

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 28. No. 5.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Mr. F. E. Holsinger, writing to the *Daily Telegraph* on March 7, criticised a B.B.C. series, "Paying Our Way," which was, he said, "fastening the Communist lie upon the minds of the people" that the Government cuts were caused solely by rearmament. On March 18, the newspaper said the third broadcast of the series had been postponed, a statement on behalf of the B.B.C. being reported as follows:—

"It has been postponed because of a misunderstanding over the script, but this had nothing to do with the question of Communism. It was felt that the script did not fulfil the description in the *Radio Times*. The postponement was decided upon after consultation with Dr. Ronald Hope."

The newspaper goes on: "Dr. Hope, formerly a Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford, and now director of the Seafarers' Education Service, is taking part in all six programmes. Last night's postponed programme was to have dealt with 'fair shares in industry.'

"An employer and an employee were to discuss with Dr. Hope the relative functions of the wage earner and the shareholder, and the justice of their respective rewards. The first programme in the series dealt with a railman's budget, and the second, last week, with producing goods.

"In these two programmes Sam Pollock discussed with a railwayman and his wife, and then with a Yorkshire miner, various questions about living standards, output and incentive.

"When the series was started it was stated that the questions it proposed to answer were:

Are our standards of life in danger?

How can we get out of the crisis that overshadows them?

Are we individually better or worse off than before the war?"

• • •

WHY WE LET THEM RUN OUR NAVY: An agency telegram from Washington reports Senator Caphart as saying in the Senate on March 18 that he was one of the four senators who in July, 1945, were about to visit Europe. They had a conversation with Mr. Truman, and the then Senator Burton Wheeler, of Montana, said to him: "Mr. President, you had better stand up to Russia." According to Senator Caphart, Mr. Truman replied that "he was more afraid of England and France than he was of Russia," and when Senator Wheeler then remarked that he was too optimistic about Russia the President said, "No, I am not."

• • •

A reader asks what is the answer to a newspaper article

which asserts in a banner headline that "Medical Science Outstrips Means to Pay for It: No Nation Can Give Health Services Their Head."

The short answer is that the cost of production is consumption, and that until this fundamental truth is given its just and appropriate regard, the discussion of matters of economics and finance by means of a succession of pictorial images borrowed from (a) the race course, (b) the Meteorological Office, (c) the Bureau of Seismological Records, and (d) almost anywhere else can only confuse the issue. As a much-quoted edition of *The Encyclopædia Britannica* correctly asserted, "Banks create the means of payment out of nothing." 'Nothing,' therefore, can stop them from declining to be outstripped, and nothing else but 'nothing.' It must be 'nothing' which gives bankers their head. Being given their head, however, there is also nothing to prevent them determining all but an irreducible minimum of human energy into the most fantastic channels. If one must employ racing metaphors to describe the process, one might then say that the good sense of a community working to produce what sustained and ennobled the lives of its members was 'outstripped' by the folly we see around us. *Ratio* and 'rational' have the same root. Money is only a *ratio*, and to regard it as a species of racehorse, nobly contesting a cause already lost, is to treat rational things irrationally, and to lose all sense of "the establishment of a just relation between the mind and things."

• • •

The allegation that private transport companies or concerns are constrained by fear of losing their licences to fall into line with the London Transport Executive and raise their fares unnecessarily is serious and doubtless more will be heard of it. It seems that there is ground for the allegation, for Mr. H. Mayo, clerk to the Metropolitan Licensing Authority, said to a reporter on March 17, "We do not force them to put up their fares, but we cannot give the small man his licence unless he is sanctioned by the London Transport Executive. Under the London Passenger Transport Act, 1933, the executive has the monopoly. If the smaller man did not come into line the executive would probably refuse to sanction him, because he would get an unfair share of the fares.

"This is a very novel situation. The licences have to be renewed every three years. It would probably be within the competence of the authority to withdraw a licence if the London Transport Executive complained of a private company's behaviour."

"Small" man? "Big" man seems to go with all the other bignesses, wars, crises, taxes, disasters—it's the Big Idea.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 11, 1952.

Social Survey Reports

Mr. *Albu* asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury whether he will publish a list of the subjects investigated by the social survey during the last two years; and the Departments for whom the work was undertaken.

Following is the list:

Mr. *Boyd-Carpenter*: I will circulate in the OFFICIAL REPORT a list of the social survey reports undertaken during the last two years, and of the Departments for whom they were undertaken.

Mr. *Albu*: Can the hon. Gentleman say whether these investigations have made a contribution towards the economy and efficiency of administration?

Mr. *Boyd-Carpenter*: Some have in a considerable degree, and some perhaps in rather less degree.

SUBJECTS INVESTIGATED BY SOCIAL SURVEY, 1950-1952.

Subject	Description	Commissioning Department
Older People's Diets	To investigate the nutrition of elderly people and by reference to other inquiries to show the association of diets and health amongst old people.	Ministry of Health.
Survey of Adolescents	To investigate the educational and vocational background and the spare-time activities of the adolescents with a view to providing information relevant to the functions and interests of departments.	Ministry of Labour and Service Departments.
Recruitment to Civil Defence	This survey was carried out in order (a) to discover the general reaction to the subject of civil defence and the effectiveness of the publicity exhibited up to the date of the survey and (b) to decide which were the most effective lines to follow in future recruiting programmes.	Home Office.
Employment of Elderly Workers	To investigate the proportions of elderly people in employment, the nature of their occupations and associated factors as well as their attitudes to employment and remaining at work after retiring age.	Ministry of Labour.
Festival of Britain	An inquiry into the state of knowledge of and opinion about the objects of the "Festival" with special reference to local activities.	Festival of Britain Office.
Medresco Hearing Aid	To investigate the use made of the aid with view to improving the system of instruction or servicing.	Ministry of Health.
Utility and the Public	A survey of the attitudes of the public towards the Utility Scheme.	Board of Trade.
Sound in Dwellings	To investigate, under actual daily living conditions, the extent to which a new type of party wall reduced the amount of noise heard in local authority housing.	D.S.I.R.
Hamilton Housing Survey	An inquiry into the housing problems of older people.	Department of Health for Scotland.
Audience Reaction to the film "The Undefeated"	To examine fears expressed by cinema exhibitors that this film about disabled ex-servicemen might upset audiences and have adverse effects on recruitment. The report showed these suggestions were unfounded, and led to wide commercial showing.	C.O.I.
Independent Traders Index	The enrolment of a panel of independent traders who would volunteer information about their monthly sales so that a sales index could be constructed.	Board of Trade.
Use of Stationery Supplies	To provide information about the use and supply of stationery in Government Offices for a review of the work of Stationery Office being undertaken by Organisation and Methods Division of the Treasury.	Treasury.
Young Children's Diets	A inquiry to determine the nutritional level of children under the age of 5 years.	Ministry of Health.
Local Authority Tenants	To investigate how far tenants of local authority houses in Scotland would be interested in purchasing their own houses or other local authority houses.	Department of Health for Scotland.
Audience Reaction	To examine the reception and effects of three recruiting films exhibited in cinemas.	C.O.I.
Colonial Affairs	To investigate public knowledge of Colonial Affairs.	Colonial Office.
Telephone Directories	To investigate the actual use made of London Directories with a view to deciding whether they could be withheld from subscribers without great inconvenience or greatly increasing calls on the directory inquiry service.	General Post Office.
Birmingham Productivity Exhibition	An inquiry made to find out: (a) the nature of the audience at this exhibition; (b) the practical results accruing from their visit amongst a sample of visitors called on some three weeks later.	C.O.I.
Night Baking	To investigate the possible effects on consumers of stopping the baking of bread at night with view to facilitating the work of the Departmental Committee on Night Baking.	Ministry of Labour.

Subject	Description	Commissioning Department
Scientific Manpower	A pilot study of the present distribution of science graduates made with view to showing whether the Scientific Civil Service is recruiting its necessary share of the better graduates, and obtaining the reasons given for not entering the Civil Service.	D.S.I.R.
Effects of a Local Road Safety Campaign	An inquiry designed to measure the effects of the campaign on road users' behaviour on the roads and their attitudes to road safety problems.	Ministry of Transport.
Welfare Foods	An inquiry made to discover the extent to which mothers and expectant mothers make use of the Ministry of Food welfare products and the difficulties they have in obtaining them.	Ministry of Food.
Borstal Studies	To analyse available information on the history and background of a sample of Borstal cases with view to tracing the effects of Borstal treatment and identifying the classes of offenders most likely to respond to treatment.	Home Office and Prison Commissioners.
Parliament Past and Present	To examine the reception and effects of the exhibition designed to illustrate the history and functioning of Parliament.	C.O.I.
Domestic Heating	To investigate fuel consumption and expenditure on heating in low cost dwellings with view to implementing the result of laboratory experimental work on heating.	D.S.I.R.
Diphtheria Immunisation ...	To investigate new problems in the Diphtheria Immunisation with special reference to fears of the suggested association of poliomyelitis and diphtheria and the effects of temporary suspension of the campaign.	Ministry of Health.
Dissemination of Scientific and Technical Knowledge.	A pilot study to measure the flow of scientific information to industry with view to improving the work of the Technical Information Service of D.S.I.R.	D.S.I.R.
Consumer Expenditure Series.	To investigate spending habits in special fields in order to assist the compilation of published accounts of National Income and Expenditure and, in particular, to examine, on the basis of small experimental inquiries, the technical problems involved in conducting the forthcoming large scale official Cost of Living Budgetary inquiry.	Central Statistical Office and Treasury.
Survey of Sickness	Statistical studies on a national scale designed to show the incidence of ill-health and injuries as well as the use made of the medical service.	Registrar General's Office.
Studies of Public Knowledge of the Economic Situation.	Investigations into the extent of public understanding of the main economic issues and knowledge of the associated facts.	Treasury.

Central Office of Information

Mr. A. Hargreaves asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury what saving will be effected in a full financial year by discontinuing the Central Office of Information film service; and what number of staff is involved.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: The saving will be approximately £70,000 per annum. The number of staff directly involved is 42.

House of Commons: March 13, 1952.

U.S. Films (Unremittable Earnings)

Mr. Shepherd asked the President of the Board of Trade how the non-remittable earnings of United States film producers in the United Kingdom have been expended.

Mr. P. Thornycroft: During the period 14th June, 1948, when the first Anglo-American Film Agreement came into operation, to 31st December, 1951, United States film companies spent £22-23 million of their unremittable film earnings. This money has been applied to the various purposes specified in the Agreement, in particular, to film production in the sterling area, which has accounted for over £8 million of the total expenditure. Other expenditure has included the acquisition of distribution rights of British films, payments for prints, and for personal services, travel and living expenses.

Mr. Niall Macpherson: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether it is possible for American interests to remit earnings from the re-investment of the blocked earnings?

Mr. Thornycroft: I understand that the total amount of remittable earnings is fixed.

Southern Electricity Board (Tariffs)

Captain Richard Pilkington asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he has made any estimate of the extra expense which will be caused to industry in the area affected through the higher tariffs proposed by the Southern Electricity Board due in part to reduced consumption by consumers.

Mr. Thornycroft: No, Sir. I have no information which would enable an estimate to be given of what additional charges may have to be borne by a wide variety of industry as a result of any increase which may be made in these tariffs.

Captain Pilkington: As these higher tariffs are most burdensome on industry and also on the home, is there any possibility of de-nationalisation or has the damage been done?

Australia (Import Restrictions)

Mr. W. A. Burke asked the President of the Board of

(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. 5.

Saturday, March 29, 1952.

Another Party ?

On the ground of some unusual features which it possesses, a leaflet which has reached us claiming to set out the first principles of "the third party so long awaited by the British People to infuse new hope into political life and a new faith and spirit into the nation" seems deserving of notice. We know nothing of its sponsors, the sole address on the document being that of a Secretary at Chorley, Lancashire. We omit a fourth and last section, headed "The Home Front," which is inexplicit. Otherwise the text is as follows:—

"THE NATIONAL FRONT DEDICATES ITSELF TO A SINGLE POLITICAL AIM: THE RESTORATION OF BRITISH NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

"The future of our country, of its overseas Empire and, indeed, of the entire West European Civilisation depends upon the attainment of this objective *and upon nothing else.*

"This principle determines all internal social and economic policies, for these are only possible within the framework of an independent, sovereign Empire.

" I. NATIONAL UNITY.

"To regain our Sovereignty we must unite our People.

"The existing parties are incapable of realising this. They are obsessed with class hatreds and bogus electioneering. They are hopelessly compromised by their joint responsibility for the record of folly and disaster which today mocks the country's sacrifice of blood and treasure in two world wars.

"The National Front is only interested in the unity of Englishmen. We welcome the support of all who reject the sham fight of the parties and who demand an immediate reversal of their policies of surrender and deception.

"National Unity is the sole guarantee of national survival.

" II. PAX BRITANNICA.

"Our ancestors developed a great overseas Empire, which was destined to safeguard not only the living standards of our people but also the maintenance of world peace.

"Within two generations the parties have all but brought about its total liquidation. As a direct result of this betrayal the country has become an economic slum of American finance-capitalism, and the onslaughts of coloured Bolshevism throughout the world threaten to annihilate the last outposts of Western Civilisation.

"That which determines England's relationship to the rest of the world is not its membership of the dictated

American alliance or even of the discredited United Nations organisation; it is rather the achievement of our imperial past and the potential of our resurgent future.

"The National Front identifies two direct threats to national Sovereignty and Independence:—

"(1) Moscow-organised Bolshevism, the irreconcilable mortal enemy of all European values.

"(2) The dictatorship of New York finance-capitalism which holds in thrall the governments of the West.

"We are now told that a conflict is imminent between these massive non-European powers, and that, by virtue of our geographical position we must espouse the cause of the lesser evil. To this end the American generalate is feverishly occupied in dragooning the manpower of Europe for mercenary service. At the same time the World Bank openly continues to undermine the overseas possessions of European states.

"This situation is intolerable. Any accommodation requested by America must accord with our national interests. In practice this can only mean the following radical changes in our foreign policy:—

1. The complete withdrawal of American troops from British soil.
2. British troops to protect national interests—Korea must yield to the defence of Malaya and Egypt.
3. Withdrawal from all international agencies and bodies which have proved inimical to the Empire.

"The reorienting of national policy also entails certain positive measure to safeguard national independence:—

- (a) The outlawing of all Moscow-inspired agencies throughout Britain and her colonial possessions.
- (b) The development of a world sphere-of-influence independent of the American and Russian power-masses, based in the first place upon the concept of the British Empire and in the second place upon a military and cultural alliance with those other sovereign states which are imbued with European spiritual values.

" III. IMPERIAL POLICY.

"The National Front regards the words, 'Britain' and 'Empire,' as synonymous.

"We consider it essential to set up a permanent Imperial Cabinet, in which each Dominion would be represented, presided over by the Prime Minister in London and having executive power to implement policy for Imperial defence, Colonial development, trade and immigration.

"The vast untapped resources of the colonies must be developed on a scale never before envisaged, agriculturally, industrially and economically. Whereas the British Empire has remained too long a mere skeleton of a pious hope, the National Front will invest it with the flesh of political reality.

"This energetic Imperial development will not only safeguard the living standards of the people; it will make certain our political independence from any other power group in the world. In the event of a major war we shall possess the means to avoid the continental follies of the last two wars by fighting within the confines of imperial-geographical strategy. The alternative is to become a battle-field."

The Falling Standard*

The decisions made at the recent British Commonwealth Ministers' Conference in London must, if implemented in Australia, further reduce the already falling standard of living of the majority of the Australian people. Mr. Richard Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Churchill Government, has openly proclaimed the necessity for all peoples of the British Empire to make sacrifices for the purpose of solving "the dollar problem." He has given a lead by immediately imposing upon the unfortunate British people further doses of the very austerity which the Conservatives promised to abolish when they were in the Opposition. Mr. Butler is continuing the treacherous policies followed by Mr. Attlee and his pro-Communists.

While in London, Sir Arthur Fadden has been advised by the Canberra Socialist planners, who convinced him that it was necessary to continue and extend the Socialist financial policies of the Chifley Government. As all the Finance Ministers at the London Conference were advised by economic "experts" who all advocate totalitarian policies, it is not surprising that there was unanimous agreement that all sterling countries must make further sacrifices. The Australian people are already being prepared for what is to come.

In a statement issued on January 30, the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, said that when Sir Arthur Fadden reported to Cabinet on the London Conference, it would be decided what steps were necessary to implement the decisions of the Conference. "It is not to be taken that this will mean further credit restriction in Australia. We will not know until the Treasurer returns." We ask readers to ponder carefully the significance of Mr. Menzies' statement. He admits that the credit policy of this country has been decided by a meeting of economic "experts," most of them known Socialists, who are doing their utmost to complete the destruction of the British Empire. The programme decided upon at the London Conference must weaken further sovereignty of the British countries and, as Mr. Churchill has already discovered, make them more subservient to "dollar diplomacy."

Step by step, the destruction of the British Empire has taken place. The sudden cessation of lease-lend assistance after the war, the imposition of the dollar loans and the Bretton Woods Financial Agreement, devaluation, the fantastic policy of sacrificing the British people so that they could increase exports, to earn dollars in order that they could import raw materials to make into further exports, have been all part of the strategy of eliminating the British Empire as a major force in world affairs. The attack has been directed by the Zionist Jews in the U.S.A., and their chief allies have been the Socialist advisers to Governments of all labels in all parts of the British Empire.

What is this "dollar crisis" which necessitates the British people and the Australian people making sacrifices? Suppose the United States were to sink beneath the sea immediately. Do we really believe that this would mean the end of the British peoples, because they could no longer export goods to America and thus earn dollars? Does any sane and honest person suggest that the peoples of the British Empire are not easily capable of adequately feeding, clothing and housing themselves? There are a few things—

although comparatively few—which the British people can more easily obtain from America than elsewhere. In order to earn the dollars to pay for these goods, it is essential for some exports to be sent to America. But a fantastic export policy at the expense of the local consumer, while, as is now proposed as a result of the London Conference, a drastic reduction in importations of dollar goods, can only mean deliberate treachery. If the Canberra Government is going to implement this policy, further doses of Socialism can be now predicted. Socialism and sacrifice are synonymous terms.

Even with the present "threat of war" being carefully maintained, it is becoming increasingly obvious that all the highly industrialised countries are, because of their internal financial policies, being compelled to resort to the pre-war struggle for a "favourable balance of trade"—exporting more than is imported. This is how the London Conference decided the British countries should meet the "dollar crisis." But, as even the Finance Editor of the Melbourne 'Herald' has pointed out, it is impossible to export more than it imports. The economic "experts" and the interests they serve are well aware of this fact. They know that the British countries cannot solve the "dollar crisis." But they also know that the "solution" they propose must inevitably weaken all British countries internally. And then, of course, there is the final step which Sir Douglas Copland has been advocating for some time: The virtual abolition of the sterling group of nations, mainly comprised of British Empire countries, and the development of Australia and other parts of the Empire by large dollar investments. This would, of course, permit the controllers of the financial system in the U.S.A. to keep the Americans on the road to Socialism under the guise of developing other parts of the world, while at the same time making British Empire countries directly subservient to Wall Street and Washington policies. That this would make impossible the continuance of British traditions and political sovereignty is obvious. Sir Douglas Copland admits this, and states that "economic union" would eventually lead to "political union." Loyal Australians can resist this treacherous programme if they but stir themselves and arouse their fellows to the danger. Such action would be most appropriate in a year when Australia's Queen is visiting the country. Let Australians demonstrate that their loyalty to their own traditions and way of life is not merely of the lip-service variety. Red-blooded action is what is required.

Lady Mountbatten at Seoul

A telegram to the *Daily Telegraph* dated Seoul, March 18 says:—

"Countess Mountbatten angrily denied here this afternoon suggestions that her visit to Korea had political implications. She said she was here purely to gain first-hand knowledge of the work of organisations in which she was interested, the Order of St. John and the British Red Cross Society.

"She said she thought that military medical arrangements in Korea could not be improved. Arrangements had been made to send two British Red Cross teams to Korea to help with civilian orphans.

"Lady Mountbatten left later in the day for Pusan."

*From *The New Times* (Melbourne).

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

Trade what action he proposes to take in order to mitigate the drastic effects on the Lancashire cotton trade of the import cuts proposed by the Australian Government.

Mr. P. Thornycroft: For balance of payments reasons which Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom fully understand, the Australian Government have found it necessary to restrict imports of cotton textiles and many other goods to the level of 20 per cent. of the imports during the year July, 1950, to June, 1951. These restrictions must, I regret to say, increase very seriously the difficulties with which the cotton industry in Lancashire is already faced. I am confident that the cotton industry will do its utmost to offset the effect of these restrictions by increasing their exports to other markets. I know the difficulties of doing this at the present time, and I am in constant touch with the Cotton Board on the subject.

Mr. Burke: Does the Minister's reply mean that the Government have really done nothing and do not intend to do anything? Does not the Minister realise that this was our best Dominion market, that we have lost £26 million, and that on top of the Japanese menace this is a staggering blow to Lancashire? Markets once lost cannot be recovered.

Mr. Thornycroft: I have not sought in my reply to under-estimate the effect of this particular Australian cut upon the textile industry of Lancashire.

Mr. Walter Fletcher: Will not my right hon. Friend undertake to make representations to the Government of Australia who may not have been fully aware of the crippling blow which this represents not only to Lancashire textiles, but to many other industries as well? Does he realise that everybody concerned believes that if he made firm representations to Australia it would have some effect? . . .

Mr. Nabarro asked the President of the Board of Trade how many motor vehicles of all descriptions, and what percentage of United Kingdom vehicles exports, were exported to Australia during the 12 months ended 29th February, 1952; what is the anticipated reduction in such exports during the next 12 months consequential upon the decision of the Australian Government to curtail drastically their imports from the United Kingdom; and how far these changed arrangements will influence supplies of vehicles for the home market.

Mr. P. Thornycroft: In the twelve months ended January, 1952, 171,000 motor vehicles, including tractors, were exported to Australia. This was 27 per cent. of United Kingdom exports to all countries. Details of exports in February are not yet available.

Until we have further information, we cannot estimate the probable reduction in exports over the next twelve months as a result of the import restrictions imposed by the Australian Government. It will, however, be substantial.

As regards the last part of the Question, this is a matter for my right hon. Friend the Minister of Supply.

Mr. Nabarro: In the light of my right hon. Friend's figures is it correct to assume that the reduction in the number of vehicles going to Australia in 1952 will be no fewer than 130,000? Can he say what special measures are in hand to place this very large number of vehicles

either in overseas markets or on the home market, and what the policy will be in that regard?

Mr. Thornycroft: My hon. Friend, of course, will appreciate that conversations are at present going on between my right hon. Friend and the motor car industry on these matters.

Mr. Maurice Edelman: During these balance of payments difficulties will the right hon. Gentleman concentrate upon improving export facilities rather than taking the easy way out of encouraging manufacturers of motor cars to re-lease their cars to the home markets? . . .

Lead

Major Guy Lloyd asked the Secretary for Overseas Trade, as representing the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, what efforts have been made by his Department to obtain lead from Australia.

The Secretary for Overseas Trade (Mr. Henry Hopkinson): The Ministry of Materials is in close touch with the Australian lead producers. During the last two years this country has obtained more than two-thirds of its virgin lead from Australia. This represents approximately 70 per cent. of Australia's total lead exports.

House of Commons: March 14, 1952.

Brick Production

Mr. Frederick Mulley (Sheffield, Park): I want now to direct the attention of the House away from the subject of safety in the home to the problem, or part of the problem, of providing homes—namely the problem of brick production. . . . I hope, . . . that the Minister will explain now what he meant when he said on 4th December:

"I asked the Federation to let me know . . . about controls in relation to building in general, which I am glad to say that they are doing. The truth is that the confidence of the brick industry was badly shaken by the faulty planning under the last Government."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 4th December, 1951; Vol 494, c. 2230.]

I hope that he will also say what action he has taken following his consultations with the National Federation of Clay Industries to which he made reference on that occasion. As he admitted then, the much derided housing programme of the late Government was held up by shortage of bricks. His predecessor set a target of 6,800 million bricks for 1951, and yet only 6,080 million were produced. That is a shortfall of 720 million, or 11 per cent. Nor is it as I think he at first imagined, a matter of removing controls. As he has since discovered, the only control over brick production is the need of manufacturers to register with his Department. After all, that is not a very substantial control.

The truth is that this is a private industry free of all controls which has constantly failed, perhaps through no fault of its own, to fulfil the demands made on it in the national interest and which constantly has to seek the assistance of the Government in various ways. If the Minister applies to the brick industry the doctrine of *laissez faire* which he used so eloquently to expound from these benches, I suggest that we shall never have enough bricks

to enable us to continue the building programme which we should like to carry out. . . .

The Minister of Works (Mr. David Eccles): I am sure the House is grateful to the hon. Member for Sheffield, Park (Mr. Mulley) for raising this important subject of bricks. Bricks, of course, are fundamental to our building programme. On looking over the history of the brick industry since the war, I must tell the hon. Member that I conclude that the Labour Government intervened too much—and at times unwisely—with this industry which, apart from the great mass-producers in the Peterborough and Bletchley areas, consists of a very large number of small brickyards which are scattered about the country and which are very sensitive to the general climate of their industry.

During the war the industry was reduced to a very small size. It produced only 1,000 million bricks annually as against 7,500 million bricks before the war. In the years immediately after the war it did fairly well, until the planners went haywire in 1947. The planners then made a sudden cut in the demand for building resources, including bricks, and there were further capital cuts in 1948. That shook the confidence of the small brick-yards and stopped the climb back to the pre-war position. Output was interrupted.

It is true that in 1949 and in 1950 there was a reasonable recovery, but we had another unsatisfactory year last year, when, as the hon. Member told us, output was very far below the target which had been set by the right hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Stokes) when he was Minister of Works. Can we do better this year? I should like to tell the House of certain steps which I am taking directly, to help this industry; but I am quite certain that nothing which a Minister can do will have the same effect as the knowledge that my right hon. Friend, the Minister for Housing and Local Government, has taken the lid off a number of houses that are to be built. The confidence in the minds of the producers of bricks that the demand is there is worth all the little help and little manoeuvres that a Minister and his advisors can undertake.

It cannot be a coincidence that when the number of houses was planned down to 200,000 a year by the Labour Government the brick producers produced exactly the number of bricks required for that total of houses. That is to say, at the end of every one of the last three years brick stocks have been almost exactly the same—one week's supply and no more. That is very much as though we were playing cricket and somebody said "Nobody may make more than 50 runs in this game." If one went into bat and made 40 runs one would proceed to bat extremely slowly in order not to get out before the tea interval. That is exactly what happened in the building industry under this planning. The industry knew that it could not go beyond what the great authorities in Whitehall said, and that must be the reason why production exactly matched up to this total of houses, which was held down by Government decision.

Mr. Mulley: I think the Minister over-simplifies the point, because bricks are used not only for housing but for other forms of building, and the Government were consequently having to hold down even defence works because of the shortage of bricks in certain areas.

Mr. Eccles: That is true, but the main expansion possibility in relation to brick production has always been breadth of the land, and taking, as it does, the bricks from

housing, scattered as it is right throughout the length and the small local yards. I say that it is a better basis for expansion to tell the brick industry, as we have told it, that as it increases its output and other materials become available, so the local authorities and private builders will be allowed to get ahead with housing.

We are not now putting an annual ceiling on houses, and I think that is a very important factor—more important than any particular steps that I, in the Ministry of Works, can take to give confidence to this industry. In other words, some of the responsibility for the rate at which their product is used has been turned over from the Ministers and their servants to the building industry itself. I believe that to be a most important factor, and it is having its effect.

The hon. Gentleman referred to the output in January. In January, 541 million bricks were produced, against 480 million in January, 1950, and 485 million in January, 1951. That is a considerable jump. I can assure the hon. Gentleman that it has largely been done because confidence has been restored. I believe that upward trend will continue. If it does, we shall get 6,500 million bricks this year. That will be a tight squeeze against all the demands we have to make, but it will go a long way. . . .

. . . . I do not think it is true that the brick industry has constantly failed, as, I think the hon. Member said. It has had a hard time and has not always been given the encouragement and continuity of orders which it deserved.

Brickyards make very little call on foreign exchange. Bricks are made with home-quarried clay and home-produced coal. They need some steel for their plant, which we will give them. This is a vital, basic industry, which has a good future before it, but my last word is that I think that brick producers will do their job better if I let them look after themselves and the Minister of Housing and Local Government keeps up his orders, rather than if I interfere with them day in, and day out.

Lord Wavell and Lord Goddard

The following extracts are from speeches in the House of Lords on March 19 and 20, the first from a debate on Education, "on our educational system as a whole since the Education Bill of 1944," the second on a Motion by Lord Mancroft to call attention to the working of the Legal Aid Scheme:—

In the Education Debate, Lord Wavell, saying that he had been associated with education in the Army for the past five years, complained of "a terrible amount of specialisation" which now resulted from the methods of selection for entry into universities. "I believe," he said, "that that situation is worst among the scientists. I meet men who have read science in their last two years at school, and some of them have told me that in those two years they have not done more than one or two periods a week of any subject except science or mathematics. I suppose the demands of industry are so specialised that the universities must require these people to have covered such a large syllabus before they begin their university course. I come to this conclusion partly from a reply which I received from one of our old universities, when I was recommending for admission to read science a man in my company. I pointed out the man had wide interests in drama and literature, was a good all-round

games player, and, I thought, a rather original personality. I received the following reply:

‘ . . . and in the mathematical subjects in natural science, it is difficult for us to do anything other than prefer the men almost entirely in terms of their capacity in their subject. We take a very different attitude in such subjects as history, where, of course, the men concerned seek employment which requires their general abilities, and where their personality is of importance, but a mathematician and a physical scientist is employed as one without regard to his other capacities.’

I found that a very disturbing reply to come from one of our ancient universities, and I am wondering what the view must still be in the provincial universities and the technological institutes. Our scientists to-day carry a great potential peril in their hands, and I trust that they will have a liberal education.

“It is not so very different, I am afraid, even in the arts. All the men who come to my company have at least the school certificate, and many of them university scholarships; yet I find considerable gaps in their knowledge. I set each intake a general knowledge question, and I find men unable to express a quarter as a decimal or tell me the capital of India, men who do not know whether light or sound travels the faster. There was even one man in the history section (I was asking dates, but I was not fussy; I was giving a margin of twenty-five years for the correct answer and of a hundred years when we got back a century or two) who told me that the outbreak of the French Revolution was in 1670, that the Battle of Trafalgar was fought in 1765, and that Wellington commanded our forces at Blenheim. Yet this man was awarded a ‘distinction’ in his higher school certificate for history, with the eighteenth and nineteenth century as his special period, by one of our university examining boards. Your Lordships must wonder how that can happen. The man told me that in fact he had just thrown in history as a special subject at the last moment, and had crammed up a few spot questions and was lucky. That should not be.

“While I am speaking of history, I deplore the fact that in our grammar schools to-day the concentration is almost entirely on modern history. It seems that mediæval and ancient history are not even taught, and it is not possible to take ancient history in the school certificate except as part of a classics paper. I should like to read to your Lordships one or two commendations of the value of ancient history. Here is that of Mr. T. S. Eliot:

‘The advantage of the study of Greek history . . . as a preliminary to the study of other history . . . is its manageability; it has to do with a small area, with men rather than masses, and with the human passions of individuals rather than with those vast impersonal forces which in our modern society are a necessary convenience of thought, and the study of which tends to obscure the study of human beings. . . .’

Lord Wavell said that “nothing like 25 per cent. of the places” available for scholarship boys in independent schools were taken up. “I believe I am right in saying that Winchester offered fifty places to the London County Council, but they were not taken up.”

In the Debate on the Legal Aid Scheme, Lord Goddard said:—

“It is all very well to say that we want to help the poorer person. Everybody wants to do that. But the

litigant against whom the poor person has brought his action has been fighting at his own expense. If an insurance company is concerned, one must remember that they are not there merely to be ‘shot at’; they have to pay just claims; and if they go to appeal the chances are that they will do so at their own expense. From what I have been told by the Master of the Rolls, and by other Lords Justices who sit in the Court of Appeal, although there have been a considerable number of appeals by assisted persons, only in very few cases have they been successful. That means that an unassisted person has been twice ‘shot at,’ and has had to fight at his own expense. Of course, if an assisted person has obtained judgment in the trial court it is obviously right that he should be given the means of supporting that judgment. So far as my experience has gone, this is one of the matters which most require consideration.

“Another matter which once surprised me very much was to find that legal aid can be given to foreigners who come over to this country for the purpose of pursuing some claim here. It seems to me very curious that foreigners should be able to come here and bring actions at the expense of the British taxpayer. I remember a case of an Austrian subject who came here to dispute a will. A most careful and lengthy judgment was given by the present Lord Justice Hodson. The case went to appeal, and the defendant was put to the expense of defending on appeal an action brought by a foreigner who had obtained representation as an assisted person. If these matters are to be further considered by the Lord Chancellor and Her Majesty’s Government I ask them to consider seriously whether or not this assisted litigation ought to be extended to foreigners.”

“Another point is this. If the magistrates give a certificate for defence at the assizes, they have to give both solicitor and counsel. That raises the expense very considerably. The prisoner can always apply to the judge at the trial, and the judge can then allot counsel to him. If this course were adopted, a good deal of expense would be saved. It is my view that at the present time this granting of legal aid ought to be much more carefully considered by justices than it is, and that people should not have a poor person’s defence given to them simply because they come up for trial at the assizes. I have often reminded magistrates of a famous charge to a grand jury given by the late Lord Mersey, when he was Mr. Justice Bigham, at Liverpool Assizes—it was just after the first Act giving legal aid to poor persons had come into operation. He said:

“Gentlemen, there was a time when a prisoner on his trial could say: ‘My mouth is closed. I cannot give evidence. The law does not allow it. If I could go into the box and submit myself to cross-examination, how quickly I could convince you that I was innocent!’ Then Parliament has said: ‘You may go into the box,’ which really means ‘You shall go into the box, because, if you do not, everyone will believe you are guilty.’ The prisoner could still say to the jury: ‘Gentlemen, I am a poor man. I cannot afford a mouthpiece. If I could only have one of these gentlemen to defend me, he would very soon show you that I was not guilty.’ Parliament has now said: ‘You shall have counsel.’ If that sort of thing goes on, the law will quickly take away from unhappy prisoners all prospect of acquittal.”

“There was in that charge an element of exaggeration, but there was also an element of truth. . . .”