

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 28. No. 18.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"ALBERTA THE DARLING OF WALL STREET." A banner headline on the leader page of *The Financial Times* for June 17 announces an article by Harold Wincott, who has been in Alberta for a month. Mr. Wincott asks his readers to "Consider Alberta. Now there's a fascinating story for you. You don't have to be a greybeard to remember . . ." etc.

"To-day, Alberta is known in Canada as 'the darling of Wall Street.' All this and heaven too is hers for the asking. And the Social Credit Government? It's still there. Doing very nicely. It's come a long way from being the most radical provincial government in Canada to the most conservative. In fact, the only criticism of Alberta's Social Credit Government I heard among the businessmen of Calgary was that Mr. Manning and his merry men were too darned conservative . . . The C.C.F., the Canadian Socialist Party, has just won a sweeping victory in the Saskatchewan elections. Folk here say: 'Now watch the C.C.F. go Conservative—not just Progressive Conservative—as Alberta did.' Foreign capital is peculiar. . ."

We know something of the peculiarities of foreign finance capital, and have no need to dilate here upon a topic which is familiar to Social Crediters outside Canada, and to some inside. At Calgary, at Regina, at Vancouver, at Winnipeg; in French Canada in Montreal and at Quebec, even at Ottawa as well as at Edmonton, there are Social Crediters who understand perfectly the implication of the *Financial Times* article, the main implication, namely, that it is in the nature of things that political parties, deriving their strength and acceptability to the domination of finance-centralised power from an exploitation of majority rule and ballot-box democracy, should pass from being dangers to being darlings of entrenched Power. They understand something at least of what this process entails for the integrity as well as for the reputation of an idea: they know well that the interests which yesterday "reached for their *sal volatile* at the mention of Douglas and Social Credit" (Mr. Wincott's assessment of their need) have not set it aside because they recognise the superior curative properties of Social Credit, but because, so far as they are concerned Social Credit has been emasculated, devitalised, denatured. The spirit is a methylated spirit.

In many cases bitter experience has brought them to this, not the tireless demonstrations of Major Douglas and *The Social Crediter* that it was inevitable.

The Financial Times mentions Saskatchewan. In British Columbia, the third of the oil Provinces in Canada, the result of the election just staged is not known, five only

(all "Social Credit") of the candidates for 48 seats having been elected on the first count. The second choices will be made known on July 4. "The-darling-of-Wall-Street-Party" was making a bid for power in both of Alberta's neighbour Provinces. "Social Credit?—we welcome it!" may be a cry not far off; but this is a minor concern compared with the contingency that wise as they now are after the event, Social Crediters are still confronted with the time-lag which seems incidental to their self-preparation to play the part they desire to play in world affairs. It is to be hoped that the completeness of the demonstration afforded by the *Financial Times* article (and by the facts it drives home) will make easier and quicker the process of future preparations. The foundations are solid, but to build upon them, the major tasks of the Social Credit movement lie ahead.

• • •

Canon V. A. Demant is Regius Professor of Pastoral and Moral Theology at Oxford. We see it stated that he has supported the Rev. Walton Hannah in his campaign for enquiry into the relations between Freemasonry and the Church of England to the considerable extent of giving his opinion that a Masonic oath is invalid for a Christian. The *Daily Mirror* last week ran a feature article on the subject matter of Mr. Hannah's forthcoming book, *Darkness Visible*. We have expressed our opinion that the powers behind Freemasonry may have come to the conclusion that Freemasonry has become too common, and the advantages which membership of the Lodge entails too general. The Age of the Common Man is all right provided there aren't too many common men.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

A Meeting for supporters of the Social Credit Secretariat and regular readers of *The Social Crediter* has been arranged to take place at

The CORA HOTEL,
Upper Woburn Place, W.C.1.,
at 6-30 p.m. on Saturday, July 12, 1952.

Speaker: Dr. Tudor Jones.

In order that arrangements may be completed, will those who intend to apply for admission tickets, for which a fee of 2/6 each is charged, please do so before July 3?

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: May 30, 1952.

Consultative Councils (Consumer Representation)

(The Debate continued. Mr. Pitman is speaking):

I would claim that the public is universally extremely dissatisfied particularly over prices. For instance, in Bath the price of gas has gone up 273 per cent. since the days before the war. The public generally hoped that nationalisation would lower prices, and they feel that a basic source of the trouble has been that the consumer is not being adequately represented. Everybody would agree that the consumer is much weaker than he used to be, that when there were small undertakings, locally run, he was, then, in a far stronger position to make his wishes felt than he is today with these large aggregations.

I would liken the consumer councils at the moment to a company trade union. The management nominate the president. He is one of their board members paid by them to act as president. They pay the secretary of the union and the union is seen to work largely in the interest of the company largely in secret, not telling its membership what is happening.

We as a House ought now to begin thinking of what is to happen in the future for consumer representation. . .

I want to put forward some such suggestions in line with a paper which I gave to the British Institute of Management on this subject, to which the hon. Member for Edge Hill (Mr. Irvine) was good enough to refer in the debate I have mentioned. First, we must take a policy decision that the council is to be on the side of the consumer and not on the side of management; that it should be advocate for the consumer against management, not for management against consumers. Secondly, we must therefore discontinue the present loyalty of the chairman and the secretary to the board, to the management they are there to criticise. We must make them loyal only to the consumer.

Then we must appoint a central staff office to serve consumer councils and consumer representation generally. After all, that is what the staff of the Public Accounts Committee do for this House in its consumer representation, and it is exactly what the town clerk's and city treasurer's offices do for the council in their erstwhile control of their undertakings. That will give the consumer council information and help which is essential for criticism. For instance, we want to know what is the basis of appreciation. Have they written up all the assets to the present replacement value and then put on a swinging charge for depreciation quite different from the charges in the old days? A consumers' council must have the staff office to go into that with skill before it can do the job properly.

Then we need to bring the local authorities more into consumer representation. . . .

I would certainly continue the area meetings, but I should have the councillors here too, briefed by their staff officers from the centre. Again, I say that all these meetings should be in public. I have made the point that the

consumer councils are powerless. Their only power is as it were, the publicity against wrongness which they can evoke in support of rightness. . . .

House of Commons: June 10, 1952.

Film Quota (Defaults)

Mr. Swingler asked the President of the Board of Trade what recommendations he has now received from the Cinematograph Films Council about the prosecution of film quota defaulters; and what action he proposes to take.

Mr. P. Thorneycroft: In respect of 55 theatres out of 105 cases of first feature default so far examined by the Cinematograph Films Council the advice given me is such that I would not be justified in issuing a certificate under Section 13 of the Cinematograph Films Act, 1938. I am considering which of these cases are suitable for prosecution. As regards supporting programme defaults, investigations are still proceeding. In the circumstances it would be best for me not to make any further comment.

Mr. Swingler: Will the right hon. Gentleman speed up his consideration of these widespread defaults in order to make the quota effective? Will he also look very carefully at the recommendations of the Cinematograph Films Council in view of the fact that the most notorious defaulters are represented in that Council and sit in judgment upon themselves?

Mr. Thorneycroft: With regard to the speed of my operations, I am doing a good deal better than the previous Government did. For the quota year 1948-49 no prosecution was heard until November, 1950.

Mr. Wyatt: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that he told me some weeks ago that the question of the prosecution of the Empire Cinema, Leicester Square, was under consideration, that cinema having shown one British film in the last two years? What is happening about this prosecution?

Mr. Thorneycroft: I am now, as in duty bound, taking the advice of the Cinematograph Films Council. When that advice is received, as it has been in these cases, I am examining the question of evidence and so forth with regard to prosecution.

Mr. Wyatt: Did not the right hon. Gentleman say he was considering the prosecution of this cinema before he received the advice of the Cinematograph Films Council?

Mr. Thorneycroft: If the hon. Member has a question on a particular cinema, perhaps he will put it down.

Fondant and Sugar-Fat Mixtures

Mr. Profumo asked the President of the Board of Trade to what extent international agreements prevent the United Kingdom from cutting out altogether imports of fondant and sugar-fat mixtures from foreign countries.

Mr. P. Thorneycroft: We have obligations under the O.E.E.C. Liberalisation Code and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade not to administer import restrictions so as to cause unnecessary damage to the commercial and economic interests of other countries. However, these obligations quite apart, in determining the level of our import

of particular commodities, we obviously must have regard as a practical matter to the desirability of admitting certain quantities in the interests of our general commercial relations with foreign countries. We have in fact already cut imports of fondant from foreign countries from about £8 million in 1951 to a rate of approximately £3 million in the first quarter of this year.

Mr. Profumo: Would my right hon. Friend not agree that as we now have to meet our E.P.U. deficits in gold, and assuming that we are taking what sugar we can get from Empire sources, it would be very much cheaper for us if we were to buy real sugar from Cuba for dollars? As regards G.A.T.T.—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—is my right hon. Friend not aware that the American slang expression for a revolver is a “gatt,” and is it not high time that this highly dangerous weapon was removed and prevented from threatening our trade?

Mr. Thorneycroft: I was in fact basing my answer not on the terms of international trading agreements so much as the practical desirability of not stopping all imports to this country because, if we do, we shall not be able to export. I really think that practical side must be borne in mind.

NATIONAL FINANCE

Personal Incomes (Net Receipts)

Sir T. Moore asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the net income derived from an earned gross income of £1,000 a year in March, 1914, March, 1939, March, 1951, and March, 1952, respectively.

Mr. R. A. Butler: For a married man with two children, £962, £888, £831 and £833, respectively. The figure for March, 1952, does not take account of my Budget proposals which came into operation only from 6th April: the corresponding figure under my Budget is £888.

Sir T. Moore: Does not this confirm the wisdom of my right hon. Friend's policy in seeking to reduce the cost of living? Does it not also show the necessity for reducing the standard rate of Income Tax as soon as possible?

Mr. Gaitskell: In view of that supplementary question, will the right hon. Gentleman tell the House by how much the cost of living has been reduced?

Mr. Butler: I have stated with the utmost frankness the effect of the Budget on the cost of living. I am glad to have, in the person of my right hon. and gallant Friend, a witness to the wisdom of the Chancellor's policy.

Mr. J. Hynd: Is the Chancellor aware that there are still a few workers under the £1,000 a year level? Would he give comparable figures for them?

Mr. Butler: I am glad to say that in the case of some 16 million persons and their dependents there will be a considerable reduction in operation from the end of this week or thereabouts. That would seem to be a very satisfactory state of affairs, and I hope that it will have its effect on the cost of living.

National Debt Commissioners

Mr. Donnelly asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer when the National Debt Commissioners last met; how many

staff are still employed in their offices; and what is their function.

Mr. R. A. Butler: The Commissioners last met in 1860. Their functions are exercised by the Comptroller-General of the National Debt Office who has direct access, when the occasion arises, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Governor, and Deputy Governor, of the Bank of England who are the three active Commissioners.

The staff of the National Debt Office totals 49. Their main functions are the investment of a number of public funds including the Post Office Savings Bank, The Trustee Savings Banks, and the National Insurance Funds, and the application of Government Sinking Funds. They also grant and pay Government Life Annuities, and have administrative duties in connection with the Trustee Savings Banks.

Mr. Donnelly: Would it not be a good thing to tidy up this queer administrative anomaly?

Mr. Butler: The arrangement seems to be working perfectly satisfactorily.

Mr. H. Hynd: Can the right hon. Gentleman give an assurance that these Commissioners will meet regularly every century?

Moscow Conference (Contracts)

Mr. Baker White asked the President of the Board of Trade what is the value of contracts placed with British firms by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, her satellites and China as a result of the Moscow International Economic Conference.

Mr. P. Thorneycroft: I have seen a reference in the Press to the conclusion of a contract at Moscow for the sale of sheepskins to Russia, but, apart from this, I am not aware that any contracts have been placed with United Kingdom firms as a result of the Moscow Conference.

Grassland Ploughing and Sowing

Mr. Hurd asked the Minister of Agriculture how many acres of grassland have been ploughed and cropped for this year's harvest, following the announcement in February of the £5 an acre ploughing grant; and if he will estimate the extent to which the downward trend in the tillage acreage shown in the last two years has now been reversed.

Mr. Nugent: Complete information is not yet available, but my right hon. and gallant Friend believes that the acreage of eligible grassland ploughed up and sown to approved crops in England and Wales will not be far short of 400,000 acres, so that the original forecast of 500,000 acres for the whole of the U.K. is likely to be an under-estimate. He would prefer not to attempt a prediction of the effect on the tillage acreage until the June returns have been analysed.

Coal Exports

Mr. Robson Brown asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what gross tonnage of coal he expects to export to overseas markets during 1952.

(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. 18.

Saturday, June 28, 1952.

"Public Investment"*

In our last issue we dealt with the policy of further sacrifice advocated by Fabian Socialist Professor H. W. Arndt. Professor Arndt stresses the importance of ensuring that "private investment" is curtailed in favour of "public investment." His views are reinforced by his fellow-Socialist, Sir Douglas Copland, who in an address at the Construction Industries Fair in Sydney on April 6, said that any tendency to reduce "public investment" "is a policy of despair and does not show a proper realisation of the role that investment plays in the economy." Sir Douglas developed his views further by saying that "Any reduction of public investment, as well as slowing down the rate of economic development, would also reduce the demands for labour and resources and could cause a fall in national income beyond that necessary to correct inflation. . . .

Sir Douglas Copland's statements are a tacit admission that the production system does not distribute sufficient purchasing power to individuals to buy goods produced. There are various ways of masking the deficiency of purchasing power, and Sir Douglas mentions two of them. A "favourable balance of trade" simply means that the local volume of money is increased without any increase in local consumer goods for sale. New credits are created and paid to producers and exporters for goods sent out of the country. The supply of goods is reduced and the supply of money increased. Under present financial rules all industrial nations are compelled to strive for greater export markets, not primarily because there is a necessity to import goods from other countries, but to prevent economic collapse at home. There is practically nothing which the Americans require from other countries, but it is an indisputable fact that, failing a modification of internal financial policies, the American economy would have been in chaos if it had not been for big dollar loans abroad—and, of course, the Korean "police action."

"Public Investment" is not merely another technique for seeking to overcome a deficiency of purchasing power; it is an important aspect of the conspiracy to bring every aspect of human activity under centralised control. The very use of the term "public investment" by the economists and other power-lusters, is dishonest. The suggestion is that the members of the public voluntarily invest their money in various Government activities. The hundreds of millions of pounds which are to be spent on the Snowy River Scheme† will be compulsorily taken from the individual by the Federal Government. Even if a portion of the

money is made available by the expansion of new credits, it is still being filched from the individual, who has no choice of how his money shall be invested.

As we have repeatedly said, all capital production means an immediate lowering of the potential standard of living. The rate of all capital expansion should, therefore, be freely determined by the individual, who would probably prefer that the hundreds of millions to be spent on a Snowy River Scheme which may not benefit him for 30 or more years, might be better spent on improving his immediate standard of living. And if new credits can be created by the Government, or acquired from individuals who find that a Government-dominated banking system will lend them credit to invest in "essential industry," then it is obvious that the same credits could be made available to ensure that the individual had sufficient purchasing power to buy all the goods and services he and his fellows had produced.

The Cat Is Out Of The Bag

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

Sir,—The national executive of the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers has done a public service in disclosing (June 10th) the text of the letter which Mr. J. A. Birch, secretary of the union, wrote on behalf of the executive to Sir Vincent Tewson, general secretary of the Trades Union Congress, criticising the T.U.C. General Council's statement on rearmament published on May 30th. By this criticism it has drawn our attention to the details of that statement, which reveal very clearly the motives behind the Trades Union Congress's support of rearmament.

Mr. Birch says that his executive was particularly surprised to find the argument adduced that any curtailment of the programme of rearmament could lead to difficulties on the grounds that it might accentuate the tendency towards unemployment. "It is surely incumbent upon the trade union movement," the letter continues, "to advise a more progressive and positive policy than to appear to justify (even incidentally) a rearmament programme as a means of creating employment. Otherwise the achievement of our ultimate objective of a negotiated settlement leading to disarmament might be presented to the trade unions as a mixed blessing."

The same dilemma confronted American industrialists and politicians a year ago, when the time was approaching for the truce talks to begin, with the possibility of a cease-fire in Korea. The New York correspondent of the Sunday Times then (8th July, 1951) described the fear that was felt lest Congress might relax and reduce expenditure on defence. Industry, he said, appeared to be at one with the White House in wanting to keep the defence programme going under a full head of steam, since spending on defence was the most dynamic factor in the American economy of the day.

This problem (so clearly brought to light now by the T.U.C. statement and the U.S.D.A.W.'s criticism of it), must remain as long as a policy of full employment is necessary to keep the industrial system working, based as it is, on false premises, which fail to take into account the nation's real credit

Yours faithfully,

ALICE RAVEN.

London, June 22.

*From *The New Times* (Melbourne) of May 2.

†Australia's hydro-electric scheme.

"Letters from England"

By ROBERT SOUTHEY

(continued)

LETTER LX. (p. 368.) In the celestial hierarchy, we are told, the gradations, though infinite, are imperceptible; so gradual is the ascent, and so beautiful and perfect is order in heaven. Experience shows that something like this is desirable in civil society; at least, where the limits of rank are most strongly marked, there is there the worst tyranny and the most abject misery, as among the castes of Hindostan. Towards this evil the English are tending; the commercial system enriches on the one hand upon the aristocracy, and on the other it treads down the peasants, and little landholders the yeomanry as they were called who were once the strength of England. Half a century ago the country was divided into small farms; here was a race of men above the labourers though labourers themselves; not superior to their hinds in manners or education, and living at the same table with them, but still in independence, and with that feeling of independence which was the pride of the country, and which has made the country what it is. These men have disappeared since agriculture has become a trading speculation: field has been joined to field; a money farmer comes like Aaron's rod, and swallows up all within his reach. Agriculture is certainly materially improved; whether the markets be better supplied or not is disputed; there is less competition, and the rich cultivator can withhold produce which his poorer predecessor must have brought to sale. In this point perhaps the advantages and disadvantages may be equal. But the evil is that there is one gradation the less in society; that the second step in the ladder is taken away. And this evil is felt and acknowledged; the race of domestic servants were formerly the children of these little farmers; they were decently and religiously educated; and because they were of respectable parentage, they possessed a sort of family pride which made them respectable themselves. But the labouring and manufacturing poor have no leisure to breed up their children religiously, and no means to do it decently, and a very general depravity of the servants is complained of.

The gentry of small fortune have also disappeared. The colonial war bore hard upon them [The American War of Independence, 1775-83], but the last war has crushed them. [The War of the French Revolution, 1793-1802]. Inheriting what to their forefathers had been an ample subsistence, they have found themselves step by step curtailed of the luxuries and at last of the comforts of life, without a possibility of helping themselves. For those who arrived at manhood it was too late to enter into any profession; and to embark what they possessed in trade was hazarding all, and putting themselves at the mercy of a partner. Meantime year after year the price of every article of necessary consumption has increased with accelerating rapidity: education has become more costly and at the same time more indispensable; and taxation year after year falls heavier, while the means of payment become less. In vain does he whose father has lived in opulence, and whom the villagers with hereditary respect still address as a gentleman, or bow to as they pass,—in vain does he put down the carriage, dismiss the footman, and block up the windows even in the house

front. There is no escape. Wine disappears from his sideboard; there is no longer a table ready for his friend; the priest is no longer invited after service—all will not do: his boys must out to sea or seek their fortune in trade; his girls sink lower, and become dependents on the rich, or maintain themselves by the needle, while he mortgages the land, for immediate subsistence, deeper and deeper as the burthen of the times presses heavier and heavier;—and happy is he if it lasts long enough to keep him from absolute want before he sinks into the grave.

While one part of the community is thus depressed by the effects of war, and the commercial system, and the diminished value of money, they who are in the lucky scale rise as others sink; the merchants and bankers and contractors make their way by wealth even into the ranks of the nobility. . . . The indiscriminate admission to nobility is a practice which produces the same mischievous effect upon public opinion. They must be short-sighted politicians who do not see that, if they would have nobility respected, they should reserve it as the reward of great and signal services; that it is monstrous to give the same honours and privileges to a man because he has the command of three or four boroughs, as to Nelson for the battle of the Nile. This however is not all the evil; the political system of the country is altered by it, and the power of the old nobles gradually transferred to a set of new men, to an aristocracy of wealth. The Lords of England form the second power in the state, and no law can be enacted till, it has received their approbation. About a century ago the party in opposition to the crown was known to be the strongest in the house of lords, and the queen, knowing that her measures would also be out-voted, created twelve new peers, who turned the scale. [In 1712 Queen Anne created twelve Tory peers in order to secure a majority in the House of Lords for the Peace of Utrecht.] This open and undisguised exertion of the prerogative, to the actual subversion of the constitution as it then stood, provoked nothing more than a sarcasm. When the first of the new peers gave his vote upon the question, one of the old nobles (Lord Wharton) addressed himself to the rest, and said, "I suppose, gentlemen, you all vote by your foreman," alluding to their number, which was the same as that of a common jury. This practice of granting peerages has been more frequent during the present reign than at any former period, not less than three-fifths of the house of lords having been created, and the number is every year increased. But to the old aristocracy of the country every new creation is a diminution of their power and weight in the political scale. This evil will eventually occasion its own remedy; the lords will become at last too numerous for one assembly, and sooner or later some mode of election for seats must be resorted to for the younger peers, as is now the case in Scotland. . . .

LETTER XLVIII (Parliamentary Elections). . . . It is only in the large cities that any trial of public opinion is made,—for in the counties the contest, if any there be, lies between the great families, and a sort of hereditary influence is maintained, which is perhaps unobjectionable. But in large cities public opinion and faction have their full scope. Every resource of violence and cunning is here brought into play. . . . The qualification for voting differs at different places. . . . These abuses are not necessarily inherent in the nature of popular election; they would effectually be pre-

cluded by the use of the ballot. [Note. The adoption of the ballot had been urged by a number of Radical reformers, notably John Cartwright in his pamphlet *Take Your Choice!* (1776). But it was generally thought a wild-cat scheme, and Southey's advocacy of the ballot here shows how much of a radical he still was.] The popular party calls loudly for reform, but they are divided among themselves as to what reform they would have; and the aristocracy of the country, as they have everything in their own hands will never consent to any which would destroy their own influence.

One evil consequence results from this mode of representation which affects the rulers as well as the people. The house of commons has not, and cannot have, its proportion of talents: its members are wholly chosen from among persons of great fortune. The more limited the number out of which they are chosen, the less must be the chance of finding able men: there is therefore a natural unfitness in having a legislative body composed wholly of the rich. It is known both at schools and at universities, that the students of the privileged classes are generally remiss in their studies, and inferior in information for that reason to their contemporaries;—there is, therefore, less chance of finding a due proportion of knowledge among them. Being rich, and associating wholly with the rich, they have no knowledge of the real state of the great body for whom they legislate, and little sympathy for distresses which they have never felt: a legislature composed wholly of the rich is therefore liable to lay the public burthens oppressively upon the inferior ranks.

There are two ways in which men of talents who are not men of fortune find their way into parliament. The minister sometimes picks a few promising plants from the university, and forces them in his hot-bed. . . . The other method is by way of the law. But men who make their way up by legal practice, learn in the course of that practice to disregard right and wrong, and to consider themselves entirely as pleaders on one side. They continue to be pleaders and partisans in the legislature, and never become statesmen.

From these causes it is, that while the English people are held in admiration by all the world, the English government is regarded in so very different a light; and hence it is, that the councils of England have been directed by such a succession of weak ministers, and marked by such a series of political errors. An absolute monarch looks for talents wherever they are to be found, and the French negotiators have always recovered whatever the English fleets have won. [A reflection that applies most completely to the Peace of Utrecht (1713.) At the Peace of Versailles (1783) the position was almost reversed: the revived power of the English fleets in the later stages of the war did much to bring the French negotiators to agree to terms.]

Long peace is no more unfavourable to the skill of an army, than long security to the wisdom of a government. In times of internal commotion, all stirring spirits come forward; the whole intellect of a nation is called forth; good men sacrifice the comforts of a wise privacy to serve their country; bad men press on to advance themselves; the good fall a sacrifice, and the government is resigned into the hands of able villains. When on the contrary everything has long been safe as is the case in England, politics become an established trade; to which a certain cast are regularly born and

bred. They are bred to it as others to the navy, to the law, or to the church; with this wide difference, that no predisposing attitude of talents has been consulted, and no study of the profession is required. It is fine weather; the ship is heavy laden; she has a double and treble allowance of officers and supernumeraries,—men enough on board, but no seamen; still it is fine weather, and as long as it continues so the ship sails smoothly, and every thing goes on as well as if Christopher Columbus himself had the command. Changes are made in the equipage; the doctor and the pilot take each other's places, the gunner is made cook, and the cook gunner; it may happen, indeed, that he may charge the guns with peas, and shoot them with potatoes,—what matters it while there is no enemy at hand?

(To be continued).

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd: On 24th March last, in reply to a Question by my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Ayr (Sir. T. Moore) I announced the Government's decision to increase coal exports this year by 2 million tons as compared with 1951. I am glad to announce that the Government now propose to make a further increase on 1½ million tons.

House of Commons: June 11, 1952.

U.N.E.S.C.O. (Spain)

Mr. Driberg asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs why the British representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations voted for the admission of Spain to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisations.

Mr. Nutting: The object of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation is to promote international collaboration in the field of education, science and culture. Her Majesty's Government saw no good reason to oppose the admission of Spain to the Organisation and trust that it may be of some benefit to the Spanish people.

Mr. Driberg: Is it the view of Her Majesty's Government that the present Government of Spain can contribute something of value to the political and cultural education of the world?

Mr. Nutting: We believe that the way to get the best out of these organisations is to make them as universal and all-embracing as possible.

Major Beamish: Could political prejudice be carried to further extremes than to oppose the admission of Spain to U.N.E.S.C.O. while at the same time favouring the admission of Communist China which has more than 500,000 men in the field fighting against the United Nations?

Mr. Nutting: While declining the invitation to take this answer rather broader than the Question on the Order Paper, might I inform my hon. and gallant Friend that we have followed the action of the United Nations in this matter? After the reversal in the General Assembly in November, 1950, of the resolution of 1946 against Spain being on these specialised agencies, the Socialist Government voted in favour of Spain's admission to the World Health Organisation and

Food and Agriculture Organisation. We believe that this admission to U.N.E.S.C.O. follows along those lines.

Mr. McNeil: As the hon. Gentleman has told us that he believes that these organisations will function best with the nearest to universal membership, can the House take it that if China applies for admission she will have the support of Her Majesty's Government?

Mr. Nutting: The right hon. Gentleman will not be surprised when I ask him to put that question on the Order Paper.

Mr. McNeil: I must press this. May I ask the hon. Gentleman if he has given a flat undertaking to the House, and, in view of that flat undertaking, will Her Majesty's Government support the Government of China if they apply for membership?

Mr. Nutting: I have said already and I think I carry the House with me, that the right hon. Gentleman must really put a question of that nature on the Order Paper.

British Broadcasting Corporation (Charter)

Mr. Beverley Baxter (Southgate): . . . I never thought that in this House I should find my political and personal friend the Home Secretary saying so many things with which I disagreed, or that I should find the right hon. Member for Lewisham, South (*Mr. H. Morrison*) expressing so much of what I thought. That is an embarrassing position. I almost think that the Home Secretary may have had some part in that first effort in the direction of a sponsored programme in this country. It is a little joke which is worth repeating tonight.

It is said that Beecham's told a certain church that they would supply their hymn books provided that they could do some concealed advertising. One day at Christmas, the congregation sang:

"Hark the herald angels sing,
Beecham's pills are just the thing.
Peace on earth and mercy mild
Two for man and one for child."

I find the Home Secretary saying that that is the kind of thing we should have now. [*Interruption.*] To my astonishment, some of my hon. Friends disagree with me.

I have had more experience of sponsored television than they have had—sponsored television. I am fortunate enough to go to the United States every winter. I do not entirely agree that they are less civilised than we are.

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: I never for a moment said that. I said they were a less mature and sophisticated people

Mr. Baxter: I accept that at once. I was putting it in the way I did to save time. To say they are less mature is, I think true. That is part of their charm. Youth is the oldest tradition of America.

To sit over there through a three-or-four-hour sponsored television programme is to come under a terrorisation of the mass suggestion of advertising. I mean this quite seriously. I hope that I shall not be accused of vulgarity for what I am about to say, but I think we must speak bluntly here.

The American girl, for example, is supposed to be the finest of her kind in the world. She is supposed to be the

quintessence of feminine charm. What do the advertisers say about her on the radio, on the television? I shall put it as gently as I can. She suffers from dandruff, from body odour, from halitosis. I could go on.

I do not for a moment believe it is true—I do not know, but the terrorisation of suggestion is not comparable to reading a newspaper, in which one can perhaps read a Sunday columnist if one has nothing else to do, or can look at the advertising if one wishes. But to see actors come and act a part and all declare that they only smoke such and such a cigarette—it is not true. And all the time is this monster of a 100 per cent. concentrated interest at any given moment. They thrust and thrust until it becomes an interference with the whole way of life. That is why I agree so much with what the right hon. Member for Lewisham, South said.

I was also very much impressed because both the right hon. Gentleman and I remember I am afraid, the first motor car, the first telephone, the first bicycle. All those have been in our time, but in those days what was life like in an ordinary home? In Canada life was very much the same as here, but more comfortable because of our central heating. We read—started with Dickens, went on to Thackeray, moved through the French writers, and had an Oscar Wilde period; we had concerts, we made our own music.

I have in my house a radio set, and now I have a television set. The piano remains silent; I am afraid the radio remains silent. This White Paper is a death sentence on what is left of radio. Radio is finished—I do not think that can be stopped. The moment sight is added to sound, one cannot do without the other, it is so elemental. Therefore, I do not see why anybody is worried about the necessary revenue for television. The sale of radio sets will fall and fall all the time and the sale of television sets will go up, and the result of that will be to give television the revenue it requires.

Mr. Charles Ian Orr-Ewing (Hendon, North): The B.B.C. in their evidence, in Appendix XII, page 84, forecast that by 1958 the total number of licences will be 3½ million. Is my hon. Friend saying that that is quite erroneous evidence, that the B.B.C.'s best estimates are quite wrong and that many more television sets will be bought at present prices and Purchase Tax rates?

Mr. Baxter: If there is enough material to produce the sets sales will be much greater than that. It means that we are now all conniving at the beginning of the end of sound radio; the other will replace it, we cannot help it.

It is a great pity that the House is dividing tonight on the B.B.C. Charter. I do not think that it is a party question at all. The Home Secretary said, "Let us have no party polemics," but we all know that the Government have issued a three-line Whip for tonight. I am very sorry, but I say quite frankly that since it is a three-line Whip I shall vote in the Lobby because I would rather have sponsored programmes than a Socialist Government. I shall vote with a heavy heart simply because I do not want this Government out. . . .

The Assistant Postmaster-General (Mr. David Gammans): . . . As most of us expected that it would, the debate has concentrated on the proposals for the appoint-

ment of the Governors and on the question of sponsored television. Those are the two points which appear in the Opposition Amendment. First of all, on the appointment of the Governors. I want to try to explain to the House what has led the Government to take this action. They have thought about it very carefully, and it is only because they hold very sincerely that this change is desirable that they have made the change at all. . .

. . . The objective is one thing and one thing only—to take the B.B.C. out of party politics; not to take it out of Parliamentary control, but to take it out of party politics. As my right hon. and learned Friend said in opening the debate, there has never been any question of doubting the impartiality of the Governors in the past, and this proposal was in no sense a criticism of them.

Mr. Ivor Owen Thomas (The Wrekin) rose—

Mr. Gamman: I cannot give way.

We live in a time when the lights of freedom are being dimmed all over the world and when totalitarian governments are spreading from one end of the world to the other. We should be foolish in the extreme if we took the view that, because the B.B.C. has never been accused of partiality in the past, there is no danger of its falling into undesirable hands in the future. The most foolish thing a Democracy could say today is the phrase: "It couldn't happen here." That phrase could easily be the epitaph of the tombstone of Democracy.

There is another reason which prompted the Government to put forward this idea. It is not only that the B.B.C. must be taken out of political hands, but it must appear to be so taken. I understand from the Governors of the B.B.C. that from time to time they are accused of political partiality, but that on the whole the charges made by one party balance the charges made by another. If this new method is adopted, no suspicion of partiality will remain.

The Opposition have made great play with the point that if they agreed with this proposal Parliament would be losing its control over the B.B.C. The proposal is deliberately intended to mean that, so far as the appointment of Governors is concerned, Parliament shall lose its control. To suggest that by so doing Parliament is losing control over the B.B.C. generally is, in my submission, absolute nonsense. After all, the House still controls the amount of money that the B.B.C. shall spend. As my right hon. and learned Friend has said, the affairs of the B.B.C. can be brought up in this House on many occasions.

The right hon. Member for Lewisham, South made what I thought was superficially a good point. He said: "This is no real safeguard against the misuse of the B.B.C.'s powers. If ever dictatorship came to this country, what would be the value of the provisions in the White Paper?" It is not against that sort of danger that these provisions are meant to operate. I would agree that if ever we came to the stage of absolute dictatorship in this country nothing that appeared in the constitution would be any safeguard to anybody. Anybody who takes that view has misread the history of Communism during the past 10 years.

If ever a dictatorship comes to this country it will not be my military *coup d'état*. It will be by gradual infiltration of Communist practices by people who do not claim to be

Communists but pretend that they are something else. Czechoslovakia was never conquered by the Red Army entering Prague. If the B.B.C. ever gets into the wrong hands it will not be because some-one turns up in Langham Place with a Tommy gun. It will be because insidious pressure will have been put on the B.B.C. over a period of time.

It is disturbing that the Opposition will not support this safeguard. It means either that they do not see there is a danger or that, if they do see there is a danger, it does not worry them. I should have thought there was another reason why the Opposition would have favoured this proposal, which is that it would be an interesting experiment for other State Corporations. A large percentage of industry is now under State ownership, and the vast majority will remain there. Whatever may have been our misgivings when these industries were nationalised, it is now up to all of us to make them work. We know that it is difficult enough in all conscience to run a nationalised industry, but if there is one thing which would do more than anything to establish confidence in the nationalised industries, it would be to remove in every sense their control from the political arena.

. . . We want to get away from the idea that anyone was appointed because he was a Conservative or Socialist. For this reason we might have expected the support of the Opposition on this question.

I come now to the other issue, that of sponsoring. As my right hon. and learned Friend said in opening, this proposal is in the nature of a compromise between two opposite points of view very sincerely and passionately held but, apparently, quite irreconcilable. I want to assure the House that this is not a compromise prompted by either weakness or irresolution. It is a genuine attempt to meet the views held on both sides. Behind this compromise are very distinct and vital principles, and the first is—and here we differ entirely from right hon. Gentlemen opposite—that this Government do not believe in monopolies. It would be possible for this Government to take a stand against monopolies and allow the B.B.C. monopoly to exist.

The second principle is that the B.B.C., with a high reputation established over many years, shall not be interfered with. It remains the principle instrument of television and the sole instrument of sound broadcasting. It retains its present wavelengths. It alone will get revenue from the State, and there is no interference with its present plans of development both in sound and television. What is more, it is to have a priority in the fulfilment of those plans before it is expected to meet any competition at all.

I should like to try to state what are the two opposing schools of thought as revealed by this debate. Many of my hon. Friends take the view that in breaking the B.B.C. monopoly the Government are not going fast enough or far enough. They see no reason why the competition should not exist in sound broadcasting. They point out that a very high frequency station can be set up at a small fraction of the cost of a television station, and even with the present restriction on capital development, the very high frequency station could be working in a short space of time.

(To be continued).