

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 6. No. 22.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

It is Mr. Churchill Who Must Go To It

By JOHN MITCHELL

Mr. Churchill, in his House of Commons speech on production, barked and barked loudly. But, far from giving a satisfactory reply, his speech cannot be said to have provided a reply at all to the well-informed critics of our war production effort. He based his defence on what he declared to be the results of the Government's production policy, that, "the Ministry of Supply output in the last three months has been one-third greater than in the three months of the Dunkirk period."

The value of this statement can be assessed in the light of an article published in *The Times* of July 25, which expressed "the opinions of a group of industrialists, with individual knowledge of conditions in large undertakings." The following statements are taken from the article:

"... The nation has never been mobilised for effective war production because the leaders do not realise what the potential production is.

"There would be a really enormous increase in the war output of industry if existing machines, men, and material were organised on a basis of co-ordinated operation. Production is increasing in most war departments, we are told. An article produced in tens a year ago is now produced in twenties or even fifties. But that is a meaningless basis of comparison if production might be in thousands or, if only fifties are needed, then in a fraction of the time, so that something else could be made on the same machines and by the same labour."

Mr. Churchill's basis of comparison, his "datum line" as he called it, for measuring the results of the Government's production policy can therefore be seen to be quite inadequate, and his complacency in the face of the opinion of the producers themselves that their production could be much greater than at present is inexcusable.

Interference with Production

The two main causes of sabotage of War production were not even referred to by Mr. Churchill. These are bureaucracy and lack of finance, combined with ill-conceived financial legislation.

On the question of bureaucracy the following statements

taken from articles by producers and informed comment thereon are to the point:—

"With the conditions and possibilities of mass production the Supply Departments of the Government appear to have no acquaintance.

"... But the crowning tragedy is the relative unawareness in the Civil Service of the fundamentals of modern production technique. The Civil Service looks with clerical eyes on a mechanical and industrial world."—from a leading article in *The Times* of July 25, 1941, entitled *Latent Resources in Industry*.

"... the manufacturer grows all the more resentful because he knows that things could still be put right or at any rate vastly improved if the national industrial effort were but regarded from the point of view of those who are making it and not confined to those who are endeavouring to direct it."

"... there is a deep feeling of frustration among industrialists and workpeople on account of the hampering effect of over-centralised Government control.

"... In their anxiety to create an industrial war machine the Government overlooked the fundamental principle that control, to be effective, must be exercised for the benefit of those controlled, not for the satisfaction of those who control."—from a leading article in *The Times* of May 21, 1941, entitled *Handcuffs on Industry*.

"... It would be incredible, if it were not true, that twelve months after being asked to undertake the manufacture of tanks, and after having made an important experiment in the method of manufacture, a firm of world-wide repute should be awaiting the first order. Equally astonishing is the fact that an admirably designed gun carriage which in production could, in the manufacturer's opinion, be produced more quickly and not less efficiently by a small modification which would not reduce strength or efficiency, though the drawings would be a little less elegant. An authority able to put the manufacturer's claim to the test and reach a decision seems still to be lacking."—from a leader in *The Times*, July 29, 1941.

"Controls must be exercised for the benefit of produc-

tion and not for the satisfaction of those who control. Readily-available advice is much more important than a multitude of regulations and forms."—from the memorandum of The Engineering Industries Association on *War Production*.

A manufacturer writing in *The Times* on July 26 gives an instance of how the lack of finance is diminishing the war effort:—

"The memorandum [of the Production Executive] also states that arrangements have been made to enable all contractors engaged on vital work to obtain all the necessary working capital from their bankers. . . . There is certainly little evidence of such an arrangement when an organisation equipped and capable of carrying out £2,000,000 worth per annum of vital work is limited to a quarter of this by the absence of liquid capital."

The memorandum on *War Production** recently issued by the Engineering Industries Association provides the clearest possible evidence of how lack of finance and the Government's financial legislation is damaging the war effort. The membership of this Association includes firms of all sizes, and yet no attempt was made by the Prime Minister to meet their criticisms. The chairman of the Council of this organisation, writing in *The Times* on July 31, 1941, said:—

"My close contact with what is going on in the engineering industry brings a huge amount of most disturbing evidence of the seriousness of the position and the need for more prompt action by the War Cabinet to bring into being for industrial needs a financial system in line with to-day's facts and adjusted to suit war conditions."

Different Policies Required

It is axiomatic that the producers are responsible for what is produced, but the *power* to decide and to do has been largely denied to them, because it has been usurped by the Government acting through the Civil Service and by the banks. Power has been divorced from responsibility, and second-rate experts are interfering with first rate experts. This is a matter which is very apparent to the producers themselves, and further extracts from the articles already quoted will make this evident:—

"... Let the Government Departments now admit that manufacturing for the fighting Services is a task rather for industry than for the Civil Service, and consequently that the organisation should be built on industrial and not on Civil Service lines. . . ."

"... firms whose knowledge of industrial management is sound and built upon long experience, have adopted the principle that maximum production at the outlying works depends upon the maximum degree of decentralised executive authority. . . ."

"... To deal with the problems of local firms needs local knowledge, and the full utilisation of all local capacity for the benefit of the nation can be achieved only by local action. Until this has been recognised we shall continue to beat the air rather than the armed forces of the enemy."—from a leading article in *The Times* of May 21, 1941, entitled *Handcuffs for Industry*.

"Management should be given authority for making capital expenditure, since it is management which should be responsible for securing consequent improvements in production. Managerial responsibility should not be separated from authority."—from the memorandum on *War Production* of the Engineering Industries Association.

The organisation of industry for war production is essentially a matter for the producer; and the Government's function in relation to it should be confined to providing adequate inducements and facilities for industry to co-ordinate and organise its own efforts. And this is not at present being done.

Mr. Churchill's Responsibilities

As the responsible authority for the carrying out of the war *policy* and as the purchaser of war production it is obviously the responsibility of the Government to decide *what* industry shall produce. But, if the principle of uniting power with responsibility is adhered to, as of course it should be, the decision in regard to what is produced will be decentralised to those responsible for the strategical and tactical employment of the war material, although of course in conformity with the general war strategy which must necessarily be decided centrally.

The careful distinction between policy and administration, the establishment of a proper relationship between those responsible for one and the other in the war effort, and the decentralisation and uniting of power, both functional and financial, to those functionally responsible; these are Social Credit principles and they are matters which should occupy the energies of statesmen. They are matters which should occupy Mr. Churchill's attention; they are his chief responsibility as Prime Minister. But it is precisely in this field that there is gross neglect and abominable confusion, and because of it and the wrong action resulting from it that the war effort is crippled and the liberty of the individual needlessly threatened. Oratory is not a substitute for correct action which the British people will be deceived about indefinitely. The setting up of a Ministry of Production so generally advocated by our daily press and the party politicians is not a substitute for correct action which will be acceptable to the British people; and the replacement of Mr. Churchill need not prove a necessarily preliminary to getting correct action. It is correct action which is required, action which is correct because it gets the results the people want, in this case, the *maximum* production of what is required for the war effort. No other action is correct. It is Mr. Churchill who must go to it.

*Reprinted in *The Social Crediter* of July 12, 1941.

Who Controls the Bank of Canada?

Mr. Ilsley, the Canadian Finance Minister, recently admitted that Parliament had no control over the Bank of Canada, in spite of its 'nationalisation'; three days later he denied that he made the statement, or, alternatively, if he did, that he did not mean it.

Just before the Canadian House of Commons rose on June 2, the Speaker suggested that the bill under discussion should be read a third time. Following a member's dissent because he wanted an opportunity to discuss matters concerning the Bank of Canada, the debate continued according to the Canadian *Hansard*:

Mr. Ilsley: I will go as far as I can on the matter of the Bank of Canada, but I do not think I would agree to a discussion of the policies or internal administration of the Bank of Canada, because it is a separate organisation.

Mr. Blackmore: Do I understand the minister to say that the Bank of Canada is not directly under the control of the Department of Finance?

Mr. Ilsley: Correct.

Mr. Blackmore: That is, independent of the Finance Department, and therefore independent of this house?

Mr. Ilsley: Correct.

Mr. Blackmore: Independent of the administration, too?

Mr. Ilsley: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what stage we are at, but the Bank of Canada is a separate organisation, just like the Canadian National Railways or the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. These separate corporations are owned by the Government; in the case of the Bank of Canada the stock is owned by the government and the directors are nominated by the government, but once the directors are appointed, I have no right, nor has the government any right, to dictate to the Bank of Canada as to what its policies shall be.

Mr. Hanson (York Sunbury): I distinctly dissent from that proposal, that in all these government-owned organisations parliament has lost control. That is distinctly not true in connection with the Canadian National Railways; and it must never be the accepted principle in this House of Commons or in this Canada of ours that any of these boards set up by the government as public agencies shall never be referred to in this House. I wish to register a protest against that statement of the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Three days later, on June 5, during the course of debate Mr. Norman Jaques, Social Credit-New Democracy member for Wetaskiwin, raised the following discussion taken from *Hansard*:

Mr. Jaques: . . . The hon. gentleman who just took his seat referred to the inevitable depression that will follow this war, but what guarantee have we that the next depression will be regarded at all differently from the previous one? Before the luncheon recess the minister said this station had

not been built before the war because of the depression. And why was there nothing done during the depression? There was only one reason. There were hundreds of thousands of men willing and able to do the actual construction work; miners, steel workers and so on all down the list, were looking for work, but nothing was done. Why? There was only one answer: because there was no money. And there was no money because, as the Minister of Finance told us on Monday afternoon, neither the government nor this house has any control whatever over the financial policy of this government. That is the reason.

Mr. Ilsley: I deny that I made that statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Jaques: Well, the Bank of Canada controls the financial policy of this country, and certainly the Minister of Finance told us that neither his department nor this house had any control whatever over the financial policy of the Bank of Canada.

Mr. Ilsley: I deny that I made that statement. I said the government had no control over the internal operations of the Bank of Canada.

Mr. Johnston (Bow River): Oh, no.

Mr. Ilsley: Well, if I did not say that I meant to do so. We were talking about the internal operations of the bank at that time. I find that this matter was discussed at great length in the banking and commerce committee of 1939, and at that time the phrase used was 'day to day operations.' I had no intention of announcing any change in the policy that was laid down at that time. The distinction between having something to say about monetary or financial policy, and the government controlling the day to day operations of the Bank of Canada, was made very clear in 1939. Just before six o'clock the other evening I was the object of some rapid questioning here, and it may be that I went further than I should have gone. I have not looked at *Hansard* to see what I said, but I want to say to the members of the Social Credit party right now that I do not want them to attach any significance to any statements I made at that time in so far as they were at variance with the clearly established rule and policy laid down in the banking and commerce committee in 1939.

Mr. Jaques: I am not blaming the minister but I should like to quote his words.

The Chairman: The hon. gentleman must accept the statement of the minister as to what he meant.

Mr. Jaques: I accept his statement as it appears in *Hansard*.

The Chairman: The hon. gentleman cannot accept *Hansard* as against the statement of another hon. member of this house. When an hon. gentleman says that he made a certain statement, and that what he said

was so and so, any other hon. member must accept what he says.

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): If the record is the other way I would raise a point of order at once.

The Chairman: *Hansard* is not the record of the house; and *Hansard* cannot prevail against the statement made by an hon. member. *Hansard* is only for the convenience of the public; it is not the official record of the house, and under the rules no one can challenge a statement made by an hon. member as to what he did or did not say.

Mr. Jaques: Then this makes the case even worse, because if the government had control. . . .

The Chairman: Furthermore it is not permissible to quote anything said during a debate, other than the one now proceeding, which took place during the present session.

"SPITFIRE" comments in "Today and Tomorrow" of June 19:—

Now it will be plain that Mr. Ilsley's denial of June 5 simply does not square with his categorical assertions made on June 2.

In the first place nobody in the responsible position of a spokesman for the Government could possibly confuse policy and administration. Policy has to do with objectives whereas administration has to do with methods for the attainment of objectives.

The Minister of Finance stated definitely that neither he nor the government had "any right to dictate to the Bank of Canada as to what its policies shall be."

If he had made a slip the opportunity to correct this arose when the Leader of the Opposition protested against the Minister's assertion and was called to order by the Speaker.

But Mr. Ilsley did not withdraw.

The second point to be observed is that the Minister of Finance implies that the Government has "something to say about monetary and financial policy," without controlling the day to day operations of the Bank of Canada. But it does not require a profound knowledge of organisation to know that control of policy automatically carries with it control of administration.

Another feature about the affair is

the amazing statement made by the Chairman regarding *Hansard* as the official record of debates in the House of Commons.

If a Minister of the Crown can make a definite statement, and, in reply to questions, clarify it so that no possibility of misunderstanding can exist, and then three days later deny he made the statement or alternatively, if he did, that he did not mean it, an extremely serious situation exists. For if he did not mean what he said the first time what assurance has the House of Commons or the public that he really means what he said the second time?

Of course the matter goes beyond this to anything a responsible Government spokesman may say in Parliament.

The next move in this altogether astounding affair followed the publication of the statement by Premier Aberhart* challenging Mr. Ilesley's rev-

*Mr. Aberhart pointed out that if neither the Minister of Finance nor the Parliament of Canada had any control over the policies of the Bank of Canada and had no right to question these policies, then clearly Parliament was subservient to the Bank of Can-

elations of June 2.

The following news item was published in the press on Friday, June 13.

"OTTAWA, June 13—While responsibility for operations of the Bank of Canada rests upon the shoulders of the governor and board of directors the responsibility for Canada's monetary policy is the government's, Finance Minister Ilesley told the House of Commons to-day.

"He referred to a statement issued by Premier Aberhart of Alberta based on statements the minister made in the House on June 2 to the effect that the bank was not controlled by the government.

"The minister said he regretted that his words spoken during a 'question and answer' exchange on another subject, had provided a basis for misconception.

ada. "Unless the people of Canada . . . demand immediate action to restore to Parliament its full sovereign powers over the control and issue of currency and credit and of monetary policy, how can responsible democratic government survive in Canada."

"In the operation of the bank the governor and directors had freedom from government control but that did not mean that the government was relieved of its responsibility for general monetary policy nor did the freedom of the bank from government interference militate against the government's power to direct the general monetary policy of the country."

If the Federal Government does in fact control the country's monetary policy and, therefore, has complete and effective control over the Bank of Canada, why should the Minister of Finance have stated that the bank is not directly under the control of the Department of Finance? Why should he have refused to allow the Bank of Canada to be discussed in the House of Commons? Further, if the Bank of Canada operates free from government interference, as Mr. Ilesley states, in reality what possible control can either the government or Parliament have over monetary policy?

In short, it would seem that far from Mr. Ilesley's last two statements being reassuring, they provide grounds for increased uneasiness.

American Views on Federal Union

The *San Francisco Chronicle* published on June 16 the answers of five prominent Californians to the question, "What is your view of the merit and practicability of the suggestion that the nations of the Western Hemisphere and Great Britain unite in a federal union?"

Francis H. Herrick, associate professor of European history at Mill College, who has some knowledge of the points at issue, wrote:—

"The question as, I understand it, includes Latin America and excludes those parts of the British Empire, other than Great Britain, which are not in the Western Hemisphere. Obviously the Latin American countries, so jealously independent even of each other, would never willingly accept union with the more numerous and powerful English-speaking peoples. Nor would the British accept a union which would cut them off from most of the Empire. Taken literally, such a proposal is clearly without merit.

"Even a federal union of the United States and the British Empire is impracticable. The ideas of union fundamental to the creation and growth of the United States were closely associ-

ated with territorial and cultural homogeneity. Although necessities of defense or moments of imperialism have brought outlying regions under our control, we have steadily resisted the admission to the federal system of any territories outside the solid block of the forty-eight states.

"The British Empire, on the other hand, glories in its far-flung lands and recognises the cultural dissimilarity of its parts. India, the Crown colonies and the mandated territories include such a variety of peoples and governments that simple union would be impossible except on the basis of despotism. Union and representation in Westminster was tried in Ireland, but it has failed. Union of neighbouring provinces and responsible governments was tried in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, and it succeeded. Years of growth have produced a Commonwealth with independent parliaments under one crown which is almost the antithesis of a union of many lands and peoples under one parliament.

"Much as we sympathise with the intentions of advocates of such a federal union, we must recognise that it would

serve no useful purpose at the present time. Every nerve of the British is strained to sustain the war, and they are not likely to appreciate a proposal which would indeed join the resources of the United States to their own, but only at the price of subordination of the institutions they are defending. They do not ask and we should not suggest that the supplies which they sorely need should be delivered wrapped in a new constitution."

He is the only democrat among the contributors; and he is the only one of them who looks at the facts.

Rabbi Irving F. Reichert of San Francisco's Congregation of Emanu-El, on the other hand, is keenly in favour of union, and apparently thinks that it is the only alternative to chaos. He asks, "But if the Axis should be defeated, what then? Without an international federal union, our world must certainly revert to its old predatory nationalisms. . . ." Nationalisms, maybe, but not necessarily 'predatory.'

"Objectors to the plan call it a scheme to salvage British Imperialism. Others criticise it as an attempt to sub-

(continued on page 11, column 3)

OVA

By B. M. Palmer

Country policeman, painfully learn in his new rôle:—

“Where’s your identity cards, sir? You didn’t ought to forget ’em. No one’s allowed to go along the Maidstone road, not unless it’s to visit a sick relative, or on important business or such like. There’s not supposed to be no joy-riding of any sort. Where’re you going? Only up the hill into the wood? You give me your word of honour you won’t go no farther and that’ll be all right, sir. But don’t forget them cards again.”

We are now approaching one of the most important of all turning points; and our interests as individuals are bound up irrecoverably with the outcome—will the British character stand the strain? All depends on the material—if it is sound, as I am certain it is, the small amount of leaven now being supplied will be sufficient.

The Kingdom of Heaven has been likened to some yeast, and yet again it has been suggested that reality (which is only another name for the Kingdom of Heaven) will be found to reside in something infinitely small, rather than in the infinitely large. No amount of intensive training would make that country policeman an efficient bureaucrat. He is only one, but multiply him a million times, and you get a picture of the situation. I think complete bureaucracy simply won’t work and we need not fear that it will. We may, however, very probably have to go through a period of intense discomfort while this is being demonstrated.

That people who already have before them a working model of bureaucracy in the present Government departmental control should have the temerity to enlarge it, seems incredible, and must be due either to stupidity or deliberate malice aforethought. Neither of these explanations is feasible to the country-people, and they are in a condition of bewildered astonishment at the moment, in regard to the second egg scheme.

This is what happens:—

1.—The producers are given a list of packing stations in their area from which they make a selection.

2.—The packing station sends to collect eggs, stamps and grades them.

3.—The packing station pays the producer 2/11, 2/8, 2/5 or 2/2 a dozen according to grade.

4.—The producer buys from the

packing station the eggs he wishes to retail on condition that he already has a producer retailer’s licence. He cannot retail as many as he produces, but has to take what he is given from the mixed pool.

5.—The producer buys back at a flat rate of 2/3 and 2/- a dozen, retailing to his customers at 2/6 or 2/3 according to grade. This is the compensated price scheme.

Results:—

1.—Everyone may buy one egg a week, and we all have an equal opportunity of buying bad ones,* since eggs from U.S.A., Eire, or Canada are mixed with new laid eggs through the country.

2.—No one knows who is responsible for bad eggs, except Lord Woolton.

3.—Even with the greatest luck no one could possibly buy an egg less than nine days old.

4.—Much work is made in collecting eggs, carting them about in the summer heat, filling in forms, clearing up the mess made by breakages, grading and stamping. One packing station near Sevenoaks waited three weeks for the correct ink. The eggs waited too.

5.—The farmer loses all pride in producing quality—but we have equality.

I heard someone ask what gas-masks were for at this point.

The egg producers scrapped the first scheme by indignant protests, but in the interval of relaxation that followed their anger, a second plan almost as amazing as the first was sprung upon them. That is a familiar technique which has been used over and over again. What is particularly evil in this case is the inversion of the Social Credit, which pays the retailers a form of dividend in the compensated price, but takes away from the consumers the sanction which they should have in demanding quality. Thus the consumers are doubly penalised in that they pay a high price, including increased taxation (or debt), for something they are forced to buy in the condition in which it is offered, or go without.

Those who govern us have the know-

*On July 30, according to the *Daily Express*, 7,200,000 bad eggs from abroad were disposed of into a pit-shaft in Lancashire: they had been left in 27 waggon loads in a siding for four days—a plague of flies was one result.

ledge and power to manipulate the money system in any conceivable way. That is why we must not give them a loophole to divert the people’s attention to the technique of prices, but must concentrate the whole of our effort on the development and use of the dynamic power of our sanctions.

We are economically disfranchised with every fresh article that comes under control. In a properly conducted democracy every citizen has a parliamentary vote which gives him power to express his wishes with regard to policy and administration, and the money vote with which he indicates his desires for production. Of what value is our money vote to-day? The money itself has become little more than a set of coupons which we are forced to give up in exchange for whatever is made available. This is what centralised socialist control has given us—uniformity of quality and a rapidly sinking standard. Though rationing may be necessary in wartime, pooling of quality is not. The persistent attempt to take from the consumer his power of demanding quality, and thus put an end to all competitive effort among producers can only lead, as Major-General Fuller has pointed out in his letter to *The Times*, to conditions of scarcity, perhaps even famine, because it runs counter to human instinct.

And when I think of the amount of work, material and petrol which is consumed each week in order that I may have one egg, weight 2 oz. or less, of which a large percentage is water—words fail me. Perhaps before long a similar plan may be contrived to give me two teaspoonsful of honey.

Could we have a better example of the tragedy of human effort, which arises from, more than any other single cause, a failure to distinguish between means and ends, a state of mind in which eggs are not something to eat, but are something to be controlled and distributed?

And how does the country policeman come in? I think of him when I am in danger of discouragement, a sin which we must all avoid. At such times I think of his obvious delight at finding some excuse for allowing us to enjoy our picnic, his readiness to trust us—we did not insult him with a tip—and say to myself, “You can’t turn a silk purse into a sow’s ear.”

July 27, 1941.

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.

Editorial Office:
4, ACREFIELD ROAD,
WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL.
Telephone: Gateacre 1561.

Business Office (Temporary):
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, 15.
Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 6. No. 22.

Saturday, August 9, 1941.

A Realm Rent in Twain

Mr. ANDREW RUGG-GUNN, F.R.C.S., in his preface to *Osiris and Odin: the Origin of Kingship*, published in 1940, has the following:—

“At this moment the British and French peoples are involved in deadly war in order to save European civilisation from extinction. The outbreak of war provoked in the press of this country and on the platform a strange and perverse chorus of opinions from representatives of almost all branches of national activity, but particularly from politicians, churchmen and members of that amorphous group, the self-styled ‘intellectuals.’ Almost without exception, they revealed among us a widespread and alarming ignorance and disregard of the fundamental characters of civilisation in general and, especially, of that precious and unique pattern which is our peculiar British heritage. Further, their opinions, most dangerous when expressed with laboured moderation and most subversive and destructive in trend when couched in idealistic language, indicated, in the first place, how far modern political theory had broken loose from the realities upon which enlightened policy and stable government must rest and, in the second, how deeply men of goodwill had been perverted and twisted by the deceptions of current ideologies.”

A footnote to the assertion in the text that an imported alien ideology has recently dominated British thought states:—“Contrary to popular opinion the leftward swing in the British Isles is confined mainly to the so-called educated or middle classes. It began with the Whigs and under their

successors has become progressively worse. It has affected deeply the national character. Thus in religion, national devotion to God has shrunk into faith in an abstraction—humanism; duty to country and to one’s neighbours has changed into obedience to the laws of International Finance; standards of value, material and moral, have or tend to have merely a money reference; and native wisdom in terms of crisis has been superseded by bureaucratic planning. The moral defence of the country is neglected and belittled. Perversity is in the ascendant. As a consequence, public opinion, even in wartime, overriding all considerations of national security and every instinct for self-preservation, permits the country to swarm with communistically-minded aliens and the people to be dazed by reiterated propaganda of the pacifist-federalist-communist type.”

CONTROL OF INDUSTRY

From “*The Times*” of August 5:—

“Eight Conservative private members have tabled in the House of Commons a motion praying for the annulment of the new Defence Regulation 78.

“This regulation supplements the provisions as to the control of industrial undertakings in which the Government, under Defence Regulation 55, have appointed an authorised controller. It proposes that the competent authority should have power to remove from office any person with functions of management who appears to be obstructing the

authorised controller in the performance of his functions.

“Another provision is that an order may be made transferring all the shares of a company to such nominees as may be specified at a price to be fixed by the Treasury.

“The members who have tabled the motion are Mr. Spens, Sir Herbert Williams, Sir Arnold Grindley, Mr. Hely-Hutchinson, Captain Cobb, Sir George Davies, Sir Harold Webbe, and Mr. Rostron Duckworth.”

LORD LOUIS MOUNTBATTEN

Lord Louis Mountbatten married in 1922 Edwina Cynthia Annette, eldest daughter of the first Baron Mount Temple, and Maud, only child of the late Sir Ernest Cassel.

AMENDED NOTICE*

(1). It is appropriate that a supporter of the Secretariat should, if he wishes to do so, reply directly to any question put to him by members of the public concerning the reasons which prompt him to support the Secretariat, since only the individual concerned is fully aware of these reasons.

(2). It scarcely needs to be pointed out that it is improper that readers or non-readers should undertake to reply *on behalf* of the Directors of the Secretariat, individually or collectively, concerning the *structure, policy or affiliations* of the Secretariat, or otherwise allow themselves to be presumed to be representing the Secretariat to the public.

(3). Circulars issued without the explicit authority of the Secretariat, even when accompanied by matter bearing some indication of such authority, have not necessarily the approval of any Director of the Secretariat.

(Signed) TUDOR JONES,

Deputy-Chairman,
Social Credit Secretariat.

*Amending a notice in the issue of June 28, 1941.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The duties of Director of Organisation have been undertaken by H.E. who continues to be Director of Overseas Relations.

From Week to Week

The *Book of Daniel*, from the V Chapter, and V verse of which our Black Magicians are said to have derived their V campaign of Sorcery, is almost certainly a forgery, written by a Palestinian Jew, hundreds of years after the events it pretends to foretell had occurred. This was the opinion of Porphyry, who wrote in the third century, and was well qualified to give an opinion.

Spinoza, Hobbs, Collins, and many other careful commentators, held the same view.

Whether Daniel himself was manufactured out of whole cloth, or was a composite character like Methuselah, does not seem clear. He and his prophecies were pressed into the service of the "Chosen People" idea in much the same way that malaria, physical debauchery, and similar causes were inserted into records of the Fall of Rome to cloak the monetary nature of the debacle.

It is becoming clear that this "Union Now" business may easily take a turn which its sponsors had not foreseen. It is intended to remove still more all initiative from the individual by centralisation but its opponents may yet succeed in stimulating an understanding of the situation which may enable a common front against the gangsters to become effective.

The names of only two "Russians"—Litvinoff and Lozovsky—appear with any frequency in the British Press. Both are Jews. Maisky, the Russian Ambassador in London, and Steinhardt, the American Ambassador in Moscow, are both Jews.

The most dangerous piece of Black Magic practised by Governments is the propagation of the dogma of the virousness of Labour, *per se*. Modern industry is founded on the principle of reducing the need for intelligence, which the old craftsman required, so that it can be concentrated in a few politically weak draughtmen and designers.

The voting strength is passed to "the Worker," who, by lack of experience, habit of mob action, and susceptibility to propaganda, can be swung into action against any threat to the Black Magicians.

Odd, isn't it, that although the *Luftwaffe* can penetrate the London air defences almost at will, and do serious damage, and the R.A.F. can drop heavy high-explosives on the centre of Berlin, the air defences of Moscow are so effective, according to the *Russian communiqués*, that raids consisting of 150 German planes are unable to get more than three or four machines through, and these content themselves with dropping a few incendiary bombs?

The Russian Army numbers at least 12,000,000. The Germans have possibly 4,000,000 troops available. The Russian individual, apart from his politics and leadership, is a first-class fighter, like all fatalists. The fanatical admirers of the Russian regime seem to be unduly modest in their satisfaction with Russian achievements, so far.

From "The Courier and Advertiser," August 1, 1941.

THE UNWANTED HOUSE

"Pitcorthie is its name. It lies pleasantly in the parish of Carnbee, near Colinsburgh, Fife.

"It's a good old house with good water supply. The only snag is no electricity, but the mains run quite near.

"No Government department will take it for any purpose.

"Sir Thomas Erskine of Cambro says—'It is a shocking state of affairs. Here is a very large country house, suitable for hundreds of evacuees, and it is going to be pulled down.'

"Lord Crawford, the owner, was willing to help and give the use of the house if he was relieved of rates and taxes.

"The County Clerk says—'I tried every possible Government department in the hope of getting them interested, but not one responded.'

"So the house goes to the hands of the housebreaker.

"Could anything be more wasteful—at a time when the demand for accommodation grows steadily—when the building trade is overwhelmed with work?

"When emergency accommodation of all kinds is needed for the bombed-

out, for children, even for stores.

"The Government has gone to great lengths in a questionnaire about storage—a questionnaire that would take a staff days to fill up.

"Yet the use of this house, which for many years before the war served as a Church of Scotland Home, is declined all round.

"It housed up to 90 people and was only given up as a church home just before the war.

"Sir Thomas is right. It's a shocking state of affairs.

"The matter should be pressed by the Fife authorities—surely they know better than officialdom in London or Edinburgh or anywhere else.

"If they want the house for the war effort they should accept it and figure about the costs afterwards."

Mr. BRENDAN BRACKEN

Mr. Brendan Bracken, the new Minister of Information, came from Sydney to Sedburgh as a school-boy. At 24 he was director of Eyre and Spottiswoode, the Royal Printers, and editor of the *Banker*. He then became chairman of the *Financial News Limited*, which owns all the shares of the *Investors' Chronicle Limited* and *Practitioner Limited*, 50 per cent. of the shares of *Economist Newspaper Limited* and a substantial interest in *Moodys-Economist Services Limited*. He became managing director of *The Economist*, and at 28 entered Parliament as member for North Paddington. A close friend of Mr. Churchill for many years, when Mr. Churchill became First Lord of the Admiralty Brendan Bracken became his Parliamentary Private Secretary.

New Leaflet

Taxation is Robbery

Prices:

£1 for 1,000; 12/6 for 500;
3/- for 100; 1/9 for 50
(Postage Extra)

Obtainable from:
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, 15.

Parliament**Emergency Powers (Defence) Act****FOOD SUPPLIES AND SMALL SHOPKEEPERS**

JULY 23.

**EMERGENCY POWERS
(DEFENCE) ACT, 1939
(CONTINUANCE)**

(83 columns)

[Points from the opening speech of this debate were given in *The Social Crediter* of August 2.]

Mr. Maxton (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I congratulate the hon. and gallant Member [Major Fyfe] upon making such a lucid case in defence of a very bad cause. It was put forward, as always, in a most impressive manner and with a great deal of experience behind it, which is apt to overawe simple people like myself. I want him to recollect that he was using all those abilities to prove that it was right for the Home Secretary to imprison some 1,800 citizens, some eight or nine months ago, and then, on the advice of a committee sitting in secret and without anyone knowing what they were charged with, to let 1,100 of those people out. Last April or May, the Under-Secretary of State said, upon an agitation in the House of Commons—surely a very bad basis for judicial proceedings—that more than 1,800 people were imprisoned. We are now told that in 1,100 cases the imprisonment was a mistake.

I listened to the statement of the Under-Secretary of State, and I understood that 700 people still remain in prison. The right hon. Gentleman who spoke officially for the Labour party told us of the mandate, and he justified this on the ground that, at any time, these men might be a menace in the case of invasion; so 1,100 were shut up when there was no invasion but are now to be allowed to run about when invasion is still a possibility, in the minds of hon. Gentlemen. This may be good politics, but it seems to me to be very far away from either British justice or British playing the game, and the only possible place where these men can have their grievances ventilated is on the Floor of this House. I would not associate myself with the hon. Member for Gravesend (Sir I. Albery) in seeking to reduce in any way our right to raise the treatment of these people on the Floor of the House.

Sir I. Albery: I never suggested that we should reduce that right in any way.

Mr. Maxton: I think the hon. Gentleman intended to do that, and the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary at once seized upon that as the logic of his proposal. It would be true to this extent: if the committee were made into a judicial committee, with a standing similar to that of a judge of the High Court, it would not be answerable for its actions to, nor could it be criticised in, this House. At present, if I know about it, I can raise every individual case, and I want to retain the right to do that.

Sir I. Albery: I did not, as the hon. Member knows, put forward any specific proposal, but I may say that one of the arrangements which had entered my mind was that some Select Committee of this House could act.

Mr. Maxton: But I understood that that referred only to persons who might be Members of this House.

Sir I. Albery: Not necessarily. . . .

Mr. Spens (Ashford): . . . I cannot add anything to what my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for West Derby (Major Maxwell Fyfe) has said. I concur entirely, as I believe that every practising lawyer concurs, with his view that you cannot substitute for this responsibility of the Home Secretary any other procedure whatever in wartime. But we in the House of Commons have a very close grip upon the Home Secretary and upon everything that he does. We are now showing how tight that grip is. We have shown it on innumerable occasions at Question Time, and we shall continue to show it. If at any time he fails, by any positive act of administration or by any omission in administration, there is only one remedy, and that is for my right hon. Friend to give place to somebody else. That is our sanction and that is the great protection of every member of the public. . . .

. . . . Taking it by and large, having regard to all the difficulties, although I do not say that there are not details of administration that could be improved, the administration of this Regulation has been good. I do not think that the House of Commons realised when this Emergency Powers Act was passed, in the form in which we passed it, what enormous power to make Regulations it gave to the Executive. Our position of

being able to pray against Regulations is one which, having regard to the enormous number and intricacy of the regulations made, is very little protection against individual injustices. . . .

. . . . If a Regulation is, in fact, inflicting injustice, once the Prayer has been passed in this House, there is really no remedy for the subject. I propose to take the opportunity on another occasion of dealing with another Regulation which has just been passed, for controlling businesses, because the attention of the House must be directed in detail to what that provides. I ask the Home Secretary and other Ministers responsible for Departments to take a great deal more care in the consideration of new Regulations than appears to be taken at present. The wording of the Regulation should be confined to dealing with the particular difficulty or hindrance of the war effort which is in the mind of the Department or Minister dealing with the Regulation. We should not have day after day, and week after week, regulation after regulation in very wide terms covering, goodness knows what, until the matter comes to be tested, with the result that throughout the whole of our industrial life there are instances of individual hardship which I am certain could be avoided. . . .

. . . . With regard to other Regulations in respect of trade and industry, the Government, under the Act, have two alternatives. They can either take possession of a concern, in which case they have to pay full compensation, or they can control it. Who knows exactly what "control" means? I ask the House to look at what the Government or somebody in the Government can do in a particular case. It comes to putting in officials or agents of the Government to manage a business, or dismiss all the existing managers or people concerned with the business, and still to run it as if it were the old business and on account of the owners of that business. Those are questions which, under other Regulations, are affecting industry and personal rights of all kinds. Many of them are extremely good and helpful, but some of them go far too far and are prepared without sufficient consideration. All that I ask in this Debate is that, in extending this enormous power to the Executive and to the responsible Ministers of His

Majesty's Government who are responsible for making these Regulations, we should see that they do not make a Defence Regulation one whit or tittle wider than is necessary for the specific purpose which they consider essential to the safety or well-being of the country in the present emergency. . . .

Mr. Loftus (Lowestoft): . . . My hon. Friend the Member for Sedgfield (Mr. Leslie) asked why Members of this House should be placed in a different position from that of the general public. Under our proposals a Member of this House would be liable to arrest, to imprisonment and to internment just as a member of the public. He would appear before a tribunal in the same way as a member of the public, but the tribunal would consist of fellow Members of the House. That seems to me very necessary, for this reason. To-day every safeguard of the ordinary citizen for personal freedom and for protection against executive tyranny has gone, and the only one that remains is the freedom of the Back Bench Member of Parliament. What are the ordinary citizen's safeguards in peace-time? The first is *Habeas Corpus*, and that has gone. The second is that every five years at the longest there has to be a general election. That was a magnificent check on an arbitrary Executive, and it has gone. The third check is the continuous series of by-elections, one of the most valuable things in our Constitution. It is a constant check on and criticism of the Government. That has gone. To-day we have co-opted Members, of whom there are nearly 100 in the House now.

The fourth safeguard is the idea that the House of Commons is above all a check on the Executive and that therefore, the ordinary Member must be independent of the Executive and must not receive any position of profit without seeking re-election. Some years ago we abolished re-elections for Ministers. It was an excellent safeguard, although a horrible nuisance to the Executive. We have now gone a step further. We create new posts for Members of Parliament, salaried posts overseas and at home, and they accept them, and there again they are the servants of the Executive. And now we, the ordinary Members of Parliament can be arrested by the Executive without cause being given to this House of Commons. And yet the only protection for the man and woman in the street is the back bench independent Member of Parliament who is not a

Member of the Government or salaried officer of the Government. That is why it is so essential that this House should keep control over the liberty of its Members. . . .

Mr. Stokes (Ipswich): The hon. Member for Lowestoft (Mr. Loftus) in the early part of his speech made reference to the experience which he had had, and which I think a great number of us have had, of frivolous reasons for the detention of some of those who have been detained under Regulation 18B. I myself know of a great number of cases. I shall not refer to them in detail because nearly all of them—at any rate the older ones—were referred to in the last Debate we had on this matter, and I am bound to say that I have not come upon a recent case where there has been a detention for more frivolous reasons. The hon. Member also referred to what the hon. and learned Member for Ashford (Mr. Spens) said with regard to the great control which this House has over the Home Secretary. I support the view of the hon. Member for Lowestoft, with all due regard to my right hon. Friend, who will know that I am not speaking personally in any way, because I find that I have very little control. As a Member of Parliament I get a frightfully slow response to the suggestions put forward and the complaints made. . . .

I am still not satisfied with the way . . . cases are handled. The individual is not given sufficient information before he goes before the Advisory Committee, to enable him to defend himself. It is no use saying that that is not so. For my sins, practically everyone detained has written to me at one time or other, and I have at least 50 cases where the information supplied to them before going before the Advisory Committee was perfectly useless. When a man is kept in prison for six or 12 months, and is told at three or four days' notice that he is to appear before an Advisory Committee, he has quite inadequate information on which to defend himself. When he goes before the Advisory Committee, therefore, he is not capable of putting up the best case for himself, especially having regard to the fact that he is not assisted by a prisoner's friend or a lawyer.

I do not wish to say anything about the hon. and gallant Member for Peebles and Southern (Captain Ramsay), because it would be out of place, but I do want to say to the House that it surprises me, a comparatively junior Member of

this great institution, to find the supine way in which the House as a whole have accepted the detention of one of their number without demanding to know the reason why. I do not know what he has done; it is not germane to the discussion here to-day. I only know that he is a perfectly honest, straightforward individual, perhaps with a kink in one way or another—perhaps some of us have kinks in this strange world. What I complain of is that Members have not risen in a body and told the Home Secretary and the Government that they are not going to stand for it and that they insist on having the hon. and gallant Member brought here to state his own case and to hear what it is all about. I leave it at that. . . .

There are five or six things to which I would like to press the Home Secretary to agree. I hope he will deal with them in winding up the Debate. First of all, I would ask, for persons who have been detained upwards of six months to a year, that they should have the right to a revised appeal before the Advisory Committee, and that they should be allowed to have a prisoner's friend with them, that it should not be at the discretion of the Advisory Committee. If they have been detained, and there is doubt in their case, they should have a right to a prisoner's friend who could prompt them and help them to state their case. Secondly, prisoners released should have every possible help given to them. I have had particulars sent to me of most pathetic cases, of people who have been released, and, because the Home Office or police covered their identity cards with writing in red ink, they cannot get employment. They are left absolutely destitute. Surely there must be some other method in the year 1941 of keeping in touch with these people. Whether you like it or not, the fact that a person has been to gaol has a very great effect upon the mind of anyone who may be considering employing him. I have sent my right hon. Friend two very bad examples. He has not replied yet, but it takes time to deal with these matters, and no doubt I shall get a reply. . . .

The *Jewish Chronicle* writes to me and says that I am a great supporter of Sir Oswald Mosley. The Communist writes to me likewise. All manner of people say all manner of things about me. I want to make it perfectly clear to this House that I have taken the action which I have taken in this matter for one reason only. I have taken up

the cases of people who are Communists, and semi-Communists, Jews and Gentiles, Fascists and anti-Fascists, because I think it is our responsibility to see that our liberties are not completely lost. Because a person holds views contrary to mine, that is no reason why I should not defend his liberties.

Mr. Morrison: . . . But I do not think as a general rule Ministers ought, so to speak, to attempt to delegate their responsibilities to a Committee of the House. When you are in a jam and in some sort of disagreement with the House, it is right that that should be done to resolve the difficulty, but I think it is best in the ordinary run of administration, particularly on these Defence Regulations, that Ministers should take responsibility. If they feel that it is right to consult Members of the House and get their reaction to certain things, by all means let it be done, but from a Parliamentary and Constitutional point of view it is best for the Minister to take his action and wait for any shootings at him that may come when the House knows what he has done.

Mr. A. Bevan (Ebbw Vale): But surely it is the right hon. Gentleman's responsibility on behalf of the House. He cannot use the language of delegating his responsibilities to the House if a Committee of the House advises him, because he is responsible to the House.

Mr. Morrison: The hon. Member is constitutionally quite wrong as to the way in which this great Parliamentary institution works. In the first place, a Government is formed, and it has the confidence of the House of Commons. It can live only by the consent of the House of Commons. It can be shifted by the House of Commons. But the basis of the whole business is that Ministers are responsible for the executive Government, subject to the check of Parliament and the powers they get from Parliament. The point I am on is that if you weaken that responsibility which Parliament rightly expects Ministers to accept, you are in a dangerous situation in which you are making a constitutional innovation which would create great difficulties for this House.

Mr. Bevan: The Home Secretary has a special relationship to this House as Minister responsible for carrying out these Regulations. Indeed, he is acting administratively in this matter and not legislatively, so that there is nothing unconstitutional in being advised by a Committee of the House.

Mr. Morrison: I did not say that

there was anything improper or unconstitutional about it, but I say that it would be a doubtful thing if carried on as a regular practice, for it would weaken the independent critical power of the House of Commons.

Mr. Morrison: . . . In conclusion, I would say that it is useful and right that this Debate should have been held. It is always right that a Home Secretary, in exercising these very great and exceptional powers, should have two things in mind: first, that he must do his duty to the State and its security and that if there is any real doubt, security must have the advantage. He must not be cowardly in exercising his powers when the security of the State is at stake. Second, he must keep in mind the fact that he is responsible to the House of Commons and is liable to be pulled up. I can assure the House that that is in my own mind. It is right from time to time that we should have these discussions and Debates in order that administration may be reviewed, but I would say, as one who is as keen as anyone to preserve the liberty of the subject—and for that reason I have been so careful in the handling of these 18B cases myself, because they are British subjects—that after a good deal of experience of administration of one sort and another I can honestly assure the House that, broadly speaking although there may be exceptional cases where things go a bit wrong, the administration of this Regulation need not cause apprehension in the House and the country. . . .

JULY 25.

FOOD SUPPLIES (SMALL TRADERS)

(13 columns)

Mr. Beverley Baxter (Wood Green): On Tuesday last, at Question time, my hon. and gallant Friend, the Member for Kettering (Captain Profumo) raised the question about the announced intention of the Ministry of Food to do away with rationed foodstuffs supplies to all shopkeepers with less than 25 registered customers. . . .

Perhaps my right hon. and gallant Friend will say that the profits of the small shopkeeper on rationed foodstuffs, if he has less than 25 customers, are a small, paltry, few shillings a week. I think the figure has been given; it is something like 6s. or 7s. a week. But the entire profits of the little shopkeeper are paltry. He is a little man, he is not

very important. But what happens, supposing that his profit is 6s. or 7s. or 8s. a week on the rationed foodstuffs, when his customers are ordered to register elsewhere? They will not come to him for unrationed goods, and go for rationed elsewhere, where they can get both. Therefore, it was, indeed, a sentence of death for the little trader. . . .

In London it would have effected 8,000 to 10,000 shopkeepers; in Manchester, 700; and so on through the country. Therefore, I think we are justified in protesting as loudly as we can, with our pens and with our voices. . .

Were the customers of these little men to be told, "You must go down the road and give your custom to this man's competitor, who has 27 customers"? That would be laughable, cruel, ironic. The vast majority of his customers would have been driven to this steadily expanding octopus of the chain stores. It would be foolish to fulminate too strongly against the chain stores. They are run efficiently, and there are enough of them to make them competitive, so that their prices are not too high. But the tendency of this Government in this war, on the domestic front, has been to strengthen more and more the great combines at the expense of the individual. . . . Perhaps the bureaucracy of Whitehall finds it easier to deal with big units than to bother about small units. I give this warning to the House, that, while, at present, these great chain stores are competitive, it is a habit of great and powerful competitors sometimes to get together, to combine eventually; in fact if not in name. I saw with my own eyes the rise of the chain store in Germany after the last war, until all over Germany the individual trader was disappearing, and these chain stores, by their very character, their very omnipotence, were paving the way for the greatest octopus of all—State control, State ownership, State direction, to which, I pray to Heaven, we shall not have to come, even in this most terrible of wars.

I do not think we want to see the little man put out of business. I do not think that my right hon. and gallant Friend or Lord Woolton wants to see it. The small trader is not very important politically. He is a "lone wolf," operating in his small neighbourhood. He cannot affect either national or local elections. Surely, this is the place where we should protect the man who cannot speak loudly for himself. It is

only fair to say that out of the vast correspondence I have received from shopkeepers on this question, there are some who say that the Ministry of Food are looking after them better than they have ever been looked after before. That is worth saying. I have a feeling that those who say it are shopkeepers with just over 25 customers; nevertheless they do write that way.

Mr. Doland (Balham and Tooting): It should be remembered that it is not only the commodities which come within the purview of coupon trading that are affected, but other commodities which are not yet rationed. People will go for those commodities to the shops where they are sent for the coupon commodities. This is a very insidious method, which I fear is spreading, not only in the Ministry of Food but in other Departments of State, of crushing out the small trader. The incidence of war has, undoubtedly, done a great deal in this direction, and has closed many places of business for the small shopkeeper.

I take a prominent part in the affairs of the borough in which I live—I have been mayor twice, and am now an alderman—and in that borough I have ascertained that no fewer than 941 shops have closed owing, primarily, to the incidence of war. That borough is, I admit, the largest in London. But, that is in one borough alone, and there are 28 such boroughs, even though all are not of that size. When we come to the provinces and the country generally, surely we must realise that it is time we called a halt to these restrictions, the latest of which have been made by the Ministry of Food. I represent many organisations—the National Chamber of

Trade and the Federation of London Traders—and they have all received lately a document known as a questionnaire. This contains 20 or 30 questions for the traders to answer and send back to the Board of Trade Committee, which was set up by the Minister to consider these questions not only during, but after the war. There is no doubt that, in regard to two or three of these questions the assumption is that, ultimately, and sooner perhaps than we know, many more shops will have to close.

Captain Cunningham-Reid, Wing-Commander James and Mr. Granville also supported Mr. Baxter's views.

Major Lloyd George: I want to give the House the reasons why we did in fact have to suggest this arrangement at the beginning. There is a very serious shortage of labour available for transport purposes and, despite what has been said, in shops; and when you have a large number of small packages which have to be delivered to many people it does enormously increase the transport and labour involved in making up the packages and in clerical work. It may be interesting to the House if I give one example. Take the case of the man with 24 registrations—although, as I have said, that does not arise now. The largest parcel that could possibly be issued per. week to one of these traders would be a 12 lb. parcel and the smallest parcel would be 3 lb.

Instructions were issued at the beginning of this week that cases in which there was hardship either to the consumers or the shopkeepers should be very seriously considered. What we are really anxious to do is to discourage those who are not in business for business purposes.

around the neck.

- (8) One tin hat, with upturned brim, to carry spare clean water.
- (9) Spare sand to be carried in all pockets.
- (10) One full box of matches, to light all incendiary bombs which have failed to ignite.

Fire-watchers should be on duty all night and all day, and should be able to deal with all types of bombs (incendiaries, fire-bombs, gas, casualties, D.A.s, H.E.s, B.F.s and others), and should be able to smell out fires by their sense of smell. All olfactory organs to be examined by the M.O.H. every six months. In their spare time they should be able to assist the Wardens and the officers of the Casualty Bureau.

This Act is not to be confused with the Acrobats Act of 1756.

This scheme applies to all unfit persons for H.M. Forces and ladies unfit for service with the W.A.A.C.'s.
Red Tape Office, S.W.

.....1941.

AMERICAN VIEWS ON FEDERAL UNION (continued from page 4)

stitute Anglo-American imperialism. Both are mistaken. *Its object is to begin a world state that will end all narrow nationalisms and imperialisms.*" [Our italics.]

The second of the three great advantages he quotes is:—

"Even were the British Isles taken, the struggle could continue effectively from Canada. The British Fleet could not be surrendered by England. It would be controlled by the union."

Finally Rabbi Reichert looks forward to an international "arrangement" in which "economic, political, social and cultural values would be humanely fostered for the good of all and the hurt of none." How tepid!

Mr. Crum, a San Francisco lawyer, in saying that the United States was already committed to policies that led inevitably to Federal Union, concludes by letting the cat out of the bag:—

"In the coming struggle, a federal union of the democracies would unify our efforts, would tend to insure against the reckless and stupid peace of 1919. It would begin to make positive our position (which we have certainly assumed) as the moral leader of the world. *It would be the instrument to make effective our policies and our aims.*" [Our italics.]

IS BRITAIN BETRAYED?

by **John Mitchell**

and

HOW ALBERTA IS FIGHTING FINANCE

Prices: 2d. each, 12 for 1/6 (postage extra)

Obtainable from
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,
49 PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, 15.

FIRE-WATCHERS ACT, 1941

Equipment to be carried by all fire-watchers:

- (1) Respirator.
- (2) Axe, stuck in belt.
- (3) One stirrup-pump carried over left shoulder.
- (4) One long-handled shovel to be carried over left shoulder.
- (5) One extending ladder to be carried over right shoulder.
- (6) One belt to go round the waist, with hooks (10) to carry six full sandbags and four buckets (two gallons) of clean water.
- (7) Two wet blankets to be slung

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Correspondence to the Hon. Secretary, 17, Cregagh Road, Belfast.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Association: All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats. Enquiries to R. J. Northin, 11, Centre Street, Bradford.

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER is obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Meets regularly on the first and third Sundays in the month. Time 2-30 p.m. Members are asked to send their present addresses to the Secretary at 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Enquiries to Wavertree 435.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP: Lunch hour reunion on the first and third Thursday in each month at 12-30 at the Plane Tree, Great Russell Street. Next meeting August 21. Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association. It is important that all Social Crediters on Tyneside should maintain contact. Write Hon. Secretary, R. Thomson, 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; or 50, Ripley Grove, Copnor.

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

SITUATIONS VACANT

Local Correspondents wanted.—One of the leading news and feature agencies of America wants a Local Correspondent in every city, town, and locality, male or female. Splendid opportunity for experienced person to further career or for novice to break into field.—Write to The North American News-Press, Confederation Buildings, Montreal, Canada.

The Social Crediter

If you are not a subscriber to *THE SOCIAL CREDITER*, send this order without delay.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd.,
49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

Please send *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* to me

Name

Address

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-
" Six " " 15/-
" Three " " 7/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer,
Social Credit Expansion Fund,
c/o The Social Credit Secretariat,
49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

I enclose the sum of £ : : ,
as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name

Address

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND.)

Name

Address

**TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE,
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.**

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Advisory Chairmanship of Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute

£ : : , { per month,
per quarter,
per year,

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

I herewith enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the above mentioned funds.

Signature.....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.)

HITLER'S POLICY IS

A JEWISH POLICY

By **BORGE JENSEN**

and **P. R. MASSON**

New edition now ready

Price: 6d. (Postage Extra)

from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,

LIVERPOOL, 15.

BOOKS TO READ

By **C. H. Douglas**:—

- Economic Democracy
(edition exhausted)
- Social Credit 3/6
- The Monopoly of Credit 3/6
- Warning Democracy
(edition exhausted)
- The Use of Money 6d.
- "This 'American' Business" 3d. each
12 for 2/-

ALSO

- The Bankers of London
by Percy Arnold 4/6
- Lower Rates (pamphlet) 3d.
- The Press Ban on Parliament
by John Mitchell..... 1/6
- Hitler's Policy is a Jewish
Policy by Borge Jensen and
P. R. Masson.....6d.
- Southampton Chamber of
Commerce Report
(again available) 6d.
- Is Britain Betrayed?
by John Mitchell 2d. each
12 for 1/6
- How Alberta is Fighting
Finance2d. each
12 for 1/6

(All the above postage extra).

Leaflets

- Bomb the German People 100 for 1/9
- The Attack on Local Gov-
ernment by John Mitchell...9d. doz.
50 for 2/6

(The above are post free).

Temporary Address:—

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, 15.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., as from 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.