

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 6. No. 1.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 15, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

OUR 7-50 A.M. BLETHER: "Education" is derived from a Latin word meaning "Nourishment." (*B.B.C Morning Sermon, March 3, 1941*).

Now then, Smith Minor, take 50 lines for translating "educu," "I draw, or lead, out."

"Priestley is only one of the many proofs which the Bosses of the B.B.C. give us of the pink, puce, and rose-madder shades of their political opinions"—MR. J. O. P. BLAND in *Truth*.

"Nationalisation—we welcome it," as Mr. Montagu Norman, of the Bank of England, which helped to build up Hitler's National Socialist Germany, said. Practically all the appointments to the B.B.C. were made or approved by Mr. Ronald Collett Norman, younger brother of Mr. Montagu Norman.

From a letter in reply to one which stated, "I love dogs, but they eat food which ought to go to the children, and should be destroyed. All dog licences should be raised at once to £5."—

"It is harrowing to think of all the starving children, who, because of dogs, are deprived of their customary supplies of horse-flesh."

"Why can't these people say 'I loathe dogs, and see in existing circumstances a good opportunity of bringing about their extermination' instead of blowing off all this super-patriot humbug."—*Dundee Courier*.

No, Clarence, this method is *never* used in political circles to stampede the electorate. It was only used by Whigs, and there are no Whigs nowadays.

The Chief Commissioner (Kominissar) for Scotland was Mr. Thomas Johnston, whose main defect was that he was making a slow and difficult re-

covery from a severe attack of Socialism in his early youth. He has been succeeded in the office by the Earl of Rosebery, son of Hannah Rothschild, and grandson of Baron Meyer de Rothschild. ("Nationalisation—we welcome it")

Practically every competent authority outside the Civil Service, supports the Duke of Westminster's criticism of the appalling waste involved in the slaughtering and destruction of the carcasses of cattle involved in the official policy with respect to Foot-and-Mouth disease.

The disease is easily curable, and cattle can be immunised from it.

Isn't it about time we had an investigation into the source of some of these curious policies?

So far as we are aware, no-one connected with this paper has the slightest interest, direct or indirect, "sporting", or proprietary, in deer-stalking. On the contrary, as Mr. Punch would say. But the clotted nonsense which is circulated to suggest that deer-"forests" are an instance of the misuse of land by the hated landowner, prompts the publication of the following few simple facts.

Deer flourish on ground which in the main is quite unfit to support other animal life in any quantity. On this ground they produce twice as much potential food as, for instance sheep. They not only require no labour but (for what it is worth) pay many times as much in rates and taxes as would be the result of any other use of the land in existing circumstances. They are shot by unpaid "labour," in nearly every case most humanely, and without preliminary fright. It is very bad form to "risk" a shot at an unwounded deer. A large percentage of the meat is distributed

free and the rest sold at very low prices. Deerstalkers provide the finest body of "practical," as distinct from "competition," rifle shots.

7-59 a.m. "And so, dear friends, the thought for the day is that everything I say is censored by the B.B.C. so that your religion shall conform to the policy of the Bank of 'England'—the greatest moral force in the world, as the great and good Lord Snowden said."

5-59 p.m. "Good-night, children, every whah. There will be a few less of you to-morrow, because the German bombers bought with Bank of 'England' money will be over to-night. But be sure to listen in at the same time to-morrow to the Zoo man talking about This Generation of Vipers."

The only point which is clear about the Russian situation is that the Russians are ejecting their Jews from many of the positions of power and profit. Litvinoff, who married the "English" Jewess, the daughter of Sir Sidney Lowe, has been ditched; Kaganovitch, Stalin's brother-in-law at the moment, has been "warned;" and Madam Molotoff has been dismissed.

As Great Britain and the United

### On Other Pages

THE GREAT PANJANDRUM  
By T. J.

SCHEMING FOR THE  
FUTURE

By B. M. Palmer

THE AUSTRALIAN SCENE

States are regarded as being ruled by Jews, this does not appear to offer much encouragement to the pathetic optimists who expect a miraculous intervention by Russia on the side of "the Democracies."

### 10,000 FORMS FOR ONE CARGO

In a recent speech Sir Arthur Sutherland, President of Newcastle and Gateshead Chamber of Commerce gave an example of the bureaucratic method in the Customs organisation:

In Newcastle they were not greatly troubled by Customs regulations, but he had heard of a ship in another North port in respect of which 3,500 pre-entry forms in triplicate had to be submitted.

**This meant more than 10,000 forms for one ship's cargo.**

He hoped that the authorities in London would see that the trade was not hampered unnecessarily by the filling in of forms.

## Letter to the Editor

Dear Sir,

### BANKERS' EXCUSES

Perhaps your readers should warn the ignorant concerning the endless excuses and red-herrings which bankers' will, from time to time, produce to mislead them and put them off the scent.

The latest, from the 1941 annual bank reports, is by way of being a gem for the collector! Bankers are suggesting, for sooth, that the creating and issuing of costless credit (money) is really a costly proceeding, because the dreadful stuff will insist on immediately returning to the banks (for feeding and grooming we presume! !).

So the bankers charge enormously for issuing *costless money out of nothing* in order to pay them for the cost of keeping customers' accounts (and then some!). It is as though a restaurant charged 6/- for a glass of water (to make their patrons think it was wine).

Not that the bankers' excuse holds water when examined. True, the customers accounts do increase, and so cost more to keep, when the banks issue costless money, but if the bankers' plea of account keeping costs were true they should then cancel the loan charges when, by withdrawing and cancelling out of existence the extra money they created,

their thus impoverished customers' accounts are drastically cut down: but they do *not* cut down loan charges. We have been steadily paying £300,000,000 per annum on the 1914-18 war debt which is nearly all held by the banks.

Bankers have very definite reasons for putting costs of customers accounts onto the costless issuing of extra money. By so doing:—

(a) They can get away with a much higher charge.

(b) They can continue the charge indefinitely even when they impoverish their customers and so reduce the cost of account keeping.

(c) They can (by indirect taxation) recover the charge from the poor who have no bank accounts at all.

(d) They can make such high charges on overdrafts when their customers are in financial difficulties that many people are ruined who might otherwise survive, thus increasing the power of the banks by increasing the spread of poverty.

(e) They can ruin the poorer sections of the community more speedily than they could if they spread the costs evenly over all the accounts including those of the well-to-do people where the charges would weigh less heavily.

(f) They can get more powerful control over industry. But they hid these reasons by suggesting for years past that it was the issuing of credit itself that was costly. Now they can no longer keep up that lie, their wriggles and squirms are giving away quite a number of their little secrets!

International finance will even suggest to the unwary (through the finance-controlled press and radio) that freedom is not a thing to be desired! That is not the opinion of great men, past or present:

"Countries are well cultivated, not as they are fertile, but as they are free."  
—MONTESQUIEU.

"Freedom and slavery, the one is the name of virtue, the other of vice."  
—EPICTETUS.

"Freedom is not caprice."  
—C. A. BARTOL.

"Freedom is the eternal youth of nations."  
—GENERAL FOY.

"The only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of this, or

impede their efforts to obtain it."

—J. S. MILL

Great men warn us to realise our lack of freedom:

"No one is more a slave than he who considers himself free without being so."  
—GOETHE.

They tell us how to become free: "He who thinks for himself, and imitates rarely, is a free man."  
—KLOPSTOCK.

"He is the free man whom the truth makes free, and all are slaves besides."  
—COWPER.

Urge us to gain our own freedom: "Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow."  
—BYRON.

And exhort us to be worthy of freedom:

"In the godlike only has man strength and freedom."  
—CARLYLE.

"No man is free who cannot command himself."  
—PYTHAGORAS.

Yours, etc.,

A. E. L.

March 6, 1941.

### COMRADE FORD

It seems that moral Mr. Henry Ford, United States citizen, has come to the same conclusion as M. Stalin of Russia:

"Keep Britain and the Axis fighting until both sides collapse," he was reported to have said on February 16.

"There is no righteousness in either cause," he added. "Both are motivated by greed.

"If we can keep both sides fighting long enough—until they cannot fight any more—then maybe the little people will see they have been dupes of this international clique of greed who have tricked them into war.

"We should give them the tools to keep them fighting until they both collapse, then help them make a just peace."

It was just before the signing of the Russo-German trade pact that Stalin said:—

"... Our aim, therefore, is that Germany should be able to conduct the war for the longest possible time in order that Britain and France should become so exhausted as no longer to be able to crush Germany."

When the belligerents were exhausted Russia's chance would come.

## Conservatives and Democracy

Recently the Labour *Daily Herald* commended Mr. Duff Cooper warmly for defending the Party System when addressing a meeting of a Conservative Association. An article in *Truth* of February 28, calling attention to this happening, contains some interesting comments which may reflect a promising development of thought, and we may hope action, among the younger generation of Conservatives:—

"It is almost certainly true that if the party system is to survive, it will have to reform itself very drastically. In the scandalous years that began about

1906 to 1911, Hilaire Belloc and Cecil Chesterton changed men's minds for ever in regard to it..."

"...party leaders once installed have a power, tantamount almost to veto, over those who shall be returned to their support, Parliament after Parliament. In other words, it is not the electorate which freely chooses a representative: the electorate in practice only chooses between a candidate approved by the agents of one set of party leaders and a candidate approved by the leaders of the opposing party, or parties."

"...If this method, or something very like it, is the only method of selecting representatives, of what is Parliament representative? Certainly not the constituencies.

"The major fault is, obviously, with the constituencies themselves. If in any local community there were sufficient number of men and women sufficiently interested in the pursuit of a particular policy, or group of policies, to give adequate time and money to a local association, that association could not only select a suitable candidate and finance him—it could do far more, it could select sound men and women and, in the slang of Hollywood, it could groom them into candidates..."

"It is, indeed, possible that a great renaissance of political feeling in the constituencies may some day result in the

creation of such strongly manned and strongly financed local bodies. An outburst of unauthorised programmes supported by a band of unauthorised candidates may startle, and even disrupt, both the selection committee of the National Union and the executive body of Central Office."

*The Press Ban on Parliament* contains a reasoned criticism of the Party System and shows clearly what is required to make democracy a reality. It is just the book to get into the hands of those dissatisfied with the present party system. Help to increase the circulation of this book.

### TANKS

"Probably the world's greatest expert on tanks," General de Gaulle some years before the war sold his design for a heavy tank to the vast French armaments ring, the *Comité des Forges*.

"This Ring had, and probably still has, a working agreement with Krupps, corresponding arms Ring in Germany. As the French authorities were not particularly impressed with the need for tanks, the *Comité des Forges* thought nothing of selling Krupps the right to make the De Gaulle tank under licence.

"Krupps made the tanks which rolled like a cataclysm over France. The *Comité* sat back and received its royalties."

—"News Review," March 6, 1941, from "Rats!" (*Gollancz*).

### THE PRESS BAN ON PARLIAMENT

Compiled and edited by  
JOHN MITCHELL

(includes as a separate section:  
What 'Capital Levy' Means to You  
by C. H. DOUGLAS)

PRICE 1/6 net.

(Postage on single copies 2½d. extra.)

from—

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,  
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

## DIARY OF EVENTS

MAR. 5—Total British casualties since offensive in Italian Somaliland, 205; prisoners taken, 10,000. R.A.F. made big daylight raid on Northern France.

Great Britain broke off diplomatic relations with Bulgaria. Mr. Eden and Sir John Dill left Athens after concluding talks with Greek leaders. (Mr. Eden also met Mr. Ronald Campbell, British Minister to Jugoslavia.) General Weygand arrived in Vichy.

MAR. 6—British Navy raided Lofoten Island, in Norway, destroying German objectives including cod liver oil factories, bringing back many Norwegian volunteers for patriot army in England.

British Government asked for clear statement of Jugoslavian aims.

MAR. 8—Lease and Lend Bill passed Senate in America. German air-raid on London.

MAR. 9—All ship-building trade to be in control of Admiralty; 480 ships built for Navy in last year. Mr. Bevin asked for more workers in ship-building

trades, and for more women for munition works.

MAR. 10—R.A.F. attacked Boulogne. Greeks have been advancing slowly through mountainous country.

Seven (equals record) German planes shot down over Britain in night raids, which concentrated on Portsmouth.

Darlan threatened to convoy French merchant ships if British continued to sink them. Persistent rumours that Germany will begin construction of factories in Russia, supplying capitals, engineers and equipment and taking 75 per cent. of output; Russia will take 25 per cent. output, supply labour and raw materials, and after the war factories and equipment will become Soviet property. New dock-labour system in operation in Liverpool: dockers employed by state at minimum wage of 82s. 6d. with overtime, instead of piece-work.

Mr. Eden and Sir John Dill, back in Egypt, saw British High Command and General Smuts.

MAR. 11—Lease and Lend Bill passed House of Representatives in U.S.A. General Weygand returned to Algiers.

## THE AUSTRALIAN SCENE

The columnist of the *Daily Herald* says that Mr. R. G. Menzies, the Prime Minister of Australia who is now on a visit to this country, can out-talk Mr. Churchill in one of those conversations that last until 3 o'clock in the morning.

"I can stand it," he boasted to an Australian friend on Friday. "Each time that I have sat up with him. . . . I was not the one to suggest bed."

In Australia Mr. Menzies and his Government are in a potentially strong position without knowing it. In the last general election votes were so cast as to give him the smallest possible majority. In the present Federal Parliament the balance of power is virtually held by Mr. Alexander Wilson, M.H.R., Independent County Member for Wimmera, Victoria. Mr. Wilson has spoken at many meetings for monetary reform. In a statement issued at Canberra he put forward his ideas:

"I believe in the complete independence of the Country Party, and that its real mission is to maintain the position of the centre party, with a popular policy, neither containing the extreme of absolute socialism, nor the rigid conservatism of capitalism.

"I believe that control of banking should be the absolute prerogative of the Government, which should control all forms of credit in the interests of the nation.

"I believe in many social reforms.

"I am anxious to see a vigorous all-in war effort, and preparations now begun for a post-war reconstruction, and for the assimilation of the large numbers of British people who, it is expected, will wish to come here after the war.

"I am appalled at the tremendous burden of taxation to be imposed in the new Budget, which must have a paralysing and deflationary effect on many sections. . . .

"I believe the present proposals of the Government for dealing with wheat do not go far enough. The Government has not given any effective present aid to the industry. The stabilisation proposals mean little to the financially oppressed wheat farmer.

"I believe the £2,700,000 loans to States for drought relief to enable farmers to sow next year's crop will

only constitute a further burden of debt on an already top-heavy structure. . . ."

It will be noted that Mr. Wilson still sticks to his party rather than to his electors, presenting the latter with an agenda rather than receiving one from them; but at least one of the points on it is in line with such policy as has been expressed by his electors.

Mr. Menzies's position is potentially strong for the same reason as it is orthodoxly weak: Australians, perhaps more than any other people except Canadians, are aware of the nature of the forces that are sabotaging both their war and their peace efforts, and are determined to conquer them.

The question of monetary reform is not boycotted in Australia as it has been until recently in England.

### Pressure for Monetary Reform

In a recent number of *The Social Crediter* a debate in the Victorian Parliament on the use of public credit to finance the war was published. This debate attracted much attention in Australia and received fair publicity. More recently a resolution has been passed (by 20 votes to 6) by the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia reaffirming its demand that the Federal Bank should finance the nation without any charge and without inflation. Many members of the assembly were backed by their constituents who had written expressing their wishes in the matter.

The same suggestion has been backed by the founder of the Commonwealth Bank, Mr. King O'Malley, who figures in the following account of an interview with the *Sydney Sunday Sun*:

"This latest Budget—truly it is a most baleful offering," he said—"the producing power of the nation is put forth as a burnt sacrifice to old-fashioned gods. These vast burdens financially cripple the people by reducing their spending power to a minimum. Down with reckless taxation—away with borrowing money—finance the war with the Commonwealth Bank," exclaimed 'The King.'

"The hand of the picturesque ex-Minister reminiscently stroked his trimly bearded chin.

"The Commonwealth Bank has power to issue national credit in the form

of fiduciary notes or else credits on the ledgers of the bank's books. If I were Treasurer to-day I would not ask people for one sou more than before the war started and I would issue notes or credit to cover the rest. . . ."

"I tell you what it is," he said earnestly, "Brother Menzies is a very cautious Australian Scot. He wants to make sure before he takes to the financial river that he can swim across. But the old cry of "Tax 'em," is no good now. The war is likely to go on. What about the next Budget and the one after that?"

Another indication of the trend of public opinion is the attitude of the newspapers. The *Sydney Sunday Sun* has published a series of articles criticising the efficiency of Australia's war-effort, and pointing out that full production cannot be expected without an alteration of financial policy:

"As the price of liberty, are we to suffer, sweat, and if need be, deny ourselves many things we may now regard as essentials. . . .?"

"We are prepared to do anything which is necessary to preserve our liberty.

"But we fear that the Federal Treasurer was merely preparing us for shocks, many of which will be due not so much to the necessity of preserving our liberty, but to support for a particular financial policy. . . .

"We want to work harder. The question is, to give us the opportunity to work at all.

"We are prepared to deny ourselves even essential things if thereby we help the Empire to win the war.

"But we are not prepared to deny ourselves those things which we can still make ourselves, merely because of a financial policy that will not allow us to make them."

An earlier article, after a brief analysis of the connection between financial policy and the production of goods, concluded:

"In short, we would endeavour scientifically to equate our money volume with our available energy potential."

The paper then ran a sort of Gallup survey, in which readers were asked to make their mark in the appropriate panel opposite the statement "I am in

favour of expanding the money volume," or, "I am opposed to expanding the money volume." As this is to say the least a misleading presentation of a technical point (for there is no doubt at all that the 'money volume' of Australia is already expanding rapidly and with extensive profit to the bankers), no useful purpose could be served by collecting a majority opinion on it. The articles preceding the survey had them-

selves pointed out that what Australians wanted were certain definite and recognisable improvements in the war effort, both in the matter of increased output and in a bettering of their own condition; and that since this was prevented only by the financial system of the country, then the latter would have to be changed.

It is generally held that Mr. Menzies's Government will be forced at no very distant date into making some

official move towards financing the war by unorthodox methods. The Australians' safeguard against being put off with any monetary 'reform' (and particularly an unsound one), instead of *that reform which produces the results they want*, lies in holding hard to a clear conception of the recognisable results (not a specific monetary method) that they want and they know are possible, and rejecting all reforms that do not produce these results.

## The Money Lenders and the Holy Roman Empire

The following extract is from "Secret Diplomacy" by Thompson and Padover (published in 1937):—

Charles's paternal grandfather, Emperor Maximilian I, was a no less pious person. When his second wife died he decided to remain celibate in order to qualify for the papacy. . . . Alas for his ambitions, Maximilian, having no money to bribe the cardinals, was deprived of sainthood. He pawned his best jewels with the opulent Fuggers to raise sums needed to "refresh the parched throats of the cardinals," but in vain. In the sixteenth century the papal throne cost more than an Emperor could afford to pay.

But ambition was not extinguished in Maximilian. If he himself could not be Pope then his young grandson should be Emperor. The Holy Roman Empire was a mediaeval vestige, without form or unity, a loose congeries of states held together by tradition, a skeleton whose breath had expired in the thirteenth century. The title of Holy Roman Emperor, however, was coveted by every monarch in Europe, for it implied titular supremacy over Christendom.

Unfortunately Maximilian was old and poor and deeply in debt to the Fuggers. Jacob Fugger—"this man is learned and hath gathered such a library of Greek and Latin books as is thought no man else to have"—loaned the impetuous Emperor 2,000 florins, for he had "nothing to eat." Young Charles borrowed 94,000 from the same banking house, promising to pay after his election; but his grandfather informed him that at least 450,000 would be necessary to buy the Electors.

The Habsburgs, however, reckoned without their French enemy, for King Francis I maliciously entered the market

as competitor for the Imperial crown. Francis I was ready, he said, to buy the glittering title even if he had to spend half of his kingdom's annual revenue, which was estimated at 3,000,000 livres. But that was only a boast, for the French King was short of cash and when he asked the Genoese bankers to loan him 80,000 scudi he was politely refused. The Lyons and Antwerp branches of the Florentine bankers likewise rebuffed the French King. Only Francis's rich mother trusted her son by loaning him 100,000 écus, which was insufficient to buy the title.

The Italian and German money-lenders showed greater confidence in the Habsburgs than in the Valois. In January, 1519, the bankers formed a pool, the house of Anton Welser contributing 110,000 florins, the house of Filippo Gualterotti adding 55,000, and two Genoese firms participating with 110,000. The Habsburgs did not get cash but notes payable in Augsburg and Frankfurt, to be liquidated after Charles's election. The notes were deposited in the safety-boxes of Jacob Fugger.

The French king asked Fugger for a loan of 300,000 écus, but the Augsburg banker thought it better to refuse, wishing he said, to remain a "good and faithful subject of our king and lord." If the bankers would not trust the French King there was little likelihood that the Electors would. Nevertheless, King Francis offered the Electors double the price the Habsburgs were willing to pay. The Electors were practical business men; although they did not take the French King's offer seriously they increased their demands on Charles who was furious at the hold up.

By March the price of the crown had risen to 850,000 florins and the Habsburgs had to borrow another 543,000

florins from the Fuggers, 143,000 from the Welsers, and 165,000 from the Italians. The seven Electors were paid at the moment they handed in their votes, about 100,000 florins per Elector. Councillors, princes, nobles, and servants all shared in the loot. The Swabian League and the hero Franz von Sickingen received no less than 171,000 florins. The Imperial cities, members of the supreme court, the Swiss Guard, the deputies, all received good Rhenish gulden. Finally Emperor Charles V had to borrow 125,000 pounds at Antwerp to celebrate his pompous coronation at Aachen.

### BANKERS

"Bankers are like people who lend you an umbrella and demand it back as soon as it rains."—*Defendant in Chancery suit brought by a bank, reported in the "Daily Mirror."*

### BEWARE OF FEDERAL UNION

By R. L. NORTHRIDGE

(which was published in *The Social Crediter* of March 8 as "The Centralisation of Power") has been reprinted in leaflet form.

PRICES: 25 for 1/-; 50 for 1/9.

Obtainable from:

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

## 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.

Vol. 6. No. 1.

#### Business Office:

12, LORD STREET,  
LIVERPOOL, 2.  
Telephone: Bank 5260.

Saturday, March 15, 1941.

## THE GREAT PANJANDRUM

Churchill and Bernard Shaw scratching each other's back in the *Sunday Dispatch* are all to the good: "Nuncle Lear, nuncle Lear, tarry; take the fool with thee!"

Churchill in the House of Commons not so good: an instance of the amazing effrontery of elected persons.

"It is none of our business to declare what constituencies think and wish," he said.

Then what is 'our business?' The business of the elector is to elect the Panjandrum? And the business of the Panjandrum is to get himself elected by the elector? In whose interest? The history of parliamentary institutions is the history of the thwarting of public demand that the correct answer be imposed upon unwilling legislatures concerning the question of their function.

As each group of electors in turn has come in sight of formulating the correct answer it has been swamped by a larger group of political innocents. The trick is called "broadening the franchise." The fact that it cannot be further "broadened" without absurdity may be one of the reasons for the world war. Was the "flapper vote," then, in sight of a solution of the riddle of parliament? Yes it was: it was in sight of the Electoral Campaign for the Abolition of Poverty: a campaign which gathered more reprobation inside as well as outside the Social Credit movement than anything ever undertaken on the advice of Major Douglas. Why? Because it was dynamic and led to a certain and inescapable conclusion, not merely to a conclusion in logic or (as Plato would have said) "in heaven."

Smuts, Stamp, Roosevelt, Baldwin, Churchill have all urged solutions "in heaven"—the *ultimate* victory of Church-

ill, the "creative freedom" of Smuts, the infinity of progressive dispossession of Stamp and Roosevelt.

The decision rests with the people—free or servile?

T. J.

### EXPERT

Mr. A. J. Cummings, in an article in the *News Chronicle* on Professor F. A. Lindemann, Mr. Churchill's "chief personal consultant in all scientific matters relating to the war," mentions the reports that Mr. Churchill "received assistance from the same source in the vetting of his speeches as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Possibly Mr. Churchill saw no good reason why a brilliant physicist should not also be a sound economist. Possibly Professor Lindemann is, in fact, a sound economist."

No-one who surveys the results of the economic policy introduced in the nineteen twenties by Mr. Baldwin's government (in which Mr. Churchill was Chancellor of the Exchequer) can avoid the conclusion that it was that policy which made the present war a certainty: Great Britain was forced back on to the Gold Standard, unemployment increased, and the number of bankruptcies and suicides shot up. (Mr. Churchill also increased the Death Duties.)

A 'sound' economist—?

### LAVAL & CO.

Miss Clare Booth who 'did' war-time Europe at a series of politician-ridden parties, describes, in the resulting book, a clique of French-Jewish politicians:—

"Bespectacled, big-nosed Blum;

hard, dark, white-tied Laval; egg-shar near-sighted Sarraut, whose stomach so high and vast that his belt, Humpty-Dumpty, seems also to be his collar; slick-haired Banker Bonnet; and smooth, fat-faced Mandel, so often called the Disraeli of France but much more like a male impersonator of Queen Victoria."

## FLOWING TIDE IN ALBERTA

The Social Credit candidate was returned with a majority four times as great as in the previous election in the first bye-election for the Alberta Legislature since the Commission on the Rowell-Sirois report on Dominion-Provincial relations. The election was fought primarily on that issue.

## MR. LOW ON BARTER

Commenting further on the new expansion of the Treasury Branch System in Alberta, Mr. Solon Low, Provincial Treasurer, said recently:

"The right to barter, which is indisputable right of every Canadian citizen, is the basis for the new arrangement which...will provide the people with a scientific system of barter. Trade claims for trade-marked Alberta-made goods may pass by voucher from consumers to retail stores and thence to wholesalers, manufacturers and producers who can pass them on to wage earners who, as consumers, may continue the cycle by purchasing from retail merchants again.

"Production can expand, a higher standard of living can be made available for our people and cash will be released for Canada's war effort according to the extent that the people, themselves, use these barter facilities. As the use of the system grows, it may be possible, through the marketing board, to develop barter agreements with other provinces through which a greater volume of interprovincial trade may be stimulated."

First signs of opposition to the scheme come from the Chairman of the legislative committee of the Calgary board of trade. Ignoring Albertans' previous experience of the Treasury Branch system, he asserted that the expansion of it would ruin private business and the "economic structure on which it depends."

# SCHEMING FOR THE FUTURE

By B. M. PALMER

Lord Reith, Minister of Works and Buildings, made the following statement in the House of Lords, "I am authorised in the preparatory work to proceed on certain assumptions:—That the principle of planning will be accepted as national policy and that some central planning authority will be required; that this authority will proceed on a positive policy for such matters as agriculture, industrial development and transport; that some services will require treatment on a national basis, some regionally and some locally . . ."

We may put this extract from his speech side by side with these words from C. H. Douglas,\*

"The attraction which the idea of 'Planning' has for many wholly well-intentioned people, is due in a considerable degree to the confusion in their minds between tactics and strategy. If you have decided to build a house, which is a strategy, you quite properly draw a plan for it, which is tactics. *The essential nature of a plan is that it is a means, not an end.* And a plan, as such, is static, and quite foreign in nature to an organic growth, such as Society. Similarly, if you have decided to conquer the world, you make a succession of plans, the *object* of which is Strategical. The plans in themselves are tactical. But to anyone familiar with warfare, an observation of a number of tactical plans will reveal the grand strategy. In short, a plan pre-supposes an objective *which has already been decided.*"

The word "plan" is certainly not used by Lord Reith in the sense in which it is used by an architect or engineer, yet this is the only sense in which the word can properly be employed. Plans can be made of viaducts, docks, houses; they can be worked out for the achievement of specified objectives in a campaign. But the plans themselves cannot grow; at any given moment they are no more than a record of what has been done and what still remains to do before a certain objective can be reached. If the objective is changed, new plans must be drawn. This is the only way in which a house can be built, or towns captured in a campaign. In each case the objective exists in the mind of the house-

holder or general; the woman knows the sort of house she wants, the general knows his strategy.

I do not think people understand what 'agriculture,' 'industry' or 'transport' are in reality. As words they are all abstract. 'Industry' has no existence in itself, nor has 'agriculture,' though imaginative artists may have attempted to personify them in groups of statuary.

They are different aspects of human activity, undertaken for the sake of furthering some human aim, which has not been specified. To speak of the "future of the Cotton Industry" for instance is almost complete nonsense. It does not matter if there is no cotton industry in this country: what does matter most profoundly, is that people shall have the cotton goods they want, supplied in the quickest and easiest way.

As no government in Britain has ever exhibited the slightest intention of giving the people what they want, except for a few brief periods when the lions have lashed their tails with more than usual energy, it is likely that they are considering what we shall want when the war is over? Nothing can be done until the objective is chosen; orders cannot be given to industry, agriculture and transport *unless you have a programme in mind*, but no one would venture to assert that *the people* have any programme.

It is, however, plain from Lord Reith's speech that there *is* a programme.

There is only one source for his activities, the mysterious entity which gave Lord Reith his authority and stated the assumption. Who or what it is we are not told. But we do know that the people have never given any mandate to this government, which is more unrepresentative than any in our history, and has lost every member of its original cabinet, now that Lord Halifax is in the United States.

Industry, agriculture and transport, living aspects of human activity, can only be dealt with on an order basis, and with the discipline which this entails. —If they must be personified it can only be as servants. We do not plan our servants—we might try of course, and

then wonder why they were incapable of carrying out orders.

You cannot confine an organic growth which has no life and is incapable of change to the restrictions of a plan. But Freemasons like to try to do these things.

They talk about "building an edifice of Freedom" (Arthur Greenwood), one of those completely nonsensical statements that are only allowed to pass unchallenged because they sound well. The gentlemen appointed by the government to plan Post War Reconstruction appear to be working very hard, and they certainly want us to think so, but what they are building is the prison of freedom. This is the only thing they are capable of planning.

What they *could* do, if this were a truly representative government, might be to organise industry, transport and agriculture in such a way that when the war is over we should have three extremely adaptable servants (if they must be personified) ready to carry out the people's orders.

But no, that is not to be, says the freemasons' philosophy, everything must be arranged according to plan. And they proceed to the ancient torture of footbinding.

## CROMWELL

"Yet there is another side; for with all his vigorous characteristic personality there is something impersonal about Cromwell. Outside the battlefield he never seems to be a free agent, but rather the instrument of forces outside and about him. . . a creature of invisible influences, a strange picture of a strong, practical nature, with a sort of unearthly fatalism, with a sort of spiritual mission. It is this combination which makes the strength of Cromwell. This mysterious symbolism appears to have struck the Eastern Jews so much that they sent a deputation to England to inquire whether he was the Messiah indeed."—ROSEBERRY.

—A quotation from Rosebery in "Oliver Cromwell" by Henry Withers.

\*Social Crediter, July 27, 1940.

# PARLIAMENT

## QUALIFICATION OF M.P.'s FOR POSTS IN GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE

February 27.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

(3½ columns)

[On the question of a debate on Shipping:—]

*Earl Winterton*: Would the right hon. Gentleman consider in connection with this matter whether the old method of arranging Business through the usual channels is not now completely out of date in view of the fact that there is no regular Opposition, and if, in respect to a matter like this, there is a general desire in different quarters of the House for a Debate, will he give prior consideration to it over other questions which may be put through the ordinary usual channels?

*The Prime Minister*: Of course, the Government is composed of all the political parties in the House, who have signified their loyalty to it. The focus of opposition has not yet become precisely defined. If a sufficient body of Gentlemen constituted themselves an Opposition, they could be definitely recognised as such, and we should know where and who they were, and special facilities would no doubt be extended.

*Earl Winterton*: Is it necessary to have an Opposition to do that? Surely if there is a general wish for a Debate, those who have that wish can express it without constituting themselves an Opposition.

*The Prime Minister*: The Whips of the different parties do endeavour to ascertain the opinion of the House as a whole and not merely of those who work on the basis of an Opposition. I am not aware that anything has arisen which renders their functions inoperative, but it might be in the event of the emergence of a definite Opposition that we would have to reconsider the present arrangements. . . .

*Mr. Mander*: With regard to the Business before us to-day, [House of Commons Disqualification Bill] may I ask whether there is to be a free vote of all parties supporting the Government, or is it to be a free vote for one party only?

*The Prime Minister*: The Government regard the Division on this Bill as a matter of confidence.

*Mr. Shinwell*: Are we to under-

stand that the right hon. Gentleman, having consulted the Lord Privy Seal and having been made aware of the decision of the Labour Party, regards this as a matter of confidence?

*The Prime Minister*: Yes, Sir, certainly. Those who have no confidence in the Government will have full liberty so to testify in the Lobby.

*Mr. Shinwell*: Are we to understand that the right hon. Gentleman has elevated the question which has arisen out of the appointment of the right hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty (Mr. M. MacDonald) as High Commissioner in Canada to a question which is to be regarded as a matter of confidence in the Government? May we not repose our confidence in the Government and at the same time be free to express our opinions on a matter of this kind?

*The Prime Minister*: If this Bill were not acceded to by the House, very great inconvenience would arise to the war effort of the country. [HON. MEMBERS: "No."] That is my opinion. If there is a desire to bring matters to the test, the House is perfectly free to have every opportunity of expressing itself.

*Sir Percy Harris*: Is it not one thing to have a free discussion, as we shall have to-day, and quite another thing to vote against the Government?

*Mr. A. Bevan*: Would it not be desirable for the right hon. Gentleman to postpone his decision upon this matter until he has had an opportunity of hearing the Debate? Will he consider this point also? I understand that the Debate is being opened by the Attorney-General. Would it not have been more desirable for the House to have been put in possession of the Prime Minister's views at the beginning of the Debate?

*The Prime Minister*: I do not think it will be possible to postpone a decision whether the Government regard this as a vote of confidence or not until the Debate is reaching its conclusion. . . .

*Commander Sir Archibald Southby*: May I ask whether the reply given to me yesterday by the Lord Privy Seal that the Prime Minister has no intention of having a secret discussion on the question of the administration of the bases leased

to the United States was based on the question of time, or whether there was any other reason? Has my right hon. Friend considered the point that in view of the fact that the House of Commons is the custodian of the Empire, it is right that no final decision should be come to until the House has been told exactly what the position is? I entirely support the right hon. Gentleman in arranging the leasing of these bases, but there is a feeling in the House and the country that the representatives of the people should be told what is being done with the British Empire when bases are being given to the United States.

*The Prime Minister*: I do not think it will be desirable to have a Debate on this subject at the present time. I must really emphasise the fact that there is a war on.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS DISQUALIFICATION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) BILL

(80 columns)

Order for Second Reading read.

*The Attorney-General (Sir Donald Somervell)*: I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

This Bill deals with the position of those who desire to serve their country and whose services are required for the prosecution of the war in capacities other than those to which I have already referred. [As a Minister, in the armed forces or as Regional Commissioner.] Whether they can so serve or not depends at present on old Statutes, the principles of which are archaic, obscure, illogical and in all respects unsatisfactory. Certain service of this kind is liable and certain other service is disqualified. . . .

Under the Act of Settlement of 1700. Parliament precluded any person holding office under the Crown from sitting in this House. . . .

It was in 1705 that the matter was reconsidered and both Houses made their contribution, with the result which was then arrived at. Under the Act of that year, which distinguished between new and old offices, the holding of an old office was not regarded as a dis-



qualification though, on appointment, there had to be re-election. [In 1926 a Bill was passed abolishing the practice of re-election on becoming a Minister of the Crown.]

*Sir C. Headlam*: . . . The real disadvantage of the appointment of Members of this House to positions outside this country is that which was touched upon by my right hon. Friend who has just spoken. It is very largely a matter of the representation of the people in Parliament. I am a good deal fresher from the electorate than a good many hon. Members of this House, and what I discovered during the course of a recent by-election in which I took part was that there was a very strongly expressed opinion among all sorts and conditions of men and women that they did not want to be represented by a Member who could not look after their interests in the House of Commons. That feeling is far stronger in my constituency of North Newcastle than I could have believed possible, and it was, I think, very largely that question which settled the election. There would be no objection whatever in nine out of 10 constituencies to their Members' services being employed by the Crown in time of war, provided that those services did not take them out of the country and did not interfere with their attention to their duties in this House. [An HON. MEMBER: "What about serving Members?"] That is one of the reasons which influence people very largely. The idea of being represented by a Member in the Forces made no appeal whatsoever to that constituency.

*Mr. Barnes* (East Ham, South): . . . In my view, nothing corrupts a modern civilisation more than patronage introduced into your political system, into your legal system, and into your national, or statutory Church. This patronage of the Prime Minister already extends to the Church, to the law, and to the life of the House of Commons, as is reflected by the number of persons appointed to positions at the direction of the Prime Minister. We have a Government already composed of 90 persons, and other persons are extracted from the House of Commons and appointed to positions overseas and in the Armed Forces. The Prime Minister will recognise the importance of this matter, for he has attained his present position essentially because he followed a House of Commons tradition when he sat here as the right hon. Member for Epping. I think he will recognise the danger to himself and his Administration, if the

number of Members in this House who might be likely to level free criticism against the Government are steadily reduced by appointments. . . . I therefore ask either the Attorney-General or the Prime Minister to make clear before this Debate proceeds to a Division exactly how they will interpret the Select Committee. . . .

*Mr. McGovern*: . . . I hope the Prime Minister will not indulge in a policy which will disfranchise constituencies, and that he will not create around him a servile force, making Parliament a paid institution to keep the Government and the Prime Minister in office instead of an institution to pay attention to the desires of the community at large.

Whether the Attorney-General likes it or not, there is a growing feeling in this country that the alleged Parliamentary democracy we possess is gradually being reduced to a servile institution of a few party leaders and the powerful machines of the Tory and Labour parties. One recognises that the most objectionable thing in politics to-day is the Whip who stands at the door and says to Members who have never listened to a Debate, "There is your Lobby." Without question, Members go into the Lobby like sheep into a pen. It is one of the fundamental weaknesses of democracy and it deprives constituents of the opportunity of having their views expressed, because the machine says, "You shall do this, even against the majority of people in your area." Therefore democracy is being undermined in a thousand ways. . . .

. . . . Who can say at the end of this war what kind of institution of Government we may have? In this Bill we see an extension of that type of legislation which has created, behind the Government, a body of men who are prepared to pay lip-service to democracy while really serving the Government of the day. . . . The Carlton Club and the T.U.C. are the real masters of democracy and they are the people who dominate the politics of this country. I cannot say exactly who is responsible for the Liberal party, but there is certainly some force behind them.

This Bill is extending the influence which is undermining democracy and brings the question into the open. The ordinary capitalist Press is beginning to ask questions about this extension, because they are annoyed not about the weakening of democracy, but about its awakening. Hitler and Mussolini have

their hacks who assemble and cheer in the Reichstag. They are men who have been local "Gauleiters" and local leaders of their party, slaves to men who would destroy people of independent thought and mind. They come right up to the front because they are dependable, and the same thing is growing up in British politics. . . . we ought to say to the Government, "Thus far and no farther. What is left of democracy we intend to retain, and, instead of going along the road to totalitarian government, we are going back to the road of real democratic government."

*Mr. Pickthorn* (Cambridge University): I beg to move, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, and to add instead thereof

"this House declines to proceed with the Second Reading of the Bill before the matter has been considered and reported upon by a Select Committee."

[Referring to a speech of Mr. Churchill's in 1931:—] . . . My right hon. Friend said. . . .

"No Government which is in a large minority in the country, even though it possesses a working majority in the House of Commons, can have the necessary power to cope with real problems."

I am the last to suggest that the present Government are in anything but a very large majority in the country. My right hon. Friend went on to say what he thought about the Press. He said:

"Look at the papers to-day."—

This was 10 years ago.

"Look even at 'The Times' newspaper to-day. Are they not a spectacle of immense democratic irresponsibility?"

If so, they are much more irresponsible now. Nobody can start a new paper, and the difficulties of getting into print are infinitely greater than they were even in those days.

Very well. This war will go on, I know not for how long. The hon. Gentleman opposite who spoke on this point said it would be not more than five years. I hope to God that he is right. How is my right hon. Friend to know from time to time the relation between the majority which he has in this House, and which, I feel certain, he always will have in this House, and the general opinion in the country? Is he to trust the newspapers? Is he to trust Gallup surveys? Or is it necessary that, if only for this purpose, nearly every one—I do not say every one—of the 615 Members in this House should regard as an extreme tax upon his energetic performance of his duties in

this honourable House of Commons? In that speech my right hon. Friend went on to say:

"Parliament is all we have, and the House of Commons is the main part of it."— [OFFICIAL REPORT, 2nd June, 1931; cols. 101-110, Vol. 253.]

To say that Parliament is all we have is putting it a bit high, but Parliament is a very great deal of what we have, and we should not allow its nature to be altered without the very fullest inquiry and the most candid possible Debate. . . .

. . . .The thing is in a hopeless tangle and is long overdue for cutting, but the question is, whether this particular scission is the right one and whether this is the right way to do it, and whether it should be by a scission proposed to us, indeed, practically imposed upon us. It seems to me that if we were all to speak freely, there could be but one answer. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot have all possible offices within the reach of each one of us, and also have that superiority over the Executive which has been our function and our glory for eight or nine generations.

"The heart of man has long been sore  
And long is like to be.  
That two and two will still make four  
And neither five nor three."

Or, similarly, you cannot have your cake and eat it too.

"Not God saving His perfection, neither the Pope saving his Holiness, nor any King nor Prince could give such privilege."

We cannot have all offices at our disposal and at the same time have an effective supremacy over the Executive. That is what our ancestors learned in the second half of the seventeenth century, with all respect for the learned Attorney-General's history. . . .

. . . .I come now to the three main arguments generally used in connection with this Bill. There is the constituency point, and that is the most obvious and the most generally understood point. It has been said that many constituencies have been disfranchised because they have elected a man with a passion, for instance, for kids, and he has then spent a year in St. Helena looking after or looking at goats and kids. That does not disfranchise the constituency. There, the constituency disfranchises itself, because it has elected a man who will act in that particular way. But here the constituency is disfranchised because the man is selected by somebody else to do something elsewhere, and I think that there is a great distinction between the two. There is a further point. We all

know the rotten part of our Constitution. It is the selection of candidates. The effect of this Bill will be to make it worse. Indeed, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the main point of the Bill is to make it worse, because it means that unless you get a constituency organisation to revolt they have got to go on electing any beneficiary of the Bill, even when they do get a general election. The constituency point is the most obvious, and I do not wish to labour it too far.

The next most important point is the weakening of the House of Commons. The argument that few of the people in the White Paper are getting money was, if I may use the word not in a quarrelsome but in its etymological sense, really a vulgar argument. It does not very much matter whether a man is taking money or not. Many offices would be worth paying for, for that matter, as we know, because the man's earning power and prestige would be so much greater after holding them. But money is not the main reason why men want to take office. To do us all justice, I think there are few of us who are moved most by money. We are much more moved by the sense of importance, and even if we were moved by money the question whether an office is actually paid or is not is, for the reason I have indicated, not all that important. Clearly, the more the abler Members are employed elsewhere, the less the ability of the Members to do the business of the House. The House of Commons suffers immensely in war from its times of sitting. The fact that we are now sitting these strange hours much weakens our powers. We are suffering from the pre-occupations of war, and most of us find it difficult to persuade ourselves each morning that anything else matters much. If the House suffers further decapitation there is the risk that we shall find ourselves reduced to the 75 Ministers, 75 P.P.S.'s, and those other Members of this House in whom His Majesty's Government can find no usefulness except the inconsequence of their criticism, the loose-mouthed loquacity of their questions, or the debate-killing monotony of their vocabulary.

This brings me to the third main objection, and I do not think it has yet been put. I wish to put it with the profoundest respect for my right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury. What is the main function of this House? I do not think anyone any longer can say, if it ever was right to say, that our main function is legislation. I mean no

disrespect when I say that that which has been said in textbooks and so on, namely, that nowadays the Civil Service legislates by and with the consent of the Cabinet and under the veto of the House of Commons, has come near to acquiring some truth. That may be an exaggeration, but I think legislation was not in the old days and is not now our primary function. Is finance? I rather doubt it. Certainly in war-time I doubt it. We can hardly have any control over expenditure, or much over taxation, in war time. What is our essential function? I would answer with the profoundest respect to my right hon. Friend. . . .The essential function of this House is that it should be the market in which the stock of the Prime Minister is made. . . . [He went on to say that in war-time the Prime Minister can only be judged by the promotions and dismissals he makes, not by the legislation and finance he sponsors, and the ability to transfer people from parliament to other services would confuse the issue.]

*Mr. Bevan (Ebbw Vale)*: I believe that the whole House will agree with me that the course of the Debate has shown to put it no higher, that the Prime Minister was misguided in making the statement which he made at the opening of the Debate. To make such a matter as this vote of confidence was, in my judgment, an error that ought not to have occurred in one with so long a Parliamentary experience. I do not object to the Prime Minister coming to the House and saying that he would treat a vote against the Bill as a censure upon him and therefore making it a vote of confidence, but it was unnecessary for him to do so because there is no feeling against him in this matter. The general attitude of the House of Commons towards the Government is not in question. This is essentially a House of Commons matter. . . .

. . . .Hon. Members will recall that Membership of this House was originally a duty imposed by the Crown upon a constituency. That is why a great deal of these safeguards are in the Constitution. That is the reason why it is difficult for Members to be exempted from their duties. But now, representation in this House is a privilege demanded by the constituents themselves, and of which they ought not to be deprived, except in the most grave emergency. When a man is taken from his constituency to-day, many thousands of people are being deprived of a constitutional right for which they have fought for centuries, and when the Service Mem-

bers analogy is used it leaves me quite cold. I regard service to this House as the highest service a citizen can render, taking precedence even over service in the Armed Forces. If that is not the case, what is the meaning of constitutional government? Whereas, formerly, Members of Parliament might feel that causing service to this House to take precedence over anything else would be regarded as an indication that they wished to escape any risk of danger, recent events have shown that it is almost as dangerous to be here as it is to be a member of one of the Armed Forces. Therefore, they need no longer blush on that account. There was no reason at all—and that is why people felt disquieted about it—why the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ross and Cromarty should want to hang on to his seat and still be High Commissioner in Canada.

... I am not prepared to vote against the Prime Minister because he has, as I have already explained, made the matter into a vote of confidence. That would be to exalt the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ross and Cromarty higher than the Prime Minister himself. I do not think he is, and, therefore, I am not going to take such a line.

*The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill):* ... Now there arises the question of the rights and interests of constituents. It is a very serious question. A constituency chooses a Member to represent it in this House. The Member goes off, perhaps for a long period of time, to Moscow or Madrid or Ottawa, or it may be to Mogadishu or Benghazi. Here is a constituency, as it is said, disfranchised. Is not this a great constitutional misfortune? It certainly raises an important question, and we should look at it in some detail. It is not only in the field of service to the State that such issues arise. A sheaf of examples has been furnished to me. I will not quote names. A Member may fall a victim to a long illness which totally incapacitates him and as a result of which, after some years, he dies; or perhaps he lingers on. A Member may become mentally deranged or feeble-minded—I am not going to cite any particular instance—and so long as that Member is not actually certified a lunatic, he can hold his seat and draw his salary. A Member may be detained in prison under war-time regulations for an indefinite period—a most painful situation for any Government to become responsible for. Or he may be sent to prison by the courts for mis-

demeanor without the constituency having the slightest power to compel him to resign.

An even more irritating case than this, from the point of view of the constituency, is when a Member has been elected to support a particular party or a particular policy and, after being returned, circumstances arise which lead him, conscientiously or otherwise, to support a different party or the opposite policy. A Member again may obviously fail to represent his constituents. He may be entirely out of harmony with their views, and he may grossly misrepresent them without having the slightest intention to do so. These cases are not numerous, but they occur constantly, and a constituency has no redress... Of course, there are Parliaments like the Parliament in Soviet Russia, where the constituencies have the power of recall; that is to say, if a Member or a delegate makes speeches or asks questions or gives votes of a kind not desired by his constituency, or by the party machine, a kind of round-robin of electors can be signed, and he can be forced to submit himself for re-election. This power of recall is contrary to the best interests and dignity of Parliament, and the whole Parliamentary tradition as built up in this country, which is at once the cradle and citadel of Parliamentary government, is adverse to it. I believe it would give a great deal more power to the executive Government and to the party machinery, which has in recent times often been considered to be too powerful and too efficient. The independence of all Members would be affected. They would not know whether, at any time, they might not be exposed to an agitation worked up in their constituencies and thus forced to fight a by-election on a bad wicket. We must be very careful not to take short or impulsive views on these questions when dealing with an institution of the antiquity and vitality of the House of Commons... I believe it will be found on reflection far wiser to put up with these occasional hard cases than to be drawn on to the slippery slope which would lead to the promulgation of the doctrine of recall.

I have given the best reply that I can to my hon. Friend on the subject of the disfranchisement of a constituency. But there is another important Parliamentary lesson to be borne in mind by the House. It is none of our business to declare what constituencies think and wish. We learned that in the Wilkes

case... I come to the last issue which arises from this Bill. It is in the interests of the House of Commons that its Members should play active, useful, and perhaps distinguished parts in the great struggle which is now going on, or ought they to confine themselves strictly to Parliamentary business and attendance upon this House? I may say that the House, or some of its Members, have shown themselves rather changeable upon this point. I remember my predecessor, the late Mr. Neville Chamberlain, drawing a very strict line against the employment of Members of Parliament, and considerable offence being given, and his modifying that line to meet the wish of the House. For my own part, I have a very clear opinion, which I expressed in the Debate on the Address last November. Here is what I said—and it met, as I thought, with general approval—

"I entirely agree with what has been said about the desirability of Members of Parliament serving not only in the military forces but in all other forms of warfare and discharging their Parliamentary duties at the same time or in alternation. No doubt difficulties arise, but I think they are well covered, and that the good sense of the House and of hon. Members will enable these dual and occasionally conflicting functions to be discharged."

I went on to say—I abridge it a little—that the fact that

"this House should be a House of active living personalities, engaged to the hilt in the national struggle, each according to the full strength that he has to give, each according to the aptitudes which he possesses, is, I think, one of the sources of the strength of the Parliamentary institution."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 21st November, 1940; cols. 31-2, Vol. 366.]...

*Mr. Pickthorn:* I think I have the concurrence of my right hon. and hon. Friends in asking the permission of the House to withdraw the Amendment which stands in my name.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

## GENERALS AND GENERALSHIP

By General Sir Archibald Wavell

(The three Lees-Knowles lectures  
republished as a pamphlet).

Price: 7d. post free.

Obtainable from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,  
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS**

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

**BELFAST D.S.C. GROUP**

Group Meeting on April 3, 1941. In the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at 8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon Sec., 17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.

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

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

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

**LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association:** Meets regularly on the first and third Sundays in the month. Time 2-30 p.m. Enquiries to Wavertree 435.

**LONDON LIAISON GROUP.**

Lunch-hour reunion on the first and third Thursday in each month at 12-30, at the Plane Tree, Great Russell Street. Next reunion on March 20.

Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

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

**PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group:**

Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; or 50, Ripley Grove, Copnor.

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

**The Social Crediter**

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

**K.R.P. Publications Ltd.,** 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

Please send *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* to me

Name .....

Address .....

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-

„ Six „ „ 15/-

„ Three „ „ 7/6

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

**EXPANSION FUND**

To the Treasurer, Social Credit Expansion Fund, c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

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

Name .....

Address .....

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

Name.....

Address.....

**TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE, THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT, 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.**

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

I will, until further notice, contribute

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

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

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

Signature.....

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

**Books to Read**

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy ..... (edition exhausted)
  - Social Credit ..... 3/6
  - Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
  - The Monopoly of Credit ..... 3/6
  - Warning Democracy ..... (edition exhausted)
  - The Tragedy of Human Effort... 6d.
  - The Use of Money ..... 6d.
  - Approach to Reality ..... 3d.
  - Money and the Price System ... 3d.
  - Nature of Democracy ..... 2d.
  - Social Credit Principles ..... 1d.
  - Tyranny ..... ½d.
- and  
 "This 'American' Business" 3d. each  
 12 for 2/-

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster ..... 4d.
- The Nature of Social Credit ... (out of print)
- Debt and Taxation ..... 2d.

**ALSO**

- The Douglas Manual ..... (out of print)
  - The Economic Crisis: Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report ..... (out of print)
  - The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold ..... 4/6
  - Economics for Everybody by Elles Dee ..... 3d.
  - The Power of Money by J. B. Galway ..... 3d.
  - The Purpose of Politics by H. E. .... 3d.
  - Tax-Bonds or Bondage and the Answer to Federal Union by John Mitchell... 1/- (Postage 2½d.)
  - Barrier to Health by Dr. Douglas Boyd..... 6d.
  - Lower Rates (pamphlet) ..... 3d.
- (All the above postage extra.)

**Leaflets**

- Invincible Britain by John Mitchell ..... 2d. each, 1/6 doz.
  - What we are about by H. E. .... 50 for 1/6
  - Hitler and Churchill Finance by John Mitchell ..... 50 for 1/9
  - Bomb Hitler! by C. H. Douglas ..... 100 for 1/3
  - What 'Capital Levy' Means to You by C. H. Douglas..... 100 for 2/6
  - Beware of Federal Union by R. L. Northridge..... 50 for 1/9
- (The above are post free).

All from

**K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.**

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