

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 14. No. 9.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 5, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Almost contemporaneously in the first half of the nineteenth century, there lived in or near London two men whose major interest was political economy as it affected the poorer classes. The first was William Cobbett, English of the English, the son of a farm labourer in Surrey. Cobbett was a giant of a man, physically, mentally, and spiritually. Able, and accustomed from childhood, to turn his hand to anything, his stormy life did not prevent him from earning by his own exertions a comfortable living, while at the same time travelling sufficiently to provide him with first-hand information in regard to the things of which he wrote and spoke. His outlook was that of the countryman on a horse—warm, generous, full of courage and sound of judgment.

Cobbett's indictment of his times is nearly flawless. So far as we are aware, his perception of the integral sequence of the Reformation, the founding of the Bank of England (characteristically, under cover of a totally irrelevant "Tonnage Act") and the American and French Revolutions, and his almost uncanny realisation of the inevitable consequences which we now experience, are not matched by any writer of his period. His whole attitude was patriotic and nationalistic—his wish was to raise the land of which he was so proud, and everyone in it, only providing that they were native to it.

His influence appears to have been negligible.

The second man was Karl Marx (Mordecai), an under-sized German Jew, expelled from France for sedition. There is no record of his ever having supported himself. In England he was provided with a competence by Friederich Engels, a German who had settled in Lancashire for the ostensible purpose of exploiting the labour of small children at pitiful wages.

There was nothing which Marx wrote which he obtained by first hand experience. His theories are a synthesis of those of Babœuf, the Chartists, and the Revolutionary Illuminists, and were patched together in the British Museum which was founded by the "class" he was attacking. No one would contend that Babœuf or the Chartists had any comprehension of the real causes of poverty, the monopoly of credit and controlled inflation (debasement of currency), and Marx has been proved completely unsound in theory and practice. His writings exude venom and his gratitude to the country which sheltered him was expressed by working continuously for its destruction. The fact that he was granted a sum of £10,000. (equal to £30,000 now) by Bismarck is fairly good evidence that his efforts were regarded with benevolence by the progenitor of National Socialism and the Cartel System.

This is the man who is regarded by the British "Labour"

Party as the author of their bible and the guide to their policy. A little depressing, isn't it?

• • •
"A wheat and cotton grower, Oklahoma State champion in dairy husbandry, contrasted the fertility of the English soil with that of America. It was much higher in England, he said, but the farms were much bigger in the U.S.A., and needed more equipment. He doubted if a 160 acre farm in the U.S. had as great an output as a 40 acre farm in 'Britain'." — Letter in *The Farmers' Weekly* on a discussion by American officers on their admiration for English farms.

But just you wait, Clarence, until the War Agricultural Committees have collectivised the farms, just like Russia. And when they've spent all the money available, they think they will hand them back. Waal, Waal, Waal.

• • •
It is quite a mistake to assert that the 'Labour' Party wishes to abolish the "little man" in industry. It merely wishes the little man to do all the dirty work, while the Trades Union Officials and the International Cartels make all the rules of the game, tell the consumer what he shall get and upon what terms, and bribe a swollen labour force to walk through the factory gates in order to get paid and belong to a Trade Union. As might have been prophesied with certainty, the "nationalisation" of the Bank of "England" is demanded, and its internationalisation is directly in line with the internationalisation which has always been the aim of Jewish Socialism. There'll always be an England, of course, even if only to provide sites for chemical factories.

• • •
Yes, Clarence, you couldn't be righter. With Germany out of the Way, a Russo-Japanese War has San Francisco beaten to a frazzle. Remember, four-fifths of the Japanese Army hasn't fired a shot.

SAN FRANCISCO

A SPEECH IN THE CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS

The following is the text, from the Official Report of the Canadian House of Commons for March 27, 1945, of a speech by Mr. Norman Jaques (Social Credit) on the approving Motion by Mr. Mackenzie King:—

Mr. Norman Jaques (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I have carefully listened to or read the remarks of previous speakers in this debate. All hon. members, of course, desire peace, but it is evident that we are not agreed as to the best way to obtain it. Previous speakers have made their earnest appeals, and I can only hope that they will credit me with like sincerity. It seems to me that this is not a party question, or even a question of right and left.

It is a question of right or wrong. Freedom and justice are the only bases of peace. Peace may be imposed by force but it cannot be maintained by force.

About a year ago it was my privilege to occupy a seat in the gallery reserved for members of dominion parliaments in the House of Commons at Westminster. In these days that gallery is occupied by members of the armed forces of the allied countries. I have heard some remarks as to what the members of the armed forces are thinking in connection with these matters. On this occasion I was sitting in this gallery in the middle of a group of men in uniform, while in the House of Commons the post-war treatment of Poland and other liberated countries was being discussed. I noticed that the man sitting next to me was a flight lieutenant in the Royal Australian Air Force, and when he turned to me I saw that he was a padre. He did not know me from Adam, of course, but he turned and said, "Is there no one in this house with the courage to get up and tell the truth?" That remark made a very great impression upon me. I may be asked, what is the truth? To me the truth is a matter between a man and his conscience. Since I have to live with my conscience my greatest desire is to remain at peace with it.

The British empire has come in for some discussion during this debate. Since in my opinion it is the only effective league of nations I cannot see the point of attempting to weaken the ties that bind the sovereign dominions of the British empire. I came back from England fully convinced that Canada is the most fortunate country in the world to-day, not only because of its natural resources, but in terms of justice and liberty, both of which have been gained while it has been a member of the British empire.

If Germany is disarmed, where will be the threat to world peace? Last fall I made this statement:

The defeat of German arms is certain, but the plots of international finance and communism, their plans for world control by the surrender of national sovereignty to world government and police force, have become a greater threat to our liberties as Christians and democrats than the disaster at Dunkirk.

That statement has met with a great deal of criticism, but I can only say that nothing has happened since to cause me to change my mind. Let me quote from page 7 of *The Road to Serfdom* by Professor Hayek in regard to Germany:

Merely hatred of everything German instead of the particular ideas which now dominate the Germans is, moreover, very dangerous, because it blinds those who indulge in it against a very real threat. It is to be feared that this attitude is frequently merely a kind of escapism caused by an unwillingness to recognise tendencies which are not confined to Germany and by a reluctance to re-examine and if necessary to discard beliefs which we have taken over from the Germans and by which we are still as much deluded as the Germans were. It is doubly dangerous because the contention that only the peculiar wickedness of the Germans has produced the nazi system is likely to become the excuse for forcing on us the very institutions which have produced that wickedness.

Again at page 194 he says:

Apart from the intellectual influences which we have illustrated by two instances, the impetus of the movement toward totalitarianism comes mainly from the two great vested interests: organised capital and organised labour. Probably the greatest menace of all is the fact that the policies of these two most powerful groups point in the same direction.

Many people seem to think that they could become more ethical by delegating their vices to larger groups. Then, again, how will we determine who is the aggressor nation? Would that not depend upon who controlled the means of

propaganda? Let me refer to the recent troubles in Greece, and quote some opinions in the matter. I hold in my hand a magazine supposed to stand for Christian democracy, and it has this to say on the Greek policy:

The Greek warfare stands out as part of a connected policy to maintain reaction and monarchy and the "right kind" of fascism everywhere in Europe. It becomes luminously clear now that the guns are actually turned against the heroic Greeks who for years have resisted singlehanded the weight of the German war machine.

No blow aimed by our enemies can match the damage inflicted by this present policy of Mr. Churchill.

Then, a press release in an Ottawa paper given by the C.C.F., and headed "C.C.F. Asks Shift in British Policy," goes on to say:

The situation in Greece and Italy shows a lack of support for the democratic people's movements and a readiness to impose, even by force, unpopular or discredited elements for reasons of power politics. Our masses are not working and dying to restore discredited monarchs to their thrones, and reactionary rulers to their pre-war power.

On December 10 I wrote a letter published in the *Ottawa Citizen* in protest of the criticism of British policy in Greece. A few days later Mr. Low, national leader of the Social Credit party, issued a statement to the press in which he described as utterly false and mischievous the propaganda directed against Prime Minister Winston Churchill and the British government with respect to the Greek situation. He pointed out that it indicated powerful world forces mobilised on the side of communism.

There you have divided opinion. So far as I know the people of Canada have never been told the truth as to what did happen in Greece. I have procured copies of the debates in the British House of Commons and have made copies of speeches by the Prime Minister and other members of that house. I have sent those speeches to various newspapers in Canada, but without success. Not a paper to which I sent the speech of the Prime Minister of Great Britain on the subject of Greece would publish that speech. Why?

I hold in my hand a white paper respecting the Greek crisis issued by the British government. While I do not wish to go into detail I shall quote from this white paper a telegram from the British ambassador to Greece to Mr. Eden. This is dated at Athens, January 15, 1945, and is the text of a resolution passed at a mass meeting held in Constitution square, Athens, on January 14, 1945. It is as follows:

The people of Athens, the Piraeus and the surrounding country is now breathing in the air of liberty after four years of slavery under three barbarous invaders and after the recent unjustifiable revolution which has thrown the country into chaos, anarchy, destruction and slaughter. Coming together in a mass meeting, called on the initiative of the working classes of the country, with the collaboration both of its professional societies and of its intellectual foundations the people of Greece declare:

Their eternal gratitude to Great Britain, the friend and defender of Greece throughout two centuries, for the unstinting and noble assistance given by her to our country, for the restoration of her liberties, which were torn to shreds by the recent anti-national revolt.

They pay homage to the heroic British army, whose precious sons have sacrificed themselves in this sacred struggle for our liberties.

They denounce the criminals of this revolutionary movement to the public opinion of the whole world for the unprecedented and hair-raising crimes, the looting and the destruction, which they have wrought at the expense of the unarmed population of town and country and which they stigmatised as entirely foreign to the noble soul and gentle customs of Greece; and they entirely

endorse the measures taken by our allies to put down the revolt.

They demand that every means be used to secure the immediate release of the thousands of hostages who have been inhumanly arrested and are still suffering torments. They resolve to lay a wreath on the tomb of the unknown soldier in memory of the British and Greek heroes who have laid down their lives for the liberties of the Greek people and the resurrection of our nation.

While I cannot pronounce the names of those who signed, it is indicated that this document was signed by the general secretary of the general confederation of workers of Greece, the vice-rector of the university, and the president of the Athens federation of professional men and industrial craftsmen.

That, I think, should answer the Greek question. Since we have had several opinions from enlightened "liberals" in the house and elsewhere I should like to quote an American labour leader, who is now vice-president of the American federation of labour and chairman of the international labour relations section of the American federation of labour. This is a quotation from his speech as delivered to the American labour conference on international affairs on December 16, 1944. It states:

The prophets of neo-imperialism accept without murmur and even with lively approval the open annexation of the Baltic states by Soviet Russia, the transformation of Poland, Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and perhaps also of Hungary and Austria into satellites of Russia as a progressive process.

The very same people are violently opposed to any intervention by Great Britain in the affairs of western or southern Europe, as in Greece, Belgium, Holland, Italy.

It is contrary to the principles of international democracy, these liberal "realists" claim, to intervene in the internal policies of liberated countries.

However these same "liberals" have never uttered a word in opposition to the intervention of Russia in the internal affairs of Poland, Roumania, Bulgaria. More than that, every word of criticism on Russia issued by anyone is regarded as a major crime and the culprit is systematically smeared and labelled as a pro-fascist and pro-nazi. Why this difference?

I hold no brief for the British empire or for British policies. Yet it cannot be denied that communist policy in the liberated countries has been divisive, provocative and dangerous to the cause of the united nations.

Those American "liberals" who do not see this connection of events and personalities are hopeless. Those who praise the fighting communists in Greece as a "democratic movement" are blind—or worse.

Mr. Rose: Who said that? Give us his name.

Mr. Jaques: Matthew Woll.

Mr. Rose: I knew it.

Mr. Jaques: He is vice-president of the American federation of labour. There is an American. Now I am going to quote an Australian labour leader. I am quoting labour leaders only so that I cannot be accused of quoting reactionaries or Tories. I am going to quote now J. T. Lang, one of the foremost labour leaders in Australia, and formerly the prime minister of the Labour government of the state of New South Wales.

Mr. Lang has just published a book on *Communism in Australia*, and I have taken some notes of what he says in that book.

Mr. Lang says that the communist party is organised. The party is shown to be a highly organised concern with unlimited funds, directed by a permanent general staff, almost every member of which has done a two years' study course in Moscow in the art of moulding and controlling

the thoughts and actions of the workers. The book shows that in every issue, whether it is industrial, agricultural, national or international, the communist party slavishly follows the policy laid down in Moscow.

Mr. Lang shows how the communist party, in addition to holding the key positions in most of the labour unions, has infiltrated all channels of publicity, such as newspapers and radio. They have penetrated the teachers' federation, the theatre, all avenues of education, instruction and entertainment. And that is just as true in Canada and the United States.

Communists have all this control and they are pledged to use it in the interests of a foreign power whenever that foreign power so orders them. And, as Mr. Lang shows, it makes no difference that that foreign power is an allied power. The local communist party calls on the Australian government to support communist actions in Greece, Italy, Poland, Jugo-Slavia, and other countries. Now, you may say those disputes are only disputes between British and Russian foreign policy, and these countries are a long way off. Very well, then, take the Pacific. That is nearer home. For years to come there will be three great powers in the Pacific—Britain, America and Russia. Our fate depends on everything those three powers do. Should they disagree it means that all the power the communists can exercise in Australia will be exercised to get the Australian government to support the Russian policy, irrespective of whether it is to the advantage of Australia or to our detriment.

You may think we are too small to count. Well, what about your weekly wages, your home, your whole standard of living? How are they affected by the power of the communist party? Let me put this to you. The financial agents of all the leading countries are continually meeting to agree upon the financial system after the war. While there is yet no complete agreement there is general agreement that the scheme will be based on some modification of the gold standard. Russia supports America's claim of almost a full gold standard. After the war, Russia will want our goods to make good her war losses. How will she pay for them? There are only two ways.

One way is further to reduce the standard of living of her own people; the other way is to reduce the standard and cost of living in the countries from which she wants to buy her supplies. It is only common sense that she will prefer that the standards of the other countries be lowered rather than the standards of her own people. Under that arrangement the standards of living in Australia would have to be lowered.

When that comes about who is going to fight for the Australian workers and through them for the whole standard of living of the Australian people?

The Australian communist party will have to carry out the new policy of reducing the cost and standard of living in Australia. The unions will not fight for Australian workers because so many of the important unions are under communist control. If the present Curtin government is still there the communist policies of the post-war reconstruction department will not defend the standards; and if Menzies is there he will not fight either.

The communist party is just as much the agent of a foreign power as if the members themselves belonged to that nation. If you would not put foreigners in charge of your

(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: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 14. No. 9. Saturday, May 5, 1945.

Into Action

Whatever explanation may be the true one, the course of the Conservative Party is clearly to seem to be opposed to regimentation in small matters, while remaining determined to impose regimentation in great matters. The Education Act and "Assumption B" of the National "Insurance" Plan are (on paper) separately or jointly not only 'check' but 'check and mate' to individual freedom in this country; and these two measures are still in the forefront of the Conservative Party programme.

Opinions differ concerning whether the betrayal of the historical position of the party is Churchillian or Machiavellian, and, since there is a wide understanding (or misunderstanding) that these grand adjectives are more or less freely interchangeable at least to an extent ranging (according to individual judgment) from 55 to 95 per cent., the only elector who might go to the poll at the forthcoming general election with complete confidence that his 'representative's' party's managers' controllers have what he wants in store for him is probably someone fairly well in the confidence of that power (whatever it is) which has brought Germany to "the lowest point of degradation to which humanity had yet descended" (*vide* General Eisenhower's British—or 80 per cent. British—parliamentary guests at Buchenwald), and means to beat that record perhaps once, perhaps twice, and, if need be, three times before the chosen policy is supreme. The *locus* of those foreseen descents can scarcely be Germany again (unless, of course, Russia is now really 'Germany' magnified, reformed and moved into less restricted quarters; or unless 'the United Nations' shelter it in a form reduced to a chosen, hand-picked skeleton, already far on the way to revival.)

Before we enter a final plea for action to stay this descent, we may, if only from deference to the feelings of those who are frankly perplexed, again record our belief, for what it is worth, that Mr. Churchill's vanity is large enough to make him dissatisfied with a reputation which could hardly endure beyond the present year let alone outlast his lifetime UNLESS he makes a material contribution to the winning of the peace as well as (if we allow him so much) the War. And when we say 'reputation' we do not mean what might come to be entered in the 'documentaries' which may soon take the place of printed books in the future proletarianised centres of mock teaching, but the general recognition of great and real service on the part of peoples free to learn the facts and free to form true judgements concerning their physical, mental and moral significance: men and women who are the modern counterparts of the *homo ingenuus*

liberaliterque educatus of Cicero: a man born FREE—and educated accordingly. And when we say 'winning' we do not mean anything which the bitter experience of a few brief years might empty of its content. There may be (though it does not appear to be so) someone near enough to Mr. Churchill to whisper the terrible meaning which these words should convey in his particular ear.

Ballot-box voting has become the kind of game which no honest and sensible man would play. If he plays he will be rooked. Probably mere desistance on the part of a sufficient number of electors would suffice to effect a marked improvement in the present outlook. This opinion is not unsupported by evidence, of which we advance three small yet significant items:—(1) When ABCA discovered that PEP propaganda was playing on a bad wicket, they switched over to an intensive campaign embodying several rational and interesting lines of argument in the hope of overcoming 'apathy' (*i.e.*, contempt), and (2) of several letters published in Scottish newspapers (three newspapers) during the recent elections there, the only sentences removed were sentences suggesting the intentional spoiling of voting papers. (3) Subsequently, great care was taken to explain away the high proportion of spoiled papers.

The only thing which frightens the *Partei* now in being in this country is a conscious, purposive, minority vote at the next election. It is time something frightened it; and we invite those Social Crediters whose admiration for us is of the modest variety to take what may well be their last chance of reinforcing the action of the Secretariat.

1823

Princess Lieven (wife of the Russian Ambassador) to Prince Metternich, August 24, 1823:—

"... Never was the country so happy and peaceful as England at the moment. The lower classes live in plenty. Trade flourishes. The nobility wallow in the lap of luxury. If anyone thought of complaining, people would laugh in his face. I have lived in this country for eleven years, and for the first time I hear no grumbling. If one looks back to the last two years, when whole countries were in open revolt, one has to admit that the present state of things offers a striking contrast. The National Debt is being reduced; taxes are being abolished. Bread is cheap. Why has all this happened? I don't know. We do not like their foreign policy; but what does John Bull mind? He has his mug of beer. And what do the Ministers mind? They are at peace among themselves."

—Private Letters of Princess Lieven.

Jesus Meets Paul

Jesus Meets Paul by the late Dr. Alexander Paterson is again obtainable from the publishers, Robert Gibson & Sons, Glasgow, or the office of *The Social Crediter*, price 2/3 post free.

THE ISSUE

Electoral Canvass for an Anti-Bureaucratic Representation.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd. 1d. each, 3/6 a hundred.

Don't Waste Your Vote!

By C. G. DOBBS

We have been told that a General Election will follow soon after the end of the European War, and the right to vote, which we have endured so much to preserve, will be restored to us. But the resumption of democratic rights after so long a period of disuse will be no easy matter. Things have not stood still meanwhile. No doubt the ballot boxes, and the electioneering, and the Parties, remain much the same, but the significance of them has changed during the interval. Democracy must go forward, or it will go back. If the vote is not used effectively to express the will of the people, it is better not used at all. Remember it was the vote which put Hitler in power!

During their long spell of joint power, the leaders of the different parties in this country, and their numerous henchmen, have found more in common among themselves, as members of a Governing Caste, than between themselves and the voters who, nine years ago, put them in power. This power has been prolonged beyond its term solely for the purpose of winning the war, and we are all grateful to Mr. Churchill and some of his colleagues for their magnificent carrying out of this purpose but the use of the Government's power has not stopped there.

While we ordinary people have been completely pre-occupied by the twin jobs of trying to win the war, and keeping the home fires burning under fantastic difficulties, certain members of our War Government have found the time and energy to prepare the most comprehensive and detailed collection of plans ever put forward in our history; plans, moreover, which they openly state are intended to affect the rest of our lives, and even our children's, "from the cradle to the grave."

It is not surprising that all these Government Plans for our future have been presented to us in a most favourable light, since the Government has had control of all the main sources of information, and even of paper stocks, of which it has doubled its consumption during the War, while restricting all other users to the barest minimum.

What is surprising to learn is that they are not new plans, but very old plans; that they follow closely the main line of legislation in Germany from Bismarck to Hitler; that they have been put forward persistently in this country for fifty years, particularly by people of German origin and connections; that up to 1939 they were the subject of violent controversy and could never have been accepted by a majority; and that in 1945, after being put over on the British people while the best men were away fighting the Germans, and the rest of us were harassed by German bombs and German rockets, and the German type of restrictions and regulations—after being put forward, I repeat, under cover of the War, *they are not to be put to the vote at the coming General Election*, because the party leaders are all agreed upon the main principles, and are prepared to squabble only about the details, and about who shall put them into effect.

That, at any rate, is what the party leaders intend, but I think they are mistaken; I think these plans *will* be put to the vote by the ordinary electors, and my purpose is to explain how YOU can do it, by using your vote in a new way.

The old way of the party vote is no use when all the parties are in collusion to give you what you do not want.

All the Plans have one thing in common: at first glance they offer material advantages which everybody wants and needs, but when looked into they all reveal a mass of restrictions and compulsions, needing a large number of officials, backed by police, law-courts and prisons, to enforce them against ordinary freedom-loving English people.

Take, for example, the Government's Social Insurance proposals as set forth in the White Paper (Part I, 1944). We all want Freedom from Want, but how many would vote for being restricted to earning £1 a week, as a condition of a £1 pension (para. 94), or for being subjected to "special behaviour conditions" by inspectors when we are sick or out of work (para. 67), or for being transferred to jobs away from home (para. 71), or for being heavily penalised if self-employed (para. 78), or for being forced under penalties to pay for benefits we do not want, on the ground that the scheme must include everybody (para. 15), or for being cut out of all benefits because we are too poor to pay the contributions (see exemption on account of low income, Appendix III).

Suppose, then, that we decide that our freedom is too high a price to pay for the benefits offered by compulsory insurance, for which Party shall we vote? They are all equally committed to it. For which Party should the doctor vote who does not want to become a State official, or the patient who does not want his life to depend upon a doctor who has to think first of obeying the regulations? All the Parties support the National Health Plan. For which Party should the parent vote who objects to the interference of the State with his children, and his right to decide what is best for them, or the Christian who objects to the interference of the State in the field proper to the Churches? All the Parties voted for the Education Act. For which Party should a farmer vote who objects to land planning from Whitehall, or a citizen who objects to his local Council losing its traditional powers, a small trader who objects to the 'concentration' of his trade in the hands of the big firms, an employer who hates doing the work of the tax collector under P.A.Y.E., or a worker who objects to the direction and transfer of his labour by officials?

A vote for a Party—any Party—is a vote for all these things and a thousand others, equally objectionable, equally characteristic of the Servile State which we have all endured so much to escape. It will be fatal to be taken in by the tub-thumping of renewed party strife and the spate of words which we can expect with the approach of the Election. Politicians are adepts in the use of words. We can expect a rush of words about Freedom and Democracy, the Menace of Controls, the Threat of Bureaucracy, the Dangers of Monopoly and the Fascist State, and so forth, and so on; but with these detailed plans for our enslavement firmly entrenched in the programmes of all parties, it all amounts to about as much as Hitler's "no more territorial claims" before the War. Politicians instinctively use whatever words they think will put them in power, and successful ones hypnotise themselves, as well as their audiences, into believing that they mean what they say. I do not blame them too much. A politician's job is to yield to pressure, and at present all the pressure is coming from the party machines, whereas it should come from us, from the ordinary electors whom he is supposed to represent. How then can it be done?

First of all it must be quite clear that to tackle the Government's innumerable proposals for extended compul-

sion piece-meal, some bringing pressure on parliamentary candidates to oppose one control to which they have most objection, and some another, will be quite useless. Each little group will be in a tiny minority, although as a whole the objectors make up the mass of the people. That is what we are intended to do. It is the old policy of all Governments, 'divide and rule.'

We must attack the common basis of all restrictions and compulsions, the army of overseers necessary to enforce them against us, the bureaucracy paid with our money to control our lives. A swollen bureaucracy is the first sign of the onset of despotism and the downfall of democracy; it is the essential instrument by which a small group of people can control the lives of the rest. War-time controls have necessitated a huge increase in the number of officials. Sir John Wardlaw-Milne in Parliament (December 1, 1944) gave the number of full-time civil servants at the end of 1943 as more than 1,400,000, as against the even then huge figure of 600,000 odd, before the war. The red light is showing. If we want our country to escape the fate of Germany, and all other nations which have followed the bureaucratic path to the totalitarian State, we must take effective action at once to reduce these swollen figures.

This does not mean an attack on the Civil Service. A small and efficient Civil Service, like a small and efficient Police Force, is a necessary instrument of democratic government. The genuine, trained, professional Civil Servant will be the first to welcome such action, and the war-temporary civil servant, who has been doing the unpleasant job of applying extra restrictions, because in war-time unpleasant jobs have to be done, will be delighted to give it up for something more useful and less parasitic. Indeed, it would be better to pay them their salaries to leave us alone and mind their own business, than to let them continue as at present, minding ours. That we cannot possibly afford!

No mere token reduction will do. What we must have is a drastic reduction to a number of officials large enough just to do their proper job of *service* to the rest of us, and quite insufficient to be able to make life a burden for us with their innumerable forms, regulations, restrictions, compulsions, and general interferences. The figure of 20 per cent. below the 1931 figure is a good and reasonable target and has other considerations to recommend it not all of which need be dealt with here.

This target is, moreover, quite practicable. We approached it as recently as 1931, when a heavy cut in the Civil Service was made at the instance of the Treasury and the Bank of England. But, judging by the amount of interference with life which even the depleted bureaucracy of those days managed to achieve, it did not go far enough.

Incidentally, the idea that the Great Depression of that time, which caused such widespread money poverty amid real plenty all over the world, was due to the actions of ordinary men and women, who made the plenty, but had nothing to do with the creation and control of money, is an obvious and calculated lie put about by the Planning Interest which was actually responsible, in order to provide an excuse for the imposition of controls. Only a people freed from the day-to-day restrictions of bureaucracy can hope to have the initiative and energy to identify its real enemies and enforce its will upon them.

Our objective, then, is clear: a reduction in the number

of officials directly after the war to a level compatible with our freedom, which events have shown must be below the number to which the Bank of England cut it in 1931. This objective is clearly within the power of our representatives in Parliament to enforce upon the Government, and they depend upon our votes at the coming General Election to secure their return to Parliament.

As I have made clear, a vote for a Party is a vote for bureaucracy, which means that if you do not want bureaucracy you will be disfranchised unless you use your vote in a new way. **PIN YOUR VOTE FIRMLY TO WHAT YOU WANT: REFUSE TO VOTE FOR WHAT YOU DO NOT WANT.** Announce publicly well in advance, and in writing to your M.P. and all the other candidates when nominated, that *you refuse to vote for any candidate who will not place the reduction of the Civil Service to 20 per cent. below the 1931 level FIRST on his agenda.* Obviously it must come first or there is no value in the candidates' pledge. If other things, quite incompatible with a reduction in bureaucracy, as most legislation is, come first, he can always wriggle out of it. It must come *first*.

If a party candidate forsakes the Party line sufficiently to give the undertaking in full, vote for him irrespective of his party, and prepare to keep him to it if he is returned. If more than one candidate does so, you have your usual choice. If none of them does, or if, as usual, they all give vague pledges which they will find easy to escape from afterwards, do not be cheated into voting for any of them. Do not stay at home on polling day. Go to the polls and vote against both or all the candidates by marking their names with an O instead of an X, and if you like explain on the back why your vote is withheld from them. You will still be *using* your vote to express *your* will, instead of wasting it in yielding to his. It will be the best way of recording your objection to having the main principles on which your life is going to be run for you, settled between the Party leaders instead of being put to the vote; and it will not be without its effect, as a warning for future elections.

Even if you have to act alone it will be worth doing, but you will not have to act alone. Tell others what you are doing, and why. Write to the local press. Get in touch with others of like mind who have not lost their initiative. Get out a simple typewritten form of statement for other electors to sign, on the lines of the printed one appended, and make sure that the candidates, and the press, are kept fully informed about the campaign.

Finally, do not act unless you mean it in deadly earnest, and do not waste time trying to get undertakings from people who do not mean to carry them out. This is not a 'phony war,' it is a very real one. That liberty which we have so long taken for granted in this country really is at stake, and the threat is all the more effective because the onset of oppression has been so gradual, and so obscured by distracting events.

It *can* happen here: it *is* happening here! The plans are going through while our best men are away at the war, or its aftermath, and the rest of us are war-weary and fantastically burdened with restrictions upon our every-day lives. The danger is as great as it was in 1940; merely the form and appearance are different. Our freedom, that freedom which no honest man will lose but with his life, is again in

danger; and only the few with the courage to fight until the rest rally, can save us from disaster.

Will you be one of those few?

FORM

The following formal undertaking is suggested for use in all Parliamentary Constituencies:—

Electoral Freedom

.....Parliamentary Division. General Election, 1945.

To the Candidates:

WE, undersigned, electors in the Parliamentary Division of....., finding that, through agreement between those in control of ALL THE PARTY MACHINES, we are deprived of effective means of voting against the mass of RESTRICTIVE LEGISLATION planned by the Government while we have been preoccupied with winning the War, which legislation if passed will have the effect of extending permanently the power of officials over our lives, **REFUSE TO VOTE FOR ANY CANDIDATE WHO DOES NOT PUT FIRST ON HIS AGENDA THE REDUCTION OF THE NUMBER OF CIVIL SERVANTS TO 20 per cent. BELOW THE FIGURE TO WHICH IT WAS CUT IN 1931.**

Signature

Address

(Any Candidate who wishes to give this undertaking to the electors is invited to do so through the customary channels, e.g., the press, the platform, or through the medium of personal canvassing for the favour of the Electors' votes.

If, in addition, he communicates his intention in unequivocal form to the Hon. Secretary of the..... Electoral Emergency Committee at the address below, assistance will be given to publicise his undertaking, and to recommend his RETURN TO PARLIAMENT.)

Pay the displaced bureaucrats if you like; but don't pay them to put Great Britain in irons.

CANADIAN PARLIAMENT (Continued from page 3)

government, and important positions in the community, you cannot afford to have members of the communist party in those positions.

That is the political picture of Australia as recorded by Mr. J. T. Lang, a former premier of New South Wales, a fearless and most able leader of the Australian Labour party.

And how do Mr. Lang's words apply to us? How does the Australian political situation compare with our own in Canada? The communist party has infiltrated all channels of publicity, such as newspapers and radio, the teachers' federation, the theatre and all avenues of education, instruction and entertainment, and the church. All these openly advocate communism and defend its policy.

What about the Liberals? Why does the communist party, now known as the Labour-Progressive party, support the Liberal party? One very good reason is the post-war reconstruction committee, appointed by the Liberal government. Listen to Dr. James, chairman of this Liberal committee for post-war reconstruction. He says:

I warn my listeners against the very dangerous propaganda

which would have you believe that mankind is about to enter an age of plenty. The end of the war does not promise plenty for us. Canada must depend, not on the demands of the Canadian people, but to a greater extent than ever before on the world market.

Just as Mr. Lang says of Australia, Ottawa supported by the communist party, is planning to bring about an age of scarcity in Canada, for the benefit of foreigners, by means of the gold standard. Who is Doctor James, or rather what is his background? Doctor James was trained at the London School of Economics, which was founded fifty years ago by British socialists with money supplied by German international finance for the purpose of training the bureaucracy of the future world socialist state, to maintain the gold standard which, as Mr. Lang says, is supported by the Soviet government. Of course it is, because the gold standard means world control by compelling nations to lower their standards of living.

Not only Doctor James, but Doctor Marsh, Mr. Deutch and I believe Mr. Rasminsky, in fact most of Mr. Ilsley's key men, were trained at this same socialist school of economics, founded in the interests of "gold" and socialism. But, you say, Mr. Ilsley is the great Liberal-defender of orthodox finance and of the gold standard and, therefore, he must be opposed to socialism. Then why does he appoint socialist trained experts to plan Canada's future?

These Liberal-Communist planners were trained at the London School of Economics. One of its professors is H. J. Laski, who is one of the most influential socialists in the world to-day. Laski is the idol of the C.C.F. "brain-trust," and a confidential adviser to the New Dealers on the gold standard. Professor Laski has written a book, for private circulation, from which I quote:

Christianity has failed, and the Russian ideal is taking its place as the inspiration of mankind, and as the standard of public morality. The Old Testament is the gospel of hard work, while in the New Testament the central figure of Jesus shows no concern for the workaday world. The trouble with Christianity is that it is subdued to nationalism.

So that our future is not to be based on Christian ideals; yet hundreds of religious leaders who call themselves Christians are subject to and working for Moscow because their faith in Christianity is dead; and it is these very men who believe that Christianity has failed—men trained by communists—who are planning the future of Canada. At the same time a rabid propaganda is being directed by certain religious leaders against the Christian religion, particularly Roman Catholicism, presumably because it is opposed to communism. Certain religious leaders are quoted by socialists and communists because they offer totalitarian philosophy as Christian democracy. Certainly these religious leaders have not uttered a single protest against the wholesale persecutions of people in recently liberated countries in eastern Europe. Will these religious leaders confirm or will they deny the persecution of political opponents by communists in Greece and elsewhere? Will they justify or will they condemn these political crimes? Dare they compare the freedom of religion, the press and politics in Russia with our own British freedoms? Do these religious leaders support or do they oppose the monarchy and the British empire? Do they agree with Professor Laski? Should we look to Russia for our ideals and moral standards? Have they lost their own faith and vision? Do they stand by the Atlantic Charter? Are we fighting to preserve democracy or to create a totalitarian world? Are the gospels unreliable and unauthentic? Are we to follow Christian ideals

according to the gospels, or communist doctrines according to Karl Marx?

Now what about Bretton Woods? My friends the non-members for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) and Acadia (Mr. Quelch) have stated their objections to the Bretton Woods proposals. I should like to add just one or two statements of my own. I might say that I brought the matter up in a speech on this subject which I made in this house on July 12, 1943. On that occasion I quoted Mr. White, who was a member of the United States congress. He said, speaking of the plans:

Both contemplate the surrender by the individual countries to the international monetary power of a large part, if not all, of the very heart of national sovereignty, that is mastership over monetary and credit resources.

Section 8 of the constitution provides that congress shall coin money and regulate the value thereof. . . . If Mr. Morgenthau and the forces back of him should be able to get around this provision of the constitution, then the last vestige of our great charter of liberty will have disappeared. All hope of restoring it would be gone, and the totalitarian state would be complete.

No, I cannot believe that the American people have as yet been beaten into such abject submission that they will allow this to happen.

Then recently a statement was made, I believe in the British House of Commons, and given to the English press, by Mr. Robert Boothby, M.P. I quote from the report in the London *Evening Standard*:

It was American big business, not the united nations, which won the great victory at Bretton Woods. For that agreement was a victory for gold over goods. And practically all the gold in the world is at present buried in the vaults of American banks.

If the House of Commons accepted Mr. Morgenthau's advice and ratified the Bretton Woods agreement, it would deliver this country, bound hand and foot, to the money power represented by the vested interests of international finance.

It would prevent us from ever making any attempt at carrying out an internal expansionist policy designed to achieve full employment.

It would deprive us of all the weapons with which we could protect ourselves from the consequences of an American depression.

It would prevent us from developing the sterling area into a regional group of nations with similar economic interests and objectives, and a complementary trade—which is our greatest hope for the future.

Last, but not least, it would subject us permanently to the economic domination of the United States; for the whole basis of the agreement is in favour of the creditor, against the debtor nation.

Mr. Morgenthau gives the game away when he says he wants to increase his exports "provided his customers are in a position to find dollars to pay for them." We don't want to have to find dollars—which, under the Bretton Woods agreement, means finding gold. Still less do we want to borrow them. We want to pay for our imports with goods of our own.

Bretton Woods does nothing to help us to do this.

Always it is the same old story—this insane American passion for "exports." . . . The main purpose of trade is not to get goods out of your country at all at any cost. It is the mutually advantageous exchange of goods. If you cannot do this, it is far better to make, and consume, the stuff at home.

"Here is an organisation," says Mr. Morgenthau, with enthusiasm, "which has teeth in it." It has indeed. Nasty sharp teeth, which can bite. Under the Final Act of Bretton Woods, if we don't do what we are told by an international authority situated in the United States, we can have penal charges imposed on us, for the payment of which we shall have—somehow—to "find the dollars." We may even be blockaded by our own dominions!

I am all for co-operation between Great Britain and the U.S.A. But not at this price.

One final point. The present British government has no mandate from the electors to jeopardise the economic future of

this country by putting us back on a gold standard, and attempting to resurrect the economic system which was one of the prime causes of the war.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from an article by Mr. Paul Einzig, one of the world's best-known economists. The hon. member for Lethbridge has already put part of the statement on record, and I shall not repeat it. But this particular statement by Mr. Einzig was published by the *Daily Express*, which is owned by Lord Beaverbrook, and more than three million copies were printed and distributed in Great Britain. At the end of the article is this warning:

On this page to-day is an article that should be studied closely by the vast *Daily Express* public, even while the news of victory in battle fills the imagination, even while the pleasures of the August holiday month tempt the multitude into more light-hearted distractions.

The article deals with the decisions reached at the Bretton Woods monetary conference. It establishes clearly that those decisions enslave Britons to gold, and are even liable to imperil British good will with the other nations in the empire.

The future of every man, woman, and child in this country is involved. Surely there will be a mighty national protest. Surely there will be a firm rejection of these proposals when they are submitted to parliament.

May I remind hon. members that, apart from all sentiment, Great Britain is by a long way the best market we have. I would like the hon. member who has just taken his seat to tell us where he proposes to market the produce of Canadian farms if the standard of living in Great Britain is lowered. Will he dispose of it in the United States? Or perhaps he will market it in Soviet Russia? I do not know, but I know that Bretton Woods is going to reflect on the prosperity of the farmers of Canada just as it did before. I remember hauling grain for seven cents a bushel when it cost me six cents to thresh it, and I remember selling hogs for two cents and shipping a carload of cattle and getting a bill back for part of the freight. That was due to the imposition of the gold standard, and the same men who imposed it then are in power to-day. They have never been discredited, and the power behind it is international finance and totalitarianism. You cannot separate them. That is the situation we face.

With regard to this San Francisco conference, legally I am not trained sufficiently to get the full appreciation of what the motion really means, what it really implies. Perhaps before the vote comes we shall be enlightened, but at the moment I will say this. I cannot support any proposal that might weaken the ties between the various sovereign dominions of the British empire, and I can have nothing to do with any proposal to re-establish the gold standard, not even in the interests of peace, because I know very well that it would destroy the possibility of any permanent peace as it did before.

"NeVer Again" Association INFORMATION BOOKLETS:

Responsible Freedom, Part I and Part II. Price 6d. each. Contributions by Horace Newte, M. Sturdy-Smith (Part I), B. M. Palmer, Walter S. Liddall, M.P., Francis G. Feather (Part II).
(Enquiries to M. Sturdy-Smith, 5, Pelham Gardens, Folkestone).