From Week to Week

Readers may recall the words with which the English translation of Tolstoy's "Anna Karenina" opens: "All happy families are alike. Every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way." We have often pondered upon the opinion, and do not intend to commit ourselves to agreement beyond observing that, in so far as it is true, its truth has something to do with the prototype: "As above, so below."

The unhappy human family, now so far advanced towards a unity (or brotherhood) of unhappiness, seems to present a great variety of corruptions: the spawn of Hell. Supporters of this review need not bear under the accusation that they behave like 'our Johnnie' besides whom everyone else is out of step. The only state of society which can possibly be in step is one based and founded upon a just appreciation of its Credit. Not only one manifestation of departure from this principle is corrupt. For example, the following story is inevitable in a ballot-box democracy:

"Within recent months... a number of gentlemen had called on (a prominent Chicago industrialist) in his office. They represented New York banks and they explained their visits as being simply prompted to ask if they could serve him in any way, and to chat about business conditions. But, our friend noted, each one managed to steer the conversation to politics and to mention General Eisenhower favourably as a potential candidate for President. That was all. For our friend held different political ideas, and did not encourage further political talk. Nor was he interested in borrowing. If he were, Chicago institutions could well handle his needs... We recalled, from vivid personal recollection, how this sort of New York influence—just a word here, a word there—worked in 1916-17 and again in 1940-41, etc.

"Out in the Illinois metropolis, there exists a fierce local pride and strong suspicion of New York. It is a political factor of big moment not only in Chicago but in the surrounding area. When Eisenhower supporters staged a rally in Madison Square Garden last week-end, the proceedings were noted in Chicago. Stage and screen stars, a hall with many seats empty, some left-wing persons on the sponsor list—all these were noted out West and received appropriate comment. Indeed, some Eisenhower supporters out there wished the Garden rally had not been held.

"Taft partisans talked of how New York money had been sent out to the Ike organization in some Western States—$50,000 dollars to Oklahoma, $50,000 dollars to Oregon, $50,000 dollars to Missouri. Now, undoubtedly, there's Taft money being spent liberally in the primary contests out there, but it doesn't bear the New York label."

Kingdom, or Dominion

Under this heading the following from Mrs. Davidson has appeared in a Toronto newspaper:

When a small child I assisted at a secret political meeting held in a private car on a railway siding near an old town in Ontario.

The meeting was between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and my grand-father, the grandson of one of General Wolfe's officers, who had fought beside him on the Plains of Abraham. At that time Sir Wilfrid was the pride of both Canadas.

The two men spoke of the name "Dominion of Canada" and both agreed it was a pity the Fathers of Confederation could not have had their way and called Canada a Kingdom, and had a King's son for first King. Failing this, they thought "Dominion of Canada" the next best title. The reason, Sir Wilfrid said, was that the United States Government had expressly stated that they did not want a Kingdom in the upper half of the North American Continent.

Toronto. Helen Davidson.
PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: January 30, 1952.

Financial and Economic Situation

Mr. Cyril Osborne (Louth): ... The position as revealed by the Chancellor, and not disputed on the Opposition Front Bench, is that last year we over-spent by about £500 million. The only problem before us is whether we are to increase output by £500 million, and thereby maintain our standard of life, or whether we reduce our standard of life by that amount. Those are the two inescapable alternatives. Instead of concentrating so much on reductions, we should concentrate more, as a Parliament and as a nation, on increasing productivity, on increasing our output so that no cuts will be necessary. I liked the bluntness of Field Marshal Montgomery at his Alamein Re-union, when he said to the 7,000 assembled there, "We either work more or we eat less." That is the position that faces us.

Hon. Members will agree that the crisis with which we are faced is not merely a British crisis, but is part of a world crisis. Three things have led up to this crisis. The first is the rapid growth in world population, the second two destructive wars and the third the rise of nationalism in the East and the demand of coloured peoples for a fair deal. Hon. Members will agree that it is impossible for us in this country to insulate ourselves from the rest of the world, but I would remind them that in the last 150 years the Briton has been the economic herenvolk. He has had a higher standard of life than anyone else and the privileges we have enjoyed as a race are going; they are going inevitably and for ever.

Hon. Members must realise that two-thirds of the world's population, even today, are living at one-seventh of our standard. Put in terms of rations, we eat as much in one day as two-thirds of the world eat in a week. [An Hon. Member: "Not all of us!"] All of us on an average and no one eats better than hon. Members in the House of Commons. Because of the world food position—and ultimately everything comes back to the question of food—a dark question mark is overhanging all mankind.

The question, ultimately, is will there be enough to eat for the enormously increasing world population? It is growing by 25 million a year, which means that every two years a nation as big as Great Britain is added to the world and has to be fed and maintained. I suggest that hon. Members opposite should look at their "Daily Herald" today and they will find next to the editorial column, a review of a book on world hunger. I commend it to them.

The United Nations Association, a week or two ago, issued a pamphlet on world food production which showed that since 1936 world food production has increased by only 7 per cent., but in the meantime world population has increased by about 15 per cent. There is less food to go to a bigger number of people and the dispossessed peoples of the world are demanding a fairer and better distribution. [Hon. Members: "Hear, hear."] I am grateful for hon. Members' support.

In India there are eight times more people than in these islands, but the income of India is one-half ours. Therefore, the average Indian lives on a standard of one-fifteenth or one-sixteenth that of the average Briton. Put in terms of food, which I agree it is over-simplifying the problem, it means that every day we eat as much as an Indian eats in a fortnight. If hon. Members believe the fair shares theory or gospel for abroad they should go back to their people and say that if we are to raise the standard of life for the Indian only twice, it would still be one-eighth of ours—and we would have to live for a week on what we have for a day's ration today. I do not believe that this country is prepared to do that.

... The United States' population is 150 million, and the income per head in dollars as calculated by the United Nations in 1949, was 1,453. Sixty-four per cent. of the world's population are living on an average income of less than 100 dollars per head per year. If the whole of the American income was divided along that 64 per cent. it would make quite a small difference to them. What right have we to ask the Americans to make sacrifices that we ourselves are not prepared to make?

That is the horrible, dark world background which we have to face. That is the problem. How can we feed 50 million people here when our agriculture will not maintain more than 30 million? There are 20 million people too many in these islands for our own resources to maintain. Ultimately, we have either to expand our exports or have a much lower standard of life.

Hon. Members may have seen the figure given by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury in the recent Government debate. In the debate last November he said that in 1951 our food imports cost us £1,000 million. We had a deficit of £500 million. Therefore, we paid for only half of what we ate that came from abroad. Since 40 per cent. of our total foodstuffs come from abroad it means that if we had paid for everything we ate last year and had eaten only what we paid for, the whole rations of the people of this country would have had to be cut by 20 per cent.

The "Board of Trade Journal" of 26th January gave some startling figures. Exports for 1951 were two-thirds greater in volume than was the case in 1938. Our imports in volume were less and yet although we were exporting two-thirds more than we were in 1938 we were £500 million "in the red." The problem of selling abroad is a terrifically difficult one. It will not be solved by mere gibe across the Floor of the House.

I would remind the Chancellor and the House, at a time when he is telling us that we must export more, that
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in 1954 the American armament production drive will be ended and the great productive energies of America will be turned from armaments to civilian goods. The competition which our goods will have to face abroad will be far greater. At the same time Germany, Italy and Japan are coming into the market and we shall be very lucky indeed if we survive at all.

In the "Manchester Guardian" annual review issued at the beginning of this month it was shown that textile workers in Japan have an average wage of 7½d. per hour. In this country the average is 2s. 7d. We are already feeling the fierceness of Japanese competition. . .


Open cast mining, Staffordshire

Mr. Stephen Swingler asked the Minister of Fuel and Power (1) how many acres of land in North Staffordshire are under requisition by his Department for open cast mining; how long this land has been requisitioned; and when open cast operations are due to start;

(2) if he is aware that several applications for licences for small mines in North Staffordshire have been rejected on the ground that the land is under requisition by his Department for open cast mining; and if he will release some of this land to enable these applications to be granted.

Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd: Seven hundred and thirty-two acres have been under requisition from various dates between 1944 and 1951. Work to recover the coal or to restore the land to agricultural use is proceeding on all this land and none can be released until the work is completed.

Mr. Swingler: Is the Minister aware of the many applications to open small mines from many of my constituents who are ex-miners or have experience of the coal industry, and who are willing and ready to extract the coal immediately? Can the Minister say how much of this land has been under requisition for some time but on which no operations have been started?

Mr. Lloyd: No. Licences for small mines are a matter for the National Coal Board. It is desirable that small mines should be worked wherever possible, but it must be remembered that if it is a choice between small mines and open cast operations, open cast usually yields a much larger quantity of coal.

Mr. Swingler: Is the Minister aware that the Coal Board consistently turn down these applications on the ground that the Minister's Department has all the land under requisition? Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire into the position as the Board appear to be ready to grant some of these applications if the right hon. Gentleman's Ministry is willing to give up some of the land?

Mr. Lloyd: The Board cannot grant licences in respect of land which is producing larger quantities of coal under the operations of my Department. This is a case where the national interest must come before private interests.

Sir Herbert Williams: Will my right hon. Friend encourage this desire for private enterprise among hon. Members on the other side of the House?

Mr. Swingler: Is the Minister aware that my constituents are anxious to contribute in any way to the greater production of coal and that it is his Department which is siding against the Coal Board and many of my constituents and preventing a greater extraction of coal by holding on to land and producing nothing from it?

Independent electricity generation

Mr. Gerald Nabarro asked the Minister of Fuel and Power the policy of the Government regarding factory installation of generating equipment for use independent of electricity mains consumption, and particularly including auto-diesel sets, back-pressure turbines and reciprocating engines; and whether he is now satisfied that all contractual restrictions and financial inhibitions have now been removed by the British Electricity Authority in respect of independent electricity generation.

Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd: These independent generators undoubtedly help to relieve the demand on the electricity supply system, particularly during the peak hours and I am anxious that firms should not be prevented from installing them otherwise than by the inevitable limitations of supply. Where oil is to be used, they should first confirm that their requirements can be met by an oil supplier. The electricity boards, after discussion with the Federation of British Industries, have waived the contractual restrictions on the use of these plants until 1959.

Mr. Nabarro: Does my right hon. Friend realise that the area electricity boards continue financially to inhibit the use of private generators by every possible means, and that their financial policy, even since the right hon. Member for Derby, South (Mr. Noel-Baker), made his last statement on 30th April, 1951, has been one throughout of, "Heads I win tails you lose"? Is not it the area boards that the Minister should get at?

Mr. Lloyd: As I have said, I am anxious that firms should not be prevented from installing these generators, and if my hon. Friend would give me specific information about these difficulties I will certainly investigate them.

Mr. P. Roberts: While thanking my right hon. Friend for what he has said, may I ask if he will see that it gets wide publicity, because there are firms who need this extra support from the Minister in making their applications to the Board.

Mr. Lloyd: I think it will receive publicity.

Mr. Nabarro: Will my right hon. Friend bear in mind that this is not only a question of the peak hour consumption of electricity, but also a question of the higher efficiency in the use of coal, by using independent generators deriving their power from waste steam?

Mr. Lloyd: Yes, Sir.

Mr. A. C. Manuel: Can the Minister say what protection there is regarding the prices charged for independently generated electricity as compared with the electricity sold by the area boards?

Mr. Lloyd: That is really a matter for the firms themselves, since they supply themselves.

Electricity supplies (rural areas)

Major Anstruther-Gray asked the Minister of Fuel and
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Viscount Samuel

"Nothing short of a restoration of the Constitution..."

"I see what you mean. In that case the man to carry it out is Mr. Churchill."

All things considered, we deem this fragment of conversation to have first-rate importance as (1) identifying a possible line of future policy with the Sanhedrin, and (2) identifying Mr. Churchill's line of policy with the Sanhedrin.

And now about Lord Samuel:

We have not recorded in this review the speeches in the House of Lords on February 11 on the Address of Condolence. They were six in number, those of the Marquess of Salisbury, who voiced the Whig opinion that "by this evolution [from an absolute to a Constitutional Monarchy] the actual powers of the Monarchy have been diminished" but "the influence which it can and does exert has, I believe, been maintained and, indeed, sensibly enhanced," said Lord Jowitt, Viscount Samuel, Lord Teynion, The Lord Archbishop of York and the Lord Chancellor. It will soon perhaps be clearer than it generally is that "If you scratch a Whig, you find a Marxist," for what is the doctrine that "power," "influence" and "authority" are interchangeable terms but the doctrine in disguise that might is right? However this may be, it was Lord Samuel's speech which exhibited the greatest peculiarity. "It is right," said Lord Samuel, "that we should think also of him as the central figure in the State." Again: "the sturdy strength of our Constitution, with the Monarchy at its centre," Centre?

"King George had that great quality [judgment], and it was that, more than all else, which brought success to his tenure of the Throne." Tenure? "Our" Constitution, with that pride of possession which distinguishes the Chosen, is nowadays condoned on the ground of the naturalisation of an alien speaker or of his ancestors—the latter an intrusion of that hereditary principle which, in other respects, Lord Samuel professes to deem absurd. We leave the matter there for the time being, believing that it is "our" Constitution which is to be preferred and fully aware of the ambiguity.

Socialism

There are not wanting folk who believe—or who would have us believe—that the only alternative to State Socialism is Private Socialism: private monopoly in exchange for monopoly masquerading as "public" monopoly: Big Business aspiring to Biggest Business by way of trustification of some sort instead of by usurpation of some sort of legitimate sovereignties. "Banker and Red agree."

The Purple and the Black

Dear Sir,

While no normal person wants a light treatment of the death of our Sovereign and friend, the continuous unrelieved plugging of the theme in the heaviest style for a solid week by the B.B.C. gives food for thought. . . . "Was the B.B.C.'s gloom really necessary?" asked yesterday's Evening Standard in a headline—surely an indiscretion unless the cat was already out of the bag. . . .

The net result may well be an attitude of: 'To hell with the Radio and God bless the Monarchy,' and perhaps an even keener appreciation of the purple which relieves the black.

February 14, 1952.

Yours truly,
R. B. Davies.

"Niebuhr on Nature"

The Editor,
The Social Crediter,

Sir,

I think that some error exists in this matter. The motto of the British Legion is "Service Not Self" and that concern is entirely outside Rotary connection. I hope that this will receive attention as confusion will result otherwise.

February 17, 1952.

Yours faithfully,
Buchan.

Printer's Pie

T.S.C. February 16, page 4, column 2:—lines 23 and 24 have changed places. So many readers have suggested other solutions of the puzzle that, reluctantly, we announce the correct one. We regret the occasion as much as anyone else.

Social Credit Secretariat

Mr. T. V. Holmes has been appointed Treasurer and Director of Revenue, Social Credit Secretariat, vice Mr. R. G. Ellis, resigned, and will take up his duties shortly.
How to be a United States Senator

By E. MULLINS

Senator Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia is one of America's most distinguished servants of world Jewry, and it is not surprising that in August of 1951 Lewis Lichtenstein Strauss appointed State Senator Harry Byrd Jr., as director of the wealthy Industrial Rayon Corporation. Strauss is a partner of the international banking house of Kuhn, Loeb Co., which represents the Rothschild fortunes in this country. The New York Times carried on the front page of its issue of March 24, 1917, the news that Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb Co., was the financier of the Communist Revolution in Russia. This may explain why Senator Byrd fought so desperately and so successfully to get the enemy alien Communist Jew Anna M. Rosenberg confirmed as Assistant Secretary of Defence.

Senator Byrd has always been on friendly terms with our real President, Bernard Baruch, and Byrd is frequently mentioned in the Jewish Press as having consulted with Baruch on some matter of national importance. Byrd, like all Gentiles who become willing tools of the Jews, has an extremely sorry record in Washington, and has been described as a great disappointment as a Senator. In eighteen years, no bill has ever been passed in the Senate bearing the name of Byrd, nor has he ever effectively carried out a programme of his own. Instead, he has been content to follow whomever is the leader of the Jewish representatives in Washington at the moment.

Harry Byrd got into the Senate of the United States by declaring himself for two principal instruments of the Jewish power, the Federal Reserve System, and the gold standard of monetary issue. In an article in Collier's of July 2, 1932, stoutly defending these Jewish ideals, Byrd wrote:

"Why confuse the already perplexed mind of the electorate with references to Federal Reserve Policy and monetary standards that may have to be abandoned?"

In plain English, this meant, "Get the voters' minds off the Federal Reserve System and the manner in which international Jewish bankers control the moneys of the United States!" Byrd wrote this after a Congressional Committee had conclusively established the guilt of the Federal Reserve Board in bringing about the Crash of 1929 and the subsequent depression. Hundreds of pages of published hearings told how the Federal Reserve Board had met in a criminal conspiracy with the heads of European banks and planned the Great Depression. Representative Louis MacFadden, Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, had moved to impeach the members of the Federal Reserve Board, but his colleagues refused to support him, and he was then defeated in his home district by New York money after twenty-two years of public service in Washington.

The "monetary standards that may have to be abandoned," which Byrd wrote of was, of course, the gold standard. The Jews controlled the gold supply of the world and manipulated its price to serve their plan of world subjugation. The League of Nations was set up to defend the gold standard in 1919, and was replaced by the United Nations in 1944, which keeps up the price of gold through its World Bank. Byrd's willing defence of these Hebrew heritages sent him a few months later to Washington as a Senator.

In the Senate, Byrd has demonstrated his ability to oppress his own people by fighting for Jewish programmes, such as war, high taxes, and the placing of important Jewish Communists in high governmental positions. Forrest Davis wrote in an article extolling Byrd in the Saturday Evening Post of August 15, 1944, that "He was an outspoken friend of the war policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt." Since it is now clear even to the dullest of us that Roosevelt led us to war in 1941 to save Zionist Communism from the German armies which were then sweeping towards Moscow, Byrd once again demonstrated his unswerving loyalty to Kuhn, Loeb Co. He is, of course, liable to prosecution for treason for his part in supporting the criminal conspiracy against the American people, the United Nations, which replaced the American Constitution with the Zionist United Nations Charter. Consequently, Americans now cannot look to their own government to protect them against Jewish terrorism.

Byrd has never raised his voice against the slaughter of American boys in Korea, nor has he ever remarked on the fact that our State Department, controlled by James Paul Warburg, the scion of Kuhn, Loeb Co., refused the help of Chang's troops to fight in Korea.

Byrd's willing support for burdensome income taxes on American workers and farmers is also in line with his record of supporting Jewish ideals, since these oppressive taxes go to pay international Jewish bankers their five billion dollars a year interest on their holdings of the national debt.

Senator Byrd crowned his years of service to Zionism in December, 1950, when he succeeded in getting Anna M. Rosenberg confirmed as Assistant Secretary of Defence. Byrd was a member of the Senate Committee which investigated the revelation that this Hungarian Jewess was a leading personality in the Communist Party in America. After listening to days of testimony during which this woman was pointed out by witnesses in person as a prominent Communist, and after much written testimony from such sources as the New York Herald Tribune and the New Masses, the Senate Committee put into the record concerning her Communist activities, Byrd questioned a witness, Theodore Kirkpatrick of the FBI, in the following manner. (Page 296 of the Hearings on Anna M. Rosenberg, Government Printing Office, 1950.)

"BYRD: There is evidently two Anna Rosenbergs (the grammar is his). Assuming this Anna M. Rosenberg didn't sign these statements, there must be another Anna Rosenberg. Do you have a file on the other Anna Rosenberg or know anything about her?

KIRKPATRICK: We have no information on the Anna Rosenberg without the middle initial M.

BYRD: Isn't there another Anna M. Rosenberg?

KIRKPATRICK: I have no idea whether there is more than one Anna M. Rosenberg.

Thus, Senator Byrd arbitrarily assumes that this Anna M. Rosenberg whom Baruch sent down from New York to become Assistant Secretary of Defence did not sign the several Communist manifestoes which were produced as evidence at the Hearings, yet Byrd does not offer ANY reason for his assumption. He attempts to make the FBI
Rationed Foods (Costs)

Mr. Osborne asked the Minister of Food the cost of imported and home-produced rationed foods, respectively, for 1951, exclusive of distributive costs; and what were the wholesale and retail costs of distribution.

Major Lloyd George: The cost of imported and home-produced rationed foods sold for domestic distribution in the financial year 1950-51 was £385 million and £190 million respectively.

The estimated costs of distribution were:
Wholesale—£31 million (imported foods £24 million, home produced foods £7 million).
Retail—£93 million (imported foods £59 million, home produced foods £34 million).

Casual Earnings

Lieut.-Commander Hutchison asked the Minister of National Insurance if he will raise the maximum limit for casual earnings, without reduction of retirement pension, from £2 to £3 in any pension week.

Mr. Peake: No. The amount which a retirement pensioner can earn in any pension week without reduction of pension was raised from £1 to £2 only last July. To raise the limit still further would tend to discourage those of pension age from continuing in full time employment.

European Payments Union
(U.K. Payments and Credits)

Mr. Harold Davies asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will make a statement on Britain’s position in the European Payments Union and say how much gold has been paid into the union and what credits have been received since the inception of the union.

Mr. R. A. Butler: The whole sterling area deficit with the union at the end of January was £308,377,000. We have received credit for £213,104,000, and have paid £95,273,000 in gold, of which £14,246,000 have been recovered from the U.S. Government under the special arrangement made in 1950.

Post-war Credits

Mr. C. S. Taylor asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will now consider issuing a short-dated stock, on terms similar to those of the 3 per cent. Savings Bonds, 1955-65 issue, to cover the payment of post-war credits.

Mr. Butler: No.

Discharged Civil Servants

Mr. H. Hynd asked the Minister of Labour what arrangements are being made to absorb discharged civil servants into important industries.

Sir W. Monckton: The assistance of my Department is available to any discharged civil servants who register for alternative employment.
Death of King George VI

Message from the Queen

The Treasurer of the Household (Mr. Cedric Drew) reported Her Majesty's answer to the Address, as follows:

I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the loyal and affectionate address which the House of Commons have presented to me on the sad loss that I have suffered and on my accession to the Throne.

I value highly the warm expressions of your attachment to my person and of your confidence in my determination to follow my dear Father's example of devotion to the service of his peoples throughout the world.

I pray that with the blessing of Almighty God I may ever justify your trust and that, aided by your counsel and sustained by the strength of the affection of my peoples, I may uphold the ideals that my Father set before me of peace, freedom and the happiness of the great family of which I am now the head.

Message from the Queen Mother

Lieut.-Colonel Walter Eliott, having been appointed, together with Mr. Ralph Assheton, Viscountess Davidson, Mr. Clement Davies, Miss Florence Horsbrugh, Mr. G. H. Oliver, Dr. Edith Summerskill and Mr. A. Woodburn, to wait upon Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, with a Message of condolence from this House, reported Her Majesty's answer, as follows:

I thank you most sincerely for your message of condolence, which will help me to bear the burden of my great sorrow. I am deeply touched by your warm sympathy, and I am moved by this further sign of your close and constant affection towards me.

Message from the Dowager

Lieut.-Colonel Walter Eliott, having been appointed, together with Mr. Ralph Assheton, Viscountess Davidson, Mr. Clement Davies, Miss Florence Horsbrugh, Mr. G. H. Oliver, Dr. Edith Summerskill and Mr. A. Woodburn, to wait upon Her Majesty Queen Mary with a Message of condolence from this House, reported Her Majesty's answer, as follows:

I thank you for your message of condolence. The warmth and sincerity of your sympathy will be a consolation to me at this time of deep personal sorrow.

War Pensions

Sir Ian Fraser asked the Minister of Pensions at what figure the basic rate of war pensions would require to be fixed in order to have the same purchasing power as 45s. in 1946. The annual cost of increasing the basic rate of disablement pension to 62s. weekly is estimated at £11½ million with a further £2 million if corresponding increases were made in officers' pensions.

Mr. Amory: Does my hon. Friend share the view of many people in this country in all parties that the time has come to make an adjustment in this matter? Will he convey that view to the Chancellor of the Exchequer?

Mr. Amory: I must be careful to withstand the stratagems—the very friendly stratagems—of my hon. Friend, but I realise, as I am sure everyone else in the House does, that the increases in the cost of living that have taken place during the last six years have involved hardships for many sections of the community, war pensioners among them. As I have said before, this matter is at present under consideration, and I have nothing to add to what I have already said.

Mr. Desmond Downley: If there are hardships involved for all sections in the community, is not the one section that should be protected from these hardships that of the war pensioner?

Mr. Amory: I certainly agree that war pensioners should have the highest possible priority.

Housing (Supplies of Materials)

Mr. Norman Dodds asked the Minister of Housing and Local Government if he will make a statement on the prospects for increased supplies of timber, cement and bricks for housing in 1952.

The Minister of Housing and Local Government (Mr. Harold Macmillan): I am working closely with my noble Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and my right hon. Friend the Minister of Works and have every reason to believe that these materials will be available for housing in increasing quantities.

Mr. Dodds: Does the right hon. Gentleman think that the information he has measures up to the optimism expressed in the Election?

Mr. Macmillan: I do not know what the hon. Member means by "measures up." I feel we shall make progress and am not so much concerned with this part of the problem as with many other sides of it.

Mr. Martin Lindsay: Is my right hon. Friend aware of the widespread feeling that brick production is far too low in brickyards inherited by the National Coal Board, due to the fact that no one in the National Coal Board knows anything about brick production? Will he consider having an independent examination of this question by one of the well known producers of bricks in private industry?

Mr. Macmillan: I am working closely with the Minister of Works, who is primarily concerned, and I feel hopeful that the brick production will rise.

Mr. Arthur Lewis: When the Minister says that he has reason to hope that conditions will improve, can he give facts and figures to support that view?

Mr. Macmillan: I do not understand the purpose of the hon. Member's question. Does he hope that the housing policy will fail?
Subsidy

Mr. Norman Smith asked the Minister of Housing and Local Government if he will make a statement about the housing subsidy.

Mr. A. Blenkinsop asked the Minister of Housing and Local Government whether he is now in a position to make a statement on the progress of negotiations with local authorities on the revision of housing subsidies; and if he will give an assurance that full regard is being paid to the effect of the further increase in the Public Works Loan Board rate of interest.

Mr. Douglas Jay asked the Minister of Housing and Local Government whether, in the light of the further increase in the rate of interest for loans from the Public Works Loan Board, and its effect on the rents of council houses, he will make a statement arising out of the discussions on housing subsidies between his Department and the local authorities.

Mr. H. Macmillan: I would refer the hon. Members to the reply given on 29th January, 1952, to the Member for Gravesend (Sir R. Acland) and others. I hope to meet the representatives of the local authorities on Thursday.

Mr. Smith: Will the Minister bear in mind that there is grave anxiety among the local authorities lest any increase in the subsidy should not be sufficient to offset the extra cost of borrowing due to the increase in the rate of interest from 3 per cent. to 4½ per cent., which will add 5s. 10d. a week to the cost of houses in Nottingham and elsewhere?

Mr. Lloyd: No, Sir, that is not the fact.

Mr. Macmillan: Yes, but if that be their anxiety I can allay it immediately. It will be sufficient for that purpose, but I thought that by tradition it would be discourteous to make any announcement in the House until I have had the normal discussions with representatives of the local authorities, which take place this week.

Mr. Blenkinsop: Are we to understand that the increase in the housing subsidy is guaranteed to be sufficient to cover the whole increased cost to local housing authorities of the new rate of interest?

Mr. Macmillan: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Jay: The Minister has made a very important statement in answer to a supplementary question. Can we be assured that it applies to all housing schemes throughout the country and that it also applies to Scotland?

Mr. Macmillan: I have answered perfectly straightforwardly the question put to me. The answer is, "Yes, Sir."

Unoccupied Premises (Requisitioning)

Mr. Nield asked the Minister of Housing and Local Government if he will take steps to ensure that the powers of housing authorities are adequate to enable them to acquire, for the accommodation of the homeless, privately-owned houses which remain unoccupied and are not needed by their owners.

Mr. Macmillan: My view is that local authorities already have adequate powers for this purpose. If my hon. and learned Friend has in mind any particular case which suggests the contrary I should be glad to look into it if he will let me have details.

Balance of Payments

Mr. Horobin asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can give an estimate of the annual rate of improvement in the net United Kingdom balance of payments, in comparison with the last six months of 1951, which must be achieved by the Government's measures to reduce imports and increase exports, in order to balance the United Kingdom's accounts in the last six months of 1952.

Mr. R. A. Butler: The United Kingdom deficit on current account with the world as a whole is estimated provisionally to have been of the order of £400 million in the second half of 1951. To eliminate this deficit by the second half of 1952 would, therefore, require an improvement at an annual rate of £800 million.

I would remind my hon. Friend that our commitment under the Commonwealth Finance Ministers' plan is to reduce the U.K. deficit with the non-sterling world from £575 million in the second half of 1951 to £100 million in the second half of 1952.