

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 6. No. 24.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

## AT SEA

By T. J.

Study of Mr. Churchill's journalistic style would probably lead the least critical reader to the conclusion that, if the Prime Minister had any hand in the Eight Points to which President Wilson's Twelve have been reduced, it was that of the wielder of the blue pencil.

*The Sunday Times* admits candidly that the joint statement by 'leading personages of two states' has been received "with mixed feelings." Its daily contemporary makes a bad start with the word 'climacteric'—the war's, not Mr. Churchill's—; but there is no indication in what follows that the newspaper despairs of keeping the war going for some time yet.

A B.B.C. 'American' commentator said the declaration was heard by Americans who asked, "What else did they say?"

Raymond Gram Swing, in Lord Beaverbrook's paper, claims to let out 'The Big Secret.' He says the conference was held to 'head off the Hitler peace offensive.' He also says Lord Beaverbrook isn't at Washington to polish up the phrases of the Eight Points. He certainly isn't! It may not be very far from the mark to say, as Mr. Swing says, that Mr. Roosevelt had stated his peace aims; Mr. Eden had stated his peace aims; but there was necessary a "telling argument of President Roosevelt with Mr. Churchill to win his consent to formulate the aims." "The Roosevelt-Churchill statement is a commitment. . . . True, the commitment is no more binding than the one made by President Wilson."

It may be well that Mr. Churchill has effected his double crossing of the Atlantic without there being visible sign of his 'commitment'; though Mr. Harriman could certainly tell us more than Mr. Swing. Mr. Harriman is a member of Brown, Harriman, U.S.A. office of Brown, Shipley and Company. Harriman's got all the Russian concessions from Lenin, acting as a more or less genteel front for Kuhn, Loeb. Mr. Harriman was present at all the Churchill-Roosevelt meetings.

The 'British' press seems to be agreed that the joint declaration is not necessarily a statement of "common principles in the NATIONAL policies" of the respective countries of the signators. *The Times* carefully refers to "the limitations of [Mr. Roosevelt's] constitutional position." Neither Mr. Churchill nor Mr. Roosevelt, nor, indeed, the two together, can make their personal (or adopted) policies their countries' by edict. Either their policies are their countries' policies, or they are not. Argument and propa-

ganda do not necessarily lead to anything more than assent, or seeming assent to an idea. Policy is not an idea. It is a fact. That fact is the reason why people continue to participate willingly in the organised life of communities. They do so for real, not for ideal reasons. They entertain objectives, personal objectives, and the unceasing friction which results from their reaping the shadow instead of the substance is the measure of the difference between a modern statesman's notion of policy and a correct notion. It is probable that the real policy of the people of Great Britain in regard to the war is, by consent, but not by declaration, to fight and win the war against the continental dictatorships. It seems that Mr. Churchill (but not Lord Beaverbrook) is becoming aware that he is being silently held to it. The same silent pressure which has moderated the earlier plans of the 'Democratic Leaders' will, if it is exerted, change their present plans into something worth while. What they have in mind they dare not put on paper, or allow to be published. So much the better. And so, point by point:—

"First, their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or other."

And so it is improper that what their countries do not seek interests within their countries should seek.

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

Why not 'Of the people concerned'? People have wishes, not 'peoples.' A people is a formula, which too often covers only the 'interest' and the caucus. And what is 'freely'? What is the worth of a wish 'freely-expressed' if it is not freely-formulated, but formulated under pressure of economic (banker) forces, exploiting all the instruments of mass-hypnotism?

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples [peoples again!] to choose the form of Government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

The 'form' of Government matters to nobody. It is the policy of government which matters. Democracy is not a form of government: democracy is decentralisation of the policy of government.

"Fourth, they will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further enjoyment by all States

[what are they?], great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

But the countries of the world do not prosper necessarily under the imposition of *equal* terms. They could prosper under *just* terms. An incessant tribute to bankers might be most equally distributed and remain as ruinous as it is now.

"Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement, and social security."

The 'economic field'?—That is to say something comparable with the 'electromagnetic field': a set of conditions constituted by—Kuhn, Loeb? Harriman's? The Rothschilds? The Anglo-American-Atlantic-Pacific-World Banking System?

Labour standards?—Why not leisure standards? In a world in which human effort and intention have prepared *freedom* from toil, a synagogue of Satan is preparing a perpetuity of *work*.

"Sixth, after the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

But not in freedom from an overriding policy imposed upon all their efforts by Kuhn, Loeb and Harriman's?

"Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance."

"Eighth, they believe all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. . . ."

The Institute of Civil Engineers was founded to secure the application of "the forces in nature to the use and convenience of man." Do Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt intend, even if with 'the inevitability of gradualness,' to deprive man of this assistance? We live in Bedlam, and it is not past belief.

"... Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armament."

But not taxes!

Beaverbrook and Hopkins are going to Moscow.

To all this there is *one* answer. The British Member of Parliament must be brought back to the representation of *policy*, and away from the discussion of methods. The House of Commons should call for experts from the properly qualified service departments, engineering organisations, etc., etc., economic or administrative, and they should be tied down to stating what **RESULTS** would ensue from their activities and how long it would be before it would be possible to check-up on the degree of accuracy of

their statement of the case. Discussion in the House of Commons should then be solely on the **RESULTS**—whether these results are desirable results or undesirable results. And **BEFORE ACTION IS TAKEN**, someone in the reporting body should be made responsible for achieving the results desired within a stated period of time, and subject to the removal of the responsible person and prohibition from further public service if the results promised are not forthcoming. This might be described as a modernising of the original British Constitution, and when it is achieved England (and possibly the world) will be **FREE** and prosperous and peaceful.

#### DUKE OF WINDSOR REDUCES TAXES

"Soon after his arrival at Nassau, Bahamas, as Governor, the Duke of Windsor appointed a Labour Advisory Committee, which found that the constant rise in the cost of living there was due to the restriction of imports owing to the lack of shipping.

"The Duke endorsed a recommendation of the committee extending the minimum wage fixed to building labourers to apply to all classes of labour. The legislature rejected this until, they said, the Duke found a way to find work for the unemployed.

"Unsuccessful in his first attempt to reduce living costs (says Associated Press), the Duke persuaded the legislature to agree to a reduction of taxation.

"Timber, fresh and salt meat, and raffia—used in the island's straw-work industry—have been exempted from the five per cent. war tax, eggs and milk being already exempt.

"The Duke indicated that he would soon ask for a further reduction on 'certain articles which are essential to the life of a huge section of the community.'"

—"*Evening Standard*," August 1.

#### ABOUT GENERAL WAVELL

From the *Londoner's Diary* in the *Evening Standard* of April 16:—

"I wrote yesterday of General Wavell's habits and I have had an interesting letter concerning them.

"The Commander-in-Chief in the Middle East seems to take life easily because he has mastered the art of organising it. He is the opposite of those men who are for ever talking about the burden of their labours and who, as Lloyd George said of Ramsay MacDonald, 'are too busy to do any work.'

"Wavell does not believe in plodding at work or slog-ging in the war. 'The genius of the British lies in lightning attack, a quick rain of blows on a bewildered adversary and victory by a knock-out.'

"... There is only one other place that Wavell knows as well as Africa. It is Russia, which he first visited as attaché just before the Revolution.

"He has been back there several times, and the last time he sent despatches home praising highly a new Red Army tactic of infiltration.

"This was the entry of the parachute into the art of war."

OPINION**Reith Racket**

*The Daily Telegraph* has hinted that schemes for 'beautiful' towns after the war "may have to be shelved" in favour of 'quick' towns.

Says Mr. Ralph Tubbs, a member of the R.I.B.A. Reconstruction Committee: "It costs no more and takes no longer to build 'beautiful' towns than ugly, planless towns."

Mr. Denzil Nield writes to *The Daily Telegraph* suggesting that thousands of 'huts' are to be rushed up because 'those in control dislike the word, planning.' Mr. Tubbs says: "If the people of Britain are determined to support a planning policy" there is no reason why our future cities should not be finer than our past and present cities.

Both these protestants against *The Daily Telegraph's* report miss the point. Those 'in control' do not dislike planning. They just love it—so long as it means that they do the planning while those who do the work or foot the bill do the suffering from the plans imposed on them.

This just won't do.

Whether there is really any divergence between Lord Reith and his bureaucrats who want to go on planning and the interests behind the building ramp which also want to go on planning, the over-ruling policy is the same, namely: "You'll jolly well have the house we think good for you, where we think good for you, when we think good for you and at the cost to you which we have decided upon."

The antithesis to that sort of planning is to plan to meet the policy: "You can have the sort of house you like—we will give you the money—but we will see you avail yourself of the best advice."

The work of this country is performed by the people of this country, and they can devote it to the purpose of getting what they want as easily as to the purpose of getting what plotters want. The expert's sphere is to advise on methods (and stand the racket if he makes a mistake) not to advise on policy and make you stand the racket if you guess wrong.

**A Director's Statement**

*A passage taken from Mr. D. M. Touche's statement at the thirty-seventh ordinary general meeting of the Sphere Investment Trust, Limited, held on May 23 at Winchester House.*

"It is doubtful if we shall ever again be able to hold our annual general meeting in this fine building. This great city is rich in ruins which bear eloquent evidence of the ghastly price we are having to pay for the folly of trusting to collective security instead of the strong arm of Britain. After the conclusion of the first Pan-German War of 1914-18, our foreign policy was attuned to the need to conciliate the pacifists, who were an important element in the electorate. At one time, indeed, they probably numbered a clear majority of the electors. Women had been given the vote for the first time by the Speaker's Conference in 1918, and there were few women in the country who had not lost father, husband, son or brother. The plausible and insidious half-truths of pacifist propaganda were cunningly calculated to ensnare the female vote. The extreme Left, with the full approval of the *Comintern*, supported the pacifists because pacifism by weakening Britain, increased the probability of a world war to be fol-

lowed by world revolution. The defeat and downfall of Britain would have been very welcome to the Soviet. Hence the Socialist policy of war without weapons. This generation is having to re-learn, at the cost of enormous suffering, the A.B.C. of diplomacy, and in particular that no League of Nonsense is an adequate substitute for a steady national policy directed towards the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe with armaments adequate to sway that balance against the potential aggressor of the day. Such a policy has been the diplomatic tradition of this country since the age of Elizabeth at least. Its abandonment has not been the fault of the people. It is too much to expect of the average man to be a deep student of history and foreign affairs. The fault lies with the shallow intelligentsia, almost solidly Left Wing, who never cease to darken counsel with their advice. Lacking all humility with respect to their past egregious errors, they are tireless in their advocacy of brighter Britains, federal unions, and other delusive utopias. Now Germany's total war and new order have turned out to be just plain savagery and ancient slavery. I likewise believe that the new order for Britain will prove nothing more original than the mortifying bureaucracy of the Roman Empire of the Decline and Fall. God forbid that we defeat National Socialism... only to lapse exhausted into the arms of the Socialist bureaucrat. For Communism, National Socialism and Fascism have this in common, that their end is bureaucracy.

"Most revolutions merely achieve a change of masters. Such a consummation would turn to ashes our victory over German terrorism and be fatal to the genius of this free people. In this connection, hear the words General Gordon wrote in his famous Khartoum journals: 'We are a wonderful people; it was never our Government which made us a great nation: our Government has been ever the drag on the wheels.'"

**Another New Order**

The National Peace Council (which "represents fifty national organisations in Great Britain") has joined in the fight against freedom by urging amongst its policies "the establishment of a new political order in Europe based upon the federal principle, involving mutual disarmament and far-reaching surrenders of national sovereignty."

Just like the New Germany.

**"THE SOCIAL CREDITER"**

It has been decided to reduce the size of *The Social Crediter* in order to secure certain coincident advantages which it would be difficult to enjoy in face of the prevailing shortage of labour and raw materials. Rising costs alone might have been met by advancing the price of the paper to subscribers. The usefulness of *The Social Crediter*, however, does not depend entirely on its size; but expansion of its circulation does, to some extent, depend upon its price. This consideration, in conjunction with that mentioned in the first place, has been decisive. By the slight change of style, which is experimental, it is hoped to present attractively nearly as much matter in the smaller paper as in that with which readers have become familiar. These alterations, which we hope our readers will accept, revive the hope expressed on one or two earlier occasions that publication a day earlier in the week may soon be secured.

## 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 (Temporarily):

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.  
Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 6. No. 24. Saturday, August 23, 1941.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The following advertisement appeared in the *Scotsman* of August 16:—

### PERSONAL A PUBLIC NOTICE

#### TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

During the depression of 1931 (while trading as D. M'VEIGH & Co., Paisley and Glasgow), due to circumstances outside my control, I was obliged to appoint a Trustee to administer my affairs. Since then "Dame Fortune" has been friendly, and I now desire to discharge my obligations in full, and will be pleased to hear from interested parties.

DANIEL M'VEIGH,  
The Bruce Arms,  
Paisley and Hamilton.

N.B.—Bankers and Brewers (with a penchant for Trusteeships) are excluded from the provisions of this Notice.

The Conferences which produced the world-shattering pronouncement of our war-aims, but didn't bring the U.S. any nearer to fighting for them were held on the U.S. cruiser AUGUSTA. But President Redfield attended a Church Service on H.M.S. PRINCE OF WALES, too. Federal Union in action, no doubt.

There is a more interesting and dramatic edition of Mr. Clarence Kirschman Streit's symposium *Union Now with Britain*. It is a story by Rudyard Kipling, and is called *As Easy as A.B.C.* Everyone ought to read it. (No charge for advertisement).

In 1921 at a magnificent hotel in Mustapha Superieure, outside Algiers, there was held a secret international Masonic Conference, attended by most of the people now living who are in the shadowy background of *Union Now*. Mr. Kipling was there.

Mr. Stanley Baldwin, who was a cousin of Kipling's, became Prime Minister. He had christened his son Oliver, just in case.

At the time of Mr. Baldwin's access to power, the British Empire had risen to a height of influence and prestige exceeding that of Imperial Rome. For all practical purposes, he remained in power until 1937, by which time

once-great Britain had sunk to a position so impotent that even Italy felt that she could be insulted with impunity, and was enmeshed in a situation in which she must fight another European War which was bound to deliver her over either to Germany or Wall Street, i.e., both. Perhaps.

Mr. Baldwin's term of office was closed by the abdication of King Edward VIII. We do not behead our kings nowadays.

President Redfield says that Russia has plenty of money to pay for supplies. Obviously. The "B" B.C. informs us that you, dear reader, have arranged a credit of Ten Million Pounds for her, just to begin with. With this she will be able to pay the United States for what she buys. That is to say, you will be able to pay the United States for what she buys. Just like last time.

Sixteenth century architectural plans were called "plots." "Planners" were "Plotters." Knowing chaps, those Elizabethans.

A plan is the crystallisation of an idea. We see the limitations of the plan method in the complaints which are made by the manufacturers (with reason *from their point of view*) at the continual changes introduced into war designs. Yet it is precisely the realism of our Service Departments, which forces these changes on the producer, which saved us. It is not the sacred blue print which is important. What matters in the stern realism of war is that the tool shall be better than that of the enemy at the moment of use.

It is typical of the half-baked P.E.P. enthusiast, by which we refer to the rank and file of that peculiar organisation, that at a time when, to an extent unique in history, the world is in a state of flux, he should clamour for the excessive use of a method whose usefulness is in direct proportion to the static nature of the problem to which it is applied. When the really competent planners of the Gothic Cathedrals began their work, they expected it to last for a thousand years. The bureaucratic planner has not yet succeeded in producing either a building or a community which deserves to last twenty years, and most of them won't.

"To speak of Communism as the system which prevailed during the War of Intervention in Russia, and at the same time, as the present system in Russia, is to miss completely the changes which have taken place there. If by Communism is meant State ownership of the land and industry, then it exists in Russia. But if by Communism is meant the equality and fraternity of pre-War theories, then it not only does not exist in Russia, but is officially repudiated there as a sentimental petty bourgeois concept. . . . the principles of individualism, freedom of speech and action, and democracy, are ridiculed as scornfully in Russia as they are in Italy or Germany."

— *The New Internationalism*, CLARK FOREMAN, New York.

Mr. Clark Foreman is a great admirer of Russia, and is very popular with President Roosevelt.

"When M. Litvinoff exchanged his series of letters with President Roosevelt as a preliminary to recognition,

the last vestiges of a world revolution from Moscow were swept away. . . . the myth of the world revolution will continue to play a role in Russia where the Press is cautiously censored. . . . After the events of 1933, only the wishful thinkers could hold out hopes for a world system based on international Socialism." — *Ibid.*

You can fool some of the people all of the time.

So now we know what Socialism means. You murder a Czar with a beard and a wife who speaks seven languages, and adopt a Czar who looks like Old Bill doing a day's work as a bus conductor, with a wife who only speaks the language of the Ruling Class—Yiddish.

You murder or starve ten millions of the population, multiply the bureaucracy by twenty and the secret police by ten, and tell the rest of the population that if they believed what you told them before the glorious revolution, that just shows what fools they are.

If there be any simple souls, nurtured on the Party spirit, who, believing that the Jews comprise most of the world's mischief-makers, imagine that Hitler's much advertised anti-Semitism makes him their champion, let them consider the parable of the Bookmaker, a profession much affected by the Chosen Race.

The Bookie lays against every horse in the race, and expects to win whichever horse loses. He has only one main anxiety—that there shall be a race of some kind. He can, however, make a little, even if the race is off, but most of all if every horse falls down dead.

Failing that, *he prefers the favourite to lose*, and the hotter the favourite and the shorter the odds, the more he wants him to lose. The larger the field, the more he will make.

Finally, if things go wrong, his debts are irrecoverable, and he can leave on the next convenient luxury liner for America.

Do you really suppose that there's no money on Hitler?

### OUR NEW ORDER

*A letter published in a recent number of "The Scotsman":—*

Sir,—Mr. W. H. F. Murdoch, in your issue of August 6, is, I think, approaching closely to the core of our present discontents. Under various and specious disguises, we are being stampeded into monopoly. It is almost irrelevant whether we call it State Socialism or Big Business—it is the thing itself that matters. One of the first considerations, but one which is largely overlooked, in connection with monopolistic organisation, is its obliteration of standards of reference.

This is obliquely brought out by your correspondent's reference to the Victorian era. Merely as an instance, it is easy to compare the character of the comment heard on the British railway system with that heard, say, forty years ago. Then, the respective contemporary merits of, for example, the Midland Railway and the London and North Western Railway were unailing matter for argument. Nowadays, criticism is of necessity a lament for the days that are gone. There are innumerable instances of the same nature.

It is also overlooked that, while the large monopolistic trusts, whether masquerading as Government Departments or as commercial undertakings with a "profit" motive, maintain research laboratories on a scale both of size and equipment beyond the wildest dreams of Faraday or Clerk-Maxwell, no major invention has been given to the world from them.

The claim that centralised monopolies are efficient, which seems to deceive so many people, is directly opposed to the nature and history of monopoly, which is always to restrict delivered output and to raise prices. A Government monopoly is simply a form of restrictive law, and the use of the economic system as a form of government is invariably disastrous. Under a money economy, the total price level, which includes taxation, is a major indication of economic efficiency, requiring, as a complement, contemporary standards of quality.

The technique by which this situation has been brought to its present critical stage is merely an extension of that elaborated in the American Railway Scandals of the nineteenth century. Genuinely individualistic enterprises are induced or forced by apparently accidental circumstances, such as war, to expand beyond their financial resources. Foreclosure in some form follows, and the undertaking is "rationalised." Hitler's form of "rationalising" Europe seems cruder, but has the same objective, and quite possibly has the same origins.

The remedy is much the same, I think, in essence, as that sketched by Mr. Murdoch, but the problem is not the nature of the remedy, but the sanctions by means of which it could be given actuality.—I am &c.

C. H. DOUGLAS.

8, Fig Tree Court, E.C. 4.; August 7.

### SMALL SHOP-KEEPERS AT BAY.

Birmingham small-shop-keepers have resolved to fight the Government plan to shut their shops if they have 25 or fewer registered customers. They hope their lead will be followed throughout the country.

Delegates from all parts of the country recently came together at the home of Mr. G. C. Raybone, hon. secretary of the Birmingham and District Small Traders Association, to which nearly all the 20,000 small-shop-keepers of the city belong.

These representatives of hucksters, small grocers, general dealers, and shops of no particular description in Manchester, Leicester, Coventry, and other big towns talked until two o'clock in the morning planning their campaign which included a mass-meeting and a delegation to the local M.P.s, and through them to the Ministry of Food.

### 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.

## PARLIAMENT

## DEBATE ON INDIA

## SUPPLY: MINISTRY OF PENSIONS

JULY 30.

Oral Answers to Questions. (33 columns).

## POST-WAR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS.

*Commander Sir Archibald Southby* asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any commitment has been entered into by the Government affecting the form of our international relationships after the war?

*Mr. Eden*: No, Sir. I think it would be premature to anticipate the post-war structure of international relations at the present time.

*Sir A. Southby*: Is my right hon. Friend aware that the name of the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs appears as a prominent supporter of the policy known as "Federal Union" in the literature and prospectus of the body called Federal Union, Limited, and is it desirable that His Majesty's Government should thereby be directly connected with the policy of federal union?

*Mr. Eden*: I was not aware of that. I do not suppose that my hon. Friend's name has been added since he became Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

*Sir A. Southby*: Would it not be desirable that my hon. Friend's name should be deleted from the prospectus now that he is a Member of the Government?

## LORD CHERWELL (DUTIES AND STAFF).

*Mr. Stokes* asked the Prime Minister (1) how many persons are working under Lord Cherwell; and the names and salaries of those paid more than £400 a year;

(2) the position occupied by Lord Cherwell and the salary paid him?

*The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill)*: Lord Cherwell is one of my personal assistants, and advises me, as he has for many years, upon the scientific and statistical aspects of our national defence. He is the head of the statistical branch which I formed when at the Admiralty at the outbreak of war to collect and collate all the figures of the various Departments, and is now specially charged with the duty of warning me of short fallings in any part of our war supply. As Professor of Physics at Oxford University, he was in receipt of a salary of £1,400 a year. But, since practically his whole time was from the beginning of the war engaged in official work, I thought it right that £1,000 a year should be paid him by the State. The remaining £400 is still paid him by the University.

Since his elevation to the peerage, Lord Cherwell has expressed his wish to serve in an honorary capacity, but I do not consider this would be right in view of the continuous demands I make upon him at all hours of the night and day. The number of Lord Cherwell's staff is 23, and I am circulating in the OFFICIAL REPORT the particulars asked for by the hon. Member.

*Mr. Stokes*: What position does Lord Cherwell occupy in regard to the committees presided over by the Lord President of the Council? Is it one of the functions of Lord Cherwell to produce arguments and figures like those

used by the Prime Minister in answer to the hon. Member for Kidderminster (Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne) yesterday?

*The Prime Minister*: The first part of the Question, is, I think, fully covered by the answer I have given, and the second part seems to me to be offensive.

*Commander Locker-Lampson*: Is not Lord Cherwell worth a great deal more than he is getting?

Following are the particulars:

The number of Lord Cherwell's staff is 23. The names and salaries of those over £400 a year are as follow:

Mr. R. F. Harrod ... ..	£1,300
Mr. G. D. A. MacDougall ... ..	£750
Mr. G. L. S. Shackle ... ..	£600
Mr. H. W. Robinson ... ..	£600
Mr. D. G. Champernowne ... ..	£600
Mr. J. L. Tuck ... ..	£600
Miss H. Makower ... ..	£480
Mr. D. M. Bensusan-Butt ... ..	£355
	£120 allowance.

JULY 31.

Written Answers to Questions (29 columns)

## FOOD SUPPLIES, EGGS.

*Mr. Sloan* asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food whether he is aware that Widow McCrindle, Pinwherry, Ayrshire, a retailer licensed to sell eggs, received two cases rattling and unfit for sale from the Government egg-packing station, Ayr; that these eggs were unstamped and therefore untraceable; that others distributed in the Girvan district have been equally bad; that the Government packing-station, Ayr, reported condition of eggs for distribution to the sanitary inspector, Ayr, who refused to take action; and what action is to be taken to end such a state of affairs?

*Major Lloyd George*: I am having inquiries made and will communicate with my hon. Friend.

*Sir P. Hurd* asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food whether he is aware that the Thames Valley Poultry Producers, Limited, a farmers' co-operative society, serving Berkshire and Wiltshire, on July 28 had had tested and graded eggs in store for 12 days after packing awaiting a release note from the Ministry of Food or London Port egg agent; and whether steps will be taken to remove such delays?

*Major Lloyd George*: As my hon. Friend put down his Question only on Tuesday I have not had an opportunity of looking into the matter. I am however having inquiries made and will communicate with him as soon as possible.

## SUPPLY (73 columns)

[19TH ALLOTTED DAY.] Considered in Committee.  
CIVIL ESTIMATES AND ESTIMATES FOR REVENUE DEPARTMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1941.

## MINISTRY OF PENSIONS.

*Captain John Dugdale* (West Bromwich): I want to refer only to the question of pensions for parents. . . The Parliamentary Secretary flourished in his hand a small and rather pretty pink paper and said that that was the form which was to be used by people desiring pensions. I will flourish in my hand a very large ugly white paper. This is the form which parents are asked to fill in if they apply for

pensions. There are between 20 and 30 questions to be answered, and it is difficult for parents to answer them unless they have had a long and arduous education. I would, therefore, ask for simplicity in the questionnaire which is sent out to parents, and that the forms should be available in post offices as well as the pensions offices. I would also like to ask that in the matter of pensions for parents we should dispense, in one respect at any rate, with the prevailing means test. I am not going to dispute the necessity of having a means test generally, but in the last war there were pensions given after investigation of means and also pensions given as of right. That pension was 5s. per week. Apart from any pension given for need, there should also be a pension given as of right. That is the least we can do for parents who have given their sons in the war. I asked a question on this point a few weeks ago and as a result I had letters from all over the country. One mother wrote:

"I certainly have no intention of giving them my personal history. I do not intend to fill in a form. Since then I have had no further correspondence. I am getting on in years, but I have still too much English pride and self-respect to allow me to answer personal questions after having given my son's life."

We can respect a woman disliking having to answer these personal questions after she has given her own son's life in the war. There are many widows and other dependants drawing pensions for men who were killed in the last war. To-day dependants of men killed in this war have to live side by side with dependants of men killed in the last war. They see that the latter are getting pensions, and they feel very hard about it. . . .

*Sir W. Womersley:* . . . My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for West Bromwich (Captain J. Dugdale) raised the question of parents' pensions, a subject which has been discussed time and time again. . . . I realised that it was a difficult problem in view of the fact that parents' pensions were given in the last war. It was a flat rate pension of 5s. for a parent who lost a son. That matter was considered very carefully by the Select Committee which considered pensions' administration and pensions' rights generally after the last war. On the evidence produced, it was then realised that that was a wrong system to adopt. Really what it amounts to is this: If you are a parent with a son fighting in the war—we are all in the same position, I have my son fighting—are you going to say that 5s. a week would be any consolation to you for the loss of that son? The better consolation is to think that he has died in the service of his country. . . .

I realised as soon as I took this matter up that the best thing to do was to carry out the recommendations of the Select Committee and assess a parent's pension on the expectation of what that parent would have been likely to receive from that member of the household by way of assistance, and more particularly to deal with the case as one of need, broadly interpreted. That is what we do, and because we are not giving these 5s. pensions to people who do not need them I am in a position to use the money to provide far better pensions for those who do need them.

## AUGUST 1.

### INDIA (ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES) (81 cols.)

*Lord Erskine (Brighton):* . . . I understand that the present position of the Congress party is that they will not co-operate in the war effort but that Mr. Gandhi does not

desire to embarrass the British Government in the conduct of the war. It is a great mistake to think that all members of the Congress party are extremists. There are all sorts and conditions of men who call themselves Congressmen, just as there are many different views in the various parties which compose this House. Perhaps there are even greater differences of opinion in Congress than in British political parties. Many of the Congressmen are people of great moderation but they are, for the time being, tied up by a very strong party discipline—a much stronger discipline than any of us in this House have ever known. The fact that many of the Congressmen are far from extreme was shown by the great reluctance of the different Provincial Governments to resign when they were called upon to do so by the high command of the party. They would, I am sure, have preferred to have continued governing their Provinces.

It is a pity that the high command of the Congress party took the attitude which it did take. The Congress Provincial Ministries were, on the whole, carrying out their duties very well. The Ministry in the Province with which I was connected was a very able one, and it was carrying out its duties in a way which, I think, surprised some of those who thought that the Constitution would be a failure. It was the over-riding of the local wishes of the various Congress Ministries and Congress parties by the Congress high command which brought the Provincial Constitution to disaster in so many Provinces. There was certainly a very healthy political ferment going on in the Provinces and in the Provincial Government under the 1935 Act. There is no doubt that great advances were made during that period and also that many measures were undertaken which no British Government could have touched. The Government of Madras, for instance, legislated to allow untouchables to enter the temples. That was not a matter about which any British-controlled Government could have legislated. It was a matter on which Indians only could legislate for themselves and that is why I am profoundly disappointed that that Constitution which was started with such great hopes has, in so many Provinces, fallen to the ground. . .

*Mr. Gordon Macdonald (Ince):* . . . The Secretary of State has said that India must realise that before long the war may be nearer her boundaries than it is to-day. It has been said that Congress is under Russian influence, and, quite frankly, I think myself there is something to be said for that view, but at the moment Russia is our Ally, and I, for one, am very pleased that she is our Ally. She is doing a good day's work for us. Will not that modify Congress views to some extent? . . .

*Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme):* . . . The noble lord who was until recently the Governor of Madras said in his speech, and it was cheered in the House, that he was grateful to the Government for preserving the idea of Indian unity. I should like to have it on record that I disagree with that. I think there are countless objections to the unitary idea in India. Of course, from the democratic point of view decentralisation is always an advantage, but particularly in India. For the more you have the Government centralised the more you get political parties divided on Imperial issues like getting Dominion status or getting independence, issues which obscure true politics.

Whereas Provincial politics deal with more practical subjects which the people understand and the politicians have to line themselves up on issues of practical importance to their Provinces. That is only one of half-a-dozen reasons which I could give, if I had time for begging the Government to consider not this idea of concentrating on unity but rather, in their new scheme, whenever it comes about, developing the Provinces so that they may become States, and thereby securing better government and a better atmosphere. ....

I have recently been to America, and at meeting after meeting some emissary of "America First" would get up and say: "What about India? You have put them all in gaol. You do not practise Democracy there." It is upsetting, because most people there have no idea that every Province in India is self-governing—as self-governing as each United State. For 20 years, education in India has been entirely in Indian hands. Because there is an agitator or two telling them lies, the American people do not realise that for the last 50 years our relations with India have made a tremendous advance, due to British honesty and British justice. There may have been one or two exceptional instances, Jalianwallah, and possibly the Mutiny, but on the whole our record has been good. ....

Mr. Amery: .... The only criticism I have heard—and I regret that I heard it—of this new National Defence Council was from the hon. Member for North Camberwell (Mr. Ammon) who suggested that the Council would be a body of "Yes-men."

Mr. Ammon: I qualified that by saying that that would be in the sense that they were not elected representatives.

Mr. Amery: It does not require election to make a man an independent person. The process of election often whittles away independence. ....

## ELECTIONS IN WAR TIME

In the *Sunday Express* of July 27, Mr. Noel Pemberton Billing, who has recently fought by-elections at Hornsey and Dudley as an Independent candidate demanding a greater war effort, described the forces opposing him:—

"The fact that the three major political parties have signed a truce is surely no good reason why the electioneering machines of all parties should be called on to combine in an attempt to make it impossible for any free and independent candidate to enter the House of Commons.

"Surely it is possible to decide either that elections in wartime are the only means of practising democracy, and the only means of testing the feeling of the people, and therefore should be encouraged in every way possible, or that they are something evil and undesirable, and in the interests of the democracy for which we are fighting should be abolished?

"Take, as an instance, the recent by-election at Dudley.

"If a sincere desire to see Winston Churchill head of an Imperial War Council, elected by a referendum based on the national identity card, is treason then I am a traitor.

"It was for this great ideal that I fought the coalition of all three political parties both at Hornsey and at Dudley, to be told at Hornsey that a vote for Pemberton Billing was a vote for Hitler, and at Dudley that I was a traitor to my country.

"Any man who dares to nominate at a by-election to-day in the interests of democracy and efficiency is immediately made the subject of violent abuse by the hired organisers of all political parties."

He was accused of wasting petrol (in spite of having a special government allowance to enable the political system to function in war-time), and waste of paper; he had only ten days instead of

## 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.
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson .....	6d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report .....	6d.
Is Britain Betrayed? by John Mitchell .....	2d. each 12 for 1/6
How Alberta is Fighting Finance .....	2d. each 12 for 1/6

(All the above postage extra).

### Leaflets

Bomb the German People .....	100 for 1/9
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell .....	9d. doz. 50 for 2/6
Taxation is Robbery .....	100 for 3/- 50 for 1/9

(The above are post free).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

Temporary Address:—

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

the usual three weeks in which to fight the election, and an electoral register already three years old in constituencies whence many of the electors had evacuated or removed.

He concludes:—

"Surely no greater evidence of justification for elections is necessary than that one man fighting all the political power of the country should in appealing to 33,000 electors have lost the seat by only 1,300 votes."

Use the new leaflet

### Taxation is Robbery

Prices:

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

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