

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 2.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 13, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

### Political Representation

#### EDITOR'S NOTE:

THE DEBATE IN THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT ON THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL IS IMPORTANT TO US BECAUSE OF ITS ACTUAL CONTENT, BUT ALSO FOR THE SUGGESTION IT CARRIES OF DETERMINATION *DEVELOPING SINCE LAST OCTOBER* TO MEDDLE WITH THE CONSTITUTION. EXTRACTS WHICH WE DEEM WORTHY OF REPRODUCTION, AS A MINIMUM, TOTAL OVER THIRTEEN PAGES OF *THE SOCIAL CREDITER*, AND WE HAVE DECIDED NOT TO CURTAIL THIS ACCOUNT. EVEN TEMPORARY ENLARGEMENT OF *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* TO ACCOMMODATE THIS LARGE AMOUNT OF MATTER IS IMPRACTICABLE, BUT IT WILL BE PUBLISHED IN AS FEW ISSUES AS POSSIBLE TO MAKE REFERENCE EASIER. THE LIST OF REFERENCES IN *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE, PUBLICATION OF WHICH WAS PROMISED RECENTLY, WILL ACCOMPANY THE PUBLICATION:—

*House of Commons: February 16, 1948.*

#### Representation of the People Bill (*Cont'd.*)

(*Mr. Churchill* continued:—)

It was, therefore, with surprise, having regard to all the customs and decencies of British politics, that we found, on reading the text of the Bill, that it departed in most important respects from the agreed conclusions of the Speaker's Conference. The Socialist Government, having taken and profited by all that suited them in that settlement, now proceeded to violate the agreement, and to repudiate what was to their disadvantage. In particular, they departed from the agreements which were reached about the business man's vote. They have destroyed the identity of the City of London and have purloined its name. Finally, they have abolished the time-honoured university representation. All these things were specific agreements at the Speaker's Conference in 1944.

It is with regret that I must place on record that this is an instance of bad faith between party and party, and between man and man, to which the history of the House of Commons can, happily, furnish few parallels. But, said the Lord President of the Council—for he is the moving spirit in these matters—after Question Time on Thursday last:

"The Speaker's Conference of the last Parliament—which was a most useful assembly, and produced a most valuable Report—cannot of course, bind the present Parliament."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, February 12, 1947; Vol. 447, c. 575.]

It is quite true that nothing can bind a Parliament. Every Parliament is entirely free to behave like a gentleman or like a cad; every Parliament is entirely free to behave honestly or like a crook. Such are the sovereign rights of this august

assembly. Every Parliament is entirely free, for instance, to repudiate the pledges in regard to Savings Certificates given to all who lent money to the Government, although it would not be advisable to do so. Their sovereign right is unimpaired. Every Parliament is entirely free to repudiate the treaties made by its predecessors, even if foreign countries make complaint that they have been treacherously dealt with. Every Parliament has these rights, but what relation has that to the problem before us?

It was the Lord President of the Council who made the statement—which, when I mentioned it, was cheered below the Gangway—that future Parliaments could not be bound. Parliament is omnipotent; nothing can bind a future Parliament. But there is such a thing as good faith and fair dealing between man and man, and especially between those who have long been colleagues in a dreadful struggle. There is also good faith and fair dealing which should exist apart from ordinary party fighting—the kind of laws of war, as it were, the Geneva Convention of politics—which have grown up between the principal parties in the State, and which play a daily part in our relations and business.

It is quite true that Parliament is free, but the eminent Labour men and Socialist leaders who agreed to the Speaker's Conference Report, many of them high Ministers in the present Government, are not free to take out of an agreement those points which suited them and to break the corresponding counter-balancing agreements to which they had simultaneously consented. . . .

*The Prime Minister (Mr. Attlee):* If the right hon. Gentleman is challenging me, I must point out that I made no bargain on this matter. The matter was adopted for the Bill which was brought before the last Parliament. No pledge whatever was given on this matter.

*Hon. Members:* Withdraw.

*Mr. Churchill:* On the contrary, I shall reiterate. The right hon. Gentleman occupied a certain position in that Government. We accepted the report of the Speaker's Conference as a whole, and he knows that that was so.

*The Prime Minister:* The right hon. Gentleman might take my point. We were dealing with legislation to be introduced in that Parliament. The proposals came from the Speaker's Conference; they were agreed by that Government, and the Bill was introduced. There was no pledge whatever with regard to future legislation.

*Mr. Churchill:* But the Lord President of the Council, who sits at the side of the Prime Minister, said on that occasion that time alone prevented the other provisions of the agreement being brought into effect.

*Mr. H. Morrison:* . . . Certainly it was the case that time did not allow that Parliament to deal with every one of

the issues which were raised at the Speaker's Conference, but to imply by that that any party which was returned was obligated to carry out every one of those recommendations in the next Parliament is sheer nonsense. There was no bargain, either at the Speaker's Conference or in the the Government.

*Mr. Churchill:* There was a definite agreement which has been grossly falsified. . . . The Home Secretary spent 50 minutes reading the contents of this lengthy Bill but there was one word on the front page of the Bill to which he did not refer. I will draw attention to it. It is a small point but I think it illustrates the level of the technique to which the leaders of an all-powerful Government have thought it worth while to descend. The sentence on the first page says that the Bill

"gives effect to most of the recommendations of the Final Report of the Speaker's Conference of 1944 (Cmd. 6543) . . ."

I should like the House to look with some attention at the word "Final." I am sure that anyone reading that would have supposed, in the ordinary way, that this was the final and complete digest of the recommendations of the Speaker's Conference which formed the subject of this Bill.

When I looked at Command Paper 6543, I found that it deals only with minor matters of electoral reform on which there was a very large measure of agreement. It was contained in the second letter addressed to me by the Speaker on July 20, 1944. I found that this was not the Final Report of the Speaker's Conference, and it dealt with none of the great matters decided then. It was only an addendum which dealt with election expenses, the costs of Parliamentary elections, *etc.*, and had nothing whatever to do with the great issues upon which this Bill is founded. It is simply intended to mislead, at first sight, the Press and the public. I am not suggesting that the Lord President or the Prime Minister or the Home Secretary put it in—I do not know who did—but I think it shows the technique and the spirit that animates the Government in their discharge of these grave constitutional matters. They knew that it would not be true to say that they were giving effect to most of the recommendations of the Speaker's Conference, and by inserting the word "final" they switched the argument on to another document and so let it all run quite smoothly.

. . . We hold ourselves bound, subject to minor exceptions of long established use and custom, to support the principle of one man, one vote, and to work steadily towards one vote, one value. We shall not stand between the working masses of the nation and the necessary changes in their representation which the Boundary Commission have recommended. But we cannot accept as a permanent settlement the treatment of the City of London, with all its world-wide reputation, or the abolition of the university franchise. As the right hon. Gentleman has said, no one can bind future Parliaments. We are certainly freed, personally, by the action the Government have taken, and as a party by the treatment we are now receiving, and no question of breach of faith can be involved if a future Parliament reverses these unfair and one-sided decisions. In general, we hold ourselves entirely bound to the position reached in the Speaker's Conference of 1944, and we are content with the words in which these decisions were expressed by the lips of many of the prominent members of the present Socialist Party. . . .

*Mr. Hollis (Devizes):* . . . The Home Secretary's pretence that this Bill establishes the electoral system of this

country on some basis of mathematical rectitude, by merely introducing the principle of one man, one vote, is clearly fantastic. If he really believes in such a mathematical rectitude, he has no alternative but to accept the Amendment which I understand the Liberal Party are proposing to introduce, and to withdraw the Bill, because if we are to establish a system of one man, one vote, and two million votes, no seat, or it may be, 12 seats, we are establishing a system as unmathematical as can be imagined. But myself I do not approach this constitutional problem so much on an abstract theoretical basis, but rather on a pragmatist basis. The question to me is not whether we are getting this absolute mathematical ration, but whether we are producing a constitution which is likely to satisfy the people of the country and give us an effective Government.

On that line of argument, there is a very important consideration which should be in the minds of all hon. Members, which has not been raised so far, and that is, to what extent does our party system really reflect the views and wishes of the people of the country? We have to face the fact that the normal elector does not accept a rigid party discipline for his opinions and actions as do Members of this House. We have to face the fact that we Members of the House are, as it were *table d'hôte* politicians, and the vast majority of our electors are politicians *à la carte*. The party system is a matter which has to be justified, and it cannot be merely taken for granted that the Party system as it exists today is a good thing. I am not denouncing it, because I think that on balance it is a good thing.

The English tradition is that the normal thing is for the vast majority of Members of this House to belong to one of two main parties. Hon. Members are familiar with the pros and cons of that argument. I am satisfied that it is a better system than having no party at all, or the system of France or Weimar Germany with a multiplicity of parties. But we cannot take it for granted, as some of us are perhaps apt to do, that it is obviously wicked to have a one-party system, and that it is obviously wicked to have a three-party system, but that it is a self-evident God-given revelation that we should have two parties, and neither more nor less. It is a balanced argument, and the argument should not be taken for granted. If the two-party system is to be a benefit to the country, the condition is that there should be no shadow of suspicion in the minds of the electors that the dice are being in any way loaded in order to preserve it against the wishes of the people. That is the basic point in all electoral reform which has not been touched on today. That being so, I would say that the ideal sort of House is that the vast majority of the 600 odd Members should belong to the one or other of the two main parties, that there should be a reasonable and not excessive majority for one party, and at the same time a number of other Members who are either technically independent, in the sense that they receive no party whip, or belong to small groups.

It is most important for the well being of Parliament that there should exist these small groups of Members—although not sufficient to hold the balance from the point of view of votes between the parties, which would cause instability—who are men of independence, intelligence and integrity and who will make substantial contributions by their speeches rather than by their votes to the deliberations of the House. We have to consider whether these changes which are being advocated assist or do not assist towards that end.

... The situation is that up to 1870 when the test of the Thirty-Nine Articles for admission to the universities was abolished and the universities ceased to be the close preserve of the Church of England, the whole situation was different from that of today. It was different until 1914, because although it is true that there was no definite church ban on the universities up to then, in those days before 1914 the university franchise was severely restricted—I think, to M.A.s, who were predominantly clerical, and they were essential clerical constituencies.

Therefore, whether we agree or not with what they said, when Lord Samuel and the Leader of the Opposition were talking before the 1914 war about the university constituencies, they were talking about something entirely different from what we have to discuss today. When the Speaker's Conference of 1918 had to make a decision its alternative was either to abolish the university constituencies or to change their whole nature by broadening the franchise and bringing in the new university constituencies of the new universities. It made its choice to destroy what was to some extent a closed corporate body and made it into a body especially designed to return to the House of Commons Members of exceptionally independent view. That was the deliberate purpose of that Conference in 1918, which has not been referred to in the Debate today. That changed the whole nature of things. Things that happened before 1918, amusing and fascinating as they may be, are entirely irrelevant to this Debate, which is concerned with one essential issue.

For various reasons, party discipline of the ordinary Member has tightened during the last 60 years. Disraeli and the hon. Member for Hornchurch's friend, Sir John Gorst, tightened the Conservative machine. Parnell tightened the Irish. Joseph Chamberlain tightened the Radical. The Lord President of the Council has tightened the Socialist. All sorts of people in all parts of the House have contributed to tightening party discipline, and the consequence has been that it has been made more difficult for the ordinary territorial Member to be independent, and more important that there should be university Members who are to some extent free to sit a little more loosely to that discipline. . . . The university has contributed to the well-being of Parliament this essential element at a time when Parliament most desperately needs it. . . .

*Sir John Anderson* (Scottish Universities): . . . I suggest for the consideration of hon. Members that the case for maintaining the university franchise is stronger today than it has ever been. The universities are a very important element in the community—an element whose importance is increasing day by day. They are an element which, unlike most other elements in the community, do not secure representation as such in the ordinary course. . . . universities count for more today in our national life than they have ever done. We lag behind many other countries in the proportion of our people who seek and obtain a university education. We lag far behind the United States and also, I am sorry to say, some European countries. As my right hon. Friend has already pointed out, humble birth and limited resources are no longer an obstacle to entry into our universities, even to the ancient universities of Oxford and Cambridge. All the universities of our country have become thoroughly democratic institutions.

I do not wish to follow hon. Members who have sought to base an argument upon an analysis of the qualities of

university Members in the past. The case for university representation cannot be made, or demolished by such arguments . . . if the franchise is granted it is for those who exercise it to determine for themselves what sort of Members they will return. In the case of university franchise, the opportunity is afforded for candidates to come forward who might be, for varied reasons, unwilling or unable to contest ordinary geographical constituencies. That cannot be disputed.

University elections present certain features which they do not share with ordinary territorial elections. There is no canvassing, there are no meetings and there is no emotional appeal. The electors decide upon consideration of a single, balanced statement of the candidate's views. We get—if I may add this—upon a limited scale through the university franchise the undoubted advantages of proportional representation without the grave disadvantages which, in my view, apply to proportional representation on a universal scale. . . . with the university franchise there is an opportunity of giving representation to electors who are overseas, a not unimportant matter. My view is that the cumulative case against the Government's decision to abolish university representation is overwhelming.

Here I come to the point which the Secretary of State for Scotland rose to make a moment ago. He asked a very pertinent question: Why is it that universities have never returned a Socialist Member to Parliament? If that is the fact—I believe there is one case which is in dispute—is not that fact in itself a strong argument for retaining the university franchise? Are the Government putting this proposal forward on party grounds? Do they seriously wish to tell the House and the country that their argument for getting rid of the university franchise rests upon their fear that the policies for which they stand will not commend themselves to the representatives of the more highly educated sections of the community? It is a very strange argument. We are not dealing with this matter in relation to one Parliament or one election but as part of the permanent electoral system of this country. . . .

*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Cuthbert Headlam* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, North): . . . It seems to me a mistake, when we are changing so much, to do away with this old traditional [university] representation. It is part and parcel of the Parliamentary system of the country. It has worked extraordinarily well in the past, at least ever since the period alluded to by the hon. Member for Devizes (Mr. Hollis) when university seats ceased to be the appanage of the Church of England. Universities now represent a large mass of educated opinion and when we have decided on the principle of one man, one vote, and to give the franchise to boys and girls at the age of 21, it is just as well that there should be certain hon. Members who represent seats with an educated electorate of rather older people. It may be, indeed, that in time we shall find, when more people have been to the universities, and education has improved throughout the country, we shall have need for more Members representing universities. . . .

*Mr. Wilfrid Roberts* (Cumberland, Northern): I do not know whether later in the Debate, Mr. Speaker, you intend calling the Amendment in the names of my hon. Friends:

"That this House declines to give a Second Reading to a measure which perpetuates the present electoral system whereby a minority of the electors is enabled to elect a majority in the Commons House of Parliament and therefore continues to frustrate the will of the people."

*Continued on page 8.*

## 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. 20. No. 2. Saturday, March 13, 1947.

### From Week to Week

The simple test to be applied to all legislation at this time, from the point of view of those whose policy we endeavour to express, is "Does it centralise power, or does it favour the individual?"

We entirely agree with the contributor to *Truth* who complains of the overplaying of "Your freedom is in danger", by the Conservatives, because in itself, that statement is becoming nearly meaningless. It was, if our memory serves us, Commander Geoffrey Bowles, R.N., who wrote some little time back, that no-one born less than fifty years ago was able to give a personal opinion on freedom from experience of it, and again we agree.

And the explanation is in essence both simple and incontrovertible—instead of being self-contained units we are, more and more, becoming components of a function, masquerading as 'economics', but accurately described as "full employment." Five minutes' consideration will convince anyone not mentally infirm that a *policy* of full employment (full employment *in war* is a necessity, not a policy) means, and can only mean, direction of labour. Combine that with egalitarianism, and you have the slave state—you cannot possibly have anything else. As frequently, *The Tablet* puts its finger (if tablets have fingers) on the fatal error of current Conservatism. "They are much too fond of running with the hare and hunting with the hounds, of claiming a main share in creating the present mould in which an Englishman's life is cast, and then representing themselves as the people naturally best qualified to break that mould and set the people free." Unfortunately, and also as usual, *The Tablet* shies off the obvious and inescapable deduction, refusing to go further back than "Mr. Lloyd George and his political entourage . . . and German inspiration." True; but not true enough to have practical value.

One of the consequences, (whether premeditated or not is difficult to judge) of the determination of those World Forces behind the Canadian Federal Government which are determined to block progress along Social Credit lines in Alberta, is that factors which are not related to immediate politics in Alberta are introduced to an Administration which, not inexcusably, is totally unconscious of their significance. Zionism is such an issue; and it is clear that Mr. Manning and his Cabinet, with a minority of exceptions, view Zionism in the light of guidance from the Prophetic Bible Institute meeting in the Masonic Temple which Mr. Manning himself adorns. That such men as Mr. L. D. Byrne, Deputy Minister for Economic Affairs, and Mr. Ansley, the Minister of Education, must be faced with the alternatives of intellectual and political dishonesty, on the one hand, and friction with

Mr. Manning and his shadowy advisers on the other, is inevitable, and their much wider equipment and experience however tactfully employed, would not placate the Empire's youngest Premier.

For this reason, the demand for the immediate resignation of both Mr. Byrne and Mr. Ansley from the Cabinet, on the first day of Session of the Provincial Legislature can have caused little surprise to either of them. But the very crudeness of the procedure, ostensibly based on a Report of the Social Credit Board which admirably indicates the nature of the forces which are blocking the policy for the implementation of which the Alberta Government has three times been returned, is bound to produce a difficult situation, requiring careful handling if it is not to achieve its real objective, the splitting of the Social Credit forces and the return of a "Liberal Government" in preparation for which one of the chief daily newspapers in Alberta has recently changed hands (subsequently to the visit of STELLA, Marchioness of Reading—Isaacs).

The proper course to pursue is, of course, to make it very bad business for those who are supporting the Zionists, who, we are fairly confident, have been assured that Zionism delivers the goods, political or otherwise. In other words, it requires to be made clear that Zionism in a Social Credit Government is like Mr. William Gallacher in the British Cabinet and that its parties are open or crypto-Communism, Socialism, and Lloyd-George, Mackenzie-King "Liberalism."

In passing, it may be observed that there is some suggestion of the abandonment of C.C.F. (Socialism) in favour of "Liberalism", by the Financial Interests in Alberta.

Most of us, because we have been conditioned to think that way, have a natural reluctance to accept "occultism" as a considerable force in world affairs. There could hardly be a greater error—it is the primary adversary of Christian civilisation. The forces of which it disposes are probably amoral; but the intention of those most evidently in possession of them is Satanic. The Jewish Cabala is one of its main roots.

### THE BOMB AND DIPLOMACY

It is a strange story that Charles F. Kettering, former research director for one of the great automotive companies, tells the U.P. correspondent at Miami. Mr. Kettering, who wanted to offer a \$15,000 prize to the scientist developing the best plan of defence against the atomic bomb "was told not to do so because it would cause the bomb to lose its diplomatic value."

Who told him not to offer the prize, Mr. Kettering does not say. From the context of his statement, it would seem that the anonymous personage spoke with authority in government policy. Whoever it was the episode is revealing. It indicates a curious estimate of diplomacy and a singular ingenuousness with respect to American common sense and the competence of other peoples.

Why, having devised this weapon (exclusive possession of which is by no means assured us) we should fail to press intensively for defence against it, is surely a mystery beyond understanding. Why it should be supposed that other nations are not working on this problem, as well as on the bomb, is another. Mr. Kettering says that if we are smart enough to make the bomb we are "smart enough to design protection against it." But then he is only one of the top-flight practical scientific technologists in America!—*Washington Times Herald*.

## A Canadian Farmer Speaks Out

### Mr. Ashby's Address in the Canadian Parliament

The following is from the OFFICIAL REPORT of the Canadian House of Commons for February 6, 1948, during the Debate on the speech from the Throne begun on December 3:—

*Mr. Patrick H. Ashby* (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, two individuals are absent from this chamber, and until they take their places we are just wasting our time, as we have been doing for many decades past. One of your many duties, sir, is to keep hon. members who are speaking from straying away from the subject matter under discussion; in other words, to keep them on the track; but there is no one here, nor is there any symbol, to indicate when we are on the wrong track. Ninety times out of a hundred when hon. members of this house rise in their places to speak, they are on the wrong track, as we shall find out with the next—

*Mr. Sinclair* (Vancouver North): Few minutes.

*Mr. Ashby*:—twelve months or so. If two years from now Canada exists as an independent nation it will be because of the hard work of a few, a very few, individuals; otherwise by that time it will cease to exist as an independent country. Of that I feel certain. Watch Britain. Should Britain fall within a few months, as it may, our turn will be next; make no mistake about it.

I said two individuals were missing from the floor of this chamber, Mr. Speaker. If I had my way about the matter I would have another chair, similar to the one in which you sit, placed to your right. In that seat I would place an individual who would represent the philosophy of life toward which we should aim. I would call him the lord spiritual representing the Christian philosophy of life. He would give us some aim toward which we might work.

As the people are not represented in this chamber, because only party politics are represented here to a great extent, I would have another chair erected on your left in which would be seated an individual representing the people of this country and not party politics. He might be called the lord temporal.

We have no individuals or symbols representing these things. When I walked around the building at noon I looked at the statues of the politicians which surround us here. I thought that in the centre of the Clerk's table immediately before you we might erect a small statue of none other than Christopher Columbus. We have all heard of Christopher Columbus. Ask any child in school; ask any university student; ask any man on the street; ask any hon. member of this house or of the other place what Christopher Columbus is noted for, and you will get the same answer—Christopher Columbus discovered America. When he started out he started out similarly to the way in which we started out, because we do not know where we are going or where we shall land.

But there are others who do know and they are guiding us into totalitarianism. I would never suggest that a statue of Christopher Columbus be placed in this chamber merely because he discovered America. The thought flashes into my mind that people really do not know what Christopher Columbus really discovered. Christopher Columbus discovered a philosophy of life, a way of life that was as nearly perfect as is possible to be reached by any human being on

this earth. He discovered it actually in operation because these people had brought it to a state of perfection.

As soon as Christopher Columbus stepped on to the shores of the West Indies he walked up those silvery sands, thumped himself on the chest a couple of times and took in good deep breath. It was an extremely good thing he had taken a good deep breath, because the next moment it was nearly knocked out of him, for he was met by a delegation of some of the most beautiful damsels he had ever seen in his life who approached to welcome him to that wonderful country. In fact they made poor Chris feel all of a tizzwazz. Never in his life had he seen such beauties. Their hair; their clear bright twinkling eyes, their wonderful smiles, their pearl-like sparkling teeth, their skin as smooth as the softest velvet—there was not a blemish on a thousand of them.

All this made Chris think of home and he sat right down and wrote, "Dear Nellie, I have discovered Utopia." To Queen Isabella he wrote, "Dear Belly," and he got half way down the page before he noticed what he had written. Then he had to screw up the sheet and throw it away and be more formal. Here is the record as it was put down by the man who made this great discovery, and I quote from the letter he sent to Queen Isabella. Listen:

So loving, so tractable, so peaceable are these people, that I swear to Your Majesties, there is not in the world a better nation, nor a better land. They love their neighbours as themselves, and their discourse is ever sweet and gentle, and accompanied with a smile, and although it is true they are naked, yet their manners are decorous and praiseworthy.

What explorer could write that of us here in Canada?

*Mr. Knowles*: It is too cold.

*Mr. Ashby*: This is serious, Mr. Preacher. Look at our schools; look at our colleges; look at our universities; look at our beer halls; look at our penitentiaries; look at our jails, and look at our religious organizations which are nothing more or less than the party politics of Christianity, with pulpit orators spouting their stuff, professing Christianity but practising the philosophy of demons, the totalitarian, or police state. That is what we are facing now and will face within the next few months right here in this fair home land of ours, Canada.

No sooner did covetous individuals, similar to those who are now coveting this homeland of ours, hear about these wonderful people and this wonderful land than they set full sail for it. Arriving there they swarmed over this wonderful country; and, calling together these wonderful people who had solved their problems, who were living so happily and contentedly and peaceably together, clambered up on their packing cases and harangued the crowd and told them that they had forgotten to put their pants on.

They then broke open their packing cases, for they were experts at exports, and began to sell these trusting souls everything from cheap cotton panties to hard liquor. They distributed among these people everything from the measles to religious tracts and smallpox. Finally they enslaved the men and ravaged the wonderful women and left ruin and desolation in its stead. They completely annihilated them. They are no more.

What a terrible history will some day be written of those men who had no colour in their skin! I sometimes feel ashamed to think that my ancestors may have taken part in that terrible work. What we must learn is that we also have a philosophy of life to aim at. Where is our lord spiritual in

this chamber? Of course we have not come near to reaching that stage accomplished by the original inhabitants of the West Indies, but in reading through some old papers I came across some prices which, I am sure, will interest hon. members and the people of this country. In the days of old Nova Scotia over 100 years ago, in fact in 1827, certain prices prevailed which, I am sure, will interest the house. In those days people did not know how to produce as efficiently as we can produce today, nor did they know how to produce as cheaply; but listen to these prices: best beef, cut from front quarters, 6 cents; cut from hind quarters, 8 cents; salt pork, 12 cents a pound; potatoes, 60 cents a bushel; good Nova Scotia apples, \$2.40 a barrel; Nova Scotia prime butter, 18 cents a pound, and this advertiser had fifty firkins on hand; white cotton cloth, 9 cents a yard; printed cotton cloth, 10 cents; white flannel, 12 cents.

He also received one and a half tons of fine cheese, just as mellow as old Uncle Sylvester, and as nippy as an old maiden aunt who had just cracked her upper plate. He also advertised Yorkshire and west of England cloths at \$1.20 a yard. He said he had fifty barrels of Irish salt pork on hand, twenty boxes of sperm candles, ten boxes of tallow candles and ten bales of tobacco. He said he had thirty puncheons of high-priced rum—come and get it—at 54 cents a gallon.

*An hon. Member:* Where is that?

*Mr. Ashby:* And he had Jamaica highproof rum, \$1 a gallon, fifteen hogsheads of Cognac brandy, and six hogsheads of best Cork Irish whisky at \$1.75 a gallon; twenty-two quarter casks of Teneriffe wine, three pipes, five hogsheads of port wine and six hogsheads of Hollands gin, all for sale at a reduced price. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that there were no government bootleggers in those days. There was no government monopoly of the black-marketing of liquor, vending the vilest alcohol imaginable, and watered at that, at ten times its value, if it has any value, the drinking of which would give anybody stomach ulcers. Bureaucracy is the greatest monopoly the world has ever known—this bureaucratic government monopoly. Talk about profiteering! They are the profiteers, not those engaged in free enterprise, in private business.

Here are a few prices of fifty years ago. Oranges were advertised at one hundred for 85 cents. Today they are five cents a piece, \$5 a hundred. Fifty years ago cheese, advertised as "Good nippy Cheddar," was selling at five cents a pound. I telephoned a grocer in Ottawa to find out what the price of cheese was today. I asked him, "What is the price of good nippy cheese, Ontario Cheddar?" He said, "If you can get it." I said, "You have none?" "No", he said, "I cannot get it." I asked him what the price would be if he could get it. He looked it up, telephoned me later on and said, "45 to 47 cents a pound."

Fifty years ago bacon was selling at five cents a pound. Today, tough old sow belly sells at from 73 to 89 cents a pound. There are no good pork products on the market in Canada today. Our primest meat is exported. The Canadian people are not fit to consume the best they can produce, but must eat culls. We are fed Spam and Spork and such offal as that, instead of the fine hams and bacons we can produce.

Fifty years ago, Indian rugs, six feet by three feet, were selling at \$2.15 each, suede gloves at 48 cents a pair. In 1819, wheat was selling at \$2.40 a bushel and you could buy a three and a half pound loaf of bread for eight cents. Have we learned nothing since those days? Are we not able to

produce far more abundantly today than ever before and far more cheaply? I can answer that question as a practical farmer. Leave us farmers alone and we will flood this country with so much food that it would be an utter impossibility for the people to consume it. Production is being deliberately sabotaged in Canada today. Let us take a look and see. Here is the record. Listen to it.

According to the *Canada Year Book* we had on our farms in Canada in 1943, 8,148,000 swine. Last year, 1947, we had 5,473,000, or a loss of 2,675,000 breeding animals. Our foundation stock is going. Last year we marketed 300,000 brood sows, No. 1 and No. 2., the foundation stock.

The output and slaughter of hogs in 1944 amounted to 11,431,000 and in 1947, 4,500,000, or a loss of some 7,000,000 hogs. This does not include the losses for 1946 and 1945 which would bring the total loss to 14,000,000 hogs for the three years. And remember we were producing those hogs at a time when our sons were away, when most of the able-bodied manpower of this country was overseas fighting a fallacious war, and the rest of the able-bodied men and women were in our factories producing munitions and war supplies which left the work of production on the farms to our farmers, their wives, and their little children of school age. So what could we produce if help was available today? Help is available but, owing to factors which I shall mention later, our production is being ruthlessly restricted.

Let us take a look at lard. In 1944 we produced 140,753,000 pounds of lard. In 1947 our production dropped to 65,761,000 pounds, or a loss of 75,000,000 pounds. Imagine that in a country such as this!

*Mr. Blackmore:* Under a Liberal government.

*Mr. Ashby:* That is true, and I will come to that in a minute. Talk about oleo-margarine! If people only knew it, lard is just as good as oleomargarine. Put a little salt in it; add a little colouring, and I will guarantee it is a mighty fine spread. The people of Britain used it for hundreds of years.

*Mr. Cruickshank:* That was a long time ago.

*Mr. Ashby:* And it is just as digestible as butter, every bit of it. I know the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) does not know much about lard. He may be an authority on apples, but I am an authority on lard, and we used to use a lot of it. In fact, if you do not believe it, look at me now. I am in very good condition, even if I do lose fifteen to twenty pounds while I am here during the six months of the session.

In 1945 we had 6,760,000 cattle on our farms; in 1947 the number dropped to 6,020,700, or a loss of 739,300 breeding animals. We slaughtered 2,606,650 cattle in 1945, and in 1947 only 1,283,034, or a loss of 1,323,616 beef carcasses. And people wonder why they cannot get the meat they want.

In 1944 we had on our farms 3,726,000 sheep. In 1947 this number had dropped to 2,706,900, or a loss of approximately 1,019,100 breeding animals. Imagine that! In 1945 we slaughtered 1,159,962 sheep. In 1947 the number had dropped to 892,655, or a loss of approximately 250,000 sheep and lambs. Dairy cattle on our farms in 1945 amounted to 4,000,000. In 1947 they had dropped to 3,697,400, or a loss of 302,600 milk cows.

Let us now turn to butter. In 1943 we produced

311,709,000 pounds. We have dropped in 1946 to 271,366,000, or a loss of 40,343,000 pounds of butter. I could not get the 1947 figures. In 1945 we produced 1,762,677,000 gallons of milk. I can hardly run through these figures, but I shall give them. In 1946 we produced 1,693,700,000 gallons, or a loss of 69,000,000 gallons of milk.

During the past three years as a practical farmer, I estimate our losses in livestock and livestock products to be fully \$2 billions. Over \$2 billions worth of livestock and livestock products have been sabotaged from the people of Canada.

*Mr. Blackmore:* You cannot blame war-torn Europe for that.

*Mr. Ashby:* But do not think for one moment Canada is the only nation that is under attack. The whole of the British Empire is now being undermined in the most ruthless manner imaginable. We are at war, and those who are fighting us are using the most despicable methods imaginable, and are apparently getting plenty of support. Here are the facts from Australia. I will not go into the situation in other countries because the time goes so fast, unfortunately. I shall quote from the federal house of representatives *Hansard* to show what the Hon. Arthur Fadden said on September 20 last. This is what he said:

A steady decrease of 500,000 hogs a year since 1944. In beef cattle a loss of half a million since 1945; 400,000 less dairy cows than in 1943; 112,000,000 gallons of milk have been lost; 53,000 tons of butter less than in pre-war years; a decline of 47,300,000 pounds of wool; a decrease of 13,000,000 bushels of wheat.

I telephoned the librarian in the Confederation building and asked her for certain figures. Later she obtained them for me and telephoned them back to me, and she made a most significant statement. This woman had never been outside the library. She did not know I was a farmer; she thought I was just a common member of parliament. She said, "These losses are due to lack of feed." I laughed. I said, "I am a farmer. We have an abundance of feed and could produce more in abundance." We could double the output of food from our farms at any time the farmers are given the freedom to go ahead and produce it.

Others will tell you that the loss is due to disease. They will tell you that this tremendous loss in hogs is due to bullnose or rhinitis which has given us some extra work. In cattle, others will tell you it is due to haemorrhagic septicaemia or some such disease as that. An hon. member from northern Ontario was telling me the other day that wolves were harassing the flocks of sheep up there, and the worst of them was a cross between stray dogs and wolves. Being a practical farmer, Mr. Speaker, I have discovered the animals that are causing these terrific losses I have placed on record, and that is a breed of creatures, the most despicable wretches the devil ever hovered. They are what are collectively known as DDOT's. We all know what a DOT is. A dot is a period; and a period is the end, and the end is death. Whenever these DDOT's get going it means death. That is why agriculture is being destroyed. These DDOT'S are closely associated with other similar species of predators known as DDA's. The DDOT's are all those employed in the Dominion Department Of Taxation. I do not see why UNRRA, UNESCO and all these organisations should have a monopoly on such words. Those known as DDA's are employed by the

Dominion Department of Agriculture. I know many of them. Do not think for one moment that all of these are guilty. They are not. I would discharge, I should say, about seventy-five *per cent.* of them; as regards the remainder I would double their salaries, because they deserve it, if they serve the people honestly and well as experts appointed. They then should be the highest paid of any individuals in our land.

There are other associated creatures, despicable things, known as PPOOP's. That is, People Preying On Other People, and there are thousands of them today. They live off the products of the toil of others. The united nations, UNRRA, UNESCO and all these other associations are claiming that there are food shortages; but they give no remedies at all. The remedy is to give these DDOT's one tremendous dose of D.D.T. and clean them right out. In fact, if this house would just make the transportation facilities available to me I would guarantee to have in Ottawa within thirty days five full battalions of fighting farm men and women and other workers armed with pitchforks and meat cleavers who would clean these bureaucrats out of these offices in no time at all. We would drive them out like rats out of a sinking ship, and hon. members could clamber to the top of the tower here and look at them as they fled across the river and up into the bush in the north country, because we do not want them on our farms.

As I said before, we are just wasting our time merely talking. We must do something, and do it mighty quickly before it is too late. When I speak to these civil servants, mind you, they tell me that they are following the policy of the government in office.

*Mr. Blackmore:* Page the treasury board.

*Mr. Ashby:* I hold in my hand one of the most ruthless, cunning and dishonest pieces of work that I have ever seen. It is called, "The Prairie Farmers Income Tax Guide and Farm Account Book." The name on the bottom is, "Dr. James J. McCann."

We are told that this is issued by the taxation division of the Department of National Revenue, which is not true. The taxation division never issued anything. An individual issues something. These DDOT'S always hide behind institutions. Go to any of them and they will tell you to write to such and such a department. Imagine people saying that several hundred years ago! People would wonder, "Who is he? Is he married?" Individuals are responsible and we have to pin this responsibility upon individuals. And we have to do it now. Look at some of the things it says here: "This is intended to help you fill out your income tax." It is not my income tax. I do not want to fill out any income tax. This is Doctor McCann's income tax. Why not insert the name of the individual? I am told that Doctor McCann is a mighty fine fellow. That may be so. I believe, however, he is too busy with his departmental business and has not had time to scan this book thoroughly.

If it is true, as these bureaucrats tell me, that this is the policy of this government, then this government will leave it as it is. They will not withdraw these state police—for that is all they are—who are ravaging agriculture from one end of Canada to the other. These tax collectors are a bureaucratic gestapo or state police employed for no other purpose than to rob and plunder agriculture, because it is agriculture that is under attack. They feel they have big business under their thumbs.

It is the most terrible state of affairs that Canada has ever known. Listen to this for an insult. They tell the people, "If you have any special problems about income tax," ignore your member of parliament. He does not amount to anything. We will get rid of this parliament; just give us a little more time. Ignore him and "write to the district income tax office." There you are—office again.

I received a letter from one of these individuals who said: "This office wrote to you . . ." Well, now, the writer might as well have said that the spittoon wrote to me, or the ashtray, or any other piece of equipment that went to furnish the office. That is what the poor fellow really said, although I do not know that I should call them poor. I believe they know better, but they always shirk personal responsibility and place it on institutions. That is where we have to strike and strike hard.

This is really humorous, but unfortunately I have not the time to go into it. Listen to this:

The Department of Agriculture, which has sponsored and administered . . .

Mind you, no individuals are mentioned; it is just an institution.

The Department of Agriculture, which has sponsored and administered many laws directly helpful to the farming community, and which has always watched over the farmer's best interests . . .

Can you imagine that? I have quoted statistics showing how they are plundering and destroying agriculture. Is that in our best interests? Is that in the interests of the people of Canada? Then they go on to speak of the Department of Trade and Commerce, whichever seeks to extend the market for Canadian products. Think of the thousands of poor old ladies who, when it is fifty degrees below zero, have to bundle up and scamper through the snow to an outhouse and scamper back again as fast as they can, because we have not made available to our own people the facilities that should be theirs. What better market is there than the people of Canada?

This is old stuff. As I said before, I have here a copy of the British *Hansard* of over 100 years ago, and I can quote almost identically the same things I have been speaking about. Here, for instance, taken from the debates of March 17, 1834, as they appear in *Hansard* of the British House of Commons, we find this observation:

But, no there was another tax to be levied on him—

The man that works.

—which was that tax resulting from monopoly. Monopoly demanded 2s. 4½d. more. And so it would ever be; and thus the poor man must pay 300 per cent. upon the real value of the article he used as a necessary for the purpose of supporting a false and a fallacious system of finance.

That was over 100 years ago. It is useless to debate. We have to do something, and here is a man who tells us what to do. I do not know whether I need mention his name

*Mr. Speaker:* Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but he has exhausted his time.

*Some hon. Members:* Go ahead.

*Mr. Ashby:* With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to finish my remarks. I quote again from the same volume of the British *Hansard*:

He said to them, "Don't go to the landlords to ask for cheap bread, because they cannot give it to you. Go to the

government, and tell them to take off the taxes, that the baker may be enabled to give you cheap bread.

And again, at page 539 of the same volume:

It was the monopoly of the monied interest which had scattered so much ruin amongst the agricultural, commercial and manufacturing classes of the country; but the day was approaching when that system would fall under the pressure of the ruin it caused.

What more can be said? And as for the rise in prices, I quote again:

Gentlemen must remember there were two ways of keeping up prices; one was by diminishing production, and the other by increasing consumption. Doing the latter, increased the comforts and gratifications of the mass of the people, and allowed them to multiply indefinitely; but to cause a rise of prices by means of an artificial famine—such as we are experiencing today.

Such as we are experiencing today.

—was only to scatter misery and discord through the nation, at the same time it dug the ground from under its own feet.

---

#### PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

Although that is on the Order Paper, it does not seem to me that the Debate so far has been dealing with the underlying differences of principle which should be raised by his Bill. The Home Secretary claimed that the Bill was really the final stage in an edifice built over the last 300 years, ever since Colonel Rainsborough laid down the principle of universal suffrage and one man, one vote; that the previous landmark was in 1832, and that now we have reached the point where the electoral system is pretty well perfect. I do not know whether I misunderstood the Home Secretary, but that was the impression he gave me. If that were right, I should be very happy, but I am still puzzled by the fact that the alterations the Bill would make in our electoral system, are most of them very small. Most of them, I think, are quite good, but they are all small. There are arguments for and against abolition of the university franchise.

Personally, I think it is an illogical remnant of an ancient and interesting system, and there might be some case for a little illogicality and for not enforcing a mathematical rule too severely; but it is not a matter of great principle, comparing with some of the reforms carried out after the last war, such as women's suffrage. The fact remains that before the recent war, and now, this House has been very far from representing the views of the electors of this country. At present, I think the Labour Party enjoy about 100 Members more than they deserve in proportion to the number of votes cast. They are in fact a minority Government; they did not poll a majority of the votes in the country. Yet they enjoy the largest majority any Government has had in this House for a long time. That is nothing new. The system persisted in the period between the wars when the Conservative Party, standing alone as a party, never polled a majority of the votes in the country. They had a majority only in 1931 because a part of the Labour Party and a part of the Liberal Party assisted them. At no other time did they poll a majority of the votes.

(The report of Mr. Roberts's speech will be continued next week.)