

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 21.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 30, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

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

by C. H. DOUGLAS

In *Freedom and Planning*, the document issued in 1931 by Mr. Israel Moses Sieff's organisation, P.E.P., which appears to have supplanted the Government of Great Britain, just as the "New Deal" appropriated the American Government, through what Lord Hewart called 'administrative lawlessness,' the following illuminating passages may be found:—

The Farmer: "The development of an organised system will lead to a profound modification of the traditional individualism of outlook of the dairy farmer."

"Whether we like it or not, the individual farmer will be forced by events [our italics] to submit to far-reaching changes of outlook and methods." (It may be remembered that the Russian farmer who was 'planned' did not like it, and was 'liquidated' in millions by Mr. Sieff's co-racialists.)

The Landowner: "Planned economy . . . must clearly involve drastic inroads upon the rights [our italics] of individual ownership of land." "This is not to say that land nationalisation in the ordinary sense of the term [our italics] is either necessary or desirable. Far from it. Nothing would be gained [by whom?] by substituting the State as Landlord. What is required . . . is transfer of ownership of large blocks of land, not necessarily of all the land of the country, but certainly a large part of it, into the hands of the proposed Statutory Bodies and Public Utility Bodies and of the Land Trusts.

"It would be possible further, in a number of cases [the Chosen People] to leave management undisturbed, together with the enjoyment of the amenities which at present go with ownership, subject to the transfer of title to the Corporations or Trusts"

The full beauty of these proposals only becomes revealed as they are carefully examined and thoroughly understood.

The first point to notice is that the rights of ownership are expressly mentioned and are not abrogated, they are transferred. To anyone who has taken the small amount of trouble necessary to penetrate the conjuring trick of "Public" ownership, it is obvious that the powers will be transferred to anonymous bondholders, who will exercise them through bureaucrats, whose advancement will depend on their alacrity in anticipating the wishes of their masters.

But "nationalisation" is recognised as an awkward threat to grinding taxation, so that "Public Bodies" and "Land Trusts" (Forestry Commissions, National Trusts and out-and-out Land Companies) are to be interposed. A writer in a popular Sunday newspaper, writing of the acquisition

of a large block of land by the National Trust, began the article by the words "Hundreds of thousands of people in this country do not realise that they are large landowners." Now, isn't that odd?

It is a safe rule in assessing the true objective of the "Planners'" measures to examine the arrangements made in forming the thirty-seven Central Banks which have been constituted since 1918. These, of course, are an integral and primary Stage in the more open "Planning" now in progress, and were formed with a clear relationship to a resumption of hostilities which would form the cover for the consummation of the World State.

The first point to notice is that, from the Bank of International Settlements to the smallest South American Republic, these banks are granted Extra-territoriality. Whether the Bank of "England" is *de jure* extra-territorial I do not know. But the answers given to questions in regard to it, in the House of Commons, make it quite plain that it is *de facto* extra-territorial.

The same idea can be seen in operation all the way through this "World Plan"—to organise institutions of overwhelming power, operated by officials themselves having no power of initiative, bound by Precedent and Regulation. Then you control the King's Regulations, and there you are—on paper. You have disfranchised everyone.

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The Jew (stated by Mrs. Webster in *The Socialist Network* to be a German) Alderman, and past Chairman of the London County Council, Albert Emil Davies, Honorary Treasurer of the Fabian Society, is a striking exhibit of the Socialist racket. He was General Manager of the British, Foreign and Colonial Corporation, a credit-mongering concern, and is completely familiar with both practical and technical finance and banking, and its responsibility for war and social distress. He has attacked every form of private property and particularly private ownership of land and railways, but has opposed in every possible manner every attempt to socialise financial credit. He was the "experienced," but anonymous, banker mentioned in the Labour Party's *Report* on the Mining Scheme of Social Credit.

He wrote, *inter alia*, *Land Nationalisation: The Key to Social Reform*. Having been born in the East End of London, of non-British descent, and never having made or grown anything but figures, he of course knows all about the land.

Look out, boys. The Ogpu-Gestapo (Ministry of Food

Branch) is coming into your kitchen to weigh the Sunday joint, bone included.

You pay them.

An Englishman's Home is his Castle. Oh, Yeah? Them ruins, I suppose.

"The British Government is only Bolshevism in embryo, and Bolshevism is only Socialism in a hurry, Socialism while you won't wait." — Speech of ISRAEL ZANGWILL at the Albert Hall, February 8, 1919. Zangwill was a prominent Zionist.

"With a determined revolutionary minority. . . . Through the Co-Operative movement we shall be able to win the masses over to Socialism by controlling the full distribution of the necessaries of life." — JOHN MACLEAN, in *Condemned from the Dock*, published by the Clyde Workers' Propaganda Society, 1918.

"The British Empire must be entirely smashed if the workers of this country were to improve their conditions." — W. T. COLYER, American Communist Party, reported in the *Daily Herald*, October 1, 1925. Now think hard, Clarence. Who's yelping at the British Empire now?

Mr. Harold Macmillan, M.P., Minister for North Africa, whose primary objective appears to be to "induce the French to reconsider their anti-Jewish attitude" was, or is, a prominent member of P.E.P., and closely associated with Moses Israel Sieff.

France is, of course, split into Free-mason-Communist-Jew, and the rest.

Rather odd the Riom Trials never came off, wasn't it?

In answering a supplementary question in the House of Commons on January 20, Mr. Eden said that he "could reassure the hon. Member [Mr. Kirkwood] completely" on the point that "there is no truth in the rumour that the British and Soviet Governments are practically at loggerheads." The original question had reference to economic reconstruction after the war.

Sir Henry Morris-Jones is so enamoured of the proposed Hydro-Electric Development in Scotland for the benefit of 'English' vested interests that he is anxious to subject Wales to similar treatment.

The rape of the loch?

Alberta Boomerang

X.Y.Z. "... would much like to know more about Social Credit, which he thought had been tried and proved a failure."

Another enquirer says, "The lying British newspapers have always led me to suppose that Alberta 'Social Credit' was a failure and that Alberta was bankrupt."

"Walka"

The *Jewish Chronicle* has the following about the Polish journal *Walka* which has some interest in view of

the known opposition to General Sikorski:—

"*Walka* first made its appearance some 18 months ago as a stencilled publication of from 12 to 16 quarto sheets. . . .

"The first copies contained violent attacks on General Sikorski's Government, on the Socialists, and on the Jews. The late Mr. Herman Liberman, Polish Minister of Justice, and a Jew by origin, was bitterly denounced; as were democratic Polish Ministers and the Polish agreement with Russia.

"An attempt made at that time to trace the place of publication failed. But there is reason to believe that it is being published from an address near Russell Square. From 3,000 to 5,000 copies are being published every few weeks and smuggled into Scotland. Some copies also reach the Polish forces in the Middle East. It is alleged that officers have been known to keep their eyes shut to it or even to encourage its distribution. Some members of the Polish National Council are rumoured to have assisted the publication materially."

Forty Slaves

By B. M. PALMER

Dr. Maude Royden has an article on "Women and the Mass Mind" in the January number of *Homes and Gardens*. Perhaps I liked the last sentence best of all. "Do not let us feed: let us eat," concludes Dr. Royden, setting forth in those few simple words the world of difference between the cattle trough of the cafeteria and the Christian table set with bread and wine where every meal is a sacrament. The fruits of the earth are holy.

Dr. Royden's article is in part a criticism of *Working Class Wives*, a Pelican Special by Margery Spring-Rice. Mrs. Spring-Rice speaks of "the great difficulty which occurs in persuading women to go into hospital for their confinements. Although trained home helps can be provided to look after the father and children the mother shows an inherent disinclination to entrust her home even temporarily to the care of someone else. Again, mothers themselves have often been the first to oppose the granting of school meals for children, holding that it is unnatural for the children to eat away from home and that they prefer to prepare the food themselves. Another example is the opposition from many parents with which the Ministry of Labour was met in the initial stages of their scheme to remove adolescent wage-earners from the distressed areas. . . . The Ministry has had to devote much time and propaganda to breaking down the parental prejudice against this 'unnatural' disintegration of the family."

And from the same book:—

"Although, with the increasing opportunities and complexities of social organisation, the activities and interests of the other members of the family tend to multiply, the magic of the hearth remains unchallenged.

"Undoubtedly it is rooted deep in all human nature, but the mother is the human anchor which holds it fast."

"The odd thing is," says Miss Royden, "that the writer of these words, Mrs. Spring-Rice, seems to regard this tendency, though 'rooted deep in all human nature,' as a vice to be combated." Miss Royden disagrees with this view, thinks women have not got the mass mind, don't want

it, and are much more valuable without it, adding that the remark of a girl in a very "enlightened" factory is worth pondering: "You couldn't call your soul your own, they welfared you to death!" (*—International Women's News*, July, 1942, p. 183.).

This article of Miss Royden's is interesting to me because she sees clearly that the system of factory mass-production wherein the "hands" are welfared to death, has only one logical end—the totalitarian state. The explanation, of course, is simple. The industrial organisations upon which mass production of so many articles depend—from cars to toothpaste—have too much power over the lives of those who work in them, especially in the United States. In the words of Major Douglas they "arrogate to themselves a right of supervision over the private lives and morals of their employees far exceeding that which would have been exercised by a British landowner at any time, or tolerated by their tenants, and this is accompanied by a close-knit organisation for card-indexing every applicant for employment, and penalising by unemployment and starvation anyone daring to rebel against the rules. But we do not hear of organised attack on these things."

Miss Royden thinks one of the first fruits of mass production has been much greater comfort for women, in the form of ready-made clothes, ready-made food, and ready-made gadgets of all sorts, which have enormously raised the standard of comfort in the home. But the end is the totalitarian state! And she asks, "At what point then, are we to stop between the good beginning and the bad end? Frankly, I don't know."

But was it a good beginning? Was it not in reality a step in an entirely wrong direction, which could lead to nothing but misery for men and women too? *Circumspice*. Men do not gather grapes of thorns.

It is a question how far mass-production is not a perverted means that must tend to an undesirable end. We have passed from the steam age to the age of the dynamo, and whether in war or peace, there is available in this country alone, the potential power of at least forty mechanical slaves for every member of the population. Who has decided, and who is still deciding, to what use this power shall be put? Surely no one would maintain that those who live on the products and receive the wages of mass-production have any voice in the matter?

I have not read Miss Pearl S. Buck's *Of Men and Women*, to which Miss Royden also refers. But if it is her considered judgment that mass-production has taken from American women all that gave them value, then I don't think this is very difficult to understand. I should say that it is perfectly possible to keep a whole people in the lap of luxury and to produce at the same time a nation of nervous wrecks by the simple expedient of removing from them all power of choice. At first sight there is a bewildering variety displayed among mass-produced articles. But to the discriminating the "ready-made" reveals itself at a glance, whether in food, clothing or shelter, as a clever mixture of the shoddy and the showy, with a dash of the Corner House thrown in. "We give the public what it wants," used to be the cry, "for nothing else will sell." This sounds very well; but it must be remembered that the choice is strictly limited by the power of the purse strings. Impress well upon a woman's mind that correctly hand-made shoes are not for her, and that she can buy a smart mass-produced article

just as good at a quarter of the price, and she will cease to consider the matter. Yet expressed in terms of human satisfaction, is there the slightest doubt that three pairs of bespoke shoes outvalue and outlast at least ten pairs of the mass-produced variety, and give infinitely more satisfaction to the man who makes them? Mass production is, as at present practised, a colossal sabotage of the fruits of the earth. Major Douglas has spoken with horror of the "egg-factories." Mass production means the same process applied to the whole of our lives—bed, board and clothing. Applied to food, it simply means that we shall feed. As Miss Royden has so justly remarked, "Pigs feed, and cattle."

If what Miss Buck says is true, that American women are the unhappiest in the world, that their lives are empty and frustrated because their homes are flooded with ready-made clothes, food, and gadgets, and that as a result they have nothing whatever to do, and simply pretend to be busy all day long, I should say it was time the American people inquired whose policy is being implemented by the forty mechanical slaves. And whose policy sets the fashion, which, as everyone knows, is not a mere question of the design of a frock, but a whole way of life, from dawn to dark.

When all is said and done, the feel of the carpenter for the wood, of the violinist for the bow on the string, of the cook for the butter and sugar in the bowl are only different aspects of the same thing, and to pretend that one is 'higher' or 'lower' than another is poisonous nonsense. What is more, every man and woman has a right to the free expansion of individuality; and I find it impossible to believe that a satisfactory life can be lived without material contact with reality through the *hands*. This is the problem before the American people, and before us too, in a lesser degree; but it will not be solved until those who work in the factories are in a position to choose whether they will or will not take part in whatever project may be set before them.

Strangely enough, it is usually those who are most anxious to set the whole population to work who also assert that mass production is the only way to feed the enormous populations of the modern world, or provide them with clothing. They leave out of account the hundreds of thousands of people who are sick to death of making little marks on pieces of paper, and who from every point of view except that of obscurantist financiers, are completely and criminally wasting their time.

"The common factor of the whole situation lies in the simple fact that at any given period the material requirements of the individual are quite definitely limited—that any attempt to expand them artificially is an interference with the plain trend of evolution, which is to subordinate material to mental and psychological necessity; and that the impulse behind unbridled industrialism is not progressive but reactionary, because its objective is an obsolete financial control which forms one of the most effective instruments of the will-to-power, whereas the correct objectives of industry are twofold; the removal of material limitations, and the satisfaction of the creative impulse." (*—Economic Democracy*, p. 73.).

That women are perfectly capable of deciding for themselves how best to use the power of the forty slaves I have not the least doubt, but, again, a pre-requisite is ability to choose whether they will or will not assist in whatever project may be set before them.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 9. No. 21.

Saturday, January 30, 1943.

The Point of Impact

One of the outstanding characteristics of current propaganda is the vicious unanimity with which ideas which underlie social credit are perverted by publicists, in the endeavour to develop their dynamic content to establish bureaucratic socialism. The dividend, the compensated price, economic democracy, poverty in plenty, local objectives, etc.; each has been befouled by one or other of our 'leading' economists or politicians. In the circumstances which now obtain, all such phases are out of the centre line towards our objective, and beneath the obvious intention to mislead there is another idea, which is to use up our energies in countering these futile commentaries. What can be learned from these attacks is that "one at least of the key words leading to an understanding of the conscious Evil Forces in the world, is 'perversion.'" What can be done about it is to refuse to be drawn off in disputation on points which are out of focus; and to *take the initiative* along a line which will cut through this tangle of purposeful beguilement directly towards the restoration to the individual of the control of his own affairs. Then only will those factors assume a central importance.

Events since 1939 have led to a situation when action by those who understand how to act on these lines may have decisive results; it is certain that without it we are all hell-bound for the Police State.

Notice was given in September, 1941 that all existing affiliations would cease as from December 31 of that year, and at the same time opportunity was given to all who wished to work in association with the Secretariat to re-establish (or to newly establish) their connection. This overhaul has resulted in the self selection of some thirty or forty associations and groups in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and South Africa. These groups have agreed to work to the line of action (strategy) counselled by Major Douglas, and to that end receive advice.

The same opportunity is open to all; and the information for the selection or rejection of this alternative is provided in:—

(a) *The Social Crediter*, for the broad outline of policy and strategy.

*(b) Article entitled *Matterhorn* (published September 13, 1941) for indication of the relationship which should exist between Groups and the Secretariat.

(c) Periodic notice setting out terms; which was re-published in issue of January 16.

*(d) Paper (O3) which contains more specific information as to strategy.

It is easy to imagine that the preliminary to action is the preparation of a programme covering all points concerning the body politic, followed by publicity, conferences and conventions to gain adherents. But effective action can only be taken in respect of specific objectives—one at a time with some regard to what comes first according to the strategy adopted. A manifesto—any manifesto—is in the nature of a safety valve whereby energy is dissipated. To change the sequence of events it is necessary to concentrate upon some objective and to gain it.

All are members of society as it exists and can most effectively play their part in that capacity, and not as a sect of people who hold peculiar ideas. This has been well exemplified in action recently taken by members of the Paint Trade (in England) which resulted in the abandonment of the Plan for concentration: and (in Australia) that taken by business men resulting in the cancellation of the proposal to limit all profits to four per cent. It is to be noted that both these suggestions were those of an irresponsible bureaucracy set upon the realisation of socialist-derived abstractions, and neglectful of the disastrous effects of such policies upon, for example, the prosecution of the war.

The social creditor who understands the contents of the Liverpool speech is in a position to aid fellow members of the public to transform nebulous desires into accomplished results. Therein is boundless scope for individual initiative.

H. E.

M.P. and Intimidation by Bureaucrats

Mr. J. H. Wootton-Davies, Conservative M.P., for Heywood and Radcliffe, in a letter to his constituents, alleges intimidation of voters by Ministry officials.

In asking his constituents to write to him freely, the member says:—

"This privilege of yours is too precious to let go lightly, and is one that you should guard. I am not going to be intimidated by anyone. And I certainly won't let you be intimidated.

"You are entitled to put complaints or suggestions before your member. Do not let any official attempt to rob you of your privileges. And, if anyone does, let me know, and I will deal with him."

In conversation with a newspaper representative, Mr. Wootton-Davies said constituents had told him that following his contacting the local office of a Ministry, an official visited them and asked questions to the effect of "Why have you written to your member? You do do yourself no good."

He went on: "If people are not to write to their M.P., who else are they to write to? This is still a free country, and I intend to guard the rights of citizens zealously."

If there were any more complaints of interference by Ministry officials he would most certainly raise the matter in the House on the question of privilege.

*Copies available to those considering this proposition.

A Parliamentary Appointment

(IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ON JANUARY 20, 1943.)

The Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Attlee): I beg to move, "That Colonel the Right Hon. Douglas Clifton Brown be the Chairman of Ways and Means and that Major James Milner be the Deputy-Chairman."

Both these hon. and gallant Members have had experience in the Chair. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Hexham (Colonel Brown) has now served as Deputy-Chairman for five years, and my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for South East Leeds (Major Milner) has been invited by Mr. Speaker every year since 1935 to serve as Chairman of the Panel and has served as Temporary Chairman of Committees throughout that period.

Mr. Austin Hopkinson (Mossley): I beg to move, the previous Question, "That the previous Question be not now put."

That is a somewhat old Motion, which is not, I believe, generally used in the House, but I understand, subject to your Ruling, Sir, that it is perfectly in Order on this occasion. I make this Question because, being an independent Member of the House, for many years unattached in any way to any party...—I have to fight all parties in my constituency—and not connected with any outside interest paying my expenses, it is incumbent upon me in a case of this sort to speak what appears to be the opinion of a very large section of the House, not of one party, but of all parties. The procedure in these appointments has always been as at present, but in the present instance a new factor comes in, and that is the composition of the Government, which is now a Coalition. It is an extraordinary thing that the majority party has no proper means of making its will felt *vis-à-vis* the Government. That is an unfortunate state of things and gives rise to a great deal of trouble in the procedure of the House in such a case as we have before us.

We see in *The Times* this morning that it is proposed that a certain Member of this House shall be the Deputy Chairman of Committees. No sort of official intimation of any kind has been given to the various sections of Members of the House. The only means by which the majority of the House, that is, the Conservative Members, can now be properly approached is through the 1922 Committee, and I have ascertained, though the chairman is absent owing to ill-health, from leading members of that Committee that this name has never been submitted to them for their consideration or approval. I have also ascertained that another party in the House has never had the name submitted to it. Therefore, those who are responsible for putting forward the name have not had the ordinary courtesy to ascertain whether it is the name of a gentleman who is *persona grata* to the bulk of the House. That is a very important thing, because, as you, Sir, are only too well aware, it is essential that the occupant of the Chair should carry with him the good will and respect and, as has happened many times in the past, the affection of the bulk of the Members. It is not a question whether the fact of that gentleman being *persona grata* or the opposite can be attributed to any particular reason. There was a certain Dr. Fell, of whom it was written—

"I do not like you, Dr. Fell,
The reason why I cannot tell,
But this I know, and know full well,
I do not like you Dr. Fell."

Where a post of this sort has to be filled everyone, even those who do not agree with me on this point, will admit that the proceedings of this House, both in the House and in Committee, are very much conditioned by the personality of the occupant of the Chair, and it is very difficult for any man to occupy the Chair satisfactorily if there is a feeling in his own mind and in the minds of the House that he is not *persona grata*. I understand that the appointment of the Deputy Chairman is merely permissive. The House is under no obligation to appoint a Deputy Chairman at all, and it cannot be said that about three minutes' notice is enough. Therefore, I appeal to the Deputy Prime Minister to separate this Motion, or at any rate to withdraw it with a view to separating it, and give the House some opportunity of understanding the position and privately expressing their opinion.

There has been a tendency which you, Sir, must have marked, as other Members have, to override the Privileges of the House. This seems to me to be a case where the House would be well advised, to use a vulgarism, to dig its toes in and show the Government that it is not the autocrat of this country but that the House of Commons must be consulted in these matters. Hence I do not see any reason why the Deputy Prime Minister should not accept my previous Question. I have had considerable discussion with him for many weeks upon the point [HON. MEMBERS: "Oh!"] No official communication has been sent me or anyone else except the Labour Party, and the other parties have not been consulted, but it is one of the duties of Members of the House to find out what is being done. When it came to my knowledge that this proposal was going to be made, I took appropriate steps, in private, to see if I could avoid this difficulty from coming before the House. I was disappointed. I did not effect my object, and the result is that I am obliged to bring forward this Motion, that this particular proposal be not put to the question now but be deferred until the House has had an opportunity of considering the matter and until there has been an opportunity of consulting the party which is in the majority.

We know perfectly well what is happening and that this is part of what is called the "spoils system." There is public money going, and the system, as in all Coalitions, is that first one party has its hands in the till and then another. It is bringing Parliament into contempt and will bring it more and more into contempt if the country sees this bargaining between side and side as to who shall get the jobs. If this is allowed to go through, the whole status of Parliament will be irretrievably lowered, and the enemies of this Constitution, whether of the extreme right or the extreme left, would rejoice to see Parliament giving up its Privileges and being lowered in the estimation of the people of the country.

Mr. Arthur Greenwood (Wakefield) rose—

Mr. Speaker: The Amendment needs a seconder. Is any Member prepared to second it?

Captain Cobb (Preston): I beg to second the Amendment.

Mr. Greenwood: We have listened to what I regard as the most mischievous speech which I have heard since I became a Member of this House. . . . It has been suggested or implied that my party has been consulted. Sir, that is

untrue. [*Interruption.*] I hope that hon. Members will take my word. I have personal friends in the Conservative Party who will take my word.

Commander Agnew (Camborne): I think my interjection was misunderstood. What I meant to say was, Was the right hon. Gentleman going to lie down under a system whereby his party, the second largest in the House, was not consulted on a matter of this kind? We think it ought to have been.

Sir Percy Harris (Bethnal Green, South West): ... As far as I am concerned, I feel that this appointment has been rushed. The first intimation I had of the resignation of my right hon. Friend the Member for Watford (Sir Dennis Herbert) from the position of Chairman of Ways and Means was at about quarter past 11 yesterday morning. It may be that the Government were not advised in the Recess that the right hon. Gentleman had decided to relinquish his appointment. At any rate, I do think that in this purely House of Commons matter, in which the House of Commons should have a say and has always had some say in the selection, the House should have had time to think who should occupy this very important post. My view, for what it is worth, is that with the composition of this House of Commons it is a good idea to divide these posts between two parties; one should be in the hands of the Conservative Party and one should be in the hands of the Labour Party. So far as I am concerned, I have found both these gentlemen efficient and impartial in the Chair, and I would be quite willing to sit under their Chairmanship when we go into Committee, but I think it would have been advisable, and it might have terminated a good deal of this discussion, if we had had a few days to think over this matter, if the Government had advised my friends below the Gangway, my friends opposite, and even a few of the Independent Members, and so prevented a good deal of waste of time.

Mr. Lipson (Cheltenham): On a point of Order. May I ask for your guidance, Mr. Speaker? Will you tell hon. Members of the House who have not been here sufficiently long to know the facts whether this is a Government or a House of Commons appointment?

Mr. Speaker: It is a House of Commons appointment.

Mr. Attlee: The Government have not departed from precedent in any way in this matter. These appointments are always made on the nomination of the Government. When new Governments are formed, one of the first things, when the House meets, when the Sessional Orders have been arranged, is the appointment of a Chairman of Ways and Means and a Deputy-Chairman.

Mr. Hopkinson: The right hon. Gentleman says that this is done on the Motion of the Government. Quite right, but in normal circumstances the Government represent a majority of the House of Commons. In a Coalition the case is completely different.

Commander Sir Archibald Southby (Epsom): I have no complaint whatever to make as regards either of the names submitted. Indeed, I think that in common with most Members of this House my view would be that the services in the Chair of the hon. and gallant Member for South-East Leeds (Major Milner) have met with universal approval. What I do complain about is that this essentially

House of Commons matter should have been put suddenly before the House without the House of Commons as a whole having an opportunity to consider the names which were to be submitted to them. It is most unfortunate that this Debate should have taken place, and it will not help either of the hon. and gallant Members when they come to fulfil their task in the Chair. It seems to me quite essential that whoever occupies that Chair should be *persona grata* with everybody in the House, and that therefore the Members of the House of Commons should be consulted by the Government in any way that is possible before a name is finally submitted to them. I must say that I think that had soundings been taken relative to the proposals which the Government were going to put forward, we should not have had this Debate. It is a House of Commons appointment, not a Government appointment. The House is selecting someone to sit in the Chair and rule over it during its Debates. There is no question of personalities, and personalities would not have come into it had some consideration been shown by the Government to all parties in the House before they brought the matter forward.

Earl Winterton (Horsham and Worthing): ... The hon. Member below the Gangway has made a speech which I can only describe as malicious. ...

Mr. A. Bevan (Ebbw Vale): ... I have on a number of occasions tried to assert the rights of the House against the Executive, but I am bound to say that hon. Members' arguments to-day leave me dumbfounded. ...

Commander Agnew: I want to make it clear at the outset that I have no objection whatever to either of the two hon. and gallant Members who have been nominated to fill these offices. My objection is as to the method in which it has been done, as, differing from Crown appointments, these are House of Commons appointments. I feel that in future the procedure ought to be—and I say it with all respect to the traditions of this House—that the Patronage Secretary and two or three colleagues in a Coalition Government should put down, some days in advance, a Motion on the Order Paper of the House of Commons. If any groups of hon. Members or parties in the House wish to discuss the matter, they can do so in their private meetings, and if any of the persons so nominated are likely to be *persona non grata* to strong bodies of opinion, then, of course, the usual representations could be made through the usual channels. I believe that if this suggestion were adopted in future, it would entirely remove the objection to the procedure in respect of persons whose nominations have been brought forward to-day.

Mr. Muff (Kingston-upon-Hull, East): ... I hope that we in this honourable House will ... repudiate the Amendment standing in the name of the very independent Member for Mossley.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Eden): ... There has obviously been some quite genuine misunderstanding about precedents in this matter. ... I have looked them up carefully, and there is absolutely no precedent for notice being given, or consultation, beforehand. I fully understood my hon. Friend's reason, but it has never, in fact, been done. On every occasion in the last century a Motion has been put down by the Government, and all the precedents I can find—I speak subject to correction—are that on the day when the Chairman of Ways and Means

resigns or retires a new Chairman and Deputy-Chairman are appointed on that day. . . .

Mr Hopkinson: When my right hon. Friend says there is no official notice given, I know for an actual fact, from my own experience, that on every similar occasion the whole thing has been unofficially discussed and the powers that be have obtained the opinion of the House as far as they could before bringing their selection forward. As a matter of fact, the Deputy-Prime Minister told me in conversation that this particular selection had the unanimous support of the Labour Party.

Mr. Stephen (Glasgow, Camlachie): I think part of the trouble has arisen from a confusion between the appointment of Speaker and the appointment of Chairman. With regard to the appointment of Speaker, generally there are joint consultations, but regard to Chairmen private consultations only took place.

Mr. Eden: That is exactly the position. I have been into this with great care. That is the procedure which has always been followed. Almost always appointments have been made on the first day of Parliament, so that consultations would not have been possible. Those are the precedents, and we have followed them absolutely. I do not regard ourselves as being guilty in any way or of being discourteous to the House in a matter of this kind. . . .

Mr. Hopkinson: In view of what my right hon. Friend has said, I beg to ask leave to withdraw the previous Question. I should explain, however, that some of the things said of me during this discussion have been demonstrably untrue, and I should have raised objection to them if it had not meant wasting time. However, in view of what has been said, and because it is now practically impossible to get a large-scale vote of the House, I beg to ask leave to withdraw the Amendment in the hope that, having moved it, it will have done some good.

Previous Question, by leave, withdrawn.
Main Question put, and agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE

Making Democracy Work

*Bristol Ratepayers' Representative League,
21, Bridge Street, Bristol, 1.*

To "*The Social Crediter*,"

For your information:

The attached letter has been sent to the four Bristol M.P.s together with a copy of the Members' Declaration of Policy (copy enclosed).

N. CORRADINE, Hon. Secretary.

January 22, 1943.

[Attached letter from the same address:—]

*A. G. Walkden, Esq., J.P., M.P.,
House of Commons.*

Dear Mr. Walkden,

As the representative in Parliament for Bristol South

you will doubtless be interested in the work being done by the above League.

The League was founded in the early part of 1942 by an enthusiastic group of citizens at a time when a rate increase of 3/- in the £ was threatened. A successful campaign was organised which prevented this and the League is steadily growing by reason of its appeal to citizens generally. We are not connected with any political party but we are interested in making Democracy work.

Certain fundamental principles have been adopted. We believe that the formation of policy should come from below not above, that is from the citizens themselves rather than from party or association leaders. The policy of any association is, of course, the objectives aimed at, and in deciding these, the citizens must confine themselves to RESULTS WANTED. It is obviously unfair to ask any body of people with inexpert or no knowledge of technique on any particular subject to decide on questions of method, or the technique involved in obtaining certain objectives, although this is the method commonly adopted in politics to-day.

The enclosed Members' Declaration of Policy* has been drafted on this basis and the Programme of the League for 1943 has been compiled from these RESULTS wanted by members. Our representatives on the City Council will undoubtedly welcome a clear mandate from their electors and can then pledge themselves to obtain the results required by their electors, secure in the knowledge that they will have full support in any action they take towards those objectives.

In this way a correct relationship will be established between people and representative, the representative functioning to carry out the declared policy of the people, not the policy of party or outside interests. This is extremely important in view of the present tendency, accentuated by the war, to reduce the powers of representative government almost to zero. Our purpose in writing to you as well as the other Bristol M.P.s is to invite you to welcome a revival of Democracy on these lines in your constituency. We shall appreciate a reply from you at your convenience.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) L. R. WHEATLEY, Chairman.

(Signed) N. CORRADINE, Hon. Secretary.

January 21, 1943.

NOTE

*For reasons of space we are unable to reproduce the Members' Declaration of Policy in full. The opening paragraph runs: "The aim of the above League is to obtain results required by the citizens of Bristol. **THE FIRST RESULT WANTED, NAMELY, 'NO INCREASE IN RATES FOR 1942-43,' HAS BEEN OBTAINED.** What we now want is a list of further results required by the people for which purpose you are asked to fill in the Declaration of Policy overleaf." The implications in democracy of this proceeding are set out, and overleaf space is provided for a list, in order of priority, of results required by the member. — Ed.

Is it a secret "what machinery is in existence for members of the public to make an appeal against arbitrary action taken by the officers" of the Ministry of Works and Planning? To such a question in parliament Mr. Hicks, Parliamentary Private Secretary to that department, answered that if the questioner had any specific action in mind and would let him have particulars, he would *have enquiries made.*

WHOSE CATSPAW?

The Times of January 22 reported that Mr. Joseph E. Davies, former United States Ambassador in Russia, recently disclosed that the Germans in 1940 offered to retire Hitler if by so doing they could make peace with Britain. "This proposal was made to him, he said, by spokesmen for a high Nazi party, and military officials at a special conference in New York arranged by 'certain important civic and business leaders in this country.' However, the condition the Germans made for such a peace was that Germany should keep the dominant place it had achieved by the conquest in Europe, and be permitted to project its 'new order' without interference.

"Mr. Davies said that he was asked to present the proposal to President Roosevelt and the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull. This he refused to do, though he did report it to the State Department. . . . The German representatives, he said, carried credentials 'that were unquestionably *bona fide*, and they were vouched for by some of the finest banking facilities in this country.'" (Our emphasis).

"The German spokesmen told Mr. Davies, he said, that 'in order to make it possible for England to make a peace with other than a Hitler Government they would guarantee that Hitler would be retired and would devote his remaining years to reading and writing as an elder statesman, and that the proposed peace treaty would be signed by a military or other Government whose word Britain could accept.'"

MR. SIEFF AND THE LITTLE MAN

"Mr. M. Sieff, vice-chairman of Marks and Spencer, Limited, is reported to have told the Senate Small Business Committee in Washington that maximum utilisation of Britain's resources for war has been prevented by the 'rugged individualistic British shopkeeper's dislike of Government interference.'

"If Mr. Sieff intended to convey that because of their rugged individualism small and medium retailers have hindered the war effort, his accusation will be treated with derision and scorn.

"It was not shopkeepers of that size who paid big commissions for suppliers' quotas or who bought very large quantities of goods from vendors illegally selling them.

"The public must not be forced into 'chains.' Nazi chaining is quite sufficient."

— Editorial Comment in *The Drapers' Record*, December 26, 1942.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is now in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.

Social Credit Secretariat

LECTURES AND STUDIES SECTION

The next examination by correspondence for the A certificate will be held in March, and will be open to all, whether registered students of the correspondence course or not. Intending candidates should apply to the Liverpool office for an entry form, which must be completed and returned not later than February 15.

Copies of earlier question papers may be obtained from Liverpool on receipt of a stamped addressed envelope.

B. M. PALMER, *Director*.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Warning Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
The Big Idea	2/6
The Tragedy of Human Effort	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy	7d.
The Use of Money	6d.
"This 'American' Business"	3d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	(<i>out of print</i>)
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee	9d.

Leaflets

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

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

Information about Social Credit activities in different regions may be had by writing to the following addresses:

BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.

BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 73 Manor Rd., Blackpool.

BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.

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

CARDIFF S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 8, Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.

DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.

LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.

LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.

SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.