

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 28. No. 19.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

LIGHT IN OUR DARKNESS.

Chicago, Friday, May 16, 1952.

Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the former Socialist Government, to-day called for an international economic conference to draw up a programme to deal with these three major economic problems:—

- (1) Continuing lack of balance between the dollar area and the rest of the world.
- (2) Maintenance of full employment as defence contracts end.
- (3) Need for large-scale investment in under-developed areas.

Mr. Gaitskell, who was addressing the Executive Club in Chicago, declared that to strike a balance of trade between the dollar area and the rest of the world the United States must buy more, or a means of financing the export surplus must be found.

... "If," he said, "the present rate of saving continues and American home investment does not take up the slack as defence contracts fall off, a recession may develop with disastrous consequences for the rest of the world.

"One method of dealing with this danger will be to increase investment in the under-developed areas. This is highly desirable on political and humanitarian grounds, because we ought to be planning increased food and raw material production, and in the interest of maintaining full employment in western democracies."—Reuter.

Not in Confidence

An Open Letter to a Friend in the United States:

By NORMAN F. WEBB.

Dear—

I wonder did you see any reports of a recent address given to the Executive Club of Chicago, by Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, the last Chancellor of the Exchequer in the late Socialist government in this country? Whether you did, or didn't, I want to make some comments on it to you, because of its bearing on a theme which you and I have discussed time and again. Now that you have returned to your native country, I can write to you in your capacity as an American citizen, giving you a warning that might stand as an Open Letter from this side of the Atlantic to the citizens of your big territory, as you call it.

Though Mr. Gaitskell has held the highest ministerial post in our government next to that of Prime Minister, he is

primarily an Internationalist. This is inevitable, since he is a member of the Socialist party, whose political beliefs compel them to put international interests before national interests on every occasion. I shall have something further to say regarding his origins and the background of his party, if there is space left after I have dealt with his Chicago address, for this cannot in the nature of things be a short letter. However, I don't want you to get the impression from what I have said that I am criticising Mr. Gaitskell, or trying "to knock" him as a political opponent, from my position as a supporter of the Conservative Party, to whom I give my vote with about the same qualification as you do yours to the Republicans. In my view, all political parties are under far too great a pressure from international interests, as distinct from national. It is obvious that the state of the world in general, which above all others, Mr. Gaitskell and his kind, the professional Social-Economists, have done so much to promote, has become so complex and confused as to be quite beyond the ability of party politics to deal with it.

Mr. Gaitskell's mission, apparently—if the reports in the papers are to be trusted, and I see no reason why they should not be, since he has been saying exactly the same sort of thing for the last twenty years, was to tell you in America what is economically wrong with the world, and what you have to do about it. The three main problems, as he sums them up are:—(1) The continued lack of balance of payments between the dollar area (yourselves on the North American Continent), and the rest of the world (sometimes known as the Sterling area); (2) Maintenance of full employment in America as defence contracts end; and (3) Need for large-scale investment on your part in the under-developed areas of the world. It is hardly necessary to add that Mr. Gaitskell, being an internationalist, wants an international economic Conference called by you to discuss these three problems. Whether Mr. Gaitskell's presentation of the case appears to you over there to have anything new or striking about it, I don't know. But we seem to have been listening to nothing else all our lives, and particularly since 1945, when the Socialist Party, who may be regarded as the official exponents of this philosophical outlook, got control of our machinery of government. During this time we have been compelled physically to experience the fruits of the philosophy in the shape of restriction of diet and clothing and a shortage of everything but bureaucratic legislation.

You in America need not begin at this late hour to follow our example. For I believe, as firmly as I believe in anything, that the international policy advocated by Mr. Gaitskell is based on an entirely false and archaic picture of the actual economic situation, and is a mistaken and disastrous policy. Owing, however, to Great Britain's insular position, which, if she should become detached from her

Empire—as it were a capital cut off from its hinterland—admittedly looks precarious, the threats and fears and apprehensions of the Internationalists are rendered very difficult to parry; assuming as they do, an inevitably hostile world. But when almost the same threatening parrot-cries are uttered in the entirely different setting of your self-sufficient economic and political area, it should not be difficult for you to see that they have no foundation at all in economic fact.

Before I start to analyse Mr. Gaitskell's three statements—economic problems, he calls them,—I want to make it clear that I am doing so solely from the economic point of view, and as they affect the United States alone. I emphasise this point because I have an idea that Mr. Gaitskell, whether intentionally or unintentionally, confuses economic problems and financial problems, treating them as one and the same thing in practice. Nevertheless, I feel equally certain that Mr. Gaitskell, were I to call him a financier would protest that he is nothing of the kind, that he is a professional economist. In that case I would be justified in describing him as the servant of the financiers; and since he is an avowed Internationalist, as being in the service of International Finance. Certainly the theories he holds and the solutions he propounds are indistinguishable from theirs.

To take Mr. Gaitskell's economic problems, as he calls them, in order,—his judgment of the International situation and its requirements. His first is the lack of balance in payments as between the United States and the rest of the world. In this connection he urges that you should buy more from the sterling area, in order to enable it to buy more from you. In the first place, if that is going to be the result, it will only leave the balance of payments where it stands, with the rest of the world in default to America. And in the second, why should your people buy more of what you can supply yourselves with? A short list of strategic materials represents your requirements of the outside world. Remove the threat of war, and most of that even would disappear. I think that is incontrovertible, but please believe that I put it forward purely as a statement of economic fact, not as an argument for or against isolationism or any other political idea.

Assuming that, economically anyway, it disposes of Mr. Gaitskell's first problem, or rather his solution of it—because unless America exports without chalking up anything against the outside world, it is obvious there can be no improvement in the credit balance situation,—may I turn next to number three in his list, the need for large-scale overseas investment on your part. This, it appears to me, is only number one put in different words. If you agree with me that the economic situation of your own country is as I have stated; that there is, in fact, no economic problem at all in the sense that Mr. Gaitskell sees it, as far as you are concerned, since you produce all, and more than all you require among yourselves, the same arguments apply exactly to the suggested need for overseas investment on your part. In such a happy state of economic equilibrium as yours, overseas investment can mean no more than advances of credit on your part to enable the foreigner—in which category I am of course including myself—to consume your products. He can't pay you for them, except in

goods which you don't want and won't take. And again, Mr. Gaitskell's disturbing Balance of Payments is only going to grow more cock-eyed.

With us over here, it is up to a point different, for not being naturally self-supporting, there are quite a lot of things we must import, and for which we are quite ready to pay in exports. But you will note that Mr. Gaitskell quite indiscriminately urges the need of the same policy on both of us, though the situation of our two countries is diametrically different. In short, Mr. Gaitskell is mentally confused and confusing, whether intentionally or not makes no difference to the result of trying to act on his advice. We in this country have been compelled to, ever since 1945; but, as I said, you needn't; and if you don't want trouble, you won't.

So that it would seem that Mr. Gaitskell urges overseas trading on you, a course that is economically unnecessary, if not impossible as the solution to an economic problem which we have seen doesn't exist in your case. That the ex-Finance Minister of another country should publicly call on you to convene an International Economic Conference to tackle a crisis which so far as you are concerned, is no crisis, should at least raise suspicions that perhaps he had an axe to grind at your expense. Possibly it is the same with his second problem; the maintenance of full employment as defence contracts come to an end. Regarded from the same point of view as we have held to so far, we may find it is no more of an economic problem, and no more threatening to you in the United States, than were his other two bogies: Balance of Payments, and the closed foreign investment field, which, if they are problems at all, begin to look purely problems of international finance, with which Mr. Gaitskell is trying to saddle you.

Again, I must point out the difficulties which exist over here in getting a clear picture of the matter as compared with your country. We are always being reminded by the international economists that we are utterly dependent on World Trade, which, up to a point, is quite true. If conditions are such that we cannot import raw materials, we are unable to produce finished goods in payment for them; for lack of American steel and cotton, and Australian wool, and Canadian timber and wheat, our whole island economy would come to a standstill. That is the threatening appearance of the situation. I say appearance, advisedly, because in fact those never have been the conditions of a trade slump in this, or any other country; at such times the trader is only too ready to sell; it is the lack of a demand, not of supply, that is the feature of a slump. In short, a slump with its accompaniment of unemployment, does not originate in a lack or a superabundance of economic commodities, but is purely financial in origin. With us, as I say, this fact is not so easily seen, because world trade—or Empire trade, at least—is more or less essential, so that we are led to identify lack of internal trade with lack of external trade, and to attribute the one to the other. But with you who have no need whatsoever for external trade, the truth is at once apparent—or should be—that should a slump and unemployment make their appearance within your own area, as Mr. Gaitskell seems to fear it may, it cannot be economic in origin, and therefore must be financial, arising from a lack of effective demand; that is, of money in the pockets of the consumer, or business organisations in want of work-

ing capital. There must, I think, be something "phoney" about this catastrophe of slump and unemployment with which Mr. Gaitskell threatens you—a country literally flowing with milk and honey—equally with us, whose country's situation appears so diametrically opposite and, as he thinks, verging on starvation. On the evidence, do you think his advice is likely to be very sound?

(To be continued).

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 11, 1952.

British Broadcasting Corporation (Charter)

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

Some of my hon. Friends—and I include my right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Leicester, South-East (Captain Waterhouse) and my hon. Friend the Member for Stratford (Mr. Profumo) in this—have got the impression that they doubt whether the Government are in earnest in their declaration that competition in television will be permitted. I know some of them take the view that the Government have deliberately chosen the more expensive medium, that is television, as opposed to sound broadcasting, because it means putting off for a longer time the thing that they want.

My answer to that is that, so far as sound broadcasting is concerned, it can very well be argued that the monopoly of the B.B.C. has long since been broken. Anyone in this country with a reasonably good set can tune in to a variety of stations abroad. We have heard a lot about Radio Luxembourg. I do not know how many people listen to it, but it is claimed that every night they have an average listening public of 5,000,000 people. What this programme is, in effect, is a British commercial station in regard to which we have the worst of all possible worlds. We have no means of influencing the programmes, and the Government derives no direct revenue from it. The reason why we have chosen television is that in television, on the other hand, there is only one station, and that is the B.B.C.

Several of my hon. Friends have raised the point as to whether the Government are in earnest, and I want to make this quite clear. The Government are in earnest, not only over breaking the B.B.C. monopoly, but also in permitting sponsored television. They have decided that the B.B.C. shall be allowed to have priority over the completion of the programmes that was held up because of the capital cuts. But that does not mean that, when adequate resources of money and materials are available, competitive television must wait until the B.B.C. extension is complete in all respects. It does not mean that the B.B.C. will have to put the last coat of varnish on any building that they may put up before competitive television can be started. In fact, it is the hope of the Government that it will be possible before long that this experiment can actually be started and that the controlling body should be set up. So much for what I believe to be the analysis of opinion as expressed on this side of the House.

What about the other side? It is a very long time since I remember a case which has been presented with

more exaggeration, not only in the House but outside it. To read some of the Press reports, one would have imagined that the B.B.C. was to be closed down altogether. There has been all this wild talk about taste being debased because people would be compelled to look at or to listen to programmes of a much lower standard than they had before. Never once in all the discussions has there been any suggestion that the B.B.C. should be curtailed, either in its money, its wavelengths, or its plans.

I see in "The Times" this morning the following statement:

"It was clear from the White Paper that pressure from an active group of Conservative back-benchers to upset the B.B.C. had been resisted."

I say to hon. Gentlemen opposite who wish to be assured, that there never has been the slightest suggestion of interfering in the B.B.C. in any respect whatsoever, except the breaking of their monopoly. If these experiments in sponsored television turn out to be as unpopular as hon. Gentlemen opposite suggest, all that they have to do is to summon the resolute energy to twiddle the knob. . . .

I am very interested to see why the Opposition defended their case. The right hon. Member for Lewisham, South denied that the B.B.C. was a monopoly at all. The right hon. Member, before he makes that sort of statement, had better get together with his right hon. Friend the Member for Smethwick (Mr. Gordon Walker), who in the debate on 19th July, 1951, said:

" . . . there should be a monopoly of broadcasting in this country under public control. . . ."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 19th July, 1951; Vol. 490, c. 1425.]

That is exactly what the B.B.C. is today. Lord Reith has always claimed that the B.B.C. is a monopoly, and of course, it is a monopoly in every sense of the word. If the opposition are going to say that the British people are to be compelled to accept a monopoly for their own good, then I say that no greater insult can be offered to our race. At election time we entrust the vote to people over the age of 21. They have full power to make most drastic decisions and they can read what newspapers they like. There is no censorship of films. What justification is there on ethical grounds for saying that in the limited field of radio and television the State should decide what they should see and what they should listen to?

What worries me, and what I think will worry many people in the country is, if the Opposition insist that there should be a monopoly of entertainment, what guarantee have we that they are going to stop there? Every argument used today to defend the B.B.C. monopoly could be used to justify a monopoly of the Press. . . .

. . . We have the argument constantly reiterated, but never explained, that competitive television must necessarily be bad and vulgar. All this talk about beer and Beethoven is good tub-thumping alliteration, but not good sense. Is there an objection that a Beethoven Symphony would be interrupted every few minutes by advertisements for beer, or anything else? Any company doing that would be out of business in 12 months—

Mr. Hobson: Not in the States.

Mr. Gammans: The hon. Member says "Not in the (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. 19.

Saturday, July 5, 1952.

From Week to Week

"I have lost faith in the present Governmental hierarchy of Great Britain. Also I have never had anything but mistrust for the Americans who now appear to rule us."—Lieut. Commander Alastair Mars, D.S.O., D.S.C., in a letter to the Admiralty.

The *Sunday Times's* choice of a metaphor in saying that the Prime Minister's answer to a "rattled and apprehensive" So-called-conservative Party rank and file was made with "almost Masonic secrecy" may suggest a confirmation of our opinion that the Big Freemasons are looking askance at the little freemasons. The fact that any tolerable future for the people of these islands is incompatible with the present leadership is still a Masonic secret, and one not likely to be widely penetrated. Encourage an M.P. into the frame of mind in which he views his prospect of remaining an M.P. without deep pessimism, and he couldn't care less.

Mr. R. E. Ansley, M.L.A., was first elected to the Alberta Legislature in 1935. He was re-elected in 1940, 1944 and 1948. In 1944 he was appointed Minister of Education but resigned four years later following differences with Mr. Manning on "fundamental principles." The *Edmonton Journal* forecasts his political liquidation at the hands of the caucus. If he does not re-enter the Legislative Assembly to represent his present constituency of Leduc as an independent at the next election—and if he decided that he would prefer to be elsewhere we should not blame him—one more genuine Social Crediter, perhaps the last, will have left Mr. Manning. That won't worry Mr. Manning. He doesn't know the significance of the demonstration which is being staged in Canada, that the thing "which failed in Alberta" has to be more and more widely sabotaged before the saboteurs can sleep soundly. Now, why must that be?

"He had barely arrived at Harwell before he began angling for university chairs in Italy, America and elsewhere. In the spring of 1950 when he [Pontecorvo] came to see Arnold with his information about his Communist brother, he was *inclining towards* a job at Liverpool University" (our emphasis). He got it! "Meanwhile the family set about planning their summer holiday in Italy." These points are cited from *The Traitors* by Alan Moorehead. Now, according to an interview in the *Liverpool Daily Post* at

this time, Pontecorvo, with the assistance of the welfare staff of Liverpool University, was house-hunting in Liverpool. Yet, "Security were well aware of Pontecorvo's departure, but they had not sufficient reason and no legal power to prevent him going." "Security" seems well able to know all that is going on, but quite unable to stop it—that would be illegal. But, short of stopping it, Security is not security. We haven't got security, and we are not intended to have it, either.

We have been reading the House of Lords Debate on Science and Industry, introduced by Viscount Samuel. We propose to print some of it.

Major Douglas has probably converted more relativists than any other man living; but we don't know them all. We do not claim Mr. Wyndham Lewis ("The Writer and the Absolute") as a convert; nor the Bishop of London, who reviews Herbert Agar's *Declaration of Faith* in a Sunday newspaper. Yet from the latter we quote:—

"There does not appear to be any very clear definition of what is meant by natural law. In one place Mr. Agar seems to accept the equation: Natural law = natural justice = reason as understood in the Common Law. He is quite certain that it belongs to the sphere of the absolute and not to that of the merely relative. His complete statement of faith would contain at least four points: first that no government may dictate on matters of conscience; second, that there are many things we must not do to our neighbour, such as degrade his moral freedom or dignity; third, that there are some things we must not do to the material world in which we live, such as ruin the soil to make quick profits on crops; and fourth, that there is an absolute sanction for these 'musts.' . . .

"This thesis is defended by reference to history. . . .

"The special part played by Christianity in this development was to make clearer than ever the sharp dualism between God and Cæsar. This produced a tension that is never felt by those who are willing to let the State take all. Nevertheless it is precisely such tension that is the parent of all our liberties. The absence of it is the real basis of Communism. The Communist system of production may (or may not) be admirable, but no true Westerner can accept Communism, because not production, but liberty, is his highest political end."

When, however, it comes to saying that these things "baffle" Statesmen, we demur.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The Meeting in London 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.

"Letters from England"

By ROBERT SOUTHEY

(continued)

LETTER LXI. The English are going to war . . . it seems as if the English, like the Jews of old, always were to have prophets, and never to believe them. The peace, however, short as its duration has been, has been highly beneficial. The English are no longer a divided people . . . There is no longer a party in the country who are desirous of a revolution, and as eager as they were able to disseminate the perilous principles of Jacobinism. Bonaparte has extinguished that spirit; he has destroyed all their partiality for the French Government, and Mr. Addington has conciliated them to their own. Never was there a time when the English were so decidedly Anti-Gallican, those very persons being the most so who formerly regarded France with the warmest hopes. Whence can have arisen this disposition in the populace, unless it be from the weight of taxation which affects them in the price of every article of life,—from a growing suspicion that their interest and the interest of their rulers are not the same, and a disposition to try any change for the chance there is that it may be for the better?

Two causes, and only two, will rouse a peasantry to rebellion; intolerable oppression, or religious zeal either for the right faith or the wrong; no other motive is powerful enough. A manufacturing poor is more easily instigated to revolt. They have no local attachments; the persons to whom they look up for support they regard more with envy than respect, as men who grow rich by their labour; they know enough of what is passing in the political world to think themselves politicians; they feel the whole burthen of taxation, which is not the case with the peasant, because he raises a great part of his own food; they are aware of their own numbers, and the moral feelings which in the peasant are only blunted, are in these men debauched. A manufacturing populace is always ripe for rioting—the direction which this fury may take is accidental; in 1780 it was against the Catholics, in 1790 against the Dissenters. Governments who found their prosperity upon manufactures sleep upon gunpowder.

There is no occasion to cry out *Aqui del Rey!* (*Here for the King!*) in England. Should one man draw his knife upon another in the streets, the passers-by do not shrug their shoulders and say, "it is *their* business," and pass on . . . Every man in England feels that it is *his* business both to prevent a crime, and to deliver up a criminal to justice.

The people then are the security of England against the populace; but the tendency of the present system is to lessen the middle class and to increase the lower ones; and there is also some danger that the people may become dissatisfied with their rulers. There is no economy in the administration of public affairs; prodigal governments must be needy, and needy ones must be oppressive. The sum paid in taxation is beyond what any other people ever paid to the state; the expenditure of the state is almost incredible, for the last two years of the war it exceeded a million of English money per week. The speculation is in proportion to the expenditure. They are now inquiring into these abuses; many have been pointed out in the department of admiralty and no person entertains a doubt that they exist in every other department in an equal degree . . . Any member who should

boldly and pertinaciously cry out that the public money was speculated bring forward his proofs and perseveringly insist upon investigation would not long be without supporters. The people would take up the case: they can bear to have their money squandered and can even be made to take a pride in the magnitude of the expenditure but they would not bear to have it pilfered. . . .

The causes which may prevent revolution arise from France. France expects to ruin England by its finances forgetful with what result that recipe has lately been tried by England herself. The French do not know this wonderful people. It was supposed that the existence of the English government depended upon the bank, and that the bank would be ruined by an invasion: the thing was tried, men were landed in Wales, away ran the Londoners to the bank to exchange their bills for cash, and the stock of cash was presently exhausted. What was the consequence? Why, when the Londoners found there was no cash to be had, they began to consider whether they could not do without it, mutually agreed to be contented with paper—and with paper they have been contented ever since. The bank is infinitely obliged to France for the experiment and no persons suffer for the experiment except the poor sailors, who, when they receive their pay put these bills in their tobacco-boxes and spoil them with wet quid.

It is certain that the English government must adopt a strict system of economy, thereby effectually preventing revolution by reform, or that sooner or later a national bankruptcy must ensue—and to this France hopes to drive them. But what would be the effect of national bankruptcy?—not a revolution. The English have no fits of insanity; if they saw the evil to be inevitable, they would immediately begin to calculate and compound, and see how it might be brought about with the least mischief. Thousands would be ruined; but they who would be benefited by the reduction of the taxes would be tens of thousands; so that the majority would be satisfied at the time, and the government begin its accounts afresh, strong enough to take credit, if the people were not disposed to give it. For this fact is apparent from all history,—that the tendency of all political changes is ultimately to strengthen the executive power. Forms may be altered—they who play for authority may win and lose as rapidly as other gamblers, and perhaps at more desperate stakes, but the uniform result is, that the government becomes stronger.

The National Convention carried decrees into effect which Louis XIV would not have dared to attempt—and Bonaparte has all the strength of that convention rendered permanent by military power. Whatever be the external, the effect is the same; the people submit implicitly to the directions of a single man, till he has riveted the yoke upon their necks; or cheerfully obey the more rigid tyranny of laws, because they conceive them to be of their own making,—A government therefore with the forms of freedom, which could persuade the people that it had no other object than their good, would be the strongest in the world. The Spartans called themselves free, and boasted of their obedience to institutions which changed the very nature of man.

In the language of modern politics a ministry has been considered as synonymous with government, and government as synonymous with nation. England made this error with regard to France, and France is now making it with regard

to England. Admit that the pressure of taxation should occasion a national bankruptcy, and that this in its consequence should bring about a revolution—England would be miserable at home; but would she be less formidable abroad? She would not have a ship nor a sailor the less; and if any circumstances were to awaken a military spirit in the land of the Plantagenets, France, mighty as she is, might tremble for her conquests. I do not believe that the fall of the funds would produce any violent change in the government; and whether it did or not, the enemies of England would do well to remember, that it would finally strengthen the nation. . . .

. . . The temper of what is called the mob . . . has been manifested at the death of Despard, and there is no reason to suppose it is not the same in all other great towns as in London. It will be well for England when her cities shall decrease, and her villages multiply and grow; when there shall be fewer streets and more cottages. The tendency of the present system is to convert the peasantry into poor. Her policy should be to reverse this and to convert the poor into peasantry, to increase them, and to enlighten them; for their numbers are the strength, and their knowledge is the security of states. . . .

(To be continued).

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

States." What do Members opposite think the controlling body is for, if not to prevent that very debasement of taste to which we object in the case of the United States?

The truth is that the B.B.C. protagonists have hopelessly over-played their hand. They have rushed to the rescue of the B.B.C., as if it were some puling infant in swaddling clothes, instead of a monster well organised and highly financed. If the B.B.C., is afraid to meet the competition of commercial radio, handicapped as commercial television will be, with all the safeguards that appear in this White Paper, all I can say is that there is something drastically wrong with the B.B.C., and the sooner it is shown up the better.

This debate has revealed not only a difference of opinion between the two sides of the House as to the way in which radio and television should be run. What is far more ominous is that it is shown how wide is the gulf which separates us in political philosophy. The Opposition have openly come out in favour of a monopoly of what the British public shall be allowed to hear and see. I think that is only a step towards establishing a monopoly of what they shall read or even what they shall say. They believe in the principle of the closed shop of the mind, and they do not trust the British people.

There was, 50 years ago, a famous speech made by a great bishop in this country at a time when drunkenness was one of the greatest social evils. He said: "I would sooner England were free than compulsorily sober." We have come a very long way along the road of the coercion of men's minds since the days when that statement was approved by the two great parties.

The other thing which is ominous is the refusal of the Opposition to remove the B.B.C. from party politics. We are prepared to shelter the B.B.C. for ever from the danger

of political intrigue. The Socialists are not prepared to keep party politics out of the B.B.C., and I hope that the country will draw the right deduction.

We contend that in this White Paper we are standing for two vital principles, the principle of breaking a monopoly of the mind and the principle of keeping the B.B.C. out of party politics. It is because we are convinced that the majority of the people support these two principles that we lay this White Paper before the House tonight.

Main question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 297; Noes, 269.

MINISTRY OF FOOD

Canned Fruit and Vegetables

Mr. Awbery asked the Minister of Food if he is aware of the danger arising from the consumption of fruit and vegetables which have been canned for a long period; and if he will take steps to make it obligatory to indicate on all tinned and packed food the date on which the contents were packed and that on which it would become dangerous for human consumption and to make it an offence to offer it for sale after that date.

Dr. Hill: No. The prolonged storage of properly canned fruit and vegetables does not itself create a health risk.

House of Commons: June 23, 1952.

Broadcasting (Licence and Agreement)

The Assistant Postmaster-General (Mr. David Gamman): I beg to move,

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

As most hon. Members are aware, the reason why the Licence and Agreement are laid before the House for an affirmative Resolution is not because of the activities of the B.B.C. here at home, in particular, but because they also relate to overseas broadcasts, and also because the Licence and Agreement create a charge on public funds and extend over a period of years. It is for these reasons that the Licence falls within Standing Orders Nos. 87 and 88. I imagine that the House would not want me to read out those Standing Orders, but I am prepared to do so if necessary.

The Charter itself is given under the Royal prerogative and does not require the approval of the House. For that reason, it would not be proper for me to refer to the terms of the Charter. The Licence and Agreement do not differ fundamentally from the Licence under which the B.B.C. is now working, but there are one or two important changes, and it would be proper for me to spend most of my time speaking about them.

As my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary told the House the week before last, the Licence will run for 10 years. This differs in point of time both from the recommendations of the Beveridge Committee and also from

the proposals of the late Government. I think from the debate on the White Paper that this period of 10 years meets with general acceptance. This will be found in Clause 2.

In the existing Licence the Postmaster-General has an all-embracing power of direction over television; in the new Licence there is no such provision, which means that the Government formally extends to television the independence which the B.B.C. has always traditionally enjoyed in programme matters. This means that the B.B.C. is in the same position so far as both television and sound broadcasting are concerned.

In Clause 3 the Postmaster-General has the power to require the B.B.C., after consultation, to establish very high frequency sound and television stations; that is, those working above 30 megacycles per second. This is a new provision for sound broadcasting, and it follows the Government's intention to seek advice from a committee on v.h.f. sound, as well as television, broadcasts. This committee is the advisory committee which the right hon. Member for Caerphilly (Mr. Ness Edwards) mentioned in the debate on the White Paper. As I told him then, the only reason why the committee had not been called during the past year was that we felt that there was not much point in calling it until questions of principle and policy had been settled. But from now on it will be called and it will be responsible for advising not only on television but on very high frequency as well.

In Clause 11 there is a slight alteration regarding the employment of aliens. The Postmaster-General will continue to specify the general conditions under which aliens can be employed but, provided they are not subject to restriction as to the length of their stay in this country or the nature of the work that they can take up, the Corporation will have discretion from now on to employ them in established capacities.

Clause 14 relates to commercial broadcasting by the B.B.C. It forbids such broadcasts except with the permission of the Postmaster-General and is exactly like the Clause now in force. The Government have no intention, as stated in the White Paper, of departing from this policy and, what is more, they would be most unwilling to see any change in the future on the part of the B.B.C. itself. . .

Clause 15 (2) lays on the B.B.C. the obligation to broadcast an impartial account by professional reporters of the proceedings of both Houses of Parliament. . .

In Clause 15 (3) there are one or two minor alterations. The first is that the power which the Government now have to require the B.B.C. to broadcast an announcement is now extended to cover television. . .

Another change compared with the present Licence is that a Government Department will no longer be able to require the B.B.C. to broadcast what is termed "other matter" except in an emergency. The B.B.C. will, of course, continue to be at liberty to say that either an announcement or "other matter" is being transmitted at the request of a Government Department.

There is also a new provision regarding the Government veto on B.B.C. transmissions, whether in television or sound. Under the present Licence the Government can

forbid the B.B.C. to say that a veto has been imposed. Under the new Licence the B.B.C. will be at liberty to announce at its discretion whether or not a veto has been imposed. The Government take the view that the Governors are a responsible body and that this discretion can safely be left with them.

I had better say a word about Clause 15 (5), which deals with external broadcasts. These used to be called the Overseas Services but at the request of the B.B.C. they will now be known as the External Services. These are the services which are financed not out of the licence revenue but out of a grant-in-aid. The programmes themselves, like the Home Service programmes, are left to the B.B.C., but the scope, the languages and the extent of the broadcasts are decided by certain Government Departments whom the B.B.C. is required to consult and from whom the B.B.C. has to get information regarding Government policies, so that the programmes can be prepared in the national interest. The Departments which the B.B.C. has to consult are the Foreign Office, the Commonwealth Relations Office and the Colonial Office. In theory, the B.B.C. is also required to consult the three Service Departments, but at present those Departments are not exercising their powers in this direction.

It is the same Clause which deals with the monitoring and transcription services, which are also financed through a grant-in-aid. The transcription services provide recordings of B.B.C. programmes in English and in other languages either specially prepared for sending abroad or else taken from the ordinary B.B.C. services. Last year some 77,000 discs and tape recordings were sent to broadcasting stations all over the world, and these form a very important part of the broadcast programmes of many overseas stations.

The monitoring service, as the name implies, is charged with the task of listening to foreign broadcasts from all over the world throughout the whole 24 hours, and the B.B.C. itself, as well as many Government Departments, derives most valuable information from it. These services have, of course, been going on for some time, but under this Clause the overseas Departments will have a more formal responsibility than has so far existed.

Clause 17 is the interesting Clause which deals with finance for the Home services. To begin with, the Post Office gets a sum equivalent to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the gross revenue received from the licences in order to pay for the services which the Post Office itself provides. . .

Lieut.-Colonel Walter Elliot (Glasgow, Kelvingrove):
 . . . We are discussing a matter of more general importance than the various forms of hysteria of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. We are discussing a Licence which is brought before us, and a matter about which many of us on both sides of the House feel fairly keenly. I hope that no one will suggest that I have any connection with any commercial company promoting sponsored broadcasting or television. [An HON. MEMBER: "The right hon. and gallant Member is being misled."] It may be, but I have done a great deal more broadcasting than has the hon. Gentleman, and for many more years. I have a great deal more acquaintance than he has with practical broadcasting.

The general position of the Government is strengthened by the fact that in many cases the service given at present by the B.B.C. is not satisfactory. I was amazed to hear

the general chorus of adulation which was going on all round the House about the wonderful system of broadcasting which we have. I was staggered to hear Member after Member say that everybody had the choice of at least three programmes and that many have the choice of seven.

Let me mention my own part of the country. For what are we paying licence fees? We cannot get television, of course; we cannot get the Third Programme; we cannot get the Scottish programme. We hear all this talk about whether we are to have Beethoven interrupted by advertisements for pills, but it is not a matter of us having Beethoven. We cannot even get the bagpipes.

We are told that we have the best system in the world. The system on the North-East coast is a disgrace. The system of broadcasting on either side of the Scottish Border is a disgrace. If it had been the subject of a little healthy competition that disgrace would have been removed long before now. The right hon. Member for Smethwick spoke at length about the report which had been made by Mr. Vincent Massey about broadcasting in Canada. Let him look at a report much nearer home—the report made by an ex-Governor-General of the B.B.C., Sir Frederick Ogilvie, in which he said that it would be a very good thing if there was competition; that it would be for the good of the B.B.C.

Hon. and right hon. Members opposite must not assume this high and mighty moral tone as if everybody opposed to them was a vulture—I think that was the cheerful phrase of the right hon. Gentleman [Mr. Gordon Walker].

... The right hon. Gentleman is not entitled to take this high moral attitude in view of the many eminent people who have given evidence to the contrary. I go no further than an ex-Director-General of the B.B.C., himself a man of the highest moral character—Sir Frederick Ogilvie.

We do not have the system which we ought to have, at any rate in the parts of the country from which I come. The airtight and iron-tight system which the right hon. Gentleman is advocating will bring disaster to the B.B.C. He for the first time is demanding a new system. He is going to divide the House in favour of a departure from 25 years of practice in this country. He is going to divide the House in favour of an exclusive Charter and against the non-exclusive rights of the Postmaster-General which he has enjoyed ever since broadcasting came into existence in this country.

Hon. Members opposite are the people who are demanding the innovation. They are the people who wish to make a change. They have no right to demand that in the name of their high moral principles. They can say that they would like a monopoly; they do. They can say that they object to competition; they do. Those are the views of hon. Members opposite but they are not the views of hon. Members on this side of the House. Those views are not held by many people in this country, and we find that the argument for an airtight monopoly is not as strong as the right hon. Gentleman would wish us to believe. It is not enough for the right hon. Gentleman to say that he does not believe in this absolutely airtight monopoly. He will find advocates on his own side.

The right hon. Gentleman will find a remarkable article by Lord Reith in last week's "Observer," demand-

ing that there should be a monopoly and saying, "What is the matter with a monopoly if it is justly and considerably exercised?" That is the argument of tyrants in all ages—what is the matter with a monopoly, if the tyrant is to judge how the monopoly shall be exercised. The argument in this article against the proposals for some departure from monopoly and for some form of extension of licence was refuted, oddly enough, by an article in another part of the paper praising the extraordinarily fine work of the Glyndebourne opera, which had been brought into existence by one of the same vultures which the right hon. Gentleman is so anxious to denounce.

(To be continued).

CO. DONEGAL.

BRUCKLESS HOUSE AND DEMESNE FREEHOLD

FOR SALE WITH VACANT POSSESSION.

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

Excellent sea and river Fishing.

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

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

THE HOUSE CONTAINS:—

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

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

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

Indoor and outside help available.

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

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

INSPECTION BY APPOINTMENT ONLY.

Further Details:

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