ordinary evidence was tested.

Crown privilege was becoming a serious obstruction to the administration of justice. "In all the cases of Crown privilege I have encountered I have never had a case where it has been suggested it would be injurious to the public interest if the public knew the contents of the documents which the Crown declined to disclose." In each case it had been said that it would be contrary to the public interest to disclose them because they belonged to a class of documents prepared by Civil servants, which must be kept secret in all circumstances.

This, of course, touches the fringe (but only the fringe) of the other side to the picture presented by the growing demand from anti-anti-sentimentalists (to put them in what is probably more nearly their correct psychological classification than would be the case if one called them just sadists) for the re-introduction of flogging in some criminal cases.

The "cat o' nine tails" is a whip of nine strips of catgut or tendon (not, we are assured, weighted with leaden pellets as in some models of the instrument; but nevertheless capable of inflicting a series of lacerations at each stroke. What the anti-antis would do or feel or think, were they to be called upon to observe the punishment, stroke by stroke, examine the wounds produced, examine the victim, order the infliction of one more lash, examine the wounds produced, examine the victim, decide upon the probable consequences to life of further doses, order another one at least, examine

the wounds produced, examine the victim—and so on, until the sentence had been carried out or the victim is pronounced unfit to receive it, whichever is the sooner. Misplaced sentiment is, assuredly, a social evil as well as an individual folly. But we are pleading for a right sense of individual responsibility, which we do not find to be common.

A current text-book on jurisprudence (Salmond's) observes that "although the system of private revenge has been suppressed, the emotions and instincts that lay at the root of it are still extant in human nature, and it is a distinct though subordinate function of criminal justice to afford them their legitimate satisfaction." That may be. The learned author goes on to say: "There can be little question that at the present day sentiment of retributive indignation is deficient rather than excessive, and requires stimulation rather than restraint."

But, as little fleas have lesser fleas, upon their backs to bite 'em, so the citizen who is propagandised into indignation concerning the indignities he suffers from lesser crimes has bigger crimes to bite 'im. The greatest crime in the calendar is Treason. We should like to see more general recognition that in its case "the sentiment of retributive indignation is deficient rather than excessive."

Flogging for politicians? For Mr. Bloodsucker-in-chief? They aren't criminal? Possibly, on enquiry, they are!

Social Credit is Taxation in Reverse

"I have read *The Social Crediter* for years yet I cannot really say I know what Social Credit is." So writes a correspondent. The subject is only difficult because we have not seen it in action, moreover the term "Social Credit" has a foreign sound to the ear and the way to counteract this is to contrast it with "Social Debt" which is just as unfamiliar owing to its proscription by the propaganda machine. "Social Debt," the *thing*, is experienced in its effects every day; it is a reality raiding our pockets by taxation and high prices. No one can deny that one is being robbed daily, for amongst other things, the service of debt both private and public. Let us put it this way:—"Can you imagine an opposite to Social Debt and if so, what would you call it?" So far as "Social Debt" is concerned the *thing* has been demonstrated for generations. What about "Social Credit"? So far as we know from recorded history there never has been an automatic system of accountancy which aimed at the maximum distribution of goods and services without discrimination. The mechanism of exchange (accountancy) (money) has always been used to concentrate power rather than to distribute it. But on the other hand we can find in the law of Moses (Leviticus c. 25) something approaching a reversal of Social Debt in the institution of the Jubilee Year when there was commanded "a remission, a general release and discharge from debts and bondage and a reinstating of every man in his former possessions" (Footnote Douai version).

In Nehemiah (c. 5) (11 Esdras 5, Douai) there is recorded an example of such restitution in Jerusalem. (The chapter is also interesting in showing that the ruling class of the Jews had access to credit in spite of the Captivity.) So

(continued on page 8.)

Christianity or Chaos

By H. E. B.

(Continued).

From an economic standpoint, Consumption—the Cause—precedes Production—the Effect. The technique evolved by Major Douglas is based on this conception, and, because it involves a reversal of an ancient habit of thought, the economic “experts,” who are naturally steeped in the old hypothesis, find they *cannot* reverse their habit of thought and the arguments which are built upon that fallacious concept.

Before man can be dragged back from the pit which he has dug for himself, he must, perforce, do as the people were warned to do in John the Baptist's day—repent and turn to God, *i.e.*, turn to a Truth which will stand up to tests, a Truth which will indeed make men free. From the firm basis of that Truth, he will be able to experience the life abundant which Christ promised to those who carried out his teaching in practice.

As the Old Testament supplies the blue-print for man's subjugation to his fellow-man, so the New Testament clearly states the principles by which—and only by which—man's emancipation may be attained. Christ's teaching cannot be grafted onto the principles of universal slavery as now practised. The principles of slavery and those of Christ are incompatible. Christ taught man to regard God as a Father, with all the attributes of a father, one who cared for his children, and supplied their needs. So Christ taught us to pray, “Give us this day our daily bread.” In this petition Christ put first things first for—“order is heaven's first law.” Man is recognised for who he *is*, primarily a consumer, or enjoyer, in opposition to the orthodox conception of man recognised primarily for *what* he is—a worker, or producer.

In accordance with the Christian conception, the three-fold economic sequence runs:—

CONSUMPTION - PRODUCTION - DISTRIBUTION
(Taking in) (Using) (Giving out)

It must be remembered that these three are essentially one, and, although they may be distinguished, they *cannot* be separated. The limited idea of compulsory “Work,” which so befuddles the minds of the orthodox, is only a tiny aspect of the generalised “Using” of energy given above. In the balance attained by the application of the *dividend plus compensated price*, Douglas devised a mechanism which goes to the heart of realistic distribution. Giving out—with the accent on *GIVING*, as demanded by Christ of all his followers,—is, or would be, under a sane economic system, as natural and as real as “Taking-in.”

Introducing timing into the sequence we get:—“We consume in the Present, (our ‘daily bread’) that we may maintain our energy to Produce in the Future.” Relative to consumption, production is in the future. A baby's “work”-days are 15 years away in the future, while its consuming days start nine months before its birth.

This natural sequence cannot be ignored with impunity, but the Dictators have made use of this very sequence to enslave man, which, by its rightful use, would ensure his freedom. The consequences of mis-using this sequence are

catastrophic; slavery, famines, misery and war are some which are so usual as to be accepted as the natural order of things! The life abundant, is, of course to the orthodox, like “living” under the fallacious sequence, always in the Future! Christianity and social credit aim to put it where it belongs—in the Present. The Dictators, knowing that man must live in the present—although they teach him in his ignorance to demand “Work,”—only allow him to live in the present by means of their Debt technique. Debt is the financiers' reprieve from death to penal servitude for life. “United States of Europe,” and “United States of the World” represent grander and more ambitious attempts to further the cause of Debt, until, so the financiers hope, no-one will be able to live without the permission of the World Banker, who will own all the necessary acknowledgments of Debt to enable him and his kind to push the ignorant “workers” into the kind of paradise envisaged by the late George Orwell in his book “1984.” Behind the formal façade of debt will stand the final sanction of brute force—the Atom Bomb—which the poor foolish “Worker” has created for his own destruction. So very far away from the life abundant have we travelled since Christ first pictured it for us!

A comparison of the respective settings of the threefold economic sequence may be of use:—

(Orthodox)	Alleged 1st Series
(Debt)———	Production...Distribution...Consumption...
(Social Credit)	2nd Series

Consumption... Production...Distribution...Consumption... It will be noticed that the “Consumption” phase of the orthodox sequence, coincides with the *beginning* of the second series of the social credit sequence. The first *real* but unrecognised phase of Consumption in the orthodox sequence is marked by——. This “gap” is the phase which is filled up by DEBT, with all the disastrous consequences known to us in this 20th Century. Without the Debt technique, the orthodox system would have collapsed long ago, but while man, in his ignorance, can be robbed of his birthright by calling it a Debt, so long will the evil system of slavery-by-consent persist. Destruction will follow Debt as the night the day, unless man comes out of his hypnotic trance, and recognises himself as a living man, dependent on God for his daily bread, and in no way required by God to justify his right to that daily bread by doing any kind of slavish task. “He sendeth His rain on the just and upon the unjust,” and it is high time mankind took notice of the teaching of the Great Emancipator.

Throughout His ministry, Christ acted against the orthodox tenets which held sway in His day. After three days of following Him about—during which time they presumably did no work—He fed the multitudes simply because they were hungry. He supplied wedding guests with wine—gratis. He consorted with gluttons and wine drinkers, *i.e.*, consumers raised to the stage of enjoyment, which the puritanical of all ages have always inveighed against so bitterly. He cheerfully allowed His disciples to break the rigid discipline of the Sabbath by plucking ears of corn and eating them. His last, thrice-repeated instruction to St. Peter, given after the resurrection, was:—“Simon Peter, lovest thou Me?” “Yea, Lord.” “*Feed my sheep.*” (St. John 21 vs. 15-17.) Peter was to treat

all people for what they are—primarily consumers. All living entities on this earth are just that, but man, hypnotised by his rulers, and refusing to become “as a little child,” proudly boasts that he is primarily a “Worker.”

In Christ's account of the Last Judgement, he differentiates sharply between those who are fit for the Kingdom and those who are not. (St. Matthew, 25 vs. 35-36 and 42-43.)

“For I was an hungred and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked and ye clothed me: I was sick and ye visited me: I was in prison and ye came unto me.”

“For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger and ye took me not in: naked and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.”

The supporters of the orthodox system, in flat contradiction of Christ's command, forbid the *spontaneous* exercise of these merciful and most necessary acts—necessary because they start the Life sequence off from its correct beginning—until *after* man has justified by abstract “work,” his right to the necessities of life, from which he may choose to use in acts of mercy such as Christ specified. It is high time that the last phase of the orthodox sequence became the first of the social credit sequence. Payment in money registers for the financier-dictators, the fact that some task—stupid or useless or even dangerous though it may be—has been performed by a wage-slave before he gets the necessities of life. So far, the dictators have not been able to exact payment for the absolutely vital necessities, fresh air and sunshine, though they seem to be doing their best to pollute the former with noxious gases, and obscure the latter by building higher and higher walls to the termite heaps they call towns and cities.

In a debt-ridden world, where all are slaves under “Full Employment,” who can hear, or act upon Christ's directive: “Freely ye have received, freely give”? In a world that practises “Get, and forget,” what chance is there for the Christian doctrine of “Give and forgive”? Unless the latter doctrine *is* put into practice, this so-called civilisation will shortly disappear, as previous ones have done, and for the same reason.

Finally, attention must be drawn to the deep significance of Christ's last memorial. The simple but vital acts of eating and drinking were raised to the mystic heights of a sacrament. He also said, at that solemn time, “I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.” (Matt. 26. v. 29.)

To the producer minded—the Workers—who, in sacrificing their manhood become potential materialists, extensions of their machines, the profundity of Christ's memorial passes unnoticed. The materialist pins his faith to organising, or planning. The best way to kill an organism is to organise it, which explains the deadness of all bureaucratic institutions. The spirit, which should be the driving power, is driven out by the planners.

To those who accept Douglas's teaching, and realise that, under God the Creator, they themselves are primarily consumers, the tremendous import of the message conveyed by

Christ's “Last Supper,” strikes with redoubled force. Only when the true economic sequence is followed by man, believed in, and acted upon, will peace and good will come to this troubled world. The lying sequence is of inestimable benefit to those who are seeking to gain the whole world, and are in the process of losing their own souls, *i.e.*, become machine-minded and devoid of all human emotions.

True work, following in natural order on consumption or living, is of equal importance with consumption and distribution. Each in turn becomes vital, just as, on one day of the week, the dustman's arrival is of paramount importance. With living granted freely, under the new dispensation, man will also be free to choose or refuse his work. How many men to-day, knowing the dreadful consequences which follow the production of munitions, dare refuse to make them on humanitarian grounds? Man will be able to choose a right or a wrong mode of life, but he will not be able to blame a wrong choice on to the economic system.

We have to break through the barrier of mass-hypnosis which has turned professing Christians from the path illuminated by Christ's teaching, and bring them to see that *Who* they are, precedes *What* they are. Symbolically, a Christian name precedes the surname, but from school days onwards this order is invariably reversed by the work-worshippers. The precedence of the Subjective to the Objective will only be restored when man comes to his senses and demands his rights as a living man and the social credit mechanism, whereby those rights may be implemented. The debt system will disappear as an anachronism—we shall, in fact, forgive our debts, as we expect our debts to be forgiven. Christ's message, “I came that ye might have life, and have it more abundantly” will mean just what it was intended to mean. “Freely ye have received, freely give,” is an *order* that must be obeyed, that “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven.”

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

nevertheless we can have our thoughts even if under the criminal law we are not allowed to implement them.

Nothing is more distasteful to the vast majority of people than that we should retain any powers of entry without a warrant or without very good cause for those powers I accept, as my right hon. and learned Friend said, that the fact that there has not been more trouble than we have had in the past is very largely due to the care with which those who have had these powers have exercised them. That was a just tribute and ought to be endorsed, but whilst, on the one hand, legislation should be kept to the absolute minimum, what I dislike more than too much legislation is too much delegated legislation. If we can accelerate the process of ridding ourselves of these distasteful Regulations, we shall be doing something which is recovering the freedom of the country.

All legislation should be kept as short as possible and, so far as possible, should affect only Ministers, civil servants and the public as little as possible. I believe that if we can control the activities of the Executive and its officers, we can probably benefit the people more than by giving extra powers to the Executive and to its officials. Incidentally, one of the reasons I am introducing a Private Bill is that it only affects Ministers and Executives.

We have tended to get into the mood of too much legislation, and therefore I make some qualification to various of the points which have been made by the right hon. and learned Member for Montgomery. We must be very sure that we want any of these things at all, whether in the form of legislation or of Regulation. My feeling is that we might very well go through the list again and make quite sure that we want anything from the Regulations put into legislation at all. We would probably find that we could cut down some of the proposed legislation, and the more we can cut it down the better we in this House can carry on with the job for which this House was designed; that is, to keep a watch on the administration of the Executive. The tragedy today is that all too often we find that, so far from being able to keep a watchful eye on administration, we have to indulge in Committee stages of Bills about whose necessity there is considerable doubt.

I disagree very strongly with the right hon. Member for South Shields (Mr. Ede) in his contention that because a Bill comes from another place, the public interest is less well served. My belief is that we in this House err, if we err in anything, on the side of being too much inclined to indulge in party disputes over matters which should not arouse any party irritations whatever. In another place there tends to be a more dispassionate approach to some of these things, and on issues such as these that is a good thing. I feel no dismay at all that the Bill was started in another place, and that is the main reason why I oppose the Amendment.

Nevertheless, I hope very much that when that Bill comes to us we shall find that it has not been thought necessary to include all the things that it at present contains. Since the war we have got into a legislating frame of mind, and the sooner we get out of it the better.

Mr. Geoffrey Bing (Hornchurch): To-night we are debating the Act and the Regulations which depend upon that Act which, in the main, control the economic life of the country. The Regulations contain a great many other things as well to which we ought to give some attention, but in the main they contain the chief economic controls without which it would be quite impossible for the country to continue.

We are discussing these Regulations in the shadow of a growing economic storm. If one looks even at the export figures published today one sees them running 5 per cent. down on last quarter, and with a 7 per cent. fall on last year. Whole schemes have been built up on the basis predicted by the Chancellor that we would have an increase in production, but we are faced with a period of falling production, and it is against that background that the House ought to consider whether this is the time to be casual about the Regulations upon which the economic safety of the whole country will depend.

One thing which has been obvious about this debate has been its casual nature. When I intervened to ask the Home Secretary why we were removing the Defence (Encouragement of Exports) Regulations he said, quite casually, "I do not know. I cannot be expected to bear everything in mind." But these are the Regulations which provide for setting up a council to promote the sale abroad of textiles.

... The real gravamen of my charge against the Government is the total irresponsibility with which they deal

with this matter. There have been no answers to any of the major issues. There have been no replies to any of the questions that are really of vital import to the country. What about Regulation 55? What line do we take from that? What about Regulation 58A? . . .

Here we are revoking a Regulation which on the face of it is designed for the encouragement of textile exports. I do not say that there may not be an excellent reason why this should be done. What I do say is that there is a ridiculous irresponsibility on the part of the right hon. and learned Gentleman and right hon. Gentlemen opposite in what they are doing, for they do not know the reason for it.

This is a very serious issue. If we pass from these Regulations without being certain of Government policy in regard to controls, and unless we have a statement from some responsible Minister on the economic plan with which the Government are going to deal with controls, this House will have lost a great part of its control over the economic future of the country.

It may be more serious. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite got back into the House by promising that the House of Commons would be the place where these things would be decided. If they now proceed in this cavalier fashion, history will not excuse the right hon. and learned Gentleman, just because he was so busy with other things, that he did not bother to brief himself and put before the House of Commons the intentions of the Government.

History will not excuse any hon. or right hon. Gentleman who takes part at this moment in stripping this country of those economic powers and safeguards on which the livelihood of every person in Great Britain depends.

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. John Boyd-Carpenter): It was an agreeable change to find the hon. and learned Member for Hornchurch (Mr. Bing) speaking at this stage of the debate. It is a somewhat odd consequence of the system on a wholly genuine misapprehension of the procedure involved in these Regulations, one which it was very surprising to find in him.

Again and again he referred to changes which are to be made in certain of the Regulations, and he said, with his habitual emphasis, that the House had a right to know why—as he then put it rather less elegantly—they were being "done away with." The doing away with, if I may adopt the hon. and learned Gentleman's vocabulary, will be effected in the normal way by the tabling of a Statutory Instrument. There will be facilities, in accordance with the procedure of the House, for debate. . . .

... The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Belper (Mr. G. Brown) and his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Kettering (Mr. Mitchison) referred to Regulation 62AA, relating to trespass by dogs on allotments. Anything which the right hon. Gentleman says on agricultural matters is received, at any rate by me, with great respect. But there are one or two facts which I think are material to the decision. In the first place, I am assured by my hon. Friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture that the records of his Department do not show one single prosecution under the Regulation.

The right hon. Gentleman may argue that none the less it has some value *in terrorem* as a deterrent. I think the answer to that was given by the Lord Chancellor in another place today when he observed that dogs cannot read notices. For the allotment holders there remain, of course, their full rights under the civil law. It is also pertinent to remember that the Regulation applies only to a certain limited category of allotments, in fact a category which I understand is rapidly diminishing. . . .

The real thing is, I think, to some extent a matter of balance and proportion. It is a question of whether, seven years after the end of the war, it is justifiable to maintain the machinery of Defence Regulations for the creation of a special specific criminal offence to deal with a subject of this sort. Though one may appreciate and fully understand the feelings of allotment owners, none the less if we are ever to reduce the amount of wartime and emergency legislation, it really is necessary to look at these matters to see whether in the circumstances of today the creation of a criminal offence of this sort, over and above the right to engage in civil law actions by the people concerned, is justifiable. . . .

Coronation (Bank of England Notes)

Mr. Norman Smith asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will use his powers under Section (4) of the Bank of England Act, 1946, to direct that the existing issue of £1 and 10s. notes shall be replaced, as soon as may be during the Coronation year, with notes of a new design incorporating the image of the reigning Sovereign.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: I am satisfied that the powers in question are not appropriate for this purpose, and regret that the hon. Member's suggestion is not practicable.

House of Commons: November 24, 1952.

FUEL AND POWER

Replacement of Trams (Oil Consumption)

Mr. Nabarro asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what assessment he has made of the aggregate increased consumption, in tons, of oil, petroleum and petroleum products and consequential diminution of electricity off-take, expressed in convenient form, during each of the years 1952 and 1953, arising from withdrawal of electric trams by municipalities and others, and replacement by oil and petrol-driven omnibuses; what fuel policy guidance is being given by Her Majesty's Government to municipalities and others, in regard to future investment in electric tramways, electric trolley-omnibuses and petroleum and oil-driven omnibuses, with special reference to fuel conservation; and whether he will make a statement.

The Minister of Fuel and Power (Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd): There may result an increase of some 20,000 tons a year in oil consumption and a decrease of about 100 million units of electricity a year. It is the policy of the Government not to interfere, on fuel grounds, with the free choice of types of vehicle.

Mr. Nabarro: Will my right hon. Friend bear in mind the strategical implications of replacing electric trams, which are based on coal supplies for electricity, by vehicles re-

quiring imported fuel, and the extra burden that would place on tanker tonnage in the event of war.

Mr. Lloyd: Yes, Sir, but the quantities are relatively small. One must also bear in mind that, in the event of air attack, an independent petrol vehicle is less of a risk from the points of view of disturbance and flexibility than the electric tram or trolley-bus.

Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (U.S. Anti-trust Inquiry)

Mr. Chetwynd asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what request he has received from the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company for authority to produce documents required by United States Department of Justice in its inquiry into alleged anti-trust activities; and what reply he has made.

Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd: None, Sir.

Mr. Chetwynd: How can any Government inquire into alleged abuses arising from cartels which are, by their nature, international if another Government refuses to allow essential documents to be produced?

Mr. Lloyd: I can only say that the decision whether or not to seek the Government's authority to produce documents is entirely one for the company.

Mr. M. MacPherson: Has the right hon. Gentleman made up his mind about the kind of answer he will give in the event of his receiving such a request?

Mr. Lloyd: That is very definitely hypothetical.

Sir H. Williams: Is it not true that the documents in question are those relating to the period from 1945 to 1950, when the late Government were 51 per cent. shareholders in the company?

(To be continued).

SOCIAL CREDIT IS TAXATION IN REVERSE— (continued from page 4.)

it may be argued that a reversal of debt has been experienced in the past and that what has been done once can be done again although we should make it clear that Social Credit goes much further in establishing everyone permanently with his share of the credit due to him both in himself and as the heir to the cultural inheritance of the past.

The so-called "Christian" reformer is invariably silent on the matter of debt. He regards it as the normal condition of human society. Far from it. Debt is a form of slavery and like it can be abolished. It is one thing to set a slave free but Social Credit goes further in giving him the means to live a life in accordance with his highest aspirations. P.L.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.

Social Creditors and others are invited to apply for the Statement published in July, 1949 (postage 1d.)

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