

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 11. No. 3.

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

## Farm Debts and Land Tenure in Alberta

*The substance of a broadcast given recently by  
the Hon. E. C. MANNING, Premier of Alberta.*

I would like to discuss an aspect of agriculture to which the government has given and continues to give prior consideration because of its dominating importance. I refer to the problem of farm debts and the security of land tenure.

While this is, very naturally, a matter which concerns all farmers very vitally, I wish to make it plain that it also concerns everybody else—professional and business men, workers in industry, public servants and all other citizens.

I feel that in the past there has been a great deal of misunderstanding on this question of farm debts and security of land tenure. There has been a tendency to treat it as a farmer's problem and not as a Provincial problem concerning everybody. I believe that before we can begin to get down to anything like a practical reconstruction of our economy, we must adjust ourselves to a realistic attitude towards agriculture.

In the first place we must recognise clearly that the foundation of any economic structure is agriculture and the system of land holding under which it is developed.

It is impossible to have a just, stable and prosperous country unless justice, stability and prosperity are accorded to agriculture.

This is not theory, it is fact which has been proved by the experience of history all down the ages. But it is truer here in Alberta than in many other parts of Canada. Here in our own Province the prosperity and well-being of manufacturing industries, merchants, lawyers, doctors, teachers—everybody in fact—is bound up with the condition of the farmers.

I know that plenty of lip service has been given to this point of view, but I am now pleading that we go further and recognise its truth as a basis for united action by all sections of the people.

Nobody realises better than the farmers of the West what an unjust and unfair deal they have had. Thousands of them came West and put all they possessed into clearing land and developing it. They knew nothing about business trickery or compound interest. They eagerly accepted the loans they were offered, thinking that with the added income from the machinery and stock they could buy with the money, they could pay off the loans together with the ex-

ortionate 8, 9 and 10 per cent. interest which was demanded by the lending institutions.

I hear thoughtless persons condemning farmers who, during those few years when prices were good and conditions looked reasonably prosperous, went away on vacations or bought good cars. I have no time for such criticisms. Farming is not an easy occupation. It demands long hours, hard work and knowledge which can be acquired only by experience. It needs a great deal of capital. And always hanging over the farmer is the constant worry of sudden calamity due to weather conditions, destruction by pests and the other hazards beyond his control. If after a hard season which proved successful, if after paying off his obligations, if after making provision for the coming season's requirements, some of our farmers felt the need for a little relaxation and took a vacation, who will blame them? Remember everything looked stable. Our economists and financiers in those days were talking of the future in the most optimistic terms.

But those few years of comparatively prosperous conditions were short lived. Drought and depression suddenly plunged agriculture into a desperate plight. Prices for farm products slumped away below production costs. Farm debts doubled and trebled. It took two and three bushels of grain to pay debt obligations where it required but one before. As prices were less than the cost of producing the grain, farmers found it impossible to meet even the interest charges.

Added to this, the people found that interest was added to principle and interest was charged on the whole. Year after year this went on. Farm buildings became shabby. Machinery wore out. A terrible blight descended upon our rural population. The producers of the nations' food found it difficult to feed and clothe themselves. Land values sank to lower and lower levels. The farmer saw all the capital invested in his land disappear. His debts exceeded the reduced value of all his assets.

The mortgage companies, instead of helping farmers to tide over the crisis, had apparently selected Shylock as their patron saint. They began a systematic campaign of dispossession. . . .

Every Provincial Government in the West was obliged to introduce legislation to protect farmers against the avaricious actions of the lending institutions.

That was before the present Alberta Government was first elected in 1935 with a definite mandate to afford more effective protection for our farmers. With our knowledge of the fraudulent nature of our debt-creating financial system, this Government was able to carry out its mandate in this sphere—at the same time doing its best to ensure

that such legislation could not be abused by unscrupulous debtors.

Debt Act after Debt Act passed by the Provincial Legislature of Alberta was attacked by the lending institutions. Act after Act was either disallowed by the Federal Government or declared *ultra vires* by the courts. The reasons for their annulment were analysed by some of the best legal minds and the Government brought forward new legislation to replace the acts rendered inoperative. But these, in turn were attacked, with equal success, by the mortgage companies.

And may I point out that Alberta alone had been singled out for this offensive action by these concerns. After the outbreak of war the attack was intensified.

Then came the final attempt to remove the last barriers to the right of action to dispossess debtor-farmers. The judgment obtained had the effect of making illegal all similar debt legislation in Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Immediately the Alberta Government took the lead in bringing together the Government and farmer organisations of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and our own Province. A united and unanimous request was made to Ottawa to pass legislation to give farmers the necessary protection from unjust dispossession by the Mortgage and other lending corporations and to provide for some kind of equitable settlement of farm debts.

Remember the war had been in progress for some time. The importance of agriculture as an essential war industry was recognised. Farmers were being urged to produce more and more. Yet farmers continued to get inadequate and inequitable prices for their products. They were still denied proper credit facilities. They were being systematically divested of their man power. They could not obtain machinery. Their debt obligations had accumulated to unmanageable proportions. And on top of all this they were living under the constant threat of dispossession by institutions whose existence is no more essential to the national war effort than a Zulu war dance is to Canadian culture.

Naturally prompt action by Ottawa was confidently expected. But for some reason such action has been delayed. Now, if help from Ottawa comes at all, there is an element of doubt as to whether it will be effective.

Now, that is the situation. Surely this matter constitutes a problem which should concern everyone of us very vitally.

First, it should concern us because if there is anything we can do provincially to give the farmer security of tenure on his land during the war, we must do it. As a vital war industry the efficiency of agriculture should not be jeopardised because a few financial institutions want to get control of the land. Actually their actions are a detriment to the war effort—because you cannot expect farmers to seed the land and build up their livestock when they do not know from month to month whether they are going to be thrown out on the highway.

Secondly it concerns us all on the grounds of equity and justice. Should the property rights, the homes and the happiness of our citizens be subjected to the kind of law, which operates only in favour of one section of the nation, namely the large money manipulating corporations?

Thirdly, it concerns us vitally because unless we can

solve the problems of agriculture, we will not be able to deal effectively with any of the other problems of the post-war period. The reconstruction of the basis of our economy is essential as the foundation for all other post-war reconstruction.

In the short time at my disposal I have endeavoured to outline the most important facts regarding farm debts. At a later date I propose to deal with the kind of constructive action which must be taken to meet the grave situation which has developed. However, before doing so, I feel we should await a little longer to see what action Ottawa intends to take in the matter. I would like to hear from our farmers, farmers' organisations and others what their views are in this connection.

Already we have received a representation from one farmers' organisation in the form of the following resolution: I quote.

"WHEREAS land is the greatest asset of any community, as it provides practically all the raw products for the satisfaction of their material wants; and

WHEREAS the development of the land to produce the maximum benefit to the largest number of persons can be carried out best under a system of private ownership which makes the individual responsible for the land under his care, combined with a proper system of rewards for those using the land to the best purpose; and

WHEREAS ownership of land involves acceptance by the owner of all the responsibilities of trusteeship on behalf of the people; and, as such, he should be assured of security of tenure so long as his stewardship is satisfactory; and

WHEREAS the people should be protected from unrestricted exploitation of land, gambling in land values, monopoly control of land, the evils of irresponsible absentee landlordism and other abuses inherent in the present system;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the delegates of the Alberta Farmers' Union in regular Convention assembled that the Provincial Government be requested, as an essential and basic measure of post-war reconstruction, to take the necessary steps for changing the Constitution of the Province to provide for a system of land tenure which will:

- (1) Assure security of tenure to all owners and tenants of land.
- (2) Institute a proper control of land titles to prevent gambling in land values, unrestricted exploitation of land by financial manipulation and the control of land by persons or corporations having no intention of using it for the public benefit.
- (3) Protect debtor tenants against dispossession owing to circumstances over which they have no control.
- (4) Ensure that owners will receive the benefit of all improvements they make and discourage the abuse of land or property by allowing it to deteriorate.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that before any legislative enactment to establish such system of land tenure becomes effective it shall be submitted to a vote of the people by referendum."

I shall be interested to know to what extent that represents the views of the majority of our farmers and other citizens.

**REDISTRIBUTION IN CANADA**

On July 8, Mr. MacKenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, made public a letter he had sent to Mr. Maurice Duplessis, opposition leader in the Quebec legislature, in which he declined to accede to a request by Mr. Duplessis that his protest against postponement of redistribution of commons membership\* be transmitted to Mr. Churchill.

Mr. King gave three primary reasons for his attitude:—

1. The matter was one of "dominion rights."

2. The theory that the British North America act could not be amended in any particular without the consent of the provinces "does not appear to be supported either in history or in law."

3. Any intervention by the government or parliament of Great Britain in the internal affairs of the dominion "would be in the negation of Canada's equality of status with the United Kingdom."

Mr. Duplessis had written to Mr. King, sending a copy of a message from himself to Mr. Churchill asking that the parliament at Westminster refuse to sanction amendment of the British North America act so as to permit postponement of redistribution.

**JUSTICE BY LEAVE**

The INFORMATION SHEET (Sydney) publishes the text of one of the recent Statutory Rules promulgated in Australia:—

1943 No. 74.

High Court of Australia.

RULES OF COURT.

As of Tuesday, the 9th day of March, 1943.

PURSUANT to the Judiciary Act 1903-1940 and to all powers thereunto enabling—

It is ordered as follows:

(a) That Part I of the Rules of this Court be amended in the manner hereinafter appearing, that is to say:

ORDER XLIVA.

Prevention of Vexatious Proceedings.

1. Upon the application of a Law Officer of the Commonwealth or of the Crown Solicitor of the Commonwealth or of the Principal Registrar of the High Court of any Justice thereof is satisfied that any person frequently and without any reasonable grounds or that any other person in concert with the person hereinbefore mentioned has instituted vexatious proceedings may after hearing any such person or other person or giving him an opportunity of being heard order that no legal proceedings shall without the leave of the Court or a Justice thereof be instituted by such person or other person in the High Court.

Such leave shall not be given unless the Court or a Justice thereof is satisfied that the proceedings are not an abuse of the process of the Court and that there is *prima facie* ground for the proceedings.

\*Reports of the passage of the British North America Bill through the British Houses of Parliament appeared in *The Social Crediter* of August 7 and September 4.

2. A copy of any order made hereunder shall be published in the Commonwealth Gazette.

1. By adding to Rule 3 of Order LVII, the following proviso:

Provided that if any such process of commission shall appear to a Registrar on its face to be an abuse of the process of the Court or a frivolous or vexatious proceeding the Registrar shall see the direction of a Justice who may direct him to issue the same or to refuse to issue the same without the leave of a Justice first had and obtained by the party seeking to issue the same.

(b) That the foregoing order and proviso shall come into operation forthwith.

J. G. LATHAM, C.J.  
G. E. RICH, J.  
H. E. STARKE, J.  
E. A. McTIERNAN, J.  
D. WILLIAMS, J.

**LIBERTY OR LICENCE?**

A single issue of the *Farmers' Weekly* yielded the following items reporting the Fight for Freedom on the Home Front (the emphasis is ours):—

"As a result of a 'holdup' of farmers' cars at Swindon Market, a man was fined £5, with £2 costs, at Swindon, for selling eggs other than to a *licensed* buyer."

"A Wimblington farmer was fined £5, with £10 costs, ... for selling 269 lbs. of potatoes other than seed potatoes or thirds for seed, without a *licence*."

"A man stated to have been helping the war effort by rabbit trapping for Somerset W.A.E.C., was summoned at Bridgwater for selling 90 lbs. of trapped rabbits, when *unlicensed*, to a butcher, and for failing to keep records."

"For buying strawberries from growers without a *licence*, a man was fined £20 with £3 9s. 9d. costs at March (Cambridgeshire)."

**ERSATZ**

"Readiness to use force, if necessary, for the maintenance of peace is indispensable, if effective substitutes for war are to be found."—Mr. Cordell Hull.

Now would that be ersatz peace, or would it be ersatz war?

**RECONSTRUCTION**

*The "Glasgow Evening Times"*  
Articles of May 1932  
on Social Credit

By Major C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 6d. (Postage extra)

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

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 11. No. 3. Saturday, September 25, 1943.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Under present circumstances, the popularity of Mr. Churchill doesn't require much buttressing, but the fishwife attack on him by the American Hearst Press ought to provide the final testimonial. What beats us is why Goebbels doesn't order it to praise him.

Algerian Burgundy, which is a good and wholesome wine costing about twopence a quart in Algeria, is now on sale in this country being distributed "under the direction of His Majesty's Government" at a controlled price of eight shillings a bottle.

You see at once, Clarence, how important it is to avoid inflation, which is a rise of prices, and how "the Government" is taking the lead in this noble cause. But you may overlook two other facts: (a) that Algerian burgundy won't keep, and so we must stop getting something for our trouble in North Africa, (b) That, after taking ten shillings in the pound off you in income tax, "the Government" is doing everything possible to give a lead to price inflation so that your remaining ten shillings will buy less than half what it otherwise would purchase. Beginning with 2½ stamps in the first week of war.

We are indebted to the Toronto *Evening Telegram* for the opportunity to inspect a photograph of Mr. Joseph E. Davies, ex-Ambassador of the United States to Russia, and endorser of the anti-British film, *Mission to Moscow*. Mr. Davies is either a full-blooded Jew, or a throwback.

"Two opposing philosophies with respect to public finance exist in high government circles, to-day. The first, which may be called the *traditional* view, is that a continuously unbalanced budget, and a rapidly rising public debt imperil the financial stability of the nation. The second, or *new*" (emphasis in original) "conception, is that a huge public debt is a national asset rather than a liability, and that continuous deficit spending is essential to the economic prosperity of the nation. According to this view, the conception of a balanced budget belongs to the category of obsolete economic dogma, the fallacy of which has been clearly demonstrated in recent years."

— *The New Philosophy of Public Debt*; published by the Brookings Institution, Washington, 1943.

"It is equally obvious that so long as this demand for a balanced national budget is conceded, there can be no

economic security, since it involves continuous application to the financial authorities for permission to live."

— *The Monopoly of Credit* (p. 59) by C. H. DOUGLAS; published 1931.

"The great bulk of the loan (National Debt) represents purchases by large industrial and financial undertakings, who obtained the money to buy by means of the creation and appropriation of credits at the expense of the community, through the agency of industrial accounting and bank finance."

— *Economic Democracy* (p. 123) by C. H. DOUGLAS; published 1918.

In the light of information we have received from a well-informed correspondent, it appears to be desirable to qualify certain comments on General de Gaulle, made in our issue of July 24.

While de Gaulle unquestionably stands for the great body of French opinion which looks to the expulsion of Germans and German influence, there does seem to be some ground for the accusation both of careerism and truckling to the least desirable elements in French life.

The United States has adopted the Compensated Price. We are not told whether it will be under the command of General Eisenheuer.

"The fundamental error of our theorists is, that they have never understood the place which integrity has in all the ramifications of life. They believe that to say a thing is the same as to do it, as though verbiage were a substitute for will, conscience and education."

— *America, the Land of Promises* by HENRY J. TAYLOR, U.S.A.

### REGINALD MCKENNA

Though vastly over-quoted by Social Crediters for statements concerning matters of fact in banking practice to which 'authority' lent nothing and took nothing away, the Right Hon. Reginald McKenna, whose death has been announced, was interesting because of the suggestion his actions conveyed of seeming to defend (if only with his left hand) the rights of the business community and the public against the insufferable and disastrous arrogance of the Bank of 'England.'

Effective resistance to those 'of all countries and of none' who constitute the Money Power by the trading banks, of which the Midland Bank is still an example, though an inflated example, was, and probably is still, a possibility which courageous and patriotic Englishmen might consider, as the consequences of complicity in a disastrous policy materialise. As *The Times* puts it, McKenna "was commonly accused of opposing Mr. Norman, in the days of the latter's autocratic Governorship." (Presumably *The Times's* obituary notice was largely written at a time when it was considered that the Rule of Montagu Norman must end some day). It may be suggested that McKenna was not a free man. Freedom is (ultimately) a matter of choice—choice of personal policy and choice of means to carry it out. It is not *necessary* that resistance to the world dominated by Satan should succeed.

## ALIENS IN GREAT BRITAIN

*Extracts from the earlier parts of this debate, which took place in the House of Lords on July 26, 1918, appeared in THE SOCIAL CREDITER on September 11 and 18.*

### BRITISH NATIONALITY AND STATUS OF ALIENS BILL

*The Marquess of Lincolnshire:* My Lords, I am not going to attempt to make a speech. I hardly think that my noble friend Lord Sandhurst can be pleased with the reception given to this Bill. I have been a member of your Lordships' House for over fifty years, but I never heard a Bill so much condemned from all parts of the House as this unfortunate production which has emanated from His Majesty's Government. Not one supporter of the Government has dared to get up and support the Bill. . .

Many members of the Government would say, if they were permitted to do so, that they are in entire sympathy with us. I have been told by some members of the Government, "We are entirely with you; we will do everything we can to help you. Let us know whether you have knowledge of any persons you consider dangerous and we will do the best we can to look into the matter." But I maintain that it is not the business of the individual to have to go to the Government and say, "I believe So-and-So to be a dangerous person, and you must lock him up." It is the duty of the Government to intern all the aliens at present at liberty in the country, or if any are left at liberty, the Government should be able to say, "Although this man of alien origin is permitted to be at large, we trust him; we are responsible for him, and you need have no anxiety on the subject." My last word is that we think it is the duty of the Government not only to govern the nation but to do their utmost to protect the country.

*The Lord Chancellor:* . . . I think there has been general consent in the House that it is probable the House will read this Bill a second time. All the points that have been taken are really points for Committee, and in Committee any such points which are embodied in the shape of an Amendment will be most carefully considered with every desire to make the Bill as effective as possible. . .

. . . Then came the Delbrück Law. To my mind that Law was a skilful piece of camouflage. It contains an enactment that "becoming naturalised in another country shall put an end to German allegiance." But then comes a proviso that, in any case in which the Government thinks fit, they may grant a licence, and that in that case, the allegiance shall still continue to exist. I think it shows no want of charity after our experience of Germany recently to come to the conclusion that this power of dispensation was really the effective part of the Delbrück clause, and it would be used precisely in these cases in which it is most dangerous for any other country to allow German subjects to become naturalised.

. . . [The outbreak of war called attention to] the fact that this peaceful penetration was going on—a danger of the most insidious character, not so noisy as war but all the more dangerous for that reason. The war has enabled us to see things in their true light, and it will be our own fault if we do not take care when peace comes that the process of peaceful penetration is not pursued as it has

been pursued in the past.

Some observations were made, I think, by some of the noble Lords who addressed the House to the effect that there was a "Hidden hand" which prevented effective measures being taken against Germany. As far as I can judge of that matter, I believe that to be a mere illusion. There is no such influence at work. No one regards naturalisation as constituting a sacred contract. I am quoting from the noble Lord who spoke secondly in this debate, Lord St. Davids. No one regards it in that light. Everyone recognises and certainly His Majesty's Government recognise, that any rights acquired under naturalisation must be absolutely subordinate to the welfare and the safety of the country and the effective prosecution of the war must be taken. We will do that, but do not let us lose our heads and rush into extreme measures which I am tempted to think would make us a little ridiculous to a great many of our best friends. Let us do what is wanted, and do it effectively, but do not take sensational measures which may earn a passing popularity but which will not really tend to promote the object which everyone in this country, including the Members of His Majesty's Government, have at heart.

. . . [Concerning Clause 7 sub-section (3) of the Bill, stating the causes for which revocation may take place after proper inquiry, if desirable:—] under that head (f) is a most important one. If the person naturalised "remains a subject of a State at war with His Majesty that does not regard naturalisation within the British Empire as extinguishing his original national status"—this is a most important point, and as dealt with in the Bill ought to meet a great part of the danger which undoubtedly has been created in this country by the presence in our midst of those who, nominally our friends, are really our foes.

The second point to which I wish to call attention is this—that with regard to certificates of naturalisation that have been granted during the present war, if after inquiry it appears desirable in the public interest that the certificate should be revoked, it may be revoked. That is a very valuable power. On the whole, my Lords, I venture to say that this Bill, though it may not go as far as many of our friends desire, is a useful measure, and that any points that have to be dealt with and which have been touched upon in the course of this debate are points really for Committee. . .

*Lord Beresford:* May I ask the Lord Chancellor whether the findings of the Committee will be public or private?

*The Lord Chancellor:* I cannot tell my noble and gallant Friend. I presume the findings will ultimately be published.

*Lord Beresford:* The reasons for the findings?

*The Lord Chancellor:* I cannot answer a question of that kind. As to whether the proceedings will be public or not, I am not in a position to make a statement in anticipation and I think the noble and gallant Lord will recognise that it would not be desirable that I should do so.

*Lord Sydenham:* May I ask the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack whether it would be in order to introduce a clause into this Bill forbidding enemy aliens becoming Members of Parliament or Members of the Privy Council. Would it be proper or improper in a Bill of this kind?

*The Lord Chancellor:* I have no authority to rule upon that. It would be for the House to determine. I should, however, very much doubt whether it would be in order.

On Question, Bill read 2a, and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

*House of Lords: August 5, 1918.*

**BRITISH NATIONALITY AND STATUS OF  
ALIENS BILL  
(HOUSE IN COMMITTEE)**

Clause 1

[An Amendment to Clause 1 substituted the word "may" in the phrase "the Secretary of State may by order revoke the certificate" by the word "shall." This Amendment was opposed by the Government but received agreement by the majority on vote.]

Clause 2

[The Earl of Jersey moved to insert a new subsection providing that "no person who at, or at any time before, the grant of a certificate of naturalisation was the subject of a country which during the present war is or shall be at war with His Majesty, shall be entitled to be registered as a parliamentary elector for any constituency for a period of ten years after the grant of a certificate of naturalisation."

In the course of his speech the Earl of Jersey said:—"It seems to me an insult to the people of this country that any persons of alien enemy origin should be permitted to take any part in making laws for the people of this country. These persons are not here for the welfare of this country; they are here entirely for their own convenience. You may naturalise them and very easily call them British citizens, but you cannot imbue them either with British sympathies or with British instincts. They are allowed to live here by our courtesy and by our hospitality, and I would say very often by our folly, but they have not and they cannot possibly have any right to take part in legislating for the destinies of this country."

The Lord Chancellor objected to the amendment on the ground that it would not be acceptable in the Dominions, where parallel legislation was being introduced, and that in this matter it was desirable to have no discrepancies between legislation in this country and in the Dominions.

The Marquess of Lincolnshire said that his experience led him to believe that while the great Dominions would stand no interference with them they did not wish to interfere as to who should or who should not be on the voters' roll in this country.

Viscount St. Davids pointed out that the franchises were not, and had never been, the same in the Colonies and in Great Britain, *e.g.*, some of them did not give votes for women. He would support the noble Earl had he said twenty instead of ten years. After further lively debate the question was put to the House, their Lordships divided, and the Amendment was disagreed to.

Lord Wittenham moved the insertion of a new subsection providing that "no naturalised alien who has been at any time the subject of a country which during the present war is or shall be at war with His Majesty, shall

be capable to be or remain a member of the Privy Council or a member of either House of Parliament" after August 31, 1918: ]

*Lord Wittenham:* ... What I desire to do in the Amendment is to upset the decision in the case of *King v. Speyer* in 1916. In that case the naturalisation laws, up to that date, were brought under review as affecting the Privy Council and Privy Councillors. The Act of Settlement was gone into, and Statute of 1844, the Naturalisation Act of 1870, and also the Act of 1914. In order that we may understand the point may I read a clause out of the Act of Settlement. Section 3 of that Act says:—

"No person born out of the kingdoms of England, Scotland, or Ireland, or the Dominions thereto belonging, although he be naturalised or made a denizen, except such as are born of British parents, shall be capable to be of the Privy Council."

That lasted until 1844, and longer, because the Act of 1844, although it trod upon the toes of the Act of Settlement, did not repeal this section. When we come to the Naturalisation Act of 1870 a section of that Act did repeal the section I have just read of the Act of Settlement. It is curious that 1870 was the year of the great struggle between France and Germany, and the flood of pro-Germanism which was setting in this country made itself felt, I expect, in that Statute, because we said in effect, "Let 'em all come." Up to that time, for a century and more, we had been content to repose upon the rock of Section 3 of the Act of Settlement. In the Act of 1870 we came to a different conclusion and the flood tide continued right through the years until now.

The case of the *King v. Speyer* decided that, although the Naturalisation Act of 1870 was revoked by the Statute of 1914, it did not revive the Act of Settlement, and thus Sir Edgar Speyer, who was a member of the Privy Council in spite of the Act of 1914, remained.\* By this new subsection I ask your Lordships to override the decision in *King v. Speyer*, but not to set up entirely again Section 3 of the Act of Settlement of 1700, which is very wide and applies to all naturalised subjects. If your Lordships will look at my Amendment, you will see that... it means that no German or Hungarian or Austrian or Bulgarian or any naturalised enemy alien shall be capable to be or to remain a member of His Majesty's Privy Council or of either House of Parliament.

[Lord Wittenham went on to say that he found it difficult to introduce this Amendment as it affected one or two individuals in whom he was interested.]

... It would be bad if a naturalised enemy alien was on our Privy Council who had been able to shed his enemy nationality. How does the case stand if we find on our Privy Council naturalised enemy aliens who have not been able to shed their foreign naturalisation and who are still Germans? I do not blame them. I ventured to say that a week ago. I hope that I did not get out of sympathy with any of your Lordships by the speech that I made then because I said it was not their fault but was the fault of the laws of the two countries, England and Germany. Germany said, "Once a German, always a German." The German

\*Five judges gave judgment on the case of *King v. Speyer*, the decision resting on a majority of three to two. The first Lord Reading, himself a naturalised alien, voted with the majority.

comes over here and gets naturalised and means to be, I assume, a good honest British Citizen, and carries that out so far that he is made a member of His Majesty's Privy Council. Then comes in the fatal evil that he still remains a member of the country that he left. We all have two Privy Councillors in our minds and we must have them in our minds when I am speaking. Am I wrong in saying that they have a double nationality? Ought they to be on the Privy Council? Under which King Bezonian? How are you to divide them up? They want to be in allegiance to His Majesty but all the time there is another country to whom they are bound by allegiance. . . . You have in the cases of Sir Ernest Cassel and Sir Edgar Speyer men whose allegiance is claimed by Germany and they remain Members of the Privy Council. Your Lordships are just as good a judge as I am—much better indeed—of what ought to be done or what ought not to be done.

[Lord Wittenham then spoke shortly of the position of the enemy-born alien in the Houses of Parliament, and concluded by moving the Amendment.

Viscount Sandhurst, in the course of his reply, said that he desired to offer the most emphatic opposition to this amendment:—]

. . . I venture to suggest that it is impossible to separate the personal view from this particular Amendment. The Amendment concerns three persons, or rather two persons, because the question of one, Sir Edgar Speyer, is . . . under consideration. There are only two other persons whom it concerns. One is a member of your Lordships' House—Admiral the Marquess of Milford Haven,\* and the other, who was also mentioned by my noble friend, is Sir Ernest Cassel.\* The Marquess of Milford Haven was honoured by the Sovereign by being sworn of the Privy Council after a long, honourable, and distinguished career in the British Navy.

*Noble Lords:* Hear, hear.

*Viscount Sandhurst:* He was naturalised under the law of 1844, and again naturalised under the law of 1870 because, had that second course not been taken, I understand that naturalisation would not have extended to his children. He had been for nearly fifty years in the service of the Navy. He had held the highest posts, and, as even the "man-in-the-street" knew, we were under great obligations to him at the beginning of the war.

*Noble Lords:* Hear, hear.

*Viscount Sandhurst:* He has two sons serving in His Majesty's Navy today with distinction. Members of that family have fallen; . . . And we are asked by my noble friend, first, that the insult of being withdrawn from the Privy Council should be levelled against this distinguished Admiral, who is such an ornament of your Lordships' House, and in the second place that the patent of a position in your Lordships' House should be torn up. . .

The noble Lord mentioned another name, the name of Sir Ernest Cassel. He has not had the opportunity of serving in the public Service which has been granted to the noble Marquess to whom I have referred, but for over thirty years Sir Ernest Cassel has been one of the most benevolent subjects of the King in every walk of life. There has been no

Lord Louis Mountbatten, Commander-in-Chief in South East Asia, is the younger son of the Marquess of Milford Haven. He married the favourite grand-daughter of Sir Ernest Cassel.

good object that has not had his support. His kith and kin also have been in the trenches, and each and every one of them who has not been in the trenches—I mean the female members of the family—has been engaged in war work of various descriptions. Many public men have availed themselves of the great ability which he possesses. I submit that these two men, the Marquess of Milford Haven and Sir Ernest Cassel, should not be subjected to what I call the insult proposed by this Amendment. . . . To such a policy as that suggested in the Amendment I cannot and will not subscribe.

[The Earl of Verulam said that such a policy would "fetter the freedom of the electors" who ought to know whom they wished to choose. Of his own personal knowledge Sir Ernest Cassel estimated the value of his wealth in Germany at five sovereigns.

Viscount St. Davids said that until then he had not realised that the Amendment would affect the Marquess of Milford Haven, he would be prepared to vote for the Amendment, but would like the mover, who he did not think knew it would affect the Marquess of Milford Haven, to put at the end of the Amendment, "nothing in the clause shall be taken as dealing with the Marquess of Milford Haven."]

*Several Noble Lords:* No, no.

*The Marquess of Lincolnshire:* . . . With regard to these aliens whom we suggest should no longer belong to the Privy Council, leaving out the Royal Family—as I believe we ought to leave it out—this applies to only two men; one is Sir Edgar Speyer, and the other is Sir Ernest Cassel. Sir Edgar Speyer has fortunately taken himself off to the United States of America, where I hope he will remain. He resigned his Privy Councillorship—some noble Lord said he threw it in the face of the Sovereign. . . .

Really when you come to think of it, the matter only concerns one single man. It is a terrible thing even to be supposed to attack an individual, but there practically is no attack made on any individual. One noble Lord, during the debate, said that Sir Ernest Cassel had behaved—I forget the exact words, but in a magnificent or splendid manner since the war. There is no doubt that, in the language of the Foreign Office, Sir Ernest Cassel has behaved in a very correct manner; there is no doubt of that. There is no accusation brought against him, there is no charge shown against him, there is no venom shown against him. Nothing of the sort. The whole question before the House is: Is a great principle, which ought never to have been interfered with, to be wiped out absolutely in order to make an exception for one single man, no matter how worthy, how honourable, and how upright that man might be?

Then I have to ask, What, after all, are the special services? We all know what Sir Ernest Cassel has done, but we have a right to ask some one to tell the House what special services and benefactions to the State this gentleman has done which would justify the abandonment for ever of a great principle which the bulk of the nation wish to see restored, and which I believe firmly they are determined to carry out. . . .

[The Lord President of the Council (Earl Curzon of Kedleston) paid a brief tribute to the Marquess of Milford Haven, who at the beginning of the war had been First Sea Lord of the Admiralty, which office he had resigned in the early stages of the war, from an excess of sensitiveness.

Mentioning that the case of Sir Edgar Speyer was under examination by the Home Office, he passed to the case of Sir Ernest Cassel, who, as he said, had also taken an oath of binding allegiance on becoming a Privy Councillor.]

... What have been the services of Sir Ernest Cassel? I do not refer to his long residence in this country. I do not even refer to the terms of intimate friendship which I have always understood existed between him and an earlier and greatly revered Sovereign, but I allude to facts and circumstances within the knowledge of many of us in your Lordships' House, and to the services which Sir Ernest Cassel has been enabled to render upon important matters of extreme urgency, involving State issues of capital importance, to successive Ministries of this country. I say that that gentleman has been in the confidence of successive Prime Ministers and has been honoured by successive Governments; and if any one here says that this is referring to confidential matters of which the public knows little, or to his relations with individuals of which the public knows nothing, then I point to his service in Egypt. The regeneration of Egypt during the last fifteen or twenty years has been largely the work of Sir Ernest Cassel—in any case has been largely contributed to by his generosity and his public spirit. There are few aspects of public life in which Sir Ernest Cassel has not played a large, magnanimous, generous and patriotic part. . . .

[After further debate Lord Wittenham agreed, in the circumstances, to ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.]

*The Earl of Donoughmore:* Is it the pleasure of the House that the Amendment be withdrawn?

*Noble Lords:* No, no—negatived.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Further drafting amendments were agreed to, and the Clause 2, as Amended agreed to.

### Clause 3

[This clause provided that no certificate of naturalisation should be granted for a period of five years after the termination of the war to any subject of a country which at the time of the passing of the Act was at war with His Majesty. There were certain exceptions. Viscount Sandhurst introduced an Amendment providing for a review by a commission of all certificates of naturalisation granted since the beginning of the war with a view to the desirability of revoking the certificates.

Lord Beresford proposed an Amendment to the Amendment to provide that all the certificates should be revoked, and then those who could prove their *bona fides* could if they wished be re-naturalised. This was negatived. The Amendment itself was agreed to. Among other Amendments moved to this clause was one by the Earl of Halsbury who moved to substitute "fifteen years" for "five years" as the period during which naturalisation would not be granted to aliens of enemy origin, on the grounds that the system of

espionage and corruption established by the Germans could not properly be eradicated in five years. He was supported by many Noble Lords.

After debate Viscount Sandhurst offered a compromise of ten years which was accepted by the Noble Lords.]

Clause three agreed to.

Remaining clause agreed to.

*Several strengthening amendments were agreed on the report stage of the Bill, which on August 8, 1918, received the Royal Assent.*

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy .....	( <i>edition exhausted</i> )
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy.....	( <i>edition exhausted</i> )
Warning Democracy.....	( <i>edition exhausted</i> )
The Big Idea.....	2/6
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

### ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...8d.	
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell.....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
Carthorse Conditions for All (the Beveridge Report issue of <i>The Social Crediter</i> ) .....	2d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet) .....	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.) .....	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	1d.
The Job of a Representative.....	½d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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

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

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

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 2s. (Postage extra).