

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 18. No. 7.

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

SATURDAY APRIL 19, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

We have not had long to wait for the benefits of Mr. Strachey's trip to Washington. The Scotch whisky quota for export is to be increased from 50½ to 75 per cent at the expense of the home consumer, and the well-known U.S. family, which is incidentally attacking this country wherever possible, will make more millions of dollars at our expense. Mr. Strachey has arranged for an increased allocation of barley so that the country will lose the barley as well as the whisky, and the dollars will go to the reduction of our American overdraft, *i.e.* will disappear. It just shows what you can do with bulk buying, bulk selling, and politicians of the Strachey type.

• • •

Not many British periodicals sink to the level of being castigated on technical matters by a popular American journal such as the *Saturday Evening Post*, but we think the extract from *The New Statesman and Nation* quoted in that publication's editorial of February 22 demands the attention it there receives.

Apparently the Socialist weekly wrote: "In 1946 new houses were built almost exclusively for those who needed them most—the working classes; interest rates were forced down for the benefit of the local authorities and to the detriment of the *rentiers*; milk was drunk daily by every school child, depriving the better off of their cream and *Stilton cheese*. In brief, there was a Labor Government in power, primarily elected by the wage-earner, and acting primarily in his interest." (Our emphasis).

It would be difficult to compress into shorter form the conception of politics expressively termed "the pork-barrel racket"—you vote for me, and we'll soak everyone who votes against us, and share the loot. Our digestions are not robust enough to stand a continuous diet of the *New Statesman* but we shall be happy to give occasional publicity to its expressions of class hatred, if sent to us by less fastidious readers.

• • •

Mr. Clinton Anderson, the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, states that over half U.S. farm land has been seriously impaired by soil erosion, and 282,000,000 acres has been ruined.

No doubt many factors have contributed to this situation; but we are solidly convinced that it is impossible to withdraw from the earth the immense quantities of energy diffused by flowing rivers, and to divert it from its natural effects by immense hydro-electric schemes, without producing far-reaching results. Until those results are identified, there is every reason to suspect that they play an important part in soil erosion.

The Chief Rabbi of Palestine, Isaac Hertzog, Broadcasting from Palestine, said, "I believe the misfortunes befalling Britain [*sic*] are heavenly punishments for her treatment of Jewish refugees... this warning has been given her."

Anyone who regards that statement as mildly funny is badly mistaken. Notice the relative importance of Jews and "Britain"; the certainty that what the Jews want is not only the will of God, but will provoke his active interference in their favour at the expense of Arabs or anyone else; and the disregard, amounting to contempt, for any difficulties which might arise if "Britain" merely kept the ring while the Arabs and the Jews fought it out. Think of all these things, and then ponder on the problem one race, if it is one race, is presenting to the world while working tooth and claw to crush what it calls racialism.

## 'Freedom and Security for One and All'

*The substance of the maiden speech of M. REAL CAQUETTE, M.P. for Pontiac in Quebec, delivered in the Canadian Parliament on February 4, on the occasion of the Speech from the Throne.*

Mr. Speaker,

You will understand the emotion I experience on speaking for the first time before the Parliament of the nation. And yet, remembering that we have in this country a people desirous of a government which will serve them, that feeling fades a little and I am profoundly disturbed at the small relief promised to Canadians in the Address from the Throne.

[After referring to the strike then in progress at the Noranda Mines, in the county he represents, in which issue he supported the demand of the miners for security for themselves and their families while deprecating the demand of the Miners' Union that contributions to the union be stopped from the men's pay at source, he continued: ]

Mr. Speaker, I have been elected to represent the county of Pontiac in this House, and I owe all thanks to the electors of my county who chose me to serve them. I might also thank all the Honourable Ministers of the Liberal party who came to the county at the time of the election... as without their help I honestly believe that I should have lost the election.

I have been elected, I say, to make known to Parliament the properly expressed will of my electors, and not the programme of a political party.

*Voices:* Ah, Ah.

*M. Caouette:* The only motive of Parliamentary activity, and of political and economic activity in our country should be the common good. Without that there is no democracy.

Democracy demands complete respect for the dignity of the human person. And this human person, Mr. Speaker, is composed of two elements, which are: matter, the body, which claims economic security; and the mind, the soul, which needs personal liberty. Security and freedom for all and each thus form the subject of my first speech.

If security and freedom for one and all make up the true democracy, let us see what it is that stops the realisation of this ideal in our country. I will quote, Mr. Speaker, a passage from a speech of the Right Honourable Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on the occasion of the General Election in 1935:

"When a nation has lost control of its money and credit, it matters little who makes its laws. Once in control the usurer will ruin any nation. Until control of money and credit is restored to the Government and by it recognised as its most clear and sacred duty, it is useless and futile to talk of democracy and the sovereignty of Parliament."

*Mr. Low:* Hear, Hear.

*M. Caouette:* There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne which deals with this regaining of sovereignty by Parliament. Instead of passing laws to regulate men, women and children, the Government ought to pass laws to subdue financiers and money. And that would settle the question of security and freedom.

The Canadian people have security and freedom when they have purchasing power. When we have money, we have security and freedom. But when we have no money, we have neither freedom nor security...

During the war money was found for making cannon, aeroplanes and shells, and to equip soldiers and send them to the other side. After the war money cannot be found to guarantee Canadians their liberty and their security.

I will now talk about the programme of the Union of Electors. Some people were surprised after the election of the new member for Pontiac, that he should take his place beside the Social Credit members.

*Members:* No, No.

*M. Caouette:* Mr. Speaker, the Social Credit programme corresponds with the programme of the Union of Electors. That is why I sit with them.

The Union of Electors is made up of Liberals, Conservatives, and supporters of all political colours. We are united, not about the party, nor the group, nor the party leader, but in the end of achieving those objectives and results that electors want from their government. The Union of Electors wants progress; and that is why it wants in Parliament representatives of the electors and not representatives of the election chests.

*Several Voices:* Hear, Hear.

*M. Caouette:* Why am I beside the Social Crediters? You know the answer, or you will soon find out. I am

well content with the Social Credit group. I think it is the only group which allows each of its members to think differently from the leader, and differently from the other members.

I hope that the Union of Electors will be useful in this House and that before long we shall represent in this Parliament all the electors of Canada. The policy of the Union of Electors is clear and aims at the good of everyone. For this reason the Union of Electors presents a clear and concrete programme which forwards the desires of one and all for security and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the first point on our programme is that all incomes of less than \$3,000 a year be exempt from taxation. That is important. The mass of electors is in favour of this part of our programme. No-one in Canada opposes it.

I am certain that many electors do not forget that the M.P.'s have voted themselves an increase of \$2,000 a year, tax free. The electors say to themselves that if that is good for their representatives, it would also be good for them. I admit that they are right. If it is good for us, the Members of Parliament, I say that it is good also for the electors who have elected us and who pay us. There is the first point on our programme.

The second point concerns old age pensions. A reasonable pension at a reasonable age. A pension of \$60 a month at the age of 60 years... and that without a means test. A more Christian and a more human pension. Let us pay the old folk instead of paying the inquisitors.

The third point: \$60 a month to the infirm, the sick, from the age of 21 years. Today there is no law in the country which guarantees security and liberty to the sick. The invalid is a burden on his relations. No law provides for his subsistence.

...The last point on our programme of economic security, Mr. Speaker, is the most important and pleasant for all the nation: it is the national dividend of \$20 a month.

*Voices:* Hear, Hear.

*M. Caouette:* Of \$20 a month. A dividend based on the discrepancy between the total production in the country and the total purchasing power in the hands of the consumers in Canada. This difference must be balanced by an equivalent purchasing power and distributed to everyone without distinction, even to M.P.'s themselves.

*Voices:* Hear, Hear.

*M. Caouette:* A dividend. One hears it said, and certain people have just said it at Pontiac—that a national dividend is nonsense. It is said that if people receive money freely they will all become lazy. It is said that it would stop them from working, that they would no longer want to work, and that laziness would become the greatest evil in Canada.

There were some people who claimed, in the course of the Pontiac election, the seat which I occupy at this moment, and which is well enough paid. When these people demanded the seat and its remuneration, not a single

one of them were afraid of growing lazy on the money that they drew, Mr. Speaker, not one. Money for us is good: but for the people, money, no! They would grow lazy...

... In the Noranda mine and in each of the counties represented by the honourable Members of this House, there are some people... who do fewer hours' and fewer days' work because of the high taxation... One cannot blame them too much. Heavy taxes are thus a drag on production, on work itself, and that is why I suggest that all incomes of less than \$3,000 should be exempted from taxation, and that the measure be passed in this session so that workers and miners may retain their wages.

It is objected that God said: "Thou shalt gain thy bread by the sweat of thy brow." Yes, but the Government has no right to arrange so that the workman and the miner have to earn their bread 500 times with the sweat of their brow before being allowed to eat it even once!

Since 1935 the Government of Alberta have promised \$25 a month to the citizens of that province; and they have never yet given this \$25. That is thrown up as an argument against Social Credit. But it is never mentioned that it is the fault of the Federal Government. No, one mustn't say that! It is never mentioned that the laws of Alberta designed to produce the dividend were disallowed by the Federal Government. No, one must not say that; it must simply be said that Mr. Aberhart, Prime Minister of Alberta at that time, made a complete fiasco in Alberta with his movement.

Mr. Speaker, if the doctrine of Social Credit is no good, why has not the Federal Government helped the Government of the Province of Alberta to try it out in practice, so that it shall break its neck at once and thus both name and theory of Social Credit be done away with for ever in Canada? But no; instead of allowing Alberta to adopt Social Credit methods, one obstacle after another has been thrown in the way of their trial. Why? Because the Government know very well that if Social Credit is put into practice and gives results in Alberta, it will spread swiftly right across Canada. There will no longer be political parties, nor division, but a government responsible to the people, a government which will not be afraid to give the people their liberty...

Mr. Speaker, we have found more and more in our province, which in the last few years we have come to know well, that the population is united as never before not about a party or an election, but about a programme: and the programme in question is that which I have just outlined to you.

In the election at Pontiac we had nothing to regret, neither incident nor accident. Several months later at Richelieu-Verchères there were accidents and acts of brutality...

[M. Caouette was here called to order, as the matter of the disturbances at Richelieu-Verchères was *sub judice*.]

... At any rate one thing is certain. On the day after December 23, the Union of Electors went on organising in the county of Richelieu-Verchères, and will take its organisation not merely throughout Quebec but throughout the whole of Canada; and before many years have passed we shall see in our country a government which knows how to respect the electors and their expressed desires. Our organisation is

already strong; it is not financed from electoral chests but by the people themselves.

Mr. Low: Hear, Hear.

M. Caouette: ... Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the Presidents of the Unions of Electors of Quebec and Ontario have sent to all federal M.P.s of these provinces, a letter drawing attention to the statement I quoted before, made by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister during the electoral campaign of 1935. This letter asks that all the deputies approve and support the demands formulated by the electors of the two provinces concerned. For my part I approve them unreservedly, because we want to rid ourselves of financial dictatorship to gain freedom and security for one and all.

Mr. Speaker, the question of federal-provincial agreements was raised yesterday... We are in favour of autonomy for the provinces and of good understanding between provinces. We consider that the federal government is nothing more than the result of agreement between the provinces. They find it useful to have a central government determined by themselves. I do not believe that the central government would have been able properly to give rise to provinces which existed before it did. That is against common sense. The provinces must be autonomous.

Therefore when there is question of federal-provincial agreements, we think that the provinces should meet together, should draw up and conclude the agreements and then present them to the federal government.

... The confederation is formed of nine provinces of Canada and these nine must have their word to say on all agreements, because the confederation arises from a pact to which all were party. To these nine provinces the federal government owes its existence.

That is our attitude as regards agreements between the Federal Government and the provinces.

[M. Caouette then called for an end of controls on production and distribution and on housing. In conclusion he again referred to the incidents at Richelieu-Verchères and by the rules of the House was called to order. Finally:]

I cannot [he said] congratulate the seconder of the Address... because I do not like either the manner or the issue of this election.

(Translated from the text in Vers Demain the official English version not being available.)

### The Member for Richelieu-Verchères, P.Q.

A group of Quebec citizens have called upon M. Gérard Cournoyer, Member of Parliament for Richelieu-Verchères since the recent bye-election, to resign, in view of the admitted irregularities in the conduct of the election at Sorel.

In the course of their letter they say,

"If you do not wish public opinion to accuse you of being the accomplice, if not the instigator, of the assaults, violence and manoeuvres attributable to your electoral organisation, but to believe that you are ashamed of it, your duty is clear. Your resignation is necessary.

"Neither in conscience nor in honour can you accept the deputyship of Richelieu-Verchères. You cannot declare that you have been elected by a free decision of the people."

## 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. 18. No. 7.

Saturday, April 19, 1947.

### The Little Papers and the Big Stick;

#### Mr. Douglas Reed and the Commission

If we are accused of inattention to the issue posited by the contemporaneous existence of a totalitarian administration in Great Britain and an enquiry, staged by itself, to "further the free expression of opinion through the press," we can only remark that the name of the Provost of Oriel (Planning, Armaments, Woollen Textile Trade, Cardroom Workers, etc.) was first mentioned in *The Social Crediter* on February 19, 1944.

We have no intention of offering to give evidence before the Royal Commission over which Sir W. D. Ross presides; but we warmly second the suggestion that Mr. Douglas Reed should do so if he doesn't object to speaking to the ineducable. It by no means diminishes the warmth of our support of his claims to be heard that he has advanced them himself. Our experience is sufficiently similar to Mr. Douglas Reed's to know rather than to believe that the accusations he is prone to advance in his paper, *Tidings*, against the newspapers are founded in fact. Our experiences began a little before Mr. Reed's,—in 1906, to be precise, and to the extent that the adage 'once a journalist always a journalist' is true, it has continued ever since. We need not go into that.

Mr. Reed stigmatises the new Commission "A Most Curious Commission," and we commend the article under that heading in *Tidings* for April 5 to our own readers. Mr. Reed says he has never seen so unqualified a commission. We are inclined to demur from Mr. Reed's insistence upon this point, which depends for its effect upon the result which those who have appointed it desire it to produce. Probably Mr. Reed shares our scepticism concerning the probability of close correspondence between the terms of reference and the conclusions likely to be reached. "In our opinion," says Mr. Reed, "the final battle of Britain will be decided during 1947 on two main fronts: impartial justice and free expression of opinion. These are the last great bastions. Impartial justice is already deeply undermined through the governmental withdrawal of many matters from the jurisdiction of courts of law. The parallel attack on free expression of opinion, through one open ban and through the concealed ban of paper-discrimination, is to our mind clear in its aims." In proposing that our readers should support Mr. Reed's claim, we should make clear that it is not our claim, and that we do so irrespective of any idea that our views would be in any sense 'represented' by Mr. Reed. But we are assured that an honest individual point of view will be represented by him, if he appears before the Commission or not, and that he may be the only witness, in that case,

who tells the Commission 'the truth' in any but the most restricted and restricting sense.

(The announcement that Mr. Reed will terminate his connection with *Tidings*, which he founded, with the issue of April 17, is not, we conjecture, an intimation of defeat, public or private; and we await a promised further announcement expectantly.)

#### New Town Stevenage

After the successful appeal in the Appeal Court by Mr. Silkin (Minister of Town and Country Planning) from the decision of Mr. Justice Henn Collins, quashing the Stevenage New Town (Designation) Order, 1946, made by the Minister last November, in which leave to appeal to the House of Lords was given on terms that the petition of appeal was lodged within four weeks, Mr. G. L. Hearn (president of the Stevenage Residents' Association) said: "We think the same as ever, but if we are going to the House of Lords we shall have to consider ways and means.

"We have got to consider the cost of such an appeal, because we have the whole of the resources of the country against us.

"Up to the present we have been fighting for what we believe to be a national principle."

Notice of Appeal to the House of Lords has since been given.

#### The "Conquest of Nature"

"... those who write on social matters have not yet learned to imitate the physicists by always including Time amongst the dimensions. In order to understand fully what Man's power over Nature, and therefore the power of some men over other men, really means, we must picture the race extended in time from the date of its emergence to that of its extinction. Each generation exercises power over its successors: and each, in so far as it modifies the environment bequeathed to it and rebels against tradition, resists and limits the power of its predecessors. This modifies the picture which is sometimes painted of a progressive emancipation from tradition and progressive control of natural processes resulting in a continual increase of human power... The real picture is that of one dominant age—let us suppose the hundredth century A.D.—which resists all previous ages most successfully and dominates all subsequent ages most irresistibly, and thus is the real master of the human species. But even within this master generation (itself an infinitesimal minority of the species) the power will be exercised by a minority smaller still. Man's conquest of Nature, if the dreams of some scientific planners are realized, means the rule of a few hundred men over billions upon billions of men. There neither is nor can be any simple increase of power on Man's side. Each new power won by man is a power *over* man as well. Each advance leaves him weaker as well as stronger. In every victory, besides being the general who triumphs, he is also the prisoner who follows the triumphal car."

"In every mixed movement the efficacy comes from the good elements not from the bad. But the presence of the bad elements is not irrelevant to the direction the efficacy takes."

—C. S. LEWIS in *The Abolition of Man*.

## An Introduction to Social Credit\*

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

### Part III.—POLITICS.

(4)

The General Election in Great Britain in 1945 undoubtedly included Socialism as one of the policies offered, so that the Labour Party could claim an unusually definite mandate to administer an unusually clear-cut policy. This is not to say that the electorate was conscious of this fact, or that it understood exactly what the mandate implied. And an examination of the opposition policies discloses that they offered the same policy less clearly expressed. In fact, the Labour Party simply made explicit the policy that had been followed by preceding Governments.

A leading article in the London *Daily Telegraph* (October 18, 1946) makes the situation reasonably plain: "To go no further back than its war-time predecessor, the famous Coalition, the present Government found much of the planning for education, other social services, finance, and defence already done. Even attempts to 'iron out' the peaks of economic fluctuations—the point with which Mr. Morrison made such play—are very far from being a Socialist invention. Such devices as Exchange Equalisation Funds, the accumulation of projects for public works, quantitative regulation of imports, censuses of production, adjustments of taxation to economic or social purposes, have been used by a long succession of Governments, not excepting the Socialist Government of 1929-31..."

This line of policy can be seen to be derived almost entirely from financial considerations. And it is all consistent, and all represents the concentration of control over both policy and administration. Financial policy promoted monopoly developments, and did so quite explicitly; the Bank of England, the local agency of International Finance, called the policy "rationalisation." Such monopoly development is an almost necessary preliminary to "nationalisation." Nationalisation is merely the penultimate stage in a process. Rationalisation, or monopoly control of specific industries, is a step to nationalisation, where distinct industries are brought under the one control. Internationalisation is the next step, where nationalised industries are linked under one world control. And this is the objective of the group of men in control of the world financial system.

The "common man" has no power whatever to issue effective directives to an organisation on this scale. Even elected representatives would be powerless in relation to the permanent officials. The ballot-box would merely introduce an element of inefficiency into the organisation, and consequently its elimination is to be expected.

It is, in fact, necessary for the stability of the organisation to control the individual; that is the significance of so-called Social Security schemes. It really is astounding that these have not been seen through long ago. Their monetary benefits are mere pittance; but the underlying assumption is that the recipients of them will be completely dependent on them and the actuarial calculations show that it is anticipated that the recipients, as old-age pensioners,

will be the majority of those contributing to them. Thus it is anticipated that ten, twenty, thirty years ahead nothing better than a pittance will be available to the majority of those over 65—and this calculation does not allow for the steady depreciation which in the past thirty years has reduced the *official* value of the pound sterling to a half, and the actual value to a quarter or less.

But the real cost of this pittance to the worker is conformity to a net-work of regulations which is reaching ever finer details of the individual's existence. Again, this is the use of the financial mechanism to achieve a definite objective. The essence of it is to make money essential to existence, arrange through inflation and taxation that whatever the standard of living, it absorbs the whole of the worker's income so that he cannot save, and so threaten him with insecurity—*i.e.*, starvation—at retiring age unless he submits to controls throughout his working life. He thus becomes a defenceless material for planning.

"The plan" will require individual workers to work in accordance with the plan. What possible effect can voting for Mr. A or Mr. B have on the individual worker's destiny?

Since the Socialist Government took office in Great Britain, appallingly rapid progress has been made towards complete and explicit totalitarianism. The shape of things to come is perfectly evident from the emphasis on compulsory trades-unionism, in association with the admonitions of trades-union leaders that the time for strikes is past, and that the worker has now achieved his goal, his future part being to work for increased production. For the rest, everything will be decided "in the public interest" between Labour Leaders and Political Leaders.

The initiative in this policy has rested with Finance, which clearly anticipates being able to retain the initiative and the control—which, indeed, probably sees no other way of securing in perpetuity the enormous power which results from international control of finance. Administrative controls are simply buttresses for financial control which itself is a most wonderfully flexible and sensitive mechanism.

(5)

The group in control of the banking system is using the financial and industrial systems in the pursuit of a long-range objective—the objective of world-dominion for that group. Such a policy is in conflict with the desires of those to whom it is applied. Where we have an opposition of policies in this way, we have a state of war in the most general sense: "War is the pursuit of policy by other means" (CLAUSEWITZ). In this sense, the translation of policy into practice involves the concept of *strategy*. "Strategy is the employment of the battle to gain the end of the war [*i.e.*, the objective of policy]... Strategy forms the plan of the War" (CLAUSEWITZ).

The objective of strategy is subordinate to the objective of policy, in the same way that the objective of a campaign is subordinate to the strategy of the nation waging a war—in the same way that policy transcends war itself as defined by Clausewitz. In this sense, the use of the industrial system by the financiers is a strategical use.

In an address given in 1924, Douglas pointed out that there are only three possible objectives of a world economic system:

\*Now appearing in *The Australian Social Crediter*. The commencement of Dr. Monahan's essay, publication of which has been interrupted, appeared in *The Social Crediter* on January 25.

"The first is that it is an end in itself for which man exists.

"The second is that while not an end in itself, it is the most powerful means of constraining the individual to do things he does not want to do; e.g., it is a system of Government. This implies a fixed ideal of what the world ought to be.

"And the third is that economic activity is simply a functional activity of the men and women in the world..."

Since that address, it has been explicitly stated that the objective of the industrial system is "Full Employment."

"Considering as a means of making people work (an aim which is common both to the Capitalist and Socialist Party Politics) the existing financial system, as a system, is probably nearly perfect.

"Its banking system, methods of taxation and accountancy counter every development of applied science, organisation, and machinery, so that the individual, instead of obtaining the benefit of these advances in the form of a higher civilisation and greater leisure, is merely enabled to do more work. Every other factor in the situation is ultimately sacrificed to this end of providing him with work..." (C. H. DOUGLAS, 1924).

Recalling our examination of the physical situation, let us imagine a man to be employed in tending an area of lawn. Under primitive conditions, he would cut the grass by plucking the blades with his hands. The first "scientific" advance would consist in the use of a single bladed cutting instrument, and even with this he could at once cut the grass much more rapidly. Therefore, he could either tend the former area in less time, or he could tend a larger area in the same time. The next advance would consist in the use of a two-bladed tool, on the principle of scissors, and this again would result in more rapid work, with the same result as previously. Then successively we see the introduction of the mower and the power-driven mower; and we can imagine the eventual introduction of the radar-controlled automatic mower.

The strategy of "Full Employment" means that with every improvement in the technique of grass-cutting, the spare time gained is devoted to extending the area of lawn to be cut. This extension of lawn is the equivalent of all those devices by which politicians create "employment." The most obvious is public works, but emphasis on further industrialisation and on the importance of export markets is exactly the same thing in principle. "Full Employment" does, in fact, counter the developments of applied science, organisation, and machinery; it steals the leisure which is the potential result of power-utilising industry.

(To be continued).

The Court of Appeal recently allowed the appeal of the defendant, the Duke of Bedford, in the libel action brought against him by Mr. Henry Hobbs, a farmer, of Chadlington Manor, Oxfordshire, in which the Lord Chief Justice gave judgment in favour of Mr. Hobbs and awarded him £500 damages.

The Court, after an exhaustive review of the facts, held that there was no evidence of malice on the part of the Duke, and entered judgment in his favour.

Leave to appeal to the House of Lords was refused.

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 26, 1947.

### Economic Problems (Publicity)

Mr. Skeffington-Lodge asked the Prime Minister whether he will consider commissioning small teams of Members of Parliament to give factory and other talks in the industrial areas of the country, with a view to explaining in simple language the problems associated with the nation's recovery.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Attlee): I certainly hope that Members of all parties will take every opportunity of explaining these problems in factory talks, and in their speeches. I think, however, that Members would prefer to make their own arrangements for addressing audiences on the nation's economic problems, whether in their own constituencies, or elsewhere. The Central Office of Information can supply Members with the material necessary for such speeches if they so desire. The Central Office of Information is in addition providing speakers to give explanatory talks to factory and other interested audiences.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: Will the right hon. Gentleman seriously consider issuing to all Members of the House, in order that they will have adequate material, the speech made two years ago by the Minister of Food telling the workers not to work harder after the war, or the bosses would reap the profits?

Mr. David Jones: Would the Prime Minister consider publishing such speeches as those made by the hon. Member for Mid-Bedford (Mr. Lennox-Boyd) in order that the public may see what is being said?

### Government Policy (Criticism)

Sir J. Graham Kerr asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to what extent, in view of Treasury letter TC5/28, dated 13th March, 1928, a civil servant is debarred in his capacity as a private citizen from criticising the legislative or administrative policy of a Government Department in matters with which his own Department is in no way concerned.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: I should regard as improper any public criticism by a civil servant of policy for which a Minister, whether of his own or of some other Department, is responsible.

### Gouzenko Report

Mr. Pickthorn asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury why copies of the Gouzenko Report were ordered so late as 29th August, 1946; why so few as 2,000 were ordered; why the second order was for so few as 750; how many of these have now been sold; and whether more are on order.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: Copies of this report published in Canada on 2nd August, 1946, were ordered by cable on the day that His Majesty's Government approved a proposal to put them on sale in this country through the Stationery Office.

This lengthy Canadian publication was very widely noticed in the British Press and it is always difficult to estimate the possible demand of the British public for any

publication of another Government. All copies ordered have to be bought out-right in Canadian dollars, and with the dollar situation as it is I am not justified in speculating on the high side and running the risk of a large number of unsold copies. The original estimate was thought reasonable at the time. The outstanding demand has now reached 223 copies. The order for 750 has now been increased to 1,250.

#### Paper (Periodicals)

*Mr. Pickthorn* asked the President of the Board of Trade why periodicals have recently been limited to 35 per cent. of their prewar paper consumption; and whether paper mills have been, and are being, supplied with enough coal to meet this demand.

*Sir S. Cripps*: Owing to the shortage of coal it has been necessary to reduce the amount of paper to be licensed for periodicals. In many cases even the reduced amount of paper may not be available and the publishers have been warned of this.

#### Coal Board Journal (Paper)

*Mr. Wilson Harris* asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what allocation of paper he is making for a new monthly journal to be issued under the auspices of the National Coal Board.

*Mr. Shinwell*: The publication which is in contemplation will be the official journal of the National Coal Board, and the Stationery Office will provide paper for it on a repayment basis.

*House of Commons: March 27, 1947.*

#### Special Juries (Proposed Abolition)

*Mr. Driberg* asked the Attorney-General whether a decision has yet been made to abolish special juries.

*The Attorney-General*: The Government have now decided that in principle, with the exception of the City of London special jury in commercial causes, special juries should be abolished. I cannot, however, promise when legislation will be introduced for this purpose.

*Mr. Hogg*: Does the right hon. and learned Gentleman appreciate that, whatever may be the theoretical advantages or disadvantages of special juries, they have in fact afforded a convenient method of doing justice in cases which could not otherwise be so well tried? Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman at least undertake that no legislation will be introduced until something as good is put in their place?

*The Attorney-General*: I cannot agree with the assumption of the hon. Gentleman. This survival of the fifteenth century has long since outlived its utility. The Government are fully satisfied that the common jury, whose competence to try criminal cases even of the gravest kind is not in doubt, is at least equally capable of trying civil matters.

*Mr. Hogg*: Does the right hon. and learned Gentleman realise that the Government's decision will be treated by the populace at large as having been inspired by the unsatisfactory result of a particular trial with which they disagreed?

*The Attorney-General*: The suggestion is unworthy of the hon. Gentleman. He gives me the opportunity of

saying that my noble Friend and I had this matter under active consideration from the middle of last year.

*House of Commons: March 28, 1947.*

#### Treaties of Peace (Italy, Roumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland) Bill

*The Minister of State (Mr. McNeil)*: I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

As the House knows, Treaties of Peace with Italy, Roumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland were signed on 10th February of this year and this is a consequential matter which, I hope, will be non-controversial. These Treaties do not come into force until ratifications are deposited on behalf of this country, the United States, the Soviet Union and France. It is, however, hoped that these ratifications may all be deposited within the next four weeks, or thereabouts. The Treaties, again as the House knows, are the outcome of difficult and complicated negotiations which have ranged over a period of almost 18 months. When the Treaties come into force they will represent the first step in the restoration of normal international relationship in Europe.

... Here for the benefit of the House are examples of situations in connection with which action under the Bill may be necessary. In the first place, all the treaties in question confer the right on His Majesty's Government to take over enemy property situated in this country. Such property is of course at present vested with the custodian of enemy property but only awaiting the peace treaties. It still stands in the name of the various enemy owners. The extent to which His Majesty's Government should avail themselves of the right to take over this property might be varied from treaty to treaty, and is indeed still under consideration, but assuming that it is decided to exercise it either in whole or in part, legislative provision by Order in Council under this Bill would be necessary in order to enable this property to be finally taken over and disposed of...

*Mr. Pickthorn (Cambridge University)*: ... Here we are taking the last Parliamentary step towards the ratification of no less than five Treaties, and the Minister of State properly said that he hoped that we were thereby beginning to get back towards a normal Europe. Therefore it is a very great occasion, and I think there are great speeches that could be made and great subjects that could be raised on this matter. But my particular task, I think I am right in judging, on this occasion is to talk rather about the machinery of the Bill than the substance of it, though I shall say a little about that.

... One impression I did get out of the earlier Debate [after the 1914-18 War] was that on all the earlier occasions, every time the Minister responsible spoke, whether it was Mr. Arthur Balfour, or Mr. Lloyd George, or Mr. Ramsay Macdonald—who came in for the last post-war Treaty in 1924 with Turkey—they all said at least one, if not both, of the following two things to the House. They said that this was no place to discuss the whole of this vast document, Versailles, or whichever it might be, and that the House of Commons would be a most unsuitable place for discussing the whole general policy of the Treaty or Treaties in question or for going into the mass of details. That was one thing that all Ministers after the last war said to us. The other thing that they said was that

people really must not think criticism was effective when it merely pointed out some error or defect in one of the Treaties. It was said from the Treasury Bench on each occasion that we must remember that Treaties were not simply the results of the wisdom of the Treasury Bench but that other people had a part in it and all that.

I would like to make a comment on these two Governmental assumptions which were then made and I am sure there is no party point in this, for they would probably be made now by whoever was on the Treasury Bench of any party. The first comment I wish to make is that if criticism is not effective merely by showing that there is some error or defect, then there really is a duty laid on the Ministers responsible for the Treaties, to explain how the error or defect came to be there. It is not enough for them simply to tell us to assume that everything that is right in the Treaties came because our representative wanted it put there and that everything that is wrong was because of the wickedness of the foreigners who are we all know generally awkward chaps. They ought really to explain to us some of these points upon which we may be doubtful. When these doctrines were first enunciated from the Treasury Bench, it was the first time we had congratulated ourselves on getting away from the absurd phrase "power politics." I rather think we have stopped doing that now. We did it for a year or so after the last war, but it has rather gone out of fashion now. If it is not to be said of anything that anybody questions or criticises in any one of these Treaties that this is simply the results of the actual strategic forces present, then there is a duty upon Ministers to say what else it was that caused these results.

If one were to make general criticism of these Treaties, I think the first question that would have to be asked is in what sense four, at least, out of five of these States can reasonably be treated as independent States which will have a real entity of their own in the immediate future; because we were told that these treaties are to be ratified, it is hoped, within four weeks. So it is a very immediate effect that we are dealing with, and I think really we ought to have—I think the country deserves—some kind of reassurance about the reality of these entities—Roumania, and so on. The names we are all acquainted with and can find on the map, too. The frontiers have moved a little one way or the other; but what the hope of the reality of these entities is, does now really want a certain amount of explaining.

The second general question which I should like to ask about is the principle upon which reparations have been fixed. If the Minister tells us there is no principle, and could be none in the matter, that the whole thing had simply to be the effect of hard bargaining, I do not say for a moment that he is necessarily wrong; but if there is any principle to be found, I think it should be indicated. And I mean from both ends—both the principle upon which it was agreed that  $x$  million dollars, or whatever it may be, was the maximum from that particular country; and also the principle, if there was a principle, upon which it was arranged what proportion of those  $x$  millions should go to the various Allied and Associated Powers. I am not trying to make party controversy out of this. If the fact is that there is no principle, that we simply had to deal with practical, almost material, pull and push, then I daresay that is quite right, that such procedure was unavoidable; but I think we ought to be told about that.

Then, I think, also we ought to be told a little—because presumably the delegated legislation which we are now asked

to authorise may be concerned with this—about what is to be done with regard to the assets in Roumania, the restoration of British and American property there, and especially the payment for such parts of it as may have gone to Russia as reparations. Again I do not say that it is wrong that such assets should be used in such a way; and even if it was wrong, I do not say the blame was on His Majesty's Government; but now we ought to have some guess whether that is all a matter really at large for negotiation and arbitration; and again, why there is the difference which the Minister of State mentioned between the provisions for payments from Roumania and from the other four... Then while we are in Roumania, I think also we should have some explanation about the question of Russian troops there. As far as I understand it, the treaty authorises an unspecified number of troops in Roumania, to cover Russia's lines of communications, for an unspecified period and, if I am right about that, then I think the House ought to have some indication when and how it is hoped to specify limits, both to the numbers of troops and to the length of time, because if these states are to have some reality, if we are to get back to a normal Europe, then clearly there ought to be a *terminus ad quem* for such things. We shall not get far back towards a normal Europe, so long as there are countries here and there which have to have in them unspecified numbers of the troops of other sovereign States, and for an unspecified period of time.

Then about Bulgaria. I think we may reasonably ask for more specific information about the suggested demilitarisation on the Bulgarian side of the frontier, and on the relation between that and the U.N.O. Commission which is now in those parts...

My last substantive question is about the exchanges of nationals and how much—by parting with this Bill and thereby, so much as in us lies, expediting the ratification of the Treaties—how much shall we thereby advantage or disadvantage persons who may now find themselves on foreign soil who may be unwilling to go back to what, *prima facie*, appears to be their own country—Yugoslavs in Italy, for instance, the ones I am most particularly concerned with personally. It is not easy to foresee from the Treaties how much His Majesty's Government will be more bound after we have let this go than before, and I think we ought to know about that. I am quite sure that in the interests of our country it is of immense importance that we should be plainly seen to have done everything we possibly can for men who have been our friends and are now in the most distressing of all political situations, exiles, cut off from their families, and not daring, rightly or wrongly, not daring to return to their own country...

## THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

PRICE: 8/6 (Postage extra).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED.