

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 28. No. 20.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 14d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The man who strokes a tiger ends by getting mauled by the tiger. We have some sympathy—that part of our sympathy which we may call of the heart not of the head—with the Dean of Winchester, Bishop Eric Hamilton, whom the tiger is busy mauling for saying, in addressing the Queen's Scouts assembled in St. George's Chapel last April, that living on the Welfare State was "only the way to live like a rich and comfortable cow or turnip." The *News Chronicle* was among the newspapers which published hostile and abusive articles and letters on the score of this opinion, drawing from the Chief Scout, Lord Rowallan, a letter saying that the Dean's address made a different impression on those who heard it than the reports conveyed, and from the Dean the following:—

"Dear Sir, It is your headline that has caused the trouble and the phrase 'Welfare Cows' which I never used. I did not 'denounce' the Welfare State. No one but a fool would do that. The benefits are too obvious to need enumeration. The fact remains that if we reached Utopia we should still be dissatisfied because man cannot live (though he can exist in comfort) by bread alone.

"I tried to say this to the Scouts."

The row has now extended to the pages of *Theology* and the *Church of England Newspaper*, which takes sides concerning what the Dean really meant. We don't take sides: it is clear that, from the tiger's point of view, what the Dean meant was quite harmless. England will go on living by bread alone (agenised), and Deans will in future stroke tigers more gently. Whether they get mauled or not, it's all "very interesting," isn't it?

The Marquess of Salisbury thinks so.

At Liverpool last Saturday he told university students they were going out into an odd world, "a more odd world than my generation went into. We thought we knew all the answers. We were confident that the world was getting steadily better. No one can now have that confidence. No one knows what the future will be, but it is a far more interesting world." Now what is it that makes it so interesting to the Lord Privy Seal? As the late Bishop of Norwich once asked Mr. Keynes, when the economist reported that he thought "we should have to admit that Douglas is right: but his scheme [*sic*] is impracticable"—Politically, Keynes, or economically?" (There was, we believe, no reply.) And so, of Lord Salisbury we ask: "Who is the interested party? To whom is this interesting world interesting?"

Lord Salisbury is one of those politicians who find the

Constitution of increasing interest, but who manage to avoid saying the right things about it, and who, presumably are managing to do the wrong things about it. "When Hitler assumed power in Germany one of the first things he did was to get rid of the independent thinkers and replace them by mere mouthpieces of his own. Were that ever done in Britain he [Lord Salisbury] believed the country would be doomed and damned."

It appears to us something more than and different from "interesting" that this certificate from the Chancellor of the University of Liverpool is a bogus certificate: it certifies falsely that what has reputation in England to-day is "independent," when in fact it is dependent, and if it were not dependent it would be accorded no reputation. If we are right, this country is "doomed and damned." What is there that is "interesting" in living among the doomed and damned?

• • •

While the heavy cavalry is blundering along in its "interesting" fashion (which is not to say that the Marquess of Salisbury's lady-like manners are blundering in the least), the Light Horse is not making much headway. Why isn't it? Not, we fancy, altogether because of a decline in horsemanship. We concede the height of the fences; but, after all, any experienced rider will tell you there are more falls at a low fence than at a high one.

• • •

We hope the more absurd idiosyncracies of the Red Dean, now receiving less kindly attention from the national dailies than they ever received from us—his "unlimited capacity for absorbing praise," *etc.*—will not detract attention from the material fact of his history, his nurture in naturalistic science at Manchester before his (not so distinguished) maturation as a Theologian at Oxford. Speaking biologically we would remark that maturation does not affect the quality of the inheritance, but is chiefly directed to economical ends—you can feed one out of four if they're big, or four out of one if they're little. The genesis, as we have remarked before, of even the most "interesting" so-called-modern ideas is ancient. There is one certain way of tracing their descent: the way enjoined by the New Testament, the assessment, by actual consumption, of the quality of their "grapes." If you have any responsibility of statesmanship (which sensible men would avoid) you have great, not little, concern with vines. Dr. Hewlett Johnson's vine is the gnostic vine, not that of John XV. i. In our day it is the more prolific.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 23, 1952.

Broadcasting (Licence and Agreement)

(The Debate continued: Colonel Elliot is speaking):

The argument that all progress has been made by public bodies and never by any body operating privately cannot be borne out in fact. That very argument is today breaking down before the right hon. Gentleman's eyes. The introduction of the new feature of v.h.f. into broadcasting will mean that it will be as easy and as simple to have a small broadcasting station with a local range as it is to have a local newspaper. Hon. Members opposite are already making use of small commercial v.h.f. stations. Hon. Members only have to go out and summon a taxi. The taxi will very likely be summoned from a v.h.f. station, and I have never heard that it has been used for disseminating pornography, as hon. Members would wish us to believe.

These new decentralisations are absolutely necessary, and where they are particularly necessary is in these new national developments of broadcasting which are about to take place. We are not now discussing the airtight monopoly. That has failed; that is already on its way out. What we are discussing are the conditions under which the airtight monopoly is to be liquidated in the future. Not one hon. Member opposite dares to suggest for a moment that the process of 100 per cent. centralisation in Portland Place, which is what is asked for by those extremists on the opposite side of the House, would be supported either in Scotland or in Wales.

Mr. Gordon Walker: Is the right hon. and gallant Gentleman in favour of commercial competition? I can quite see a case for competition between public bodies, but is he in favour of commercial competition?

Lieut.-Colonel Elliot: First of all, I would say that I am opposed to the monopoly. If I carry the right hon. Gentleman with me on that I have taken him a long way. Secondly, I would say that the Press and the opera promoters have certainly done nothing to demand that they should be ruled out as untouchable in any kind of promotion of either entertainment or education for the people of this country. As I say, the Glyndebourne opera itself is one of the outstanding examples of a man of wealth devoting his wealth to elevating the public taste.

Hon. Members opposite suggest that all men of great wealth are vultures—[HON. MEMBERS: "No."] That is the argument they have brought forward, that they wish to imply that such people feed upon carrion. That is the sort of argument that is being submitted. I say that in Scotland and in Wales decentralisation will have to take place. Not a single Member representing a constituency in Scotland or Wales would deny that that is so.

Mr. Ivor Owen Thomas (The Wrekin): Decentralisation for the purpose of fulfilling the needs of particular areas by the public broadcasting service is an entirely different matter from that which we are discussing, namely, the breaking down of the public monopoly of the B.B.C. for the benefit of private enterprise and the flood of private advertisements which will follow.

Lieut.-Colonel Elliot: What the scheme demands is that there should be a 100 per cent. decentralisation in Portland Place, who feel just as keenly against decentralisation in Scotland or Wales to public bodies as to commercial companies.

Mr. Thomas: Is it not a fact that under the present B.B.C. set-up one has one's regional services, which are locally autonomous to a very large extent to the selection of their programmes? There is none of the tyrannist monopoly complex at Broadcasting House. That is just a figment of the right hon. and gallant Member's imagination. He is distorting the whole picture.

Lieut.-Colonel Elliot: Hon. Members opposite are for 100 per cent. centralisation. We know that very well. There is not a penny spent which is controlled by the executive in Scotland or Wales. If one reads or listens to the speeches or reads the arguments put forward by hon. Members opposite, they are all against effective devolution—which is what we want—not only of authority over programmes but the Executive power to spend money, which is one of the absolute touchstones of the truth.

Mr. Turner-Samuels: The right hon. and gallant Gentleman does not only want decentralisation; he wants a sponsored programme. The two things are quite different.

Lieut.-Colonel Elliot: There should be a non-exclusive Licence—I am sticking closely to the phrase used by the right hon. Member for Smethwick in his arguments—and not an exclusive Licence. The right hon. Gentleman said that he would divide the House tonight on the question of an exclusive Licence—a 100 per cent. control in Portland Place of all broadcasting in this country for ever.

... I want a non-exclusive Licence, but the right hon. Member is going into the Lobby for an exclusive Licence.

I think that there should be even more devolution to the regions than is proposed under this scheme. I might myself divide against this scheme, but for different reasons than those of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. I do not think this goes far enough in the provision of devolution and the breaking up of the monopoly. I look forward to the day when there is a Scottish Broadcasting Corporation, when there is a Radio Scotland, and we shall be able to provide our own programmes in our own country.

I am opposed to the high degree of centralisation for which the right hon. Gentleman asked us to go into the Lobby in his support tonight. He says that the airtight monopoly came into existence because of certain technical conditions, but those conditions no longer exist. We have plenty of time. For years to come it will not be possible to make any changes. There will be plenty of time for the changes to take place and to be fully discussed on many occasions in this House.

We ought now to be discussing seriously, and not as some form of taboo, whether there can be other provisions for broadcasting in this country except that provided from Portland Place. It is time we were discussing these things, and when morals are introduced, we have at least as much right as right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite to say that we resent it, that we throw it back again and that there is no more reason to proclaim us as vultures than there is for us to proclaim them.

Mr. A. Woodburn (Clackmannan and East Stirlingshire): I am listening to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman's argument with interest and I have sympathy with some parts of it, but I am not clear about what he suggests for Scotland. Does he suggest that Scotland should deprive herself of the right to draw upon British programmes, with their great resources?

Lieut.-Colonel Elliot: The right hon. Gentleman knows very well that no such provision was in my mind, or could be in my mind. After all, if Russia can beam her programmes upon Scotland, it is not impossible for us to pick up English programmes. I have never heard it suggested that we were going to set up jamming stations in Scotland to prevent the English broadcasting programmes from being heard there, or that when Tommy Handley was on the air, the sound of bubbling water would pour forth on Scottish radio sets to prevent him from being heard.

We say that there is room for all, that there is more room on the ether than there has been, that advantage should be taken of it, and that there is a place both for an increase in the national system and an increase in the privately promoted system, too. We say that these things should be discussed without adopting any "holier than thou" attitude, without introducing the attitude of the untouchables—"these are the Brahmins." The reason for this caste system has long since passed. We say that we must consider when and where and how the monopoly which has existed up to now shall be modified. That should be discussed in a realistic spirit, and until it is discussed in a realistic spirit we shall make no progress in these debates.

Mr. Edward Short (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Central): I shall not be controversial and I shall not talk about sponsored broadcasting. The Assistant Postmaster-General referred to the position in the North-East. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Kelvingrove (*Lieut.-Colonel Elliot*) also did so and said that the position was disgraceful. I want to tell the House and the Government exactly what the position is in the North-East.

We get a very raw deal from the B.B.C. in both sound broadcasting and television. We have no sound broadcasting wavelength of our own and share a medium wavelength with Northern Ireland, which means that the North-East has to listen for long periods to almost incomprehensible indigenous Irish programmes, things like "The M'Cooley's." There is very little community of interest between a country like Northern Ireland and a big industrial area like the North of England. We have got a raw deal in sound broadcasting and we have to pay the same licence as the rest of the country. In addition to this injustice, we have no television station.

Mr. William Wellwood (Londonderry): Does not that cut both ways? We in Northern Ireland get "Watcher Geordie" which we do not understand any more than the hon. Member understands "The M'Cooley's."

Mr. Short: I quite agree; we are both in the same position. This sort of programme is of very little community interest to any but the people who appreciate it.

As I have said, we have no television station. Ours is the last of the large, thickly populated areas to be covered and at present it is very difficult to get any reception at all in television in the north-east. Some people buy sets

and get very poor reception accompanied by the perpetual "snowstorms," but we have to pay the same licence as in any other part of the country. This area deserves much better treatment from the B.B.C. In Northumberland, Durham, and North Yorkshire there is a population of two to three million people. This area possesses one of the largest and most important coalfields and, in addition, it is one of the key industrial areas of the land, and plays a considerable part in the export drive, on which our future depends.

The two to three million people living there deserve something better than they are getting both in sound broadcasting and in television, and I hope that the Minister who replies to the debate will refer specifically to this point. My plea to the Government is that before they engaged in any of the developments mentioned by the Postmaster-General, such as colour television, television from external sources or other capital expenditure I hope they will spare some capital expenditure to give the north-east a better deal.

Mr. Christopher Mayhew (Woolwich, East): . . . My argument is devoted to showing that the B.B.C. should have an exclusive Licence and that a non-exclusive Licence does not merely not give the public what it wants but gives programmes which it does not want and does not give programmes which the public does want . . .

I will leave the example I was giving and return to my main point. No one disputes that the advertiser wants the largest audience for his programme. Now the theory looks a little sillier when we inquire to what extent the largest audiences are attracted by the programmes that are enjoyed most. At first sight it sounds platitudinous; it sounds obviously true, but in broadcasting it is plainly untrue.

Mr. C. I. Orr-Ewing: Declare an interest.

Mr. Mayhew: If the hon. Gentleman wishes me to declare an interest as a broadcaster I certainly do so. I wish hon. Members opposite would always declare their interests.

Of course, the fact that a programme is enjoyed increases its audience but there is another factor which increases an audience to a television programme which has nothing to do with enjoyment itself and the keenness of enjoyment. I refer to the factor that is must simultaneously appeal to the 90-year old and the nine-year old, to the clever man and the stupid man, to the Scots and the Welsh and to both sexes, of all ages. That is to say, this programme must have two factors: it must be enjoyed but it must also appeal to no particular age, no particular sex and no particular intellectual level.

That is not just a theory. One can see it working out in the United States, that when one goes out for a large audience at all costs one is depriving viewers of many of the programmes which they enjoy most keenly. Facts are available on this issue. It is an open secret that the B.B.C. research organisations, the Viewer Research Organisation and the corresponding Listener Research Organisation produce, in relation to any programme they cover, two figures. One figure shows the size of the audience and the other figure, called an appreciation index, shows whether the audience thought it was very bad, bad, fair, good or very good.

(continued on page 6.)

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. 28. No. 20.

Saturday, July 12, 1952.

The Cussed and Chuckled

The Times at the time of our going to press is still reluctant to present a consistent picture of even the facts known to it concerning what has happened to the Manningite army which was to "sweep" British Columbia in its provincial general election. There is missing the result of a third count, which should have been known on July 4. Elmore Philpott, writing in the *Vancouver Sun* for June 23, may be right in his forecast—"the election of a OCF minority government, thanks entirely to Social Credit." The very great importance of these moves lies, as it usually does where we are concerned, deeper than the "cussing and chuckling" (to use Mr. Philpott's words) which accompanies them. As an introduction to anything we may deem it useful to say on the matter, we print below some quotations from a broadcast over the Canadian Broadcasting transmitter in January last by Major A. H. Jukes, D.S.O., President of the Social Credit Association of Canada in British Columbia, warning those who might be disposed to listen of the illusory character of ballot-box democracy:—

"The moment you label a party Social Credit you get a wrangle about the technique of Social Credit which is exactly what you must avoid. You do not send candidates to Parliament to be technicians. You send them to impose your will upon the technicians who already exist." (The technician is the servant of policy, not its designer.) . . .

"There is no excuse for not knowing Douglas's views on the futility of forming a Social Credit Party, because in a long CP despatch from London he said in part, 'By the time a Social Credit Party was elected it would have jettisoned everything that would make it effective. I am willing to credit even congenial party politicians with the best motives, but anyone who supposes this financial system can be captured by a frontal attack is either childish, ignorant of its mechanism, or a dangerous megalomaniac.'

"It is significant that the party idea of Social Credit has never been attacked in the propaganda of our opponents, obviously because they do not consider it offers them any real threat. In this connection let us remember that Mr. Aberhart received no quarter from the press or any agent of the Money Power. Today the popular support given Mr. Manning and his administration in the press should be a danger signal. It is all to the advantage of the Money Power to see that the people of Alberta are satisfied with what they are getting, and that they believe that what they are getting is called Social Credit. The old crusading spirit of Aberhart's day has disappeared in Alberta.

"Mr. Solon Low in his *Man or Money* states 'Alberta

has established the first Social Credit Government in the world,' which Douglas says it is not. Mr. Low also says: 'once the provincial debt has been paid off the people will no longer pay tribute to high finance,' a statement which ignores the fact that Albertans will still be under Ottawa who control taxes, customs, cost-of-living, inflation, prices, banking, currency and the big stick. This position is infinitely more serious since Manning sold his province's tax rights to Ottawa contrary to Aberhart's stand against all forms of centralisation of power as shown at the Sirois investigation.

"Mr. Aberhart also said 'the way to kill any progressive movement was to hand it on to Ottawa' yet this is exactly what Mr. Manning and Mr. Low are doing in their 'On-To-Ottawa' campaign which they think will one day enable them to get a majority at Ottawa and so change the Bank Act., etc. Originally there were 17 Social Credit federal members. Today there are only ten and some of those ten barely held their seats in the last election. . . .

"Mr. Low who calls himself Party leader is trying to build Social Credit into a national party in defiance of the resolutions passed at both the first National Convention in 1944 and the last National Convention held in 1946.

"Both Mr. Manning and Mr. Low though they agreed at those conventions to adhere to the principles and tenets of Social Credit as enunciated by Major C. H. Douglas, have not done so. They have failed to respect the sovereignty of each province as they agreed to do, and have organised, or assisted in organising, in British Columbia a Social Credit League as a party, some of whose members, are presenting to the public astounding views on Social Credit.

"One of these League members spoke on Town Meeting giving his views on full employment and excess profit tax as if both were the aim of Social Credit.

"Now, employment is associated in the public mind with the provision of jobs in order to qualify men to receive a wage, but jobs must become scarcer as more labour-saving devices are introduced. Unemployment in this sense is a sign of progress and only Social Credit has a solution which will enable society to take advantage of these devices without allowing anyone to suffer in consequence. The speaker did not appear to understand this and was no different to any other party politician who can not find a solution within the limitations of the debt and usury system and is relieved of having to think by total war which effectively solves his political problem of full employment. . . .

"In its announced policy of 'pay-as-you-go' this B.C. Social Credit League of party politicians is acknowledging that our progress is limited by what we can collect in taxation which is an admission that the ownership of all production is vested in the creators of money. This is exactly what the Money Power wants. . . ."

For correct information concerning the Constitution of
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.

Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for the Statement published in July, 1949 (*postage 1d.*)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., LIVERPOOL

Not in Confidence

An Open Letter to a Friend in the United States:

By NORMAN F. WEBB.

(continued)

Now I propose to tell you something of Mr. Gaitskell's origin and background. In singling him out in this way I don't want to give you an exaggerated impression of his personal weight or importance. There's nothing exceptional about him, not even the rapidity of his rise from the post of lecturer at the London School of Economics to the position of Chancellor of the British Exchequer, the government post next in importance to that of Prime Minister. But in addition to the impelling fact of his Chicago address, I choose him because he is just about as typical an Economist, in the accepted and popular sense of that term, as could be found anywhere in the world; the perfect fruit of the London School of Economics, out of which came the Labour Party, (the first official Labour organisation in the world), British Socialism and the T.U.C. (Trades Union Congress).

It was from the co-operation of the Fabian Society and the international financier, Sir Ernest Cassel, that the London School of Economics, which must have supplied Finance Ministers and economic advisers to half the Governments of the modern world, came into being. He endowed it, specifically as he told his friend, Lord Haldane, "to train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State"—the World State presumably. Mr. Gaitskell is a typical bureaucrat, with all the virtues and vices of his type. His social category would be described as middle-class intellectual and he is to be grouped with a number of others of similar origin, such as Mr. Attlee the Socialist ex-Prime Minister, Dr. Hugh Dalton and the late Harold Laski. All of them were members of the Fabian Society and all or most of them were one-time pupils or lecturers at the School of Economics. These men represent the spear-head—the specially trained, and mentally conditioned leaders—of the British sector of the vast Socialist World Movement for overturning the existing, dispersed and individual order of society, and replacing it by a unification of all political power and authority.

Whether he approves of it or not, there is surely no one who, looking round the world today and listening to all the clamour for international bodies conferences and pacts, could deny that considerable headway has been made towards that object, in appearance at least. I think the average man dislikes the idea; yourself, for one. But I find he dislikes even more the suggestion that there is a consciously-directed plan with actual, flesh and blood individuals behind it,—I know you do; and tend to ridicule the idea of what you call the World Plot. Nevertheless, this movement towards the unified Socialist World State is just that; a definite, long-term policy or plan, which such men as Ernest Cassel, the great Edwardian financier, and Alfred Mond, creator of the immense chemical combine of I.C.I., and, in your country, Henry Morgenthau and Bernard Baruch—to take a few names almost at random—have openly backed and promoted, and worked for.

There may seem to be numbers of separate movements,

even opposed movements, but that is only appearance. There is in fact only one movement, differing in the methods employed in different areas, but everywhere working on the dangerously humanistic plea that the end justifies the means, and in the practical belief that conditions of ideal Peace can really be *enforced* on live human beings. Both assumptions are flatly contradicted by Christian experience. The methods employed range from open warfare in the far East, and the Soviet labour camps and mass liquidation, to our own bloodless revolution in the West. And though it may be difficult, we must keep the fact always in mind that what we know as the Socialist Movement, promoted by well-groomed, University-trained intellectuals and professional humanitarians, though so apparently different, subscribes to the same fundamentally pagan philosophy, and is directed by the same group of individuals, with the same political objective, and carried through with the same cold, ruthless calculation as is Russia's sanguinary programme.

To bring this letter back to Mr. Gaitskell—Sir Ernest Cassel's bureaucratic projection,—I warned you not to attribute too much to him as a statesman or an individual; but you can safely accept him as an authoritative mouth-piece of International Finance, the Socialist World movement. And if he has proved under examination to be shallow and confused and wrong-headed in what he had to say to you, as I maintain he has,—and has given a strong impression of having motives other than those he professes, in urging you to call another of these needless World Conferences, then you can safely take that as representative of the whole nature of Socialism as a political and social philosophy.

One cause of what appears to me his really childish wrong-headedness, is that what Mr. Gaitskell imbibed at the London School of Economics, apart of course, from its economic theories which we have been pulling to pieces, was a profound distrust of human nature, and a correspondingly naive belief in the practicability of completely centralized control of society by a self-appointed, but secret, clique at the centre. That is the policy of Statism, abstract government, and allied to it, is abstract public ownership. In the present disturbed state of the world, its chief and most compelling arguments centre round the fallacy of physically enforceable Peace. To enforce you must have sanctions, *i.e.*, control of physical power, and the road to that is through economic control *i.e.* control of the transfer of all commodities which is obtained through the control of credit by the use of money. In short, this plan of political World Dictatorship must have complete control of the creation and cancellation of all money, *at its own discretion*, for the purposes of the World State.

In 1919 Major Douglas, a consulting engineer, not trained at the London School of Economics but at Cambridge and subject to no tendency, or temptation, to confuse what constitutes the science of Economics with the theory of Money, published a thesis pointing out a flaw in the practice of orthodox accountancy, the mathematical operation of which was rapidly bringing the potential ownership of all the physical assets of the world into the hands of those who professionally operate the issue of financial credit; briefly, those persons who control the world's Central Banks and International Banking Houses. This flaw only required

official recognition in the financial money centres, say London and New York, to be easily adjustable with a minimum of disturbance, and Major Douglas indicated several ways by which this could be done. The thing looked like creating quite a stir in business and political circles in Great Britain of the early Twenties.

In 1921 the Scottish Miners' Federation asked for an enquiry to be made, and a committee was appointed by the then newly-formed British Labour Party, to examine and report on Major Douglas's thesis. The Labour Party, it must be remembered, was the creation of the Fabian Society, and the chief projected instrument for the Socialisation (internationalisation) of British politics. Naturally enough, the composition of the committee, apart from a sprinkling of newly-promoted Labour leaders, was largely Fabian; such men as Mr. G. D. H. Cole, and Dr. Dalton, later to precede Mr. Gaitskell as Socialist Chancellor, with a prominent Fabian internationalist member of the London County Council, Mr. Emil Davies, as adviser.

This committee duly reported, defending the "orthodox" view and asserting that there was no foundation for Major Douglas's. And on the strength of that thirty-years-old report the whole Socialist-Labour Movement, that was supposed to be working for the economic emancipation of at least one section of the community, and that numerically the largest and neediest, from that time turned its back on what Major Douglas had to say. And along with it, all the other political parties, including not only the Conservatives in Great Britain but all over the civilized world.

In the years that followed, books and pamphlets, written by orthodox economists, as far away as Australia and Canada, mostly trainees of the London School of Economics, of which Dr. Dalton became head, have frequently appeared, to confute Major Douglas. One result has been so to confuse and inflame the atmosphere surrounding the issue he raised,—which, had it been a non-controversial problem in engineering, instead of one in national accountancy, could have been proved either correct, or incorrect, in ten minutes,—that people like yourself are led to make a mental detour round it, as you might round a disturbed wasp's nest. Later, Mr. Cole, who had served on the original committee edited a compilation entitled "What Everyone Wants to Know about Money," and Mr. Gaitskell, then a young and unknown lecturer at the London School, was brought in to dispose of Major Douglas. From that time until now—I merely state facts; you can make what deductions you please—Mr. Gaitskell has steadily advanced, first as economic adviser, and then Parliamentary secretary, and now top-ranking ex-minister; all in a setting that has steadily deteriorated internationally, and nationally, more especially where Great Britain is concerned; and in which the assets of every individual and organisation and nation are being progressively mortgaged to the controllers of the system which the Socialist party has officially, and apparently once for all, pronounced *flawless*. But it still rests with the orthodox economists who condemned Major Douglas's mathematics, to explain how it comes about that the logical result to which his calculations lead, and of which he gave timely warning in 1919, is so exactly reflected in fact.

(To be concluded).

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

If hon. Members opposite were correct in their assumption then there would be a correlation between these figures. The programmes with the larger audience would tend to have the highest appreciation index, but if they look at the facts they will find that that is not the case at all. It stands to reason that a programme which is adjusted to a particular individual's state, not necessarily highbrow or lowbrow, but a programme which is addressed to a certain interest and a certain intellectual level, will be more keenly appreciated and enjoyed by that person.

This whole idea is alien to commercial radio and commercial television. They want the big audience at all costs, and for that they are prepared to sacrifice the minority programmes which are often the most keenly enjoyed programmes of all. We drive down our television and radio programmes inevitably as soon as we make a large audience our only criterion of success in broadcasting.

But now, of course, in their defence, hon. Members opposite advance this theory, "All right, let us accept that sponsored television has a particular role—the role of what you might call the average programme for the largest audience. Let sponsored radio do that job and let the B.B.C. do the minority programmes which are often more keenly appreciated. Let us have a dual system." We are told not to invoke Gresham's Law. The hon. Member for Bath referred to the publications department of the Stationery Office working side by side with private publishers; he said that they worked hand in hand and asked "Why not the same with television?"

This plan does not work either in theory or in practice and it is clear why it should not work. In practice, my right hon. Friend has referred to the example of Canada and Australia. Now may I deal with the theory of the matter? I do not know whether this is presumptuous, but let me take a personal example. Even at the risk of seeming immodest, I want to impress this upon the House. Let us take a personal example of the programme with which I am concerned—a programme called "International Commentary." This is an example of a programme with a less than average audience and with a higher than average appreciation index. For this to be sponsored there would inevitably be pressure to increase the audience, and this could be done quite easily. It is a technique. Anyone can increase an audience. A pretty girl in a studio and a quiz programme in the middle with a prize attached can increase the audience straight away. That could easily be done.

If sponsored television gets a hold it will first either take these minority programmes and dilute them, destroy their character and drive them down to the average programme level, or else it will suppress them altogether in the following manner. It will have at its disposal—we have discussed this and admitted it—enormous financial resources, such as would rightly be regarded as extravagant if handled by a public corporation. With this money it will simply buy away the B.B.C.'s programmes.

Take the popular programme, "What's My Line?" This is a very good illustration of what I mean. "What's My Line?" is one of the most popular British television pro-

grammes, and it is also a popular programme in the United States of America.

Air Commodore A. V. Harvey (Macclesfield): Where did it start?

Mr Mayhew: It started in the United States of America. Here, we do a public service version. Would the hon. and gallant Member like to know the difference between these two programmes? The main difference is that in America "What's My Line?" is begun, ended and interrupted by an advertisement for a deodorant. That is the Stoppette spray deodorant. Next time the hon. Gentleman is looking at "What's My Line?" on the B.B.C., let him lament the fact that when Elizabeth Allan has finished there is no advertisement for Stoppette deodorant. That is the kind of thing he means to do to this most popular programme.

When I say that the two systems cannot exist side by side I mean that if sponsored television were allowed in this country the big business firms and advertisers would simply buy up a programme such as "What's My Line?" They have the financial resources and they would use them to buy away with double or treble the fees the performers, technicians, cameramen and producers. This happens today in Canada and Australia.

Every time the B.B.C. produced a winning programme it would be bought up by big business and put on with advertisements in the middle, in a sponsored programme. [HON. MEMBERS: "Why not?"] Why not—because we say that we do not want to undermine the B.B.C. Hon. Members opposite say the same thing. One cannot have the two things running side by side. I think there are hon. Gentlemen opposite who know that and who mean to undermine the B.B.C. If they do not know it they have not studied the matter. That is what will be the effect of this policy. . .

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 302; Noes, 267.

Resolved,

That the Licence and Agreement, dated 12th June, 1952, between Her Majesty's Postmaster-General and the British Broadcasting Corporation, a copy of which was laid before this House on 13th June, be approved.

House of Commons: June 24, 1952.

MINISTRY OF WORKS

Building Works (Free Limits)

Mr. Hurd asked the Minister of Works if he will now make a statement on further changes in the licensing system, particularly a relaxation of the £100 a year free limit in building.

Mr. F. M. Bennett asked the Minister of Works whether, in view of the increased cost of building materials and labour since the £100 limit on house repair work was introduced, he is now prepared to raise, at least proportionately, the present ceiling of £100.

Mr. Nabarro asked the Minister of Works the present limit of licence-free building work that may be carried out by an industrial undertaking without licence or permit from his Department.

Mr. Black asked the Minister of Works whether he intends to renew the £100 building limit for a further period; or whether he has any alternative proposals.

The Minister of Works (Mr. David Eccles): I have examined carefully the possibility of increasing the free limits for building work. The potential demand for building and repair work is so great and the load on the building industry differs so much from one district to another that it has been found impossible to make a general relaxation of the licensing system at this time. I am, therefore, making an Order continuing for the 12 months from 1st July the present limit of £500 for industrial and agricultural buildings, but increasing the limit for other buildings from £100 to £200. The position will be reviewed in the autumn, and if conditions justify a change another Order will be made. In issuing licences for repair and maintenance above the free limits careful regard will be had to the load of work in the area concerned.

Mr. Hurd: Will my right hon. Friend and his colleagues take heart from the welcome that local authorities and individuals will give to this decision, and see whether it is possible to raise the free limit still further in certain districts where it would obviously be desirable and altogether practicable to do so?

Mr. Ellis Smith: Is the minister aware that in industrial areas which have the best housing record this decision will be received with great indignation because of the inevitable consequences; and, if he accepts that line of reasoning, will he undertake to consult local authorities in order to avoid this decision affecting the building of houses?

Mr. Eccles: I think the hon. Gentleman is possibly wrong. The number of licences between £100 and £200 which are refused today are very few indeed. It is my view that a sufficient volume of maintenance actually helps the construction of new houses, because it enables the small and medium builder to dovetail in some maintenance work with some new construction. I hope and believe that the result of this, which is a very modest concession, will actually be that we shall get more houses than we otherwise would. . .

Industrial and Building Licences

Mr. Nabarro asked the Minister of Works how many building maintenance licences were issued by his Department to industrial undertakings during the 12 months ended 31st May, 1952, or latest convenient date; what was the aggregate value of such licences; and whether he will consider substituting for the present system an open general licence granting to every industrial undertaking an entitlement to spend on building maintenance a sum properly related to the assessment of the property to general rates or similar formula.

Mr. Eccles: During the 12 months ended May, 1952, 41,570 annual maintenance licences to a total value of £30,833,767 were issued by my Department.

I have very carefully considered the suggestion in the third part of the Hon. Member's Question and as the matter is very complicated, I have written to explain why I do not think it would be an improvement on our existing system.

Mr. Nabarro asked the Minister of Works how many licences for new construction, reconditioning and renovation, excluding building maintenance licences, were issued by his Department to industrial undertakings during 12 months ended 31st May, 1952, or latest convenient date; what was the aggregate value of such licences; and how many such licences were in respect of applications to spend less than the sum of £1,000.

Mr. Eccles: The number of licences issued to industrial undertakings (excluding the annual maintenance licences) during the 12 months ending 31st May, 1952, was 45,416, to an aggregate value of £130,770,140. 11,911 licences amounting to £5,551,117 were in respect of applications to spend less than £1,000 on new work; I regret that figures for reconditioning and renovation under £1,000 are not available.

Mr. Nabarro: Would my right hon. Friend undertake to give further consideration to this problem in view of the fact that industrial undertakings at present often have to apply for a large number of small licences for maintenance work in connection with putting in machinery or undertaking work of that kind, all of which causes a great deal of administrative work to the firms and to the right hon. Gentleman's Department.

Mr. Eccles: I have not had many complaints, but if my hon. Friend will give me particulars I will certainly look into them.

Korea (Air Attack, Yalu River)

Mr. Sydney Silverman (by *Private Notice*) asked the Prime Minister whether he has any statement to make to the House concerning the attack by 500 aeroplanes under United Nations command upon power stations upon the Korean—Manchurian frontier serving the needs of Manchuria.

The Prime Minister: As the House is aware, it is the policy of the United Nations Command to limit hostilities to Korea. While there has not been much ground fighting in the past few months, air operations by United Nations forces have continued with the entirely legitimate object of decreasing the enemy war potential in Korea. Attacks such as those now-reported do not appear to us to involve any extension of the operations hitherto pursued or to go beyond the discretionary authority vested in the United Nations Supreme Commander. So far as Her Majesty's Government are concerned, there has been no change of policy.

Mr. Silverman: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman three short supplementary questions arising out of that statement? First is he not aware that every point in dispute in the armistice negotiations has already been agreed on, except one, and on that point the Foreign Secretary told the House last week that he had every hope that agreement would be reached? Secondly, does he think that so extensive an operation as this in this place, affecting as it does places outside Korea, is likely to lead or could lead to an extension of hostilities which all sensible people in the world are doing their best to avoid? Thirdly, will he say whether the Minister of Defence, on his recent visit to the United Nations Command, was told about this forth-

coming operation and whether he expressed any opinion about it?

The Prime Minister: I can only say that I am aware of what has been said by the Foreign Secretary in the House. As to the second question, that really is not a matter on which I have any means of giving an outside judgment at this moment. On the third question, I will talk to Lord Alexander when he comes home and find out, but we have not had any notification of any change in the policy which hitherto has been pursued, nor have we made any ourselves. I cannot feel that any serious departure in principle has been made or, if it had been made, that we should not have been consulted upon it. . . .

(To be continued.)

CO. DONEGAL. BRUCKLESS HOUSE AND DEMESNE FREEHOLD FOR SALE WITH VACANT POSSESSION.

A Gentleman's Medium sized, easily run Residence, beautifully situated with Southern aspect, surrounded by well-timbered grounds and grazing lands of 19 acres sloping down to a sheltered inlet of Donegal Bay, with own pier and Boathouse.

Excellent sea and river Fishing.

Station (Strabane-Killybegs Railway) and Post Office and Church within five minutes walk.

The deep sea harbour and town of Killybegs within 4½ miles. Donegal Town 12 miles.

THE HOUSE CONTAINS:—

Entrance Lobby and Cloakroom (H. & C. Basin), 2 well-proportioned Reception Rooms and Breakfast Room; 4 Principal Bedrooms and 5 Secondary ones; Bathroom; Front and Back Stairs; Kitchen with new AGA COOKER and AGAMATIC HOT water Heater; Spacious and ample Offices and Store Rooms.

Range of commodious Out-buildings, Cow Byre, Garage, etc., and a large Stone-built Storehouse convertible into a Dwelling-house, adjacent to the sea.

Productive, walled-in Garden and Greenhouses. Mains Electricity.

Indoor and outside help available.

Four-roomed comfortable Lodge Cottage at entrance to 100 yards Avenue.

As a Guest House it has particular advantages and could be taken over fully equipped and Going Concern.

INSPECTION BY APPOINTMENT ONLY.

Further Details:

A. C. FFORDE, Bruckless House, Co. Donegal.