The New Deal

“There never has been in American politics a religion so expansively and luminously righteous as the New Deal. From the beginning to the end it was constant in one heroic enterprise—war to the death upon evil, upon greed and poverty and oppression. It had, in fact, one monstrous enemy against which it tilted its shining spear seven days a week and that was SIN. If you criticised the New Deal, you were for sin.”—The Roosevelt Myth, p. 183.

No group of people has less reason to require purging of the illusion of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s greatness than the habitual readers of this journal; for they have been accustomed to regarding him as the pioneer in that active and direct phase of Socialism which only set in with us in Great Britain after the 1945 election. Yet the mountain of decayed vegetation accumulated through years of systematic and cynical banquet-throwing had to be cleared up some time, and this book* is a considerable help towards that end. Anything less like the picture of an Elder Statesman—a Lincoln or a Chatham or, let it be said, a Churchill—than the figure of Mr. Flynn’s researches discover it would be hard to imagine.

And yet, at its best, the rôle of the critic is a graceless one; because it is so very difficult not to be captious and, worse still, self-righteous after the event. So that what should be a most humble attempt to appraise a complex situation with impartiality, and soon enough after to be of real use in bringing some order and light into what appears to be deliberate confusion—one of the most difficult things in the world;—such an attempt so often degenerates into mere polemics and the raising of more dust. Paradoxical as it may sound, Mr. Flynn’s clever indictment would be more valuable were it less devastatingly effective. This is the defect of over-statement, generally associated with youth and lack of confidence. It is a noticeable trait of our modern society, and particularly of America, and lies at the back of the extraordinary volume of what may be called self-justificatory literature that the New Deal has produced.

Mr. Flynn has done his age a great service in collecting this comprehensive indictment of the New Deal—for to show up Roosevelt is to show up the work he was undoubtedy raised to do—from the writings to those men who were most deeply involved in it themselves. The picture it presents is unedifying to a degree quite impossible to realise without such a study as this. But at the finish, the total impression is of a summing-up not quite just; of something not quite balanced, not quite human; of a criticism itself partaking too much of the thing criticised. The holier-than-thou follows an awkward, boomerang-like orbit; unbridled condemnation of our fellows is in effect condemnation of the whole human race, and so, self-condemnation.

The field covered by Mr. Flynn in his book is vast, even if it only stretches in time from Roosevelt’s first election in 1933 to 1945. And the period is covered with a commendable comprehensiveness such as no reviewer could possibly deal with in detail. What chiefly emerges, apart from the violent personal attack? One of the first things to be noted by the experienced reader is the marked difference in the birth and coming-about of the New Deal and our own Socialist Revolution, in spite of the identity of the inspiration and philosophy of both movements. The relative unpreparedness of the first in comparison with the slow, laborious build-up of things in Great Britain. The patient tillage and sowing, culminating in the founding of the Fabian Society and the Labour Party, followed by the inevitable cash-in on the part of International Finance with the endowment of the London School of Economics by Sir Ernest Cassel, “to train the Bureaucracy of the future Socialist State,” all culminating in the supremely non-spectacular figure of Prime Minister Attlee, firmly embedded in a political party machine built up with the same typical British thoroughness as a Naysmith steam-hammer. Indeed it would almost seem, at times, as if it was destined to resist its international commissioner’s abstract and devilish intention by virtue of its innate structural integrity; this incorrigible and typically British bias or instinct for organic strength, which has already driven some person, or persons to that now historic conclusion, that “only in war, or under threat of war will a British Government embark on large-scale planning.” (Planning, the official publication of P.E.P., Political and Economic Planning Group, October, 1938). “They” got their war, and we, our Planning on the largest scale.

Certainly there was not the same evident preparation in the United States as in England; though without doubt Dr. Murray Butler and Columbia University were responsible for some. And in the case of the Second and Third New Deal—Roosevelt’s Second and Third Terms of office—Mr. Flynn discloses that Judge Felix Frankfurter, who was a life-long disciple of Justice Brandeis, though he kept away from the public eye, exercised great influence through the young men he trained, who all found jobs in the later New Deals. They were known as the “Happy Hot Dogs.” Thomas G. Corcoran was outstanding, and lived at the White House until he was turned out by his rival for the position, Harry Hopkins. The whole thing gives more the impression of having happened aboriginally in the credit crisis following the economic collapse of 1929, which so completely prostrated the highly artificial, installment-buying economy of the United States. To Mr. Flynn it looks like a sudden haphazard idea, to build up the semi-para-layed, indifferently-educated Franklin Delano Roosevelt, with what was for the States the historical figure of Theodore Roosevelt in his family background. Indeed, it may have been so, for the plans being all laid, the actual choice of the individual to sponsor them was of only secondary importance. Whatever the facts, the American financial system was prostrate, and Hoover and the Republicans out, and Roosevelt and the Democrats in,

instead, and the New Deal Band-Waggon was off on its career, with the rest of the playboys sprinting alongside and jumping on as occasion occurred.

With us in Great Britain, alas, even the “threat of war” was not sufficient, so aversive is the British national instinct from Planning, i.e. international dictation, and we persisted in carrying on in our obstinate, sedate way through the economic crisis of the thirties. So the war had to come, and every chance it offered of clamping down restrictive domestic legislation was eagerly embraced, as well as the opportunity afforded by the mobilization of the great proportion of the country’s young manhood to instil socialist ideas.

And by the time the guns ceased in 1945, England was ready to start off on her New Deal, more soberly, it is true, than in the United States of 1932, albeit to cries of “We are the masters now!” There was some semblance of discipline and strategy in Attlee’s cohorts; in Roosevelt and his, there was none. British Laborites at least knew what was wanted and expected of them; their American fore-runners do not give the impression that they realized that anything at all was required—which is not to say that they were not just as much to the purpose of those who were the real inspiration of the New Deal.

It is tragic to think that the devil, for his purposes, can depend on men like this, without any preliminary education, or even briefing whatsoever; they do his will instinctively, for he relies on the all-consuming power-complex of the human mind, if given the opportunity, to gather more and more abstract power into its own hands—power for its own sake, the lust of it—where it is wholly at his, the devil’s, service. So that however much Roosevelt plunged and reared like a youth newly come into his father’s estate, under the influence of one irresponsible school of advice after another, and between his various terms of office, the basic objective, which was the centralisation of power in the Federal Government, was never lost sight of for an instant, since it was fundamental to the personal urge of the chosen dictator.

That sums up the introductory aspect of the New Deal with its common source to our own Socialist Revolution in Karl Marx and European Illuminism. Another, of peculiar interest to Social Crediters, is the light its casts on the struggles of the power-manics to deal, in its own terms, with the problem created by their own lust for centralised control. One has sometimes speculated how it was that Social Credit ideas, even at the time that Social Credit in Alberta was top-line news, never made more headway or attracted more interest in the United States. Mr. Flynn’s recapitulation of the years of the economic crisis preceding the New Deal, and all the economic plans propounded, gives the complete answer to such queries. For the disease of modern society is a species of social elephantiasis and a federation such as the United States is itself too elephantine to permit of the growth of realistic ideas.

When the economic collapse came in the States, quite a number of individuals had sufficient realism to see that the immediate problem concerned the failure of distribution and nothing else, a break-down of the function of credit. Admittedly they were a wild and varied crew, these monetary reformers, and Mr. Flynn, whose own complete answer to all the mistakes and blunders of the period occupies less than a page, dismisses most of them with summary ridicule. Nevertheless, many of them did represent an attempt to approach matters realistically, and so, no doubt, were accounted potentially dangerous. And the fact that most of the schemes were either scotched or absorbed before the 1932 election, suggests that Roosevelt was “somebody’s” choice. First on the list came Hughey Long. He survived the election, and came to direct grips with the New Deal Government; but he wasn’t strong enough to withstand Washington with its unlimited credit facilities, and he ended with a bullet in him. Then there was Townsend with his Pension Scheme, and Young, and Upton Sinclair with ideas bordering on Syndicalism.

“There were other groups,” Mr. Flynn rattles on “—Major Douglas’s Social Credit and Howard Scott’s Technocrats, none of which made much progress . . . . The Social Credit advocates laid out as a principle that the capitalist system does not produce enough money incomes to enable all producers to buy the national sum of consumable goods at a profit . . . A powerful argument can be made for this thesis. However, the Social Credit advocates proposed that to correct this deficit in purchasing power, the Government should at intervals issue to all people what they called Social Dividends, Government-issued cash to enable them to buy what they needed. It amounted to this, that the Government would give a cash hand-out at certain periods of the year.” Well, well! One has heard it worse put, but not much worse.

It must have been a particularly unpleasant period in the history of the United States. Even at this distance one can feel how utterly unready the country was for anything as thoughtful and deeply radical and undramatic as Social Credit. The American mind, and therefore the nation’s literature and journalism, is steeped in sophistication. Nothing is hidden; and while exposition is at its peak, understanding and sympathy are at the very lowest level. After all, America is in the van of the modern know-all dictatorial trend of thought. To that mentality, which is the bureaucratic mentality, the philosophy of Social Credit is as naturally unwelcome as dawn to the house-breaker. As we draw away from this period—and although we are, in a sense, still in it, the Socialist Revolution is beginning to take shape in the public mind as an event; even as a distinct experiment with individual experimenters behind it,—all attempts, such as Mr. Flynn’s, to objectivise its different phases are of great use. The history of the New Deal in the United States is ugly enough, in all conscience; and degrading to our self-esteem, but it is salutory. As Mr. Flynn suggests in the quotation given at the beginning of this review, one of the basic impulses behind what we know as Socialism is self-righteousness, pharisiasm, which is self-esteem of the wrong kind; or would it be more correct to say, esteem of the wrong self? So that this washing of dirty linen in public has its useful side, so long as we remember that no one of us is completely exempt; we are all involved, even if it is only in paying the laundry bill.—N.F.W.

“How To Lose A War”

“It is curious how few people ask the $64 question: Do the nations which adopt total mobilisation actually win their wars? Germany, the greatest exponent of total mobilisation lost its last two wars . . . . Modern totalitarianism is weak, not strong; it is the product not of growth, but of decay.”—Edna Lonigan.
Catholicism and Freemasonry

Fiat (Dublin) No. 22 devotes the major part of its space to material bearing on the Catholic Church and Freemasonry, beginning with a translation of the text of an article in L'Osservatore Romano for March 19, 1950, by the Very Reverend Mariano Cordovani, O.P., who has since died. A French translation appeared simultaneously, reinforcing Fiat's opinion that the article is authoritative, "indicating a line of conduct specially authorised." The chief object of the article is to reassert the "essentially anti-Catholic attitude of Masonry of every rite"; viz.: —

"... The Bishops know that Canon 684 and especially Canon 2335,—which inflicts excommunication on all who become members of Freemasonry, no matter what the rite —are in full force today as yesterday. All Catholics ought to be acquainted with this teaching and recall it to mind so as not to fall victims to this Masonic snare, and in order to judge on its merits the fact that certain naive individuals believe they can with impunity be both Catholics and Masons. This, I repeat, applies equally to all rites of Freemasonry, even if some of them, motivated by personnel or local contingencies, declare they are not hostile to the Church.

"The name 'Freemason' has a significance well-documented historically by texts and facts, namely, that of hostility to Religion." The famous secret, which for some concerns the purpose of the sect, for others merely the means to be employed, is always at least suspect and dangerous. The minimum that one finds even in the most independent Masonic groups—who uphold 'non-confessionalism' and 'the absolute equality of all cults' in countries specifically Catholic—are facts and affirmations that prevent any recognition of Masonry on the part of the Church; a recognition which, if granted, would but cause scandal and increase confusion.

"Accord then between the Church and Freemasonry—as if they were two powers which impart a juridical character to their new attitudes—can but spell flagrant contradiction. Those, therefore, who are not partial to the designs of the sect and who are genuinely Catholic in outlook, will feel obliged to dissociate themselves therefrom and avoid multiplying the doubtful standards under which they fight. For this standard of 'non-confessionalism', 'neutrality', 'universal concord' leads naturally to religious indifference. It is an anti-Catholic standard because, other considerations apart, it denies the absolute primacy that must be given to truth in every sphere, especially in that of religion where it is a condition of salvation. If (in certain periods) Freemasonry does not appear militantly hostile, it manifests at least a supine indifference: and for that reason the Church cannot come to terms with Freemasonry in the sense of approving of the sect or yielding to its overtures..."

A commentary follows the text of the article. This embodies facts concerning Freemasonry in Ireland and elsewhere which it may be desirable to record: —

"GROWTH OF MASONRY IN IRELAND. The following extract from 'Freemasonry in Ireland' by Seumas Hurley in the S.V.D. Annual, 1950, published by the Society of the Divine Word, Donamon Castle, Co. Roscommon, serves to indicate how timely and topical the foregoing instruction is for us Irish Catholics: —"When the Irish Free State was established," writes Mr. Hurley 'and Britain withdrew her occupation army from twenty-six of our counties, Freemasonry remained. The 'Government of Ireland Act, 1920,' decreed: 'It is hereby declared that existing enactments relative to unlawful oaths or unlawful assemblies in Ireland do not apply to the meeting or proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Ireland, or of any Lodge or Society recognised by that Grand Lodge. Neither the Parliament of Southern Ireland nor the Parliament of Northern Ireland shall have power to abrogate or affect prejudicially any privilege or exemption of the Grand Lodge of Freemasons in Ireland, ...'

"Yet, despite the fact that a great many British Masonic army officers and government officials left this country soon afterwards, the number of Masons in Ireland, according to statistics published in the London Times, increased from 28,000 in 1920 to 43,000 in 1925. During the same period the number of ordinary Masonic Lodges in Dublin city rose from 59 to 70.

"In 1929 the total number of Lodges in Ireland on the register of the Grand Lodge of Ireland, as listed in the Irish Masonic Calendar for that year, was 610. In addition, there were 440 Lodges of the higher rites, known as chapters and preceptories, making a total of 1,050 Masonic Lodges of all kinds. 'The mere statistics, however, of Freemasonry in Ireland,' wrote Fr. E. Cahill, S.J., in Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement (1930), 'do not convey any adequate idea of its effective strength. For the Freemasons control at present most of the economic life of the country and have entrenched themselves in very many of the more important commercial, academic and educational institutions, such as the banks, the railways, the Dublin University, some of the medical institutions, the Royal Dublin Society, etc. Besides, they can utilize the Orange Society, which is practically a Masonic body, for the more openly aggressive activities of their anti-Catholic and anti-Irish policy.'

"According to the Irish Masonic Calendar for 1949, the total number of Masonic Lodges of all kinds in the whole of Ireland has now increased to 1,091. Of these 294 are in the twenty-six counties, while 797, or more than two-thirds are in the North. These figures do not include the exclusively B'nai B'rith lodges. Strangely enough, for organisation purposes, Partition is not recognised by the Irish Freemasons, who treat the country as a whole. Thus twenty-three ordinary Masonic Lodges in the Republic of Ireland are under the jurisdiction of the provincial Grand Lodges of Derry and Armagh.

"Dublin city counts 133 lodges against 250 in Belfast. The Dublin lodges are made up of seventy-nine ordinary Masonic Lodges, thirty-nine Royal Arch chapters and fifteen preceptories of the Order of the Temple. Since the suppression of Freemasonry in Spain by General Franco's government, Dublin can now boast of having more Masons in proportion to its population than any European city—a distinction formerly held by Barcelona.

"Furthermore, according to the Masonic Calendar published in Leipzig, and quoted by The Times in October, 1928, there were then more Masons in the whole of Ireland (not including members of the Orange Society) than in any European country except Germany and France, and far more in proportion to the population than in any country in Europe or South America.

"Twenty years have passed since then, and Freemasonry is as strong in Ireland as ever before. We are often spoken of, and truly so, as one of the most Catholic countries in the world. It is well to remember that we can also be claimed that we are, after the United States and Britain, the third most Masonic country in the world."
Further arrests are expected. But not in these islands of course.

"IN JERUSALEM: Thursday.—Mr. De Valera, accompanied by his two sons, arrived here to-day on a visit to the Holy Land. They are staying at the King David Hotel. Mr. Vivian De Valera described the visit as 'a pilgrimage,' and said it had no political significance.

"The De Valeras, wearing skull caps as a compliment to Rabbi Hertzog, their host, dined amid a gathering of Israeli Ministers. Rabbi Hertzog who was in Dublin from 1925 to 1936 as Chief Rabbi of Ireland, welcomed Mr. De Valera by saying: 'There is an old joke, that it is too bad that Jews don't speak Irish, and the Irish don't speak Hebrew.' At dinner the language was English.—Associated Press."

The secular politics of the Church of Rome are so tortuous that a superficial appraise-ment of them is almost certainly misleading. And the first error likely to seduce the unwary is that they are not cohesive; that there is in fact no overall secular policy.

This subject has an intimate relationship with the comment of that thought-monthly, Theology, that "The Church of Rome has a way of disowning, or at least, clouding, the credentials of its most effective apologists." The remark is in reference to a book on doctrinal matters, but is equally, or even more applicable to the impact of Vatican policy on the affairs of everyday life, especially in these times of stress.

With full appreciation of the gravity of the statement, we affirm that there is no philosophy, and in consequence, no policy, which deviates less from the philosophy of Christianity than that of Social Credit. The following statement is worded with care; we do not affirm the exclusive possession of the law and the prophets; but we do claim a rather disinterested pursuit, by a body of individuals, of the truth as it presents itself to those whose primary question to Christianity is, 'Is it true?'

Some of the finest examples of the Roman priesthood, more especially in pre-Alberta days, have been exponents of Social Credit; and it is within our first-hand and indisputable knowledge that they have been warned-off their activities by the highest dignitaries of their Church.

We think that we know the explanation of this very regrettable fact. It is connected with the overwhelming importance of Faith, Credit; and we leave it to our readers to think the matter through, as an exercise.

"A Catastrophe"

"There is a whole mythology of 'prehistory,' which has grown up, mushroom-like, in less than a lifetime, which pretends to explain the unknown past of man, and which has already become more fixed and sacred to the multitude than any mythology accepted by our fathers. Not one of the millions who accept that mythology could give you even the briefest account of the supposed steps of evidence upon which it reposes. In this process the strange mechanical, universal, influence of what is called 'popular education' plays a very great part, and whereas the half-educated man was always a danger, to-day he is a catastrophe."—Hilaire Belloc, The Cruise of the 'Nona.'
PARLIAMENT

British Army

National Service Men (Malaya)

Mr. Ellis Smith asked the Secretary of State for War how many National Service men have been sent to Malaya; what is the average number of months they have served before being sent out; and if he proposes to continue the period 1st January, 1949, to 31st May, 1950. Since May, 1949, it has been the rule that National Service men must serve for 4½ months before being sent to Malaya. The average period is slightly higher. As I have previously stated, National Service men must continue to be sent abroad to the extent that our military commitments render this necessary.

Mr. Ellis Smith: Is the Secretary of State aware that there are some boys of 18 years of age who have just finished training for three months and who are now on leave before proceeding to Malaya and Hong Kong? Is he further aware of the undertaking, which was given during the passing of the National Service Act through this House, that no boy under 19 years of age would be sent abroad, and that during even the dark days of the war no boys under 19 were sent?

Mr. Strachey: I am not aware that they are being sent to Malaya after training of three months, for the rule is four and a half months before they are sent out. If my hon. Friend has any case in mind where this rule is not being followed I should like to hear of it.

Mr. Blackburn: Is it not being shown in Korea that the use of conscript troops at that stage of a war is not the best use that can be made of them? Does not my right hon. Friend think there should be a special volunteer force which was given during the passing of the National Service Act through this House, that no boy under 19 years of age would be sent abroad, and that during even the dark days of the war no boys under 19 were sent?

Mr. Strachey: That is a much wider question, but I do not make there, I took a very different view from that.

Mr. Strachey: I am not aware that they are being sent to Malaya after training of three months, for the rule is four and a half months before they are sent out. If my hon. Friend has any case in mind where this rule is not being followed I should like to hear of it.

Mrs. McLean: Is it not being shown in Korea that the use of conscript troops at that stage of a war is not the best use that can be made of them? Does not my right hon. Friend think there should be a special volunteer force for Malaya of people with experience of Commando and similar operations in the last war, properly trained, which would be, in my view, the most effective method of dealing with the Malayan situation?

Mr. Strachey: That is a much wider question, but I do not take the view that National Service men have proved unsuitable in Malaya. From such personal observations as I could make there, I took a very different view from that.

Savings (Cost of Living Index)

Mr. Osborne asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will produce a scheme whereby payment of the first £500 invested in National Savings Certificates shall be based on the cost of living index so as to safeguard small investors against loss of real capital through depreciation of the pound sterling and to encourage the wage earners in their support of the National Savings Movement.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Stafford Cripps): No, Sir.

Mr. Osborne: Is it not a great scandal that the British Government should be satisfied to pay 16s. in the pound to men and women who have saved week by week to assist the National Savings Movement?

Sir. S. Cripps: When there is a change in the value of money it affects all the citizens.

Sterling Purchasing Power

Mr. Osborne asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the purchasing power of the pound sterling at 1st July, as compared with 20s. in 1945.

Sir S. Cripps: About 16s. in mid-May, the latest date for which figures are available.

Mr. Osborne: Can the Chancellor give the House any hope when he anticipates that the pound will start to recover its value instead of continually losing it?

Sir S. Cripps: I cannot now make a general statement on the economic position. I made one quite recently.

Mr. Lindsay: Does not the Chancellor know that the figures which he has given to the House are an appalling indictment of the Government?

Sir S. Cripps: I do not think it is.

Sir H. Williams: Will the Chancellor say whether the increase in cost affects Ministers in respect of their free cars in the same way as it affects private motorists?

Premises (Authorised Inspections)

Mr. Fitzroy Maclean asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the total number of officials authorised to carry out inspections and investigations in private houses and premises without a search warrant at 15th July.

Sir S. Cripps: The current number of officials who may exercise statutory powers to enter private houses, used exclusively as such, is 4,170; of whom 3,154 are officers of the Inland Revenue—mainly valuers; 996 are assessors acting for the War Damage Commission, and 20 are members or officers of the Board of Control who, under Section 206 (2) of the Lunacy Act of 1890, have power to enter a private house to visit a person apparently detained as a lunatic without an order or certificate.

Mr. F. McLean: Can the right hon. and learned Gentleman say if that figure includes all other private premises?

Sir S. Cripps: It includes all private premises.

Mr. Frederic Harris: Does not the right hon. and learned Gentleman agree that that is 4,170 too many?

Sir S. Cripps: Considering that the majority of these powers have existed since 1836, I do not think that they have been abused.

Government Publications (Price)

Mr. Teeling asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that according to the daily price list of Government publications dated 11th July, No. 113, the proposed charge for a complete edition of Statutory Rules and Orders and Statutory Instruments is 65 guineas; and, in view of the fact that this price renders it impossible for the average citizen, and burdensome for lawyers and other professional persons directly concerned to purchase copies, what other steps it is proposed to take to make these volumes more readily available or to diminish the contents of future volumes.

Sir S. Cripps: The charge of 65 guineas is no more than sufficient to cover costs of printing and selling. The need of the legal and other professions and of private citizens has not been forgotten and the Instruments contained in each title of the work are being published separately in paper covers at the lowest possible prices. In order to make the
volumes more readily available, rate-aided public libraries and university libraries in receipt of grants from the University Grants Committee can purchase official publications at half price. With the gradual disappearance of such wartime controls as become unnecessary, the contents of the volumes will diminish. So far this year there is a reduction in the number of Statutory Instruments compared with last year, of 175.

Government Officials (Powers of Entry)

Mr. Remnant asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury what has been the result of his further inquiry into the powers and numbers of officials authorised to carry out inspections and investigations in private homes.

Mr. Jay: I can find no evidence that any vexatious use has been made of the powers given by Parliament to certain officials in the course of their duties to visit premises including, in some cases, private houses exclusively used as such. The powers of the Inland Revenue Department’s valuers have been exercised without serious complaint since the last century. Auditors representing the Inland Revenue are empowered, by the Income Tax (Employments) Regulations deriving from the Income Tax (Employments) Act, 1943, to inspect documents supporting P.A.Y.E. deductions on employers’ premises, which are usually business premises; and the War Damage Act of 1943 also provided for powers of inspection in order to settle claims. If the hon. Member knows of any case where these powers have been vexatiously exercised I will look into it. Questions about the use of powers granted under the Lunacy and Mental Deficiency Acts dating from 1890, and other powers of this kind, should be addressed to the Ministers of the Departments concerned.

Newsprint Supplies

Air Commodore Harvey (Macclesfield): . . . British newspapers at the present time are the only section of the Press which is controlled by the Government. My information is that the British newspapers are smaller than in any other country in the free world . . . I believe that the freedom of the Press is impaired owing to the shortage of newsprint, and the situation is likely to worsen in the future. For a few months earlier in the year, round about the time of the General Election, the newspapers published an average of seven pages a day, and that continued for a time. But since 2nd July newspapers have been forced to reduce their size to six pages daily.

The provincial daily papers which have the responsibility of printing not only local news, but national news, have also had to cut down; and the provincial weekly papers have been cut pro rata. It seems quite a wrong time for newspapers to have to cut down their space. I am told that the stocks of newsprint are so low and future supplies so uncertain that newspapers may even have another cut in the near future, which might possibly bring them down to four pages a day. What a thought, that in 1951, with the Festival of Britain coming along, this country may have four-page daily newspapers!

. . . The Government must carry full responsibility for the present situation because they have had full control over the raw material. It is all very well for the right hon. Gentleman at Question Time to give the impression that this is run by the Newsprint Supply Company who have got themselves into this position. But nothing of the kind is correct. They have been carrying on, on their own behalf, dependent on Government licences and instructions to a very great extent.

Before the war something like one-third of our total supplies of newsprint came from Canada. This was also the case during the war when the supplies from Scandinavia were cut off. Without Canadian help the newspapers of Great Britain would not have been capable of carrying on at all. The 1950 imports from Canada, which have only recently been agreed, are set at 23,000 tons. The war-time minimum yearly was 67,000 tons. Until devaluation last September, Canadian newsprint was cheaper than any other in the world. Today the right hon. Gentleman in answering a Question of the hon. Member for Hendon, North (Mr. C. L. Orr-Ewing)—which was on the tape machine this evening inferred that the industry had only itself to blame.

Lord Layton went to Canada in 1946 to arrange supplies and contracts for 1949, 1950 and 1951 on a basis of 300,000 tons per annum. He carried with him a written assurance from the Government that licences would be provided. Unfortunately the Government broke their contracts, and in doing so they upset the whole of this great industry in Canada which happens to be second to agriculture. In 1945 Canada and Newfoundland shipped to the United Kingdom 198,458 tons. In the autumn of 1945 the present Minister of Town and Country Planning announced that licences were available for only 93,000 tons. The Government went back on their contracts. The price of Canadian newsprint was £25 a ton against a British controlled price of £34 a ton. The Canadians made great sacrifices in this matter, and the British Government demanded cancellation of contracts.

Had coal been supplied to the Canadians as they wanted we should have had the newsprint. Coal could have been sent at a freight rate of 10s. a ton and newsprint could have been shipped back at an additional freight rate of 35s. a ton, but the Government broke its contracts. It seems to me that this Government completely lacks the ability to work out its priorities. The right hon. Gentleman will tell us, no doubt, that it is due to the shortage of dollars. We know we have been through a dollar crisis, but since the American loan has been forthcoming a lot of money has been spent in the United States on a lot of unnecessary items. I do not want to weary the House with figures, because they are all well known. If the hon. Member wants to interrupt I will give way.

Mr. Michael Foot (Plymouth, Devonport): I should like to invite the hon. and gallant Gentleman to weary the House with one of the items on which we have spent dollars unnecessarily.

Air Commodore Harvey: Tinned oysters, chewing gum and marbles. . . . The onus is on the Government to maintain these contracts and to make proper arrangements for newsprint to be imported from Canada.

The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Harold Wilson): . . . I shall not follow the hon. and gallant Gentleman’s remarks about the cancellation of the Canadian contracts some time ago. That matter has been frequently debated in this House and I do not intend to go over those Debates tonight. . . .

. . . I want to assure the House most sincerely that the Government regret this decline in the newsprint position
just as much as do the newspapers themselves. The change in the newpasing position since the beginning of this year is chiefly due to the increase in the consumption of new-press by the United States newspapers. It is due principally to their heavy rate of buying, not only in Canada, but also in Scandinavia. Of course, when the American Press come with their considerable demand for newpaper from the soft currency countries, those countries, which are themselves dollar-hungry, naturally give priority to the American de-

mand.

I think it is fair to say that it was not possible to foresee this development in the world newpaper situation... .

House of Commons: July 19, 1950.

International Conference, Montreal

Mr. G. C. Orr-Ewing asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Civil Aviation whether he is aware that the United Kingdom delegate at the recent International Civil Aviation Organisation conference in Montreal advocated the internationalisation of air transport; and what consultations were held with the Dominion Governments before taking this action.

Mr. Beswick: The policy of international ownership and operation advocated by the United Kingdom delegate at Montreal has been consistently supported by the United Kingdom since the first meeting of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organisation in 1946. This policy has been discussed with members of the Commonwealth, who are well aware of our views.

Mr. Orr-Ewing: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that, if I may borrow his expression, some of the Dominions have seen the light since these consultations took place and have changed their Governments? Did he discuss this with both Australia and New Zealand before going to I.C.A.O. and recommending this action?

Mr. Beswick: The question which arises is whether they have seen the right light.

Mr. Jowsey-Hicks: Are the Dominion Governments still in accord with the British Government's point of view in the matter?

Mr. Beswick: No, Sir. We now have different views, which have been expressed at the international conference.

Arab Refugees (Assistance)

Major Legge-Bourke asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will instruct the British representative on the Advisory Commission to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency to propose that all possible assistance should be given to those Arab families, members of which were deposited in the desert Wadi Araba on 31st May after severe ill-treatment.

Mr. Younger: Instructions on these lines have already been sent to the British representative on the Advisory Com-

mission, who will by now have taken the necessary action.

Major Legge-Bourke: While I welcome that, may I ask the hon. Gentleman to see, at the same time, if there is anything that can be done to prevent the Israeli Army apparently adopting the same methods which the Nazis used, including the tearing out of fingernails?

Mr. Younger: I understand that the matter is under consideration by the Mixed Armistice Commission. There are, of course, conflicting accounts of this incident.

Mr. Janner: May I ask my hon. Friend to advise that these rash and wicked statements about ill-treatment should not be made, and that hon. Members should take very careful note of facts and not of fancies?

Major Legge-Bourke: Will the Minister examine the photograph which I have in my hand of one of these men with his fingernails torn out?

Mr. Younger: I think that this is a matter which, if it is to be investigated, should be investigated by the Mixed Armistice Commission and not by His Majesty's Government. There are conflicting accounts, and I can make no comment as to their accuracy.

United Nations (Secretariat)

Mr. Russell asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what proportion of the secretariat of the United Nations are nationals of the Union of Soviet Socialist Repub-

lics, China or any of the satellite States of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. Younger: On 31st August, 1949, the proportions were: Soviet Union, 1.2 per cent.; China, 6 per cent.; Poland, 2.5 per cent.; Czechoslovakia, 1.9 per cent.; Ukraine, Bulgaria, Hungary, each 0.2 per cent.

Mr. Russell: Would the right hon. Gentleman agree that all members of the United Nations secretariat should be in sympathy with the action taken by the Security Council over Korea?

Mr. Younger: The hon. Gentleman must bear in mind that the United Nations is a world organisation, and that great pains have been taken to try to draw its staff from all members of the United Nations.

Sir Herbert Williams: Could I ask the hon. Gentleman how many people 1.2 per cent represents?

Mr. Younger: I could not give the answer to that without notice.

Food Supplies (Banana Imports)

Mr. W. Hudson asked the Minister of Food whether he is aware that substantial shipments of bananas are being offered to British merchants through the enterprise of French exporters at a price equivalent to less than 5d. per pound f.o.b. West Indian Port; and if he will permit bananas so offered to be imported privately.

Mr. Webb: I know that these offers have been made, but the price asked is much higher than that which we pay under bulk purchase contracts from the West Indies; and I could not maintain the controlled distribution and price control which are still necessary as long as bananas are scarce if I allowed these imports on private account.

Constitutional Reform, Leeward Islands

Mr. Driberg asked the Secretary of State for the Col-
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American Medical President Takes Oath

"For the first time in the history of the American Medical Association," says the Journal of the American Medical Association for July 8, "the incoming president received an oath of office. This oath, which was repeated by Dr. Elmer L. Henderson reads:

"I solemnly swear that I shall carry out the duties of the office of President of the American Medical Association to the best of my ability. I shall strive constantly to maintain the ethics of the medical profession and to promote the public health and welfare. I shall dedicate myself and my office to improving the health standards of the American people and to the task of bringing increasingly improved medical care within the reach of every citizen. I shall uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution and By-Laws of the American Medical Association at all times. I shall champion the cause of freedom in medical practice—and freedom for all my fellow Americans. I do solemnly swear that I will discharge the duties of this office to the best of my ability, so help me God." This oath and the President's inaugural address were offered in a public ceremony held on June 27 while the House of Delegates was in session.

Money in Korea

The Editor, The Social Crediter,

Sir,—I have been re-reading a letter signed Mak Loon published in The Social Crediter of January 22, 1949, which described what happened in China when the United States supported Chiang Kai Shek and the "Nationalists" with arms and money in the fight between the South and the North. "The ultimate act of subjugation of a conquered race, or nation," says the writer, "is to do away with its form of currency, and to institute that of the conquerors." Nationalist China was stripped of her currency of silver, was forced to use U.S. paper money and was brought under a foreign banking system alien to her traditions.

In Fleet Street Preview of July 29, a writer on "Korean Communists" says: "At the beginning of this year Southern Korea's finances looked bleak. The Won, 15 to the dollar in 1945, had dropped to 4,700. With American help currency in circulation dropped by 17 billion won in four months." With American help prosperity increased in South Korea, but South Korean finances were brought under American control.

Yours faithfully,

Alice Raven.

5, Pump Court,
Temple.
August 2, 1950.
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