

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 7. No. 8.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Colonel Wedgewood, the Labour Member of Parliament for the Pottery District of Newcastle-under-Lyme, who received a well-deserved snub from the Under Secretary for the Home Office for his attempt to have *Truth* suppressed because of its "anti-Semitic" (?) views, is a curious example of the interweaving of Liberal-Labour-Whig-Puritanism with strong Judaic sympathies and the worst manifestations of Finance-Capitalism.

The Staffordshire hill country, before the development of the pottery industry, was one of the most desirable and beautiful districts to be found in the British Isles.

The pottery industry developed by the Wedgewoods contributed largely to its transformation into a sullen refuse dump, with an industrial system perhaps the most abominable and repellent in the world's history. Contemporaneously, Calvinistic sects appeared everywhere in the district, with a philosophy as gloomy as the smoking landscape.

"General Macfarlane, who is spoken of by soldiers and journalists alike as 'Mason Mac' has the best possible equipment for his new post [Military Attaché at Moscow]."
— *Manchester Guardian*.

Just as good as Mason Beaverbrook and Mason Anthony Eden?

"The caustic tones of the *Sunday Times* editorial raised considerable objection in both British and American circles, but it was generally agreed that it was more refreshing and far more helpful than the endless stream of soft soap which the British Press is accustomed to dish out to the American public."

— *Edmonton (Alberta) Bulletin* (Alberta's oldest daily Paper).

The R. A. F. have a Flying School at Americus, Georgia, U. S. A. Georgia is one of the Southern States—the Secessionist States.

To have established a colony of British young men there strikes us as about the first sensible thing done in this American business.

"The failure of generalship [in France] might still have been redeemed, but for the paralysing influence of general restriction, general suppression, and general suspicion."

— CAPTAIN LIDDELL HART in *Dynamic Defence*.

Punch's comment on Evacuees: "Never were so many such a nuisance to so few".

The greatest danger of the post-war period is that large numbers of the population have been inoculated with abstract ideas which have no correspondence with any concrete facts. Such words as "the public", "social equality", a "classless society" are completely without any possible meaning. There are only men, women, and things.

Concepts not subject to operation are meaningless. You can't do anything to or with "Germany" or "Judaism", but you can bomb Hitler, the Mendelssohn-Bleichröders, the "German" Rothschilds, and others in various countries whose names occur to one, *pour encourager les autres*.

The Albertan 'Independent' Party, the official opposition to social credit in Alberta, has adopted the principles of 'Union Now.'

SPITFIRE says in *Today and Tomorrow* of September 25:

"During the course of a speech reported in the press on September 18, the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King made an ominous statement; it may or may not be an indication of the direction in which we are being headed. At any rate the matter requires clarification—and it should not be allowed to rest until we are told just what the Prime Minister meant. He said:

"... no nation which wishes to see freedom can now look to anything so old fashioned as its own sovereign rights, or so restricted as its own unaided strength."

"Mr. King should be asked to explain what freedom a people can have if they have lost their own sovereign rights. The very terms 'sovereignty of the people' and 'the freedom of the people' are synonymous.

"And if this country and the other nations of the Empire had depended more upon their own unaided strength, and less on others, we would not be in the position confronting us to-day.

"If Mr. King is trying to tell us that the people of Canada are to lose their sovereign rights in fighting for freedom, then it is high time that the full implications of his statement should be brought out in the open.

"Let us hope that the menace behind those words of the Prime Minister is realised by Canadians and that they demand a full explanation. They are entitled to it—for, thank God, the people still retain their sovereign rights, even though Mr. King thinks they are old fashioned."

PARLIAMENT**Mr. Morrison and the Defence Regulations**

OCTOBER 16.

Oral Answers to Questions (34 columns)

WOMEN (REGISTRATION)

Mr. Rhys Davies asked the Minister of Labour whether he is aware that Dorothy Riding, Bessie Leigh and Beatrice Fearnley, all of Westhoughton, all unmarried, in business separately on their own account as hairdressers, after registering with their groups have been requested to undertake work in munition factories; that Form E. D. 346 does not indicate any compulsion but Form E.D.L. 74 states that they are required to take up such work; and will he make it clear as to whether compulsion is being resorted to in these cases and what are the penalties for refusal?

Mr. Bevin: I am having inquiries made into the cases of the three persons mentioned by my hon. Friend and will let him know the result. Meanwhile I am sending him copies of the forms to which he refers.

Mr. Davies: I have copies of the forms. What I want to know is this: Now that the right hon. Gentleman is compelling women to leave their present occupations for work of national importance, what are the penalties if they refuse?

Mr. Bevin: Happily, I have not had to compel very many. As I explained in reply to an earlier Question, I do use all the influence I can to get the women to transfer to national work. If a woman refused, I should have to issue a direction. There is no penalty until I issue a direction. If a direction is disobeyed, then she comes under Defence of the Realm Regulation 58A.

Mr. Davies: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether he has already reached the stage of compulsion? One of these forms states in print that these women are required to undertake work of national importance.

COMMUNISTS

Commander Bower asked the Home Secretary having regard to his decision that the British Communist Party are not loyal to this country, how many members of this party are now detained under Regulation 18B?

Mr. H. Morrison: No persons are detained under Defence Regulation 18B merely on the ground of membership of the British Communist Party.

Commander Bower: Since my right hon. Friend has decided — in my view, rightly — not to intern these people, whose loyalty he publicly impugned, will he now, in the fair and just exercise of his quasi-judicial powers, release such internees against whom there is no evidence of actual, and very slender presumption of potential, treachery?

Mr. Morrison: No, Sir. I presume that the hon. and gallant Gentleman refers to Members of the former British Union of Fascists.

Commander Bower: No, Sir.

Hon. Members: To Communists.

Mr. Morrison: There are no Communists interned.

No British subjects who are Communists are interned as such.

Mr. Gallacher: Is it not the case that the Minister has not "decided," but has merely expressed a foolish opinion?

Mr. Morrison: Whether it is foolish or not is a matter of opinion.

Sir Irving Albery: Are any members of the British Union interned merely because they were members of the British Union?

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL EXPENDITURE

Sir John Wardlaw-Milne (by Private Notice) asked the Prime Minister whether he has any statement to make in regard to the Memorandum reported to the House on October 2 as having been submitted to him by the Co-ordinating Sub-committee of the Select Committee on National Expenditure?

The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill): . . . since this matter was raised in the House through the application of the four members concerned for discharge, I have considered very carefully, on its merits, the question of whether the Memorandum could have been made to the House or whether it should have been made to the Prime Minister personally, in accordance with the decision of the House of November 26, 1940. Although it is not for me to decide, I may say I am convinced in my judgement that the view expressed to me by the Air Staff when I asked at a later stage for their opinion, that this Memorandum is not suitable for publication in time of war, is well founded, and I am very glad that the Select Committee decided in that sense of their own volition. . . .

There is one further point. The hon. Member for Mossley (Mr. Hopkinson) is reported as having stated yesterday that there were two Reports, of which only the longer was presented to me. I, of course, can only deal with what is brought before me. With regard to his suggestion that I came to a decision on the question of publication, I have already said that neither I nor any other Member of the Government has ever made any such decision, although individual Ministries when asked by the Select Committee may have given an opinion on any point submitted to them.

OCTOBER 21.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (VISITS TO IRELAND)

This debate was a lively attack on Mr. Herbert Morrison, the Home Secretary, for his administration of the Defence Regulations, with immediate reference to his refusal to allow Mr. McGovern (M.P. for Shettleston) to go to Ireland. Its quality cannot be conveyed by the brief extracts for which we have space. The principle of the matter has been dealt with, therefore, without going into the involved circumstances of the particular instance in question.

Interruptions in the speeches and the parliamentary equivalent of heckling were frequent, as were irrelevancies

(continued on page 3)

AGAINST THE NEW ORDER

London's burning! London's burning!
No reviving, no returning,
There it goes in smoke and flame,
It will never be the same,
It will never be the same.

London Tower where I was born
Is a picture charred and torn,
Rich and splendid, dark and mean,
It will never more be seen,
It will never more be seen.

Roaring off to Kingdom Come,
Home and office, church and slum,
Wrapped up in their smoky shrouds,
Blazing on the bronzed clouds,
Good and evil, foul and fair,
Burn to rubble, ash and air.

Desolation is such fun,
Say the Leveller and the Hun,
Good we build on ill foundations,
Peace on earth from blasted nations,
Fire and Ruin are well done,
Say the Leveller and the Hun;
Level! level! quoth the Devil,
Good and Evil shall be One.

Brave New Worlds are built on rubble,
Fire burn, and cauldron bubble,
Soon we shall produce our Plan
For the Betterment of Man;

Level! level! quoth the Devil,
Good and Evil shall be One.

Union of all Mankind
Dominated by Our Mind,
World Policeman, Judge and Warder
To enforce World Law, World Order;
Level! level! quoth the Devil,
Good and Evil shall be One.

Soon our Flag shall be unfurled,
Soon shall dawn our Brave New World,
Inequalities smoothed away,
Neither white nor black, but grey,
Tepid, neither hot nor cold,
Middle-aged, not young nor old;
Level! level! says the Devil,
Glory! glory! gloats the Hun,
And Hosannah! shouts the Planner,
Good and Evil shall be One.

• • •

We who in the ashes dwell
Want no planned and ordered Hell,
Fight no wars to be policed
When the bombs and fires have ceased;
Life's too precious far to give
For any freedom but to live.

'Twixt the Leveller and the Hun
We are like to be undone,

Shackles of their monstrous Plan
Grip the living mind of Man,
Level! level! quoth the Devil,
Struggle with me if you can!

We who used to lift our eyes
For our succour to the skies,
Find destruction and despair,
Howling desolation where
Hun and Devil now hold revel
And defile our English air.

Lifeless monsters on us fall,
Shrieking, with gigantic sound,
We would turn to something small,
Firmly rooted in the ground;
Though all Hell the Heavens rend
Hope shall rise, and not descend,
From the ruin round our feet,
Gay, invincible and sweet.

Scarcely are the ashes cold,
Dormant seeds beneath unfold,
Twining shoots and leaves are thrust
Through the rubble and the dust,
Green, and shouting in the Sun,
Good and Evil are not One,
Lift your heart up and your head,
Living things can cope with dead!

— GEOFFREY DOBBS.

(From *The Poetry Review*, the journal of
The Poetry Society, for September, 1941.)

PARLIAMENT

Continued from page 2

and quips, but Mr. Morrison was well able to hold his own against these.

Sir Irving Albery, opening the debate, questioned the Home Secretary's prohibition for two main reasons: firstly the right of the Home Secretary to prevent an M.P. from going where he pleases in the United Kingdom on his Parliamentary duties, and secondly the refusal to allow an M.P. to inquire into detention under Regulation 18B. He pointed out that many other M.P.s had been allowed permits.

Sir Hugh O'Neil (Antrim), supporting Sir Irving Albery, said that Northern Ireland M.P.s were already being treated differently from the ordinary public as they were allowed to travel freely between Northern Ireland and London. Mr. Mander (Wolverhampton, East) quoted precedents for the free movement of M.P.s within the British Dominions.

Squadron-Leader Donner (Basingstoke): . . . There are two schools of thought in relation to this matter. One says that in order to win this war we must as a nation surrender a great number of our liberties and much of the freedom to which we are accustomed, and the other believes that the fewer infringements that are made during the course of the war as regards the individual liberty of the citizen, the better for the country. I sympathise with the second view. How difficult it is to regain liberties once forfeited we know from the last war. "Dora" remained for 20 years and never disappeared. Not only that, but there are in England, there are in public life to-day, men who publicly avow their belief in regimentation, in the infringement of individual

liberty and in State control. Therefore, I believe it is better to try and get through this war and win it by surrendering the fewest liberties that we possibly can. I agree entirely with my hon. and gallant Friend who laid so much emphasis on the point that the more Government infringe the liberties of the ordinary citizen, the more important it becomes to maintain the comparative immunity of Members of Parliament, and the greater is the need to safeguard Members of Parliament, because when the war is over this House, and the Members of this House, will alone be in a position to grapple with the great problem which is bound to face us, and that is the problem of the octopus growth of our bureaucracy, which is growing every day. . . .

Mr. Morrison: . . . I have been administering the Regulations for the last 12 months. It is a great responsibility to administer many of the Defence Regulations. It is a terrible responsibility that the House has imposed upon the Home Secretary, and I can assure the House—and I think the House will accept my assurance—that I do not take that responsibility lightly. I think too that the House generally will say that I have administered the Regulations fairly. At any rate, it is the case. . . .

As for the suggestion that I take too much on myself in the administration of the Defence Regulations, that rather surprises me. Surely the House of Commons in matters which affect the liberty of British subjects under Defence Regulation 18B will expect me to take the responsibility for the detentions and releases. It is not one of those matters which the Home Secretary can properly delegate to officials.

(continued on page 7)

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*) 4, ACREFIELD ROAD, WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL, Telephone: Gateacre 1561; (*Business*) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 7. No. 8. Saturday, November 1, 1941.

A SINISTER MOVEMENT

The statue of Nelson, who knew his place as an expert, has looked down upon a number of odd demonstrations, but never upon one at once funnier or more sinister than the demonstration which 'called for' an invasion of the continent of Europe for the establishment of a Western Front.*

We have watched this ramp growing up and have noted the names of the politicians associated with it. They are mostly the names of persons prominently associated with the doctrine that the best way of ridding nations of the disorders which afflict them is to destroy nations. Whether enthusiasm for their creed is the motive of their present mobilisation of mob opinion in opposition to expert opinion, or whether they really think themselves better experts than those entrusted with the conduct of the war, matters little. The only democracy they understand is the democracy of the Gadarene swine. These unfortunate animals, it may be recalled, being possessed of devils which otherwise would have been without habitation, "ran violently down a steep place into the sea, (they were about two thousand;) and were choked in the sea." It would be a fitting end to the congregation of dupes in Trafalgar Square, if they were subjected to a similar fate, and were immediately mobilised to storm Dunkirk with their 'leaders' at their head instead of behind their backs. We have no objection to mistaken notions of democracy, provided those who entertain them themselves suffer the natural consequences of the putting into execution of their ideas.

The movement is sinister and spreading, and the strongest measures should be taken to arrest it. Democracy does not consist in mass decisions concerning methods. It is not democracy of any conceivable kind to hold the public responsible for decisions upon any subject requiring *technical* information or training. The first requisite of a political democracy is that its operation shall be confined to objectives, not to methods.

"... It is a perfectly legitimate subject," said Douglas (*The Tragedy of Human Effort*), "for the exercise of political democracy to decide by democratic methods a policy of war or no war, but it is not a subject for democracy to say *how* war should be avoided, or the *means* by which it should be waged. It is, however, a fit subject for democracy to remove responsible persons who fail to carry out its policy, and the responsibility for that action is on the democracy concerned.

*Stated by the "B" B.C. and some national newspapers, but not referred to in *The Times's* report.

It will be seen, therefore, that the question of practicability is an essential part of a genuine democracy; that is to say, democracy should not demand something which cannot be done, and should be prepared to accept the consequences of what is done, and to assess responsibility for those consequences. Undesired consequences may result from bad technical advice and management, or they may on the other hand be inherent in the policy pursued.

"In other words, a genuine political democracy must essentially be a device based upon trial and error. A political democracy which will never try something which has not been tried before is useless, because things which have been tried before can be reduced to the routine of administration, and administration is not susceptible to the democratic principle, in which it is wholly out of place."

Is it strange that the dissatisfaction which is being fomented as well as directed into wrong channels should be so closely associated with that curiously inverted phrase 'the dictatorship of the proletariat'—a phrase which only naive minds conceive to hold any suggestion of democratic determination of policy? "Scrutator" says, "These are dangerous days. The whole tribe of carpers are in action... They organise public meetings up and down the country, and it is strange that journalists responsible for the policy of a newspaper which happens to belong to a member of the Government take part in some of these demonstrations." That, perhaps, is damnable, though not at all 'strange.' Trafalgar Square may yet be the scene of some plain speaking about policy and responsibility. But why go all the way to Trafalgar Square?
 T.J.

REPRIÈVE FOR SMALL SHOPKEEPERS

Britain's small shopkeepers—there are nearly a million of them—may yet be able to retain their independence despite the Government's efforts to "concentrate" them.

A committee on retail shopkeepers, headed by Mr. Craig Henderson, K.C., has submitted an interim report to the President of the Board of Trade, Sir Andrew Duncan, who may shortly make a statement in Parliament.

Payment of suitable compensation is proving one of the biggest difficulties. The Government is not likely to favour grants to shopkeepers to cover their loss of business and goodwill, but M.P.s of all parties are ready to defend the interests of the traders in this respect.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED.

We regret to announce the severance of Mr. John Mitchell's connection with K.R.P. Publications Limited as its Manager. Mr. Mitchell, whose admirable articles in *The Social Crediter* have attracted wide attention, is succeeded by Mr. L. Patterson.

D.S.C. MOVEMENT, BELFAST GROUP

At the invitation of the Belfast Group, the Northern Ireland area meeting will be held in the Grand Central Hotel, Belfast, on Saturday, November 8, at 3 for 3-30 p.m. All interested are requested to attend.

THIS MONEY MADNESS

By L. D. BYRNE

(In Great Britain the strain of war has driven the bankers into using 'unorthodox' methods to finance it. In Canada, money methods so far have been strictly orthodox. An emphasis on money correct in Canada is not necessarily proper to Great Britain and other countries. — Editor.)

One of the most sinister and dangerous features of the ominous situation which is developing is the seemingly blind determination, in all anti-totalitarian countries, to preserve the present financial system *at all costs*—in spite of the fact that it is responsible for bringing the British Empire to the brink of disaster.

In war the over-riding national objective is to inflict decisive defeat upon the enemy. The attainment of that object is largely a matter of proper organisation. It is not sufficient to have an advantage in manpower and resources. Both manpower and resources must be organised to meet the enemy with stark force of overwhelming superiority.

The training of men; the manufacture of explosives, guns, tanks, airplanes and other instruments of modern warfare; the supply of food, clothing and the essential goods required by both the fighting forces and the civilian population;—all these are dependent upon organisation. And the more efficient the organisation the more effective will be the result.

Contrary to the generally accepted view, the monetary system is *primarily* a flexible accounting system and, like the accounts department in a factory, its main function is to facilitate the organisation of economic activity. In other words it exists to aid in the orderly production and distribution of goods and services according to requirements.

The sole test of the efficiency or otherwise of any system of organisation is whether it produces the desired results. Judged on this basis the financial system proved a miserable failure during the pre-war years.

Bearing in mind that the national effort is dependent upon the *efficiency* with which the country's resources can be organised to that end, it should be evident that a financial system which created havoc and ruin in peace time cannot possibly function efficiently under the stress of a war time economy. And the proof of this is to be seen in the results we are getting—the ruin of agriculture, the fantastic debts which are being accumulated, the crushing taxation that is being imposed on the pretext of *curtailing* consumer purchases while effort on a vast scale is being dissipated in advertising and other means directed towards *increasing* sales, non-development of idle resources at the expense of maintaining non-essential activities, and a continuous barrage of ballyhoo designed to obscure the glaring deficiencies.

However the matter goes much deeper. Just as in the years immediately preceding the war, financial considerations were given precedence over the growing threat of the Nazi war machine, so we find the same blind adherence to financial orthodoxy is shutting out the grim realities of the situation we face. The men who control finance are determined not to relinquish their power, but rather to use the conditions created by the war to attain their goal of world dictatorship. And those who are being used as their tools seem to have their heads buried so deep in the sand of make-believe that they cannot see the tornado which is approaching.

More than two months have elapsed since Premier Aberhart issued the last of a series of four press statements, urging a reform of the national monetary system both to meet war time needs and to prepare for post-war reconstruction.

Though these received wide publicity across Canada, it is significant that not a single constructive criticism has been advanced against his concrete proposals. Of course, there was the usual cheap abuse from certain sections of the press, tempered by favourable comment from others.

The only effect the article seem to have had in responsible quarters has been a marked anxiety by Federal Ministers to stress that Government does control the monetary system. If they realised the implications of this they might not appear so anxious to make that claim.

In the first article Premier Aberhart pointed out that *The Economist* of England had stated in a recent article that:

“The war-time financial system is obviously far from perfect. Are decisions of economic mobilisation made on strictly real, physical and non-financial grounds alone? Clearly not.”

It is impossible to imagine a more damning indictment of the financial system emanating from a source reputed for its past adherence to orthodoxy. Yet, for all the effect the statement seems to have had, it might be meaningless.

In his next article, published a week later, the Premier set forth the case for effective government control of the financial system. He pointed out that “the control of money affects every aspect of human life,” stating:

“People generally know that this vital control of money is at present in the hands of a highly centralised banking monopoly.

Such is the power this control gives the money monopolists that no one can enter industry nor engage in production without coming under their domination.

“It is now common knowledge that most of the economic havoc of the past and of the present has been caused by the deliberate manipulation of money to serve the selfish interests of its controllers. Industries have been wrecked, time and again, by rigid foreclosures and heartless credit restriction. Money has been intentionally kept in short supply by the money changers and controllers of finance in order to increase its scarcity value, and thus yield them greater profits and increased power.

“Business men know by bitter experience that shortage of money causes curtailment of production and trade on account of the resulting lack of purchasing power. This slow-up in turn tends to unemployment, with its terrible harvest of poverty, undernourishment, disease, crime, suffering and a host of attendant evils.

“The appalling havoc which has been produced by the present private monopoly's control of the money system should convince every person that there must be a change.

“The private money monopoly, therefore, having caused this devastation, it logically follows that there is but one other course open to us, namely the introduction of government control of the money system.”

Later in the article he quotes Abraham Lincoln's famous statement:

“... The privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of government, but it is

the government's greatest creative opportunity."

And after advancing evidence to show that the Government does not control the monetary system at present, he urges that:

"The time has come when the people of Canada must decide whether they will continue to suffer under the present inadequate and outworn money system, controlled by a private monopoly, or whether they will liberate themselves from financial bondage by demanding a reform of the money system under government control."

However it is when we come to the third article that Premier Aberhart puts forward definite proposals for a reform of financial system to meet the situation.

He reviewed the fantastic rise in debt in Great Britain, Canada and the U.S.A. and the increase in federal taxation in this country from \$7 per capita in 1900 to \$90 per capita to-day, quoting an article in *The Wall Street Journal* of July 11 of this year as stating:

"... The Dominion is now developing an economy and piling up a fantastic debt, which cannot be sustained by the existing population..."

The definite proposals for a reform of the monetary system, which follow, are condensed under six headings:

Pointing out that "control of the monetary system... is a sovereign power which should be vested in Parliament on behalf of the people" he advocates that:

"... a national finance commission should be established, to be responsible to parliament through the minister of finance (a) for the issue and withdrawal of all money (both currency and credit) in accordance with the nation's need and (b) for the administration of the monetary system in accordance with the principles of true democracy."

Next he deals with the present monopoly power of the banks to create, issue and withdraw financial credit, pointing out that "it is an obvious absurdity that a democratic government vested with sovereign authority over the monetary system should be obliged to put the nation in pawn to the banks in order to borrow money for national purposes. In point of fact the position should be reversed."

To bring the banks effectively under control of Parliament, he proposed that:

"... chartered banks should cease to create, issue and withdraw financial credit, except as agents for the National Finance Commission, and they should be required to hold currency or credit certificates, issued by the National Finance Commission through the Bank of Canada, against their total deposits."

While this would leave the banks free in matters of administration, they would be obliged to conform to the policy laid down by the Commission, and it would put an end to the present evil of legalised plunder.

Whenever a reform of the financial system is suggested a loud howl of "inflation" goes up from the banking fraternity. It is significant that they were silent on this occasion—for in the next submission by Mr. Aberhart they have probably met their Waterloo. After dealing with the principles involved he advocated that:

"... the National Finance Commission should be required to establish a proper system of accounting, and, from time to time, ascertain the total prices of goods available for purchase by consumers and the total purchasing power of

the public. Any surplus purchasing power should be withdrawn by means of an equitable system of taxation and any deficiency of purchasing power should be corrected by reduced taxation or by an increased issue of credit in the most equitable way possible."

It will be plain that with such a safeguard in operation inflation would be impossible, for purchasing power and prices of available goods would be maintained in balance at all times.

Next the article sets forth two proposals for dealing with the present chaotic price structure:

"(a) The prices of primary products and in particular agricultural products as required, should be regulated to provide producers with guaranteed prices equivalent to the average cost of production plus a reasonable profit for their services to the nation.

"(b) A system of price regulation should be introduced to ensure that prices will not be inflated by unwarranted profit taking. Goods in short supply, either because of curtailed production due to the prior needs of war industries or to restricted imports for conserving foreign exchange, should be apportioned for the period of war on an equitable basis."

Within those two short paragraphs are condensed the principles for dealing with the plight of agriculture, the dangerous trend of rising prices, inadequate wages levels, the shortage of consumer goods resulting from the needs of war production which beset our harassed authorities at present.

This is followed by a section on financing the national war effort.

The article points out that "During wartime a vast amount of energy and resources are consumed and destroyed in fighting the enemy. This diversion of economic effort and materials used in production of war supplies constitute what is called the real economic cost of the war. At the end of the conflict, since this energy and these resources have been all consumed, the real economic cost has been supplied."

"The monetary system, as such, should accurately reflect the foregoing reality. There should be no war debt after the struggle is over except for which has not been made in terms of exports."

"Therefore, it should not be necessary for the Federal Government to borrow for either war or normal expenditures (except for purchase of war supplies from outside the country, settlement for which is not made by exports). The requisite money should be made available by the Bank of Canada and 'surplus' purchasing power should automatically be withdrawn via taxation. By this means a scientific check against inflation would be in operation continuously."

The proposals conclude with the basis upon which industry and trade would be financed:

"Industrial and trade requirements would be met, as at present, by means of loans from chartered banks on such terms as the National Finance Commission may authorise as being equitable to both borrowers and the banks. Special facilities should be provided for firms engaged on war contracts."

In urging the people of Canada to face up to the great challenge which confronts them, Premier Aberhart quoted

the words of the great Greek philosopher, Demosthenes:

"And are you so unintelligent, men of Athens, as to hope that the same policy that has brought our state from success to failure will raise us from failure to success?"

It would be difficult to find a more appropriate quotation to fit the situation which faces us to-day.

In the concluding article the Premier dealt with the dangers which lie ahead. He pointed out:

"The suffering, the discontent, the strife and the hatred which this vicious system generates has brought us to the brink of disaster."

Adding that:

"Unfortunately, too many people to-day are making the terrible mistake of looking for a new civilisation and a new era of prosperity to emerge from this world struggle" without action on their part.

After drawing attention to the trend towards centralisation of power resulting from the financial system, he shows that the objective of the International Money Power is "to impose a World Dictatorship, a Super-World-State, that would involve a tyranny worse than anything mankind has ever known."

As an example of the very real menace which confronts us, Mr. Aberhart instances the proposals of "Union Now," under which it is proposed to hand over to an international authority control of finance and citizenship rights backed by control of the armed forces. He pointed out that this would centralise, in the international authority, complete control over every aspect of economic activity and leave the people helpless to challenge the resulting dictatorship, which would have all the armed forces at its disposal. Thus, at a single blow, democracy would be destroyed, the British Empire would cease to exist as a Commonwealth of free and sovereign peoples and International Finance would gain its objective of World Dictatorship.

He concluded with this solemn warning:

"Unless the people awake to the peril of the situation and insist on the essential democratic reforms of our monetary system being carried out before it is too late, they will have only themselves to blame for the disaster which is looming."

In face of the evidence of the present situation and the forceful case submitted by Premier Aberhart in the articles under review, it seems inconceivable that any responsibly minded person in authority should continue to ignore the realities which confront us. Yet they apparently do so.

It should demonstrate beyond any possibility of doubt the utter uselessness of appeals to reason.

We have a situation in which a small gang of men, wielding a power before which even governments seemingly cringe helplessly, are menacing the very existence of civilisation by their determination to preserve, *at all costs*, the financial system from which they derive their power, as a means of gaining some fantastic dream of World Dictatorship.

There is only one way in which disaster can be averted—and that is by the people asserting their sovereignty over their Parliament in a united demand for the results they want in common. That is a power superior even to the power of finance.

It is impossible to exaggerate the urgent need for effective action along these lines before it is too late.

(Reprinted from *Today and Tomorrow*.)

PARLIAMENT

Continued from page 3

He cannot even delegate it to an Under-Secretary. These Regulations affect the liberties of the individual British citizen, and I feel that it would be the wish of the House that I, personally, should deal with all these cases. If that is taking too much on myself I have made a mistake, but I do not believe the House of Commons would wish me to do anything other. . . .

I want to make it clear and it is the case of course that in the applications, one written and one verbal by telephone, of the hon. Member for Shettleston (Mr. McGovern), to which I will come in a minute, he did ask for a permit to visit Ireland generally, both Northern Ireland and Eire, including Dublin. . . .

I do not wish that Members of Parliament should be treated in exactly the same way as ordinary members of the public and we have not said so. But we have said that we must have regard to the principle embodied in these Regulations, in the case of Members of Parliament, as we do in the case of the public. . . .

The House of Commons has not claimed, and I do not think is going to claim, that, automatically, restrictions which are imposed upon the general public shall not be imposed upon Members of the House of Commons. I would point out again that there are plenty of these restrictions. There are restrictions in defence areas in Great Britain and Northern Ireland. There is the coastal strip, which is very extensive; no passes at all can be obtained for entry to those areas and special arrangements would have to be made. . . .

[Continuing, Mr. Morrison quoted some words of Mr. Churchill's in replying to a question in 1940 withholding from M.P.s the general right to visit dock yards, munitions factories, military defences, etc., and said that all requests for permits were most carefully considered. "I can assure the House that we are not looking for grounds for refusal. On the contrary, if there is any reasonable ground of public interest we would be very broad in our interpretation."]

. . . I have given the House the assurance that I will be as broad and considerate in administering that as I can because Members of the House of Commons and the House of Lords are members of the legislature and they have special right of consideration. There is only one point further to which I could go, that is to say, that no questions should be asked, that a Member of the legislature, because of his position, as a Member of the legislature, has a right to go without questions asked, and without restrictions, to any part of Ireland. We must consider where that takes us. It takes us to the point that if there be one, or two, or three, four or five Members of the legislature who, going to those countries, did harm or mischief, or committed a grave indiscretion that would involve us in trouble—and that is not difficult in Ireland—[An HON. MEMBER: "Or America."]—and then there would be questions about it. Indeed, there have been Questions in this House about journeys abroad—not to Ireland, I admit; but the same principle applies. . . .

Earl Winterton (Horsham and Worthing): . . . The right hon. Gentleman has propounded a completely new doctrine. There is no pretence about it [*Interruption*]. It may be, as the Minister says, a new situation. Then we ought to have a full-dress Debate in the House in which we could be told, from the mouth of the Prime Minister, that it is in the public interest that Member of Parliament "A"

should be treated on a different basis from Member of Parliament "B." I need not warn the Government or the House what use could be made of that if, after the war, we had an extremist Government either of the Right or the Left. . . .

Mr. H. Morrison: . . . This is a duty imposed upon me by the House of Commons. It is imposed upon me personally, as Secretary of State, and I cannot avoid it. Therefore, it is a little unjust, if I may say so, for my Noble Friend to put me in the dock for carrying out the duties which Parliament has imposed upon me.

Earl Winterton: . . . if that is the effect of the Regulations, then I would say quite frankly to the Prime Minister that the sooner we alter the Regulations the better.

Commander Sir Archibald Southby (Epsom): . . . My view, which is perfectly well known to hon. Members of this House, is that no Member of this House should be locked up under Regulation 18B without this House being told why. I will not depart from that view, for I believe it to be in the interests of Parliamentary government and freedom that that view should prevail. I say that you may take a Member of this House, charge him under Regulation 18B, arrest him and lock him up, but that you should not have the power—it is not right that you should have the power, either under this Home Secretary or any Home Secretary, or under any other Minister—to silence the voice of a Member of this House without telling his fellow Members upon what grounds that voice is being silenced. It goes much further than that; it is silencing the voice of everybody in his constituency. . . .

I do not know why the hon. Member for Shettleton wished to go to Ireland. I am not greatly concerned, but I am greatly concerned that the Home Secretary arrogates to himself the right to decide [*Interruption.*] My right hon. Friend says it is not true.

The Prime Minister: I really must state that the Home Secretary does not arrogate to himself the right. These duties have been placed upon him by the House. The House may be right or wrong, the House may change its mind, the House is all powerful, but to say that the Home Secretary has arrogated this to himself is most unfair.

Mr. Maxton (Glasgow, Bridgeton): . . . Then one gets the extreme case of having to go to the Home Secretary and say, "Please give me a permit to go to Northern Ireland, because I have a suspicion that there is a case against you, and if I bring it up in the House, I shall be able to knock spots off you." "Please give me a permit to go to Ireland to collect information to enable me to make a fool of you in public debates." He says: "No, I have considered this from all points of view, and I am satisfied that it is not in the national interest." I believe he means that. . . .

I do not believe there has been much interference in the past. When I have asked the Home Secretary, or his predecessor, or the Under-Secretary, for special facilities to investigate matters, they have given me everything I have asked for. . . .

The Prime Minister: . . . I must say that I should feel very proud and happy if I could come down to the House, even while the war was going on, and say, "Our position is now so good and solid we now see the path before us so firm and clear, that even in time of war we can of our own free will give back these special powers." Unhappily that is not the case at present. The time may come, but not at present. In the meantime, I cannot conceive how Parlia-

ment can better keep control of the exercise of these abnormal powers than by insisting upon their being exercised in the discretion of a Minister present in the House and accountable to the House. The Minister has been made accountable to the House. He has come down to-day and has explained in the greatest detail his use of the powers in a particular case. I should think it was a most objectionable thing to have this discretionary power conferred upon him, but it must be a discretionary power, and there must be a choosing between this and that. The House has given the power, and I am bound to say that the manner in which my right hon. Friend has explained the whole position has given the House the feeling, first, of the submissiveness of the Executive to the Parliamentary institutions, and, second, of the care with which these powers are exercised.

For my part, I hope that the day may come as speedily as possible, even before the end of the war, when we may be able to relieve ourselves of these exceptional powers, or some of them. In the meanwhile, I feel that we are entitled to ask from the House a general measure of support for the Minister charged with executing them. There can be no question of going behind the powers of the House. . . .

Mr. A. Bevan (Ebbw Vale): . . . I am convinced that the House as a whole believes that in this particular instance the Home Secretary unnecessarily used his power. That is the whole point at issue. He has not shown to-day that the exercise of the right of a Member of Parliament to go to Northern Ireland would have been prejudicial to the public interest. . . .

LONDON LIAISON GROUP

Lunch-time reunions are held on the first and third Thursdays in each month at 12-30 at The Plane Tree restaurant, Great Russell Street, W. C. 1.
Next meeting November 6.

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., 17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.

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

BLACKBURN S.C. Association: 168 Shear Brow, Blackburn.

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

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

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

LONDON Liaison Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.

MIDLAND D.S.C. Group: see Birmingham.

NEWCASTLE and Gateshead S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

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

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