

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 4.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

## "Rumblings in Alberta"

THE FOLLOWING EDITORIAL FROM *The Western Producer* OF MARCH 4, 1948, IN CONJUNCTION WITH ITS PUBLICATION IN THAT NEWSPAPER, IS INFORMATIVE CONCERNING MATTERS OF WIDER IMPORTANCE THAN THE FACTS, SIGNIFICANT AS THEY ARE, WHICH IT INTRODUCES BEARING UPON RECENT EVENTS IN ALBERTA:—

Rumours of dissension within the ranks of the Social Credit party in Alberta have been circulating for some time. Matters were brought to a head by the forced resignations of Hon. R. E. Ansley, minister of education, and the able and hard-working deputy minister of economic affairs, L. D. Byrne. Opponents of the Government are perhaps being a bit sensational in calling this a "purge," but it is of sufficient importance to be deserving of examination.

It is in the interest of all concerned that there should be the fullest and frankest discussion of a matter of this nature. This, not for political party reasons in which, as such, we are not interested, but rather on account of the significance of financial reform at this time. Despite the disposition of newspapers and politicians to sneer at it and despite the somewhat unfortunate manner in which its case has occasionally been presented Social Credit has always been important. But it is even more so now when by the inexorable pressure of events at home and abroad a large and rapidly increasing body of opinion has reached the conviction that no enduring solution to present difficulties can be reached without a fundamental revolutionary change in the money system. That is why the affairs of the present Alberta administration which owes its existence mainly to its advocacy of monetary reform have a deep interest for students of public affairs of all political shades far beyond the confines of that Province.

When Mr. Aberhart was elected some eleven years ago the issue on at least one important point was quite clear. The U.F.A. Government, which he defeated, were not by any means hostile to Social Credit. Indeed, on two occasions the U.F.A. had brought the founder of the movement, Major C. H. Douglas, to the Dominion and had a good deal of responsibility for popularizing the ideas associated with his name. No. A main difference—there were others—was Mr. Aberhart's insistence that a provincial government had sufficient power to introduce Social Credit policies and the equally insistent claim of the U.F.A. that a province could do nothing because finance and banking were federal matters.

The Manning Government held firmly to the same position until comparatively recently. The first hint that the official attitude was changing came at the 1945 convention in Calgary. But popular opinion in the ranks was adamant against change. This is clearly borne out by the following excerpt from the report which appeared in our issue of

December 13, 1945:—

Delegates attending the 11th annual meeting of the Alberta Social Credit League in Calgary last week rose to their feet in the convention hall to give unanimous endorsement to a resolution authorizing the Alberta Government to renew its battle against finance, even to the extent of defying 'law and the constitution.'

The action came after Premier Ernest Manning made it clear that he personally was in favour of maintaining respect for all laws, even those which were not good, and after Attorney-General Lucien Maynard warned the delegates to be quite sure of what they were voting for and whether they meant what they said. "We've had disallowances and *ultra vires*," he reminded them. "We had war on our hands before this war. If you pass this resolution, it means another declaration of war on those who oppose the will of the people."

"Do you want to go beyond the law and the constitution?" he asked, and was greeted with applause and a shout from a delegate: "The sky's the limit."

"Two of our boys went to jail," Maynard reminded the convention. "Are you prepared to take the same consequences?"

A roar of applause followed. Then the delegates rose, passed the resolution, gave three cheers and broke into "Onward Christian Soldiers."

Between that time and the 1947 convention last fall a change took place. That change may have come about from a normal shift in public opinion, the result of altered circumstances. Or it may have been engineered by smart staff work on the part of the leaders. We don't know. But there was nothing that happened in the intervening period which would seem to justify it. Be that as it may, the cry of the 1947 convention was "On to Ottawa." In future all efforts to make progress in the provincial field were to cease. Most peculiarly the people who still held the views so vociferously endorsed in 1945 were now called "Douglasites"—apparently a term of opprobrium in the opinion of some of the leaders.

In his announcement in the Alberta Legislature on Mr. Ansley's retirement, Premier Manning had this to say:

I want to make it very clear that the matter in which Mr. Ansley finds himself at variance with the Government does not arise from any change in the Government's position with respect to its allegiance to Social Credit principles and its determination to establish a true Social Credit economy in this country. It is in the matter of the proper and necessary procedure to attain this goal of a true Social Credit economy that Mr. Ansley has felt unable to dissociate himself from viewpoints and actions at distinct variance with those of the Government and the Social Credit movement in Alberta.

The word "country" instead of "province" may be significant.

What seems to emerge pretty clearly from all this is that it is the Government position and not that of Messrs. Byrne and Ansley that has veered. They seem to have embraced the former U.F.A. and present C.C.F. position—namely that in matters of monetary policy the provincial government is helpless, it can do nothing.

From this certain interesting conclusions may be drawn. First, it was a waste of time electing the Social Credit party in the first place. True, they have given Alberta "good government." But as we have said on another occasion, good government is not enough. If it were there would have been no object in defeating the U.F.A. administration which was every bit as "good" as the one that succeeded it.

There may be some justification—outside of maintaining a number of nice people in nice jobs—for continuing the Manning regime in office. But surely if a provincial government is powerless in matters financial it is a palpable waste of time and money for Social Crediters as such to waste their energies in trying, for instance, to elect a provincial administration in Saskatchewan. If the battle cry is "On to Ottawa," then on to Ottawa let it be.

A minor point which might be explained is how it comes that the term "Douglasite" is flung by professing Social Crediters at other Social Crediters as a term of reproach. After all, Douglas is the discoverer and founder of Social Credit. With the greatest of deference one may ask: Is it then necessary to deny Christ before one can claim to be a good Christian?

The goal now is Ottawa. In that case a key province is Quebec. No political party lacking strong French-Canadian backing has governed Canada. As it happens, though this does not seem to be well known, there is today in Quebec the strongest Social Credit movement that exists anywhere in Canada with the possible exception of Alberta. They preach the straight S.C. doctrine and are not ashamed of its origin. They have one member in the House of Commons and have scored good votes in elections and by-elections. If the goal is now Ottawa, Alberta should cultivate Quebec. In the past they have met on friendly terms and the brilliant Professor J. Ernest Grégoire has been vice-president of the National Social Credit Organization. But he no longer holds that office. He resigned as of January 30, last, on account, as he alleges, of the intransigence of the English speaking majority on the executive. The first step in the march to Ottawa is thus marked by a quarrel with the powerful Quebec organization. That is not a happy augury. We do not apportion the blame, but certain it is that this breach will have to be healed before there can be any real advance on a national scale.

For all that has happened in Alberta there may be quite acceptable explanations. The enemies of Social Credit and of the Manning regime argue that they have grown fat in office, have lost their crusading fire and are now lazy and complacent. Being enemies of neither Social Credit or Manning or of any other political party we are loath to believe this charge. But we do believe that a full and candid statement should be forthcoming. The supporters of the Government should be fully informed about exactly what has happened and why. In line with the professions of the Manning Government they should be given ample opportunity

to discuss it and express their views. Elected Social Credit representatives never tire of insisting that they are merely the instruments for carrying out the wishes of the people. This is a time when that policy should be put into practice. The whole case should be laid before the public and a free expression of opinion sought. Then if it should really be disclosed that the electors do want to quit the provincial field, the wise course would seem to be that work there, outside of Alberta at any rate, should cease and the time and limited funds available should be expended in the Federal arena.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: March 10, 1948.*

### Palestine Bill

*The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Creech Jones):* I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

This Bill is necessary to make provision for certain matters arising out of the termination of His Majesty's Government of Palestine. On November 29 the General Assembly of the United Nations recommended the adoption of a plan for the partition of Palestine with an economic union. That plan provided for the termination of the Mandate "as soon as possible but in any case not later than August 1, 1948."

The Bill accordingly provides that on a day to be appointed by His Majesty the jurisdiction of His Majesty in Palestine shall cease and His Majesty's Government will no longer be responsible for the government of Palestine. The day to be appointed, as has already been announced will be May 15 of this year. As the House is aware, it will not be possible to withdraw all our Forces by that day, but they will be withdrawn by August 1 at the latest.

The Government of Palestine as we know it today will cease to exist on May 15, and any contracts made by that Government will automatically terminate on that date, for example, contracts with public officers. The authority for the administration of Palestine after May 15 will, in accordance with the United Nations Resolution of November 29, be the United Nations Palestine Commission. The partition plan gives the Commission authority to issue "necessary regulations." As I have said, His Majesty will have no jurisdiction in Palestine after May 15, and any decision of His Majesty in Council after that day cannot be enforced. It necessarily follows that proceedings before the Privy Council must abate . . .

*Mr. Pichthorn (Cambridge University):* . . . Is it not a horrible thing that His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State should have brought this Bill before us and made a Second Reading speech about, I will not say the abandonment, but the relinquishment of two millions of His Majesty's subjects without a word to try to explain to us the subsequent international rights and status of what had been His Majesty's subjects? . . . We ought to know. It is quite ridiculous that this House should discuss the Second Reading of this Bill without knowing that; and it is quite contemptible that one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State should have thought it possible for the House to discuss the Bill without knowing that. . . .

. . . Now I want to indicate why I think these questions important. First of all, it is the most absurd devaluing of

democratic or Parliamentary procedure that we should discuss a Bill of immense and incalculable consequences without having had these things explained to us. I shall not be a bit abashed if I am told that all my questions are unnecessary, or that all the answers I may have appeared to indicate are wrong. That will strengthen my argument. My argument is that, just as any kind of economic planning becomes more and more nonsense as the currency gets less and less current, so similarly any kind of Parliamentary Government becomes more and more a contemptible parody as the House is increasingly asked to give decisions on the greatest matters when it is well known that there cannot be 50, 20, perhaps not even 5 *per cent.* of the House understanding what it is to which they are giving assent.

*Mr. Crossman* (Coventry, East): Oh!

*Mr. Pickthorn*: If the hon. Member who seems to be amused can explain the Bill clearly, and its probable legal effects, I shall be the first to congratulate him.

*Mr. Paget* (Northampton): If the hon. Member was referring to me—

*Mr. Pickthorn*: No, I was not; I should not.

The second reason why questions of this sort appear to me important is that we are going an awfully long way, not only to devalue Parliamentary procedure and democracy below the point of parody, but also to devalue the United Nations below the point of parody. There came a moment when it was said that the League of Nations was midsummer madness. That may have been the wrong way to put it; perhaps it should have been said sooner, or perhaps not till later, or perhaps in different language, or perhaps not from the lips from which it fell. But it is perfectly plain that any kind of organisation purporting to direct the use of physical compulsion, especially in international matters, must at some point, of either ineffectiveness or disrespectability, be disallowed, be written off. . . .

. . . On each of the last two or three occasions when we discussed this, I asked the right hon. Gentleman to put beyond any question the cleanness of our hands in having done everything possible to remove the argument that Zionist immigration into Palestine must be allowed on humanitarian grounds, of sympathy for the unfortunate Jews from Europe. Over and again we have begged for that, and I particularly have asked for it. More than once we have had some kind of assurance from the Treasury Bench. If the United Nations were united about anything, could they not have been united in offering asylum? And so that argument could be taken away, these two questions, which should never have been tied up together, could thus be clean separated. The first question, which is the Zionist question, is whether it is or is not right for Britain, or the United Nations, to exercise military force to compel a long-settled society to permit immigration without having any control of its quantity and quality. The other question is what ought to be done as a matter of human pity for such Jews as are miserable and homeless in and around Europe. Let us get and keep these two questions apart. Which nations have promised that they will take  $x$  thousands for the next  $y$  years? And if none of the nations have made such promises, have they refused requests from the right hon. Gentleman that such promises should be given? And if so, why is it that there have been no such promises? . . .

*Mr. Hopkin Morris* (Carmarthen): . . . We entered Palestine nearly 30 years ago as the mandatory Power with

high hopes. We found it had a population of 750,000 and was a backward Ottoman province. There were no highways, and it was riddled with disease, but, despite all the difficulties, and the great obstacles, in the last 30 years the population has increased from 750,000 to something like two million. Today Palestine has the necessary equipment for a modern civilised State.

That is a great achievement, a magnificent achievement by this country, made in the space of 30 years, and one of which we might well be proud. It must be a matter of great regret for every Member of this House that at the end of that 30 years, with all that work to our credit, we are faced with this Bill, and that the best offer we can make in the terms of the Bill is to withdraw from Palestine. It is a great tragedy, not only to Palestine, but to the world, that this withdrawal has to take place. The party opposite cannot escape responsibility for what has made this withdrawal necessary. They cannot forget that they fought the last General Election with wholesale pledges to Jewry, and Jewry has legitimate claims to make about those pledges. It was a great misfortune that they were made, and today they have returned and recoiled on the heads of the Government Front Bench. . . .

*Mr. Warbey* (Luton): I beg to move:

"That this House declines to give a Second Reading to a Bill which, in making provision with respect to the termination of His Majesty's jurisdiction in Palestine, fails to make provision for the independence of Jewish and Arab States in Palestine as provided by the United Nations decision, for the orderly transfer of such jurisdiction to the United Nations Commission, or for consequential and connected matters."

There is a second Amendment on the Order Paper:

"That this House, while welcoming the Government's decision to terminate the Palestine Mandate on May 15 and to withdraw all British troops from Palestine, declines to give a Second Reading to the Palestine Bill, while the Government pursues a policy in respect to Palestine which undermines the authority of the United Nations Organisation."

I think it will be shown, before this evening is out, that hon. Members who have put their names to the second Amendment will support the first not only in their speeches but, unless the Government are able to announce a sudden and dramatic reversal of their policy, also in the Division Lobby. . . .

NOW READY

## THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By

C. H. DOUGLAS

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, LIVERPOOL.

## 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. 4.

Saturday, March 27, 1948.

### From Week to Week

"The Social Crediters, supporters of the anti-Semite Major C. H. Douglas, are disturbed by reports of the purge which is now going on in Alberta, Canada.

"The anti-Jewish and pro-Fascist elements in the Alberta Social Credit Party are fighting a losing battle. The Editor of the *Canadian Social Crediter* has resigned, and the new Managing Editor, Gordon Taylor, has declared: This paper in future will carry nothing of an anti-Semitic, anti-Gospel or anti-this-and-that nature. A final split is also threatened between Social Credit and the Quebec affiliate, the *Union des Electeurs*. This latter group has been noted for its pro-Fascist sympathies. *Vers Demain*, its official organ, has publicised the forgery *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and links Freemasons, Jews, and Communists as responsible for the world's ills."—*The Jewish Chronicle*, February 27, p. 9.

Well informed, aren't they?

White to play, and mate in three moves.

"The people of God operate with atheists; the most skilful accumulators of property ally themselves with communists; the peculiar and chosen race touch the hand of all the scum and low castes of Europe. And all this because they wish to destroy that Christianity that owes them even its name, whose tyranny they can no longer endure."—*Life of Lord George Bentinck*, Benjamin D'Israeli.

"The education we have so far succeeded in giving to the bulk of our citizens has produced a generation of mental slatterns . . . a great part of the nation subsists in an ignorance more barbarous than that of the dark ages, owing to this slatternly habit of illiterate reading. Words are understood in a wholly mistaken sense, statements of fact and opinion are misread and distorted in repetition . . ."—Dorothy L. Sayers: Preface to *The Mind of the Maker*.

Not the least of the services which *The Tablet* renders to an ungrateful world is its flat negation of the claims of the present Administration to be representative of the national character. "The history of the English shows them to be a people naturally talented but not naturally industrious, all profoundly imbued with a sense of the aristocratic ideal that the measure of a civilised life is to be able to live at leisure . . . There is among the English virtually none of the feeling

by which unrepresentative Puritans, like Sir Richard Acland, are animated, that unearned wealth is morally discreditable."

At a time when the ideas fathered on the cahmon man, by the Common Enemy, seem likely to involve us in a common ruin, it would be difficult to over-rate the importance of this "stand for righteousness." In an immediately preceding paragraph, we have reiterated, by quotation from Miss Dorothy L. Sayers, what we feel to be a very fundamental contributory to our ills—the lack of "a just relationship between the mind and"—ideas. Bacon was no doubt thinking of what we should now call the scientific outlook. But we have to face something far more insidious, since language as a bridge has been broken down. We are confronted with a schizophrenia which, it would appear, can only be resolved by an "atonement" between ideation and understanding—an atonement in which words have been enlisted in the service of the Father of Lies.

The resignation of Professor Grégoire [\*] from the position of First Vice-President of the Canadian National Social Credit Association is at once a damaging blow to that not very happy organisation, and, superficially a success for the Communist-Zionist infiltrators whose objective is primarily to disrupt the Social Credit activists or alternatively to direct Federal policy through capture of the Provincial Legislature.

As our esteemed contemporary, *Vers Demain*, points out, the *Canadian Social Crediter* which was specifically designated as the National (Federal) organ of Social Credit activity, has, without renouncing its title, become the organ of Alberta Government policy, presumably as laid down by or through Mr. Manning, and in contempt of the rest of Canada, including the rather more powerful Quebec movement. We are witnessing once more a battle between A and B for the benefit of C and we cannot too strongly urge A and B to concentrate their first activities on C.

It has been arranged that the brother of Dr. Elliott Wershof, the President of the Zionist Organisation in Edmonton, Alberta, is to be employed in the Office of the Canadian High Commissioner in London (England).

This will enable intimate information on the political situation in Alberta to be available to those concerned to manipulate it, without delay.

In an address to the Canadian Construction Association, at Calgary, on January 6, the Hon. W. A. Fallow, Minister of Public Works, delivered a vigorous attack on the "Canadian" Broadcasting Corporation, which he accused of disseminating Communism disguised as news. "The Planners who are laying this strait-jacket have as their objective complete control of all propaganda agencies as well as complete control of the means by which men and women live."

The Minister not only directed his attack on radio, but on the motion picture industry, and the Press.

"He claimed that these two propaganda agencies were controlled by the 'planners' whom he referred to many times

\*See page 8 for text of M. Grégoire's letter.

during his address, but never identified them."—*Edmonton Bulletin*, Jan. 8, 1948.

While we are not favourably impressed by the recent trend of events in Edmonton, it must not be overlooked that Mr. Manning, and his more significant colleagues are the target for perhaps the most venomous manoeuvres which have ever been directed against Administrative Office holders, and we are absolutely convinced that these attacks would, or will, stop at nothing to deflect legislative policy from a direction leading to success. And when we make that statement, we include murder. (It is perhaps unnecessary to remark that the danger emanates from centres far removed from local politics).

Social Credit in Alberta simply *cannot*, from the point of view of the Planners, be permitted to succeed. A whole world is at stake, and atomic or bacterial war are arguments only deferred until less troublesome inducements have failed.

It may be said, with some reason, that anyone can give brave advice when the guns are pointed in the opposite direction. Nevertheless, there are many cases, and Alberta has always been one of them, in which the bold course is not merely the right course, it is the safe course. If, as we strongly suspect, pressure of a very severe character has been brought to bear upon Mr. Manning, by far the wisest course to pursue would be to let that fact be widely known. Unless we greatly misjudge the character of the Western Canadian he would collectively resent such tactics as an infringement of sovereignty, and Mr. Manning would be much safer.

Whether our rulers are really becoming more contemptuous of the ruled, or whether events are taking the finish off their style, we do not know. But the character of President Truman's speech to the Congress and Senate, at almost the same hour that the Masonic United States of Europe was tied up and handed over the counter with rather less ceremony than accompanies the fixing of a County Rate, suggests that "either in war, or under threat of war," a fresh batch of insults is to be added to our present injuries.

It must be painfully obvious that Mark Twain's story of the country doctor whose practice was to give all his patients a dose which would produce blind staggers, because he knew a remedy for blind staggers although it left a broken leg, is a faithful presentation of our State Political Hospital, and you can't go to an alternative practitioner.

Perhaps the only grain of consolation to be derived from the situation is that, for the moment, we are fairly certain that "threat of war" is more in the minds of the political quacks than its reality. But there is little doubt that, to use the American expression, we are living on borrowed time, and that a situation is being constructed which will leave us mentally, morally and physically bankrupt. It would be no compliment to our readers to elaborate the fact that the fundamental nature of "Russian" and "American" High Policy, monotheistic centralisation, is identical, and that if they are not dictated from the same source, it is only because they do not need to be. But it may not be superfluous to point out that there is one alternative, and one practical alternative only, while Time remains, and that is the British Empire, of which the fundamental link is *cultural*. And if that is realised, it will also be realised that the Empire of the Spirit and the Dominion of the Atom Bomb cannot co-exist.

## Political Representation

*House of Commons: February 17, 1948.*

### Representation of the People Bill

(*The Debate continued:—*)

*Mr. Ronald Mackay* (Hull, North West): . . . We cannot work a democracy properly if eight million people are either not interested or are not able to vote. Anyone who produces his registration card to the returning officer should be entitled to vote after making a declaration if, by some mistake, he has been left off the register. However, I want to take the matter a stage further.

I want the Home Secretary to think about the introduction of what is called, quite wrongly, compulsory voting. This operates in our Dominions in most cases. The provision is not that someone has to vote, but that someone has to perform a specific act. He can go and vote or he can make a declaration saying he does not want to do so for conscientious reasons or because he does not like the face of the candidate, but he must perform a civic act because he is a member of the community and must take part in its political life. The result is that in perfectly free countries like Australia and New Zealand, you get a vote of 98 *per cent.* not by any totalitarian methods of force, but because the duty of seeing that everybody votes is thrown on to the returning officer and so is brought home to people in a way in which it is not in the ordinary methods of electioneering. . . .

*Lady Megan Lloyd George* (Anglesey): . . . I believe that the moment has come for the abolition of university representation. . . . At the same time, I believe, there is a place for university representation in Parliament, for the representation of men of science and of letters, for educationists apart from pure politicians—and I use the word advisedly—but the appropriate place for them is in a reformed Second Chamber, and I hope that they may some time in the near future find their place there.

. . . I happened to be a member of the Speaker's Conference of 1944, and I think the facts and the recommendations speak for themselves. What are those facts? First, there is the fact that the Conservatives assented to the assimilation of the municipal and Parliamentary franchise. The Secretary of State for Scotland said today that they did it out of conviction; but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Woodford said yesterday that it was distasteful to the Conservative Party and greatly to their disadvantage, but they accepted it. No one will suggest that they accepted it from any altruistic motive.

The second fact is that the Labour Party who, throughout their history have been hostile to university representation, did not challenge its retention at the Conference. The Secretary of State for Scotland said today that he and his colleagues had suddenly become convinced at the Speaker's Conference of the value of university representation, and that they had come to that judgment out of conviction. Well, it was a very sudden change—[An HON. MEMBER: "A sudden conversion."] Yes, perhaps more sudden than any since that which took place on the road to Damascus. But what happened then? The Secretary of State for Scotland then asked us to believe that because two university Members were returned to this House on a party label, he changed his mind back again, and became again convinced that there was no value in university representation.

May I remind him that there was another recommenda-

tion made at that Conference to which no reference has been made at all in this Debate, that is the question of the abolition of plural voting. The motion was that no person at any election should vote more than once. That recommendation was voted upon, and the result is incorporated in the letter which the Speaker sent to the then Prime Minister. That motion was defeated by six votes to 25. I would remind the House that there were only 15 Conservatives on that Conference. It becomes perfectly plain, therefore, that Labour Members must have voted against the abolition of plural voting. Is the Secretary of State for Scotland going to tell me that although they had always been unalterably opposed to that principle, they suddenly became convinced of the rightness of plural voting at the Speaker's Conference? I suggest that they had not changed their minds; I do not say they abandoned their principles but I do say that they struck a bargain. It certainly looks like it from the facts and from the recommendations. It looks as though a *quid pro quo* bargain had been made.

The question has been asked, if there were a bargain what should have been its duration? It has been said in the Debate that the election of a new Parliament cancelled out that bargain. Surely, in the circumstances of the case, a new Speaker's Conference should have been called to consider the whole situation. . . .

*Mr. Assheton* (City of London): . . . I shall not try to make a case for the City of London merely on the grounds of history, sentiment and tradition, though I suggest that all these things are important and should be taken into account. This House should remember the great part which the City of London played in the 17th century in support of Parliament in its great struggle with the Crown. The House should remember also that it was largely due to the City of London that later on General Monk was able to rally the forces of democracy and restore the Parliamentary system. It is useful that the House should remember that it was the City of London that secured the freedom of the Press to report the Debates of Parliament. It is interesting that the House should remember, particularly some members of it, that it was pressure from the City of London that resulted in Jews being admitted to full citizenship and to membership of this House. The House, I think, should remember all these things. It should remember also that the whole history of local government in this country derives from the history of the City of London, which established, as a separate entity, an independent unit of Government at a time when such a thing seemed almost impossible in this country.

The City has, of course, been represented here since the earliest days of Parliament. It has been represented 300 years longer than any of the universities whose position also is challenged, alas, under this Bill. . . .

. . . Today we are in a great financial and economic crisis. I would suggest to the Government that the need for invisible exports is greater today than it has ever been. We are very short of dollars, and it is the dollars which the City of London has earned in the past that are missing at the present time—largely owing to the restrictive action of the present Government. [HON. MEMBERS: "No."] Oh yes, certainly. It is the present Government who are preventing the restoration of the trade of the City of London. . . .

. . . A month or two ago, one or two hon. Members told me that they had heard that the universities and the City of

London were going to be disfranchised. I said I did not believe it.

*Mr. Morrison*: When was that?

*Mr. Assheton*: A month or two ago, just before this Bill was issued. I said that I did not believe that was possible. I knew then that right hon. Gentlemen opposite had pledged themselves to this arrangement, and it never occurred to me for one moment that they would break faith. . . .

. . . I was reinforced in my view by what the Lord Chancellor had said in another place. I do not, for one moment, believe that he would have misled the Members of another place; I cannot understand how it happened. These confessions were made, and agreement was reached, but, now, all is thrown over by those Ministers. Although they are bound in personal honour to respect the agreement, they appear, nevertheless, to have been unable to resist pressure from some quarter. . . .

*Mr. Maclay* (Montrose Burghs): . . . The first point which I would like to raise is one of fairly major importance. There is no doubt that this Bill carries a good deal further the tendency which has been observed for some time past to merge, progressively, industrial interests with agricultural interests. It comes up in various ways, but, particularly over the last 50 years, in the progressive disappearance of constituencies such as my own, which is a group of burghs. There is another very good example of that in the Eddisbury Division, which is held by another Member of my party, and I would like to point out what has happened there, because I am quite certain that it is not in the best interests of the country particularly at a time like this when agriculture is of the first importance. Eddisbury, in its present form, is completely agricultural. Under the Bill, it will be split into three or four pieces, and each of these very small pieces will be dominated entirely, or very substantially, by the industrial vote. In my own constituency, the situation is exactly the opposite, and I only give this as an illustration of this major principle to which I am calling attention.

The Montrose District of Burghs, as a constituency, has existed in this precise form since 1832, and, as a burgh constituency, for 100 years before that. It is now to be merged with large areas of the county. . . .

*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Walter Smiles* (Down): . . . Another point is that I would like to see British-born subjects only eligible to be Members of this House. The United States has a law of that kind. I have a young brother who has become a naturalised American citizen. He told me that he could never become President of the United States, but his son, who was born in the United States could become President.

*Mr. Anthony Greenwood* (Heywood and Radcliffe): Would the hon. Member apply that principle to the son of an American mother becoming a British Prime Minister?

*Sir W. Smiles*: I understand that the Prime Minister in question was born a British subject. At the present time, any British subject born in a Dominion could sit here. Mr. Jinnah or Mr. Nehru could be a Member of this House, and so could Mr. Bustamente from Jamaica.

I heard the hon. Member for North-West Hull (*Mr. Mackay*) speak about compulsory voting. I think it would be a very good principle to introduce into this island. It is a

very good thing in Australia and Canada where every voter, I understand, must turn up at the polling booth. He need not vote if he does not want to, but 98 *per cent.* of them turn up. Only a doctor's certificate excuses them and there is a fine of £5 or £10 if they do not attend. Such a measure would encourage the people of this country to take an interest in their own Constitution, would make democracy stronger and not weaker, and would be more likely to unite than to divide.

*Mr. Kenneth Lindsay* (Combined English Universities):

... I ask the Lord President, in his reply tonight, to say three things. Was not the Speaker's Conference morally binding on successive Parliaments until a further Conference was held? What was the actual agreement or bargain made between the two main parties? What steps does he propose to take to retain the organic relationship between the universities and Parliament? In the process of reforming and in some cases liquidating time-honoured institutions, there is one principle which I learned at the feet of Radicals by whom I was brought up, and which was, "Do not destroy any good and growing thing merely for the sake of reform." Because institutions are made by men, they can be unmade by men. But the second process is swift and easy compared to the process of construction. I think there are ways of reforming the university franchise and of making it part of our Constitution. I doubt whether wholesale abolition will add anything good to our democracy—except to make it conform more closely to arithmetic. Is that a sufficient reason? Parties and democracies were made for man, not the reverse. The spirit of man as expressed in minorities is not always wrong. . . .

*The Lord President of the Council* (*Mr. Herbert Morrison*): . . . I admit all the mathematical criticisms against the existing system. I admit that a mathematical case and a theoretical case can be made against it. I admit that governments do not always represent the majority of the electorate. That happens to both sides. On the whole, the Left have had the worst of it up to now, although at the moment we are not doing badly. It happens both ways, but, broadly speaking, the system works. I would sooner have governments with strength and power behind them—even though I do not agree with them—so long as they observe the democratic forms, than a Parliament which can only live by the making and unmaking and remaking of Coalitions and bargains of all sorts. . . .

... I do not like to see independent Parliamentary representation of the City of London go. I am sorry, but I just cannot think of an argument for preserving the City's representation. . . .

(*To be continued*)

## Social Credit Secretariat

### DIPLOMA OF ASSOCIATE

The following overseas Candidates satisfied the Examiners at the 1947 Examination:—

#### CANADA

Roy Harvey Ashby.

#### AUSTRALIA

Bernard Henry Alford.  
Charles Harold Allen.  
Francis Richard Bell.  
James Andrew Lannen.  
Kenneth Bell Macdonald.

Arthur John Munyard.  
Leonard Victor Turner.  
John Gibson Weller.

#### NEW ZEALAND

Fredrick Allen.  
Frank Stanley Ayres.  
Edward Browne.  
Gordon E. Turbitt Carder.  
Harold Heaton.  
Cuthbert Fraser Holt.  
Thomas Ronald Huston.  
Philip Anthony Hutt.  
Donald Neil Irving.  
Harry Jeffries.  
Ernest Moss.

(*Signed*) B. M. PALMER,  
Director for Lectures and Studies.

The paper for Canada was as follows:—

(Candidates must attempt to answer all the questions).

(1) "The episodic conception of the history of this past hundred years is quite untenable."—C. H. Douglas, from *The Brief for the Prosecution*, page 62.

- (a) What is "the episodic conception"? Give an account of this idea in your own words.
- (b) Discuss the current view that "Socialism and 'planning' is the legitimate inheritor of political and economic liberalism." (*op. cit.* p. 47).

(2) What meaning do you attach to the statement that "we live in a scientific age"?

(3) What is *credit* as distinct from *money*?

(4) What do you understand by "The Party System"? What, in your opinion, are the outstanding defects of "Party" government? What proposals do you know to have been made for the correction of such defects as you have mentioned?

In the paper for Australia and New Zealand, the following was substituted for question (4):—

(4) The Australian elections of the Autumn of 1946:

State clearly what you think might have been your answers to the questions below in October, 1946, and, separately, your answers now:—

- (a) What issues were raised?
- (b) To what extent, in your opinion, were they settled?
- (c) How do your answers to (a) and (b) affect your own attitude to participation in elections of the kind held?
- (d) What is "an election"?

## A Premature Settlement

"The greatest enemy harmony can have is a premature settlement in which some essential force is wholly disregarded. This excluded element will rankle in the flesh; it will bring about no end of disorders until it is finally recognised and admitted into a truly comprehensive regimen. The more numerous the interests which a premature settlement contains the greater inertia will it oppose to reform, and the more self-righteously will it condemn the innocent pariah that it leaves outside."—George Santayana, *The Life of Reason; Reason in Art*, p. 216.

### M. J. -Ernest Grégoire

*Vers Demain* for February 15 contains the following paragraphs including the text of the letter of resignation from the Vice-Presidency of the Canadian National Social Credit Association, together with an "Internal Documentary" extending to a page of the issue for the information of its readers:—

#### M. Grégoire

"HE RESIGNS FROM HIS POSITION OF VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE CANADIAN SOCIAL CREDIT ASSOCIATION"

"Since the first National Convention of Canadian Social Crediters which took place in Toronto in April, 1944, M. J. -Ernest Grégoire has been Vice-President of the Canadian Social Credit Association, founded at that Convention. At the second National Convention at Regina in 1946, he was re-elected to the position, with the title of First Vice-President, the Convention having instituted a Second Vice-presidency to which it had elected Major A. H. Jukes, of Haanichton (Vancouver Island).

"M. Grégoire has sent us a copy of the letter of resignation which he sent on January 30 to Mr. Solon Low, President of the Association, to Major Jukes, Vice-President, and to Dr. J. N. Haldeman, Chairman of the National Council. A translation follows:—

[The following is a re-translation, since we are not in possession of the original English.—Editor, *T.S.C.*:—]

"Quebec, January 30, 1948.

"Mr. Solon Low, President of the Social Credit Association of Canada,

"Major A. H. Jukes, Vice-President,

"Dr. J. N. Haldeman, Chairman of the National Council,

"Since, at the moment, a faction is leading the Social Credit Association of Canada along lines of conduct contrary to those adopted at the last National Convention;

"Since this is being done without direction from the National Executive of which, as Vice-President, I am a member;

"Since *The Canadian Social Crediter*, supposed to be the official organ of the Association, is giving space to harmful matter, which I cannot accept, directed against the leaders of the movement of the Province of Quebec;

"Since the same paper has published a letter from the Chairman condemning the ways and methods of the Institute of Political Action and of the Union of Electors of Quebec;

"I wish to dissociate myself entirely from this action and from these lines of conduct, and hereby resign my office of Vice-President of the Social Credit Association of Canada, this dissociation and resignation to take effect immediately.

J. -E. Grégoire."

### "Political 'Saints'"

In Mr. Jensen's article published in *The Social Crediter* on February 21, in the quotations at the foot of column 1 (both of which were from *The Last Days of the Romanovs* by Robert Wilson), the "he" of the first quotation and the "she" of the second both refer to Rasputin.

### DOES IT FIT THE FACTS ?

(Major Douglas's correspondence with the Rev. Dr. Salis Daiches in *The Scotsman*: collected by B. M. Palmer).

4/.

From K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

### BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution .....	8/6
Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy .....	6/6
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea .....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War .....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money .....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism .....	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

#### ALSO

Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit.....	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage.....	7/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	5/-
Protocols of Zion .....	1/6
The Smear Terror .....	1/3
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning .....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
This Freedom .....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Beveridge Plot .....	3d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate .....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
Social Credit: An Explanation for New Readers 1½d. each, or 50 copies for 5/-.	
"Pages from <i>The Social Crediter</i> ".....	1½d.
"Private View" for Industrialists .....	1d.
Does it Fit the Facts ?.....	4/-
Communism in Action .....	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	6d.

FROM K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.