

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 28. No. 9.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Nobody is going to tell us that *The Tablet* did not receive any publishable letters of protest against the gratuitous incursion of Mr. Dandy recently into the field of defamatory finance-politics. You will notice that it hasn't printed one. Who is the gainer we cannot say: not, we think, *The Tablet*, whose reputation for reliability over an exceptionally wide range of topics is self-smirched and whose witness-value concerning things higher than itself is reduced.

• • •

If the present looks too bad to be true, we may remind ourselves of the possibility that its looks do not belie it.

• • •

What we in our day and generation may justly hope to do is to *influence opinion*. Now, there are many credible witnesses to the truths of the proposition that the influencing of opinion is effected *almost* in inverse proportion to the ascription of personal credit. The scoundrel Stockmar, whose influence is still active in British politics—e.g., “modern” science and the controversy about the Battenburgs—said quite truthfully in his infamous “Memoirs” that a man could do almost anything in this world, *if he let someone else take the credit for it*. In his hands and in the hands of the *Illuminati* everywhere, it is just a technique. But technics is, after all, the price we have to pay for incarnation: a good watch is a *time-keeper*; it is not a *time-creator* or a *time-user*. It just abides by *one* (and *only one*) of the peculiarities of Time; and, truth to tell, it is very hard to lay one's finger on *which one*.

As things are now an anonymous opinion is much more effective than any personal opinion—notice the reaction to the Duke of Bedford's (to which we intend to give further publicity). If it were anybody's but the Duke of Bedford's, the muck-rakers could have done less with it, although they had to coalesce to do anything with it as it was. But in face of an anonymous opinion in the sense we mean, they could have done nothing but hide from it.

• • •

Almost all you touch now has to do with Sovereignty. Sovereignty is the overriding problem of our condition. When three people say black is white, what is it? There has to be constituted (and this is the crux of the Constitution) a reserved area which is *not* subject to voting.

The “London Letter” of *The Scotsman* published in that newspaper on April 14 said:—“There are signs that Pakistan's plan for a Moslem bloc stretching from Syria to Indonesia is coming unstuck diplomatic sources in London state. A conference to set up the machinery for such a bloc was to have met in Karachi on Tuesday, but has been unaccountably postponed.

“The Pakistan Government had invited the Premiers of twelve Moslem countries to Karachi for the conference. They are Afghanistan, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, the Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, and the Yemen. The object of the conference, officials of the office of the High Commissioner for Pakistan in London state is ‘to establish a system of consultation and to thrash out any subjects of common interest.’ The aim is by this means to achieve common policies and then to take concerted action.

“The difficulties into which the sponsors of the Moslem bloc are running spring from the age-old rivalries of the Arab states. Egypt is lukewarm because she considers herself the leader of the Arab States; she would take second place to Pakistan in a Moslem bloc. Syria has been aspiring after Egypt's position. Afghanistan is never likely to co-operate with Pakistan. Turkey is believed to be unwilling to accept the invitation to the conference at all. The Persian Government, before accepting the invitation to attend, has asked for clarification on the attitude towards Middle East defence which Pakistan will seek to foster at the conference.”

It will be noticed that this statement does not mention the question of a Central Bank concerning which a report was published in *The Social Crediter* last week.

THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

By

C. H. DOUGLAS.

The Revised and Enlarged Edition published in 1937
is again on sale.

12/- net.

“The standard literary instrument for the correct information of the public concerning the technical aspects of Social Credit”—*The Social Crediter*.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: April 1, 1952.

North Wales Hydro-Electric Power Bill

(By Order)

Mr. Gerald Nabarro (Kidderminster): (continued).

... My case with regard to rural electricity supply is simply this. If the Connah's Quay power station at present under construction were to work on a proper load factor of 80 per cent., the additional 40 per cent. over the present 40 per cent. would yield sufficient electricity for the whole of North Wales without any difficulty at all. In that regard, I would say that this is not only an individualistic view of mine, but that I am reinforced by possibly the highest planning authority in this country—Professor Sir Patrick Abercrombie—who, in his report on these hydro schemes to the County Council of the administrative County of Caernarvon wrote this:

"The simplest would appear to be to raise the load factor of the new station at Connah's Quay (installed capacity 180,000 KW.). This has been placed abnormally low at 41 per cent., doubtless to work in with the Authority's policy of using certain stations as base load and others as semi-base.

"If Connah's Quay could be run at 80 per cent. load factor (a high but not impossible load) by arrangement of the Merseyside Power producing units, it would produce 1,260 million KWH. in place of 650 million KWH. or thereabouts; and would thus provide more than the 500 million KWH. dropped from not using the new installations of North Wales hydro-electric power."

Professor Abercrombie is undoubtedly absolutely right, for this one power station, perhaps aided by smaller stations, is the answer to rural electrification in North Wales.

I now want to say something about comparative costs. This is highly technical, but I will try to reduce it to everyday terms, although there are few electrical engineers in this country who would ever agree on the merits or demerits of hydro-electric schemes. For years we have been arguing about these North Wales proposals, but I will try to put the matter in as simple language as I can. A hydro-electric scheme has a very high capital cost, but a low cost of operation. A steam power station has a relatively low capital cost, but a high cost of operation, for it has to be fuelled with coal.

There are hazards connected with both types of generation. The hazard with the steam station is the availability of coal at a time when our coal budget is in a state of grave unbalance. The hazard in connection with a hydro-electric scheme is principally, of course, the fact that the water supply is not by any means certain, and that the abstraction of large quantities of water from these catchment areas might seriously affect agricultural development, river flow and various other technical points of that kind.

... Most people seem to imagine that hydro-electric schemes last for ever, but that is not so. Perhaps they will last for 75 years.

Mr. A. C. Manuel (Central Ayrshire): Or 100.

Mr. Nabarro: Nobody knows, but I am prepared to be advised by a countryman of the hon. Gentleman who interrupted and who is a high authority on this subject, and who draws our attention to the dangers of siltation in these schemes. For instance, Mr. R. M. Prothero, a geographer,

until recently at Edinburgh University, wrote in "Nature" on 7th July, 1951:

"Precise information is practically non-existent. In the United States, by 1934, already 13 major dams had silted up completely during an average life of 29 years, but although such spectacular examples are lacking here, silt may accumulate in a short time and seriously reduce the capacity of reservoirs. A case is quoted of one of the Lancaster Corporation reservoirs which has lost nearly half its capacity in 78 years, but as regards the Scottish hydro-electric reservoirs, silting does not appear to have been allowed for in the calculated capacities, and unless we are informed to the contrary no doubt the same applies to those proposed in North Wales."

This is a very real hazard, but let me pass on to an approximate estimate of the capital costs.

In the case of a hydro-electric scheme, the capital cost per kilowatt installed is not the £94, as referred to by my hon. Friend the Member for Barry. I denounce that statement emphatically. Lord Citrine wrote to me on 7th February, 1952, and said that the average capital cost per kilowatt installed was £122 for hydro schemes in North Wales. Why should it be £122 for North Wales and £200 per kilowatt installed for a hydro-electric scheme in Scotland? The answer is that the North Wales scheme will cost £200 per kilowatt installed by the time it is completed, whereas steam station costs today average £60 per kilowatt installed. Therefore, although the length of life of a hydro-electric scheme is three times longer than that of a steam station, the capital cost of a hydro-electric scheme is three times as great as that of a steam station and in terms of amortisation per annum the one cancels the other out.

... I pass to a further point in connection with the installation; the load factor of the schemes in North Wales. The load factor is less than 20 per cent. In the case of Dolgarrog it is 15.4 per cent., at Maentwrog 14.7 per cent. and at Ffestiniog 15.75 per cent. A load factor of less than 20 per cent. means that the capital vested in the scheme is less than one-fifth employed whereas in a steam station the load factor is as high as 80 per cent. but at an average of 60 per cent. Therefore, not only is the installation cost three times as high in a hydro-electric scheme as in a steam station, but the use of the power once the installation is completed is only one-third in a hydro scheme as compared with a steam scheme. That weights the capital cost case against hydro schemes by something like ten to one.

Great play is made, and my hon. Friend referred to it, about coal conservation. I have rarely read such a Dutch auction as the figures put out on these North Wales hydro schemes in the last few years. The House will be interested in these figures, all of which can be checked. The divisional controller of the British Electricity Authority, in the "Manchester Guardian" on 22nd December, 1948, said that the eight hydro schemes in North Wales would save 500,000 tons. In the "Electrical Review," page 143, on 27th January, 1950, the same gentleman said that the eight schemes would save 400,000 tons—he pulled it down by 100,000 tons.

The predecessor of the present Minister, on 25th July, 1949, when replying to a Parliamentary Question by my hon. Friend the Member for Twickenham (Sir E. Keeling) said that the coal saving in the eight schemes would be 374,000 tons. Lord Citrine wrote me on 7th February, 1952, and said that the saving on six schemes only would be 252,000 tons—still going down—but even allowing for the exclusion

of the two schemes at Snowdon and Nant Ffrancon it is still a reduction. When a calculation is made, based on the thermal efficiency of a new power station today, at 28 per cent., the coal saving on the six schemes to which I have referred—that is, excluding Nant Ffrancon and Snowdon—is only 182,000 tons.

Here is the crux of the case. To save 182,000 tons of coal per annum the British Electricity Authority want to invest £30 million. That is sheer nonsense. If hon. Members will read the debate on fuel efficiency on 7th March, 1952, and take the trouble to refer to a case I quoted from a Kidderminster carpet factory, relating to the installation of back pressure generation for the sum of £100,000 they will see that 6,000 tons of coal a year were saved. Hon. Members should compare that with the saving of coal in the North Wales Hydro schemes and they will arrive at the conclusion that it is ten times as great, relatively, as the saving in those hydro schemes. In other words, the most extravagant way of trying to save coal is to invest in water power.

... The coal economy of these hydro schemes in North Wales is negligible compared with the capital investment cost. The capital investment cost is, in my view, extravagant and the yield is problematical. The load factor is so low as to make them most uneconomical. The cost to the consumer of a unit of electricity is the same if it is generated by hydro as if it is generated by a steam power station. Much quicker electrification in North Wales could be obtained by using the Connah's Quay steam power station augmented by the high tension line along the North Wales Littoral.

Over the whole picture must be considered the danger of spoilation of one of the finest areas of mountain scenery in the United Kingdom. I do not believe that any planning authority control over these proposed schemes will safeguard all the amenities. Thus, on financial grounds, on economic grounds, on agricultural grounds, on scenic grounds, and on piscatorial grounds I believe that these schemes stand condemned. I refuse to contribute tonight to any scheme of electricity development in North Wales which will lead to the spoilation of the mountain grandeur of that country, and I shall vote against the Bill.

Mr. Goronwy Roberts (Caernarvon): I will not attempt to follow the hon. Member for Kidderminster (Mr. Nabarro) into the maze of financial, technical and piscatorial excursions to which he treated us, but I wish to join with him at the outset in reminding the House that this Bill should not be dealt with in isolation. I do hope the House will bear in mind that this Bill is the first of a series of measures by which the British Electricity Authority hope to implement a vast and complex scheme to harness the entire watershed of Snowdonia for hydro-electrical purposes.

It is true, as the hon. Member said, that the Bill embodies the least controversial of the proposals of the Authority but, nevertheless, it is of the utmost importance that this House should closely scrutinise its provisions for it does give very clear indications of what the Authority have in mind in regard to the five other much larger and more complex schemes it is proposing. What the B.E.A. are trying to do under this Bill will be the very minimum which they will try to do and seek to do in the rest of Snowdonia.

Let me say at the outset that I do not object in principle to an appropriate scheme for the utilisation of the water surplus of North Wales for hydro-electricity. The position about the sources of fuel and power is such that we are bound to use, within reason and with proper safeguards, the surplus water that we have in this country, as well as coal and oil, when we can get it. In my constituency the British Electricity Authority, if I may pay them this compliment on this occasion, are setting up a kind of windmill which will capture the four winds in order to generate electricity.

We must look forward to the utilisation of water power, within reason, and with proper safeguards, side by side with the use of coal and oil, but this Bill does not set out to utilise the water surplus in Snowdonia in that careful and proper fashion. The Bill with all its implications, is, I submit, unacceptable, and if it is given a Second Reading I hope it will be sent upstairs together with a set of instructions on the lines of those set out on the Order Paper, which will convert the Bill into something like that which is proper in the circumstances both of North Wales and of this country. I believe it must be drastically modified in many of its provisions and I hope that will be done. . . .

... In the Bill the B.E.A. seek to take over the planning powers of the local authorities for the areas with which they are dealing. Perhaps I may mention one or two Clauses. Some of the Clauses in the Bill are incredibly drastic in the way in which they arrogate to the British Electricity Authority the full planning power in that part of the world. Clause 6, for instance, empowers the B.E.A. "notwithstanding any other enactment" to build, free of all planning control, about three dozen constructions and apparatus from dams and dynamos to ancillary and satellite conveniences.

Clause 8 says that the Authority may dredge and blast the beds of lakes and rivers and deposit the mud "as they think fit." Clause 23 empowers the B.E.A. to build generating stations and enables them to produce and manufacture "any product or thing arising or used in such generation."

By the terms of Clause 12 they can take their time over all these things. They can spread them over ten years. They can gouge and tear and mangle the landscape, leaving masses of rubble about the place for ten years. In fact, before streams are to be dried up, they are to be polluted. . . . Quite simply, as far as this area is concerned, the Clauses in this Bill mean the setting aside of the provisions of the National Parks Act and the River Boards Act in favour of the British Electricity Authority.

I suggest that this is quite intolerable. Many other hon. Members wish to speak in this truncated debate and I have no time to follow up this amenity point, but I suggest that if this Bill is given a Second Reading, the Committee upstairs should insist that whatever works are set up under this Bill must be subject to local planning authority consent and, in turn, there must be consultation with the Royal Fine Arts Commission or, alternatively, the National Parks Commission on the question of landscape.

The second great objection is on the question of water supply, and this is, perhaps, a little more technical. The proposals of the British Electricity Authority assume that

(continued on page 7.)

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. 9.

Saturday, April 26, 1952.

Sovereignty and the Constitution in S. Africa

We note the opinion of Dr. Donges, Minister of the Interior in the Government of South Africa, that the opposition to Dr. Malan is "releasing forces they would not be able to control."

Let us get this quite clear. The opposition to which the Minister refers is a parliamentary Opposition consolidating from a three-fold alliance against Dr. Malan composed of the United Party (formerly led by the late Field-Marshal Smuts), the Labour Party and a "Torch Commando" movement led by a group-captain who has the same name as the Premier, Dr. Malan: a war veteran organisation—a queer mixture to embody an explicitly Constitutional challenge to the doctrine of the supremacy of Parliament, the Sovereignty of majorities, and all that sort of thing. Dr. Malan's Government passed legislation which placed coloured (mixed-blood) voters on a separate electoral roll, depriving them of rights given under the so-called 'entrenched' clause of the South Africa Act of 1909. The Bill has been declared *ultra vires* by the Supreme Court of South Africa on constitutional grounds. It is not material so far as we are concerned what these grounds are: they are constitutional grounds: Dr. Malan is saying that Parliament can do anything it likes; the Opposition, backed by the Court, is saying it can't. This is the Constitutional Issue, and involves not merely forms but the realities of social organisation: is the only Sovereignty that of majorities as expressed by present-day methods, or is there a true, overriding Sovereignty? It is appreciated, in South Africa and elsewhere, that the dispute has expanded far beyond any question of the rights or privileges of a group within the community, coloured or white.

Admittedly there are constitutions and constitutions. Modern politics provides many instances of what may be called "the involution of forms." For the moment, we rest upon the same note as Dr. Donges: the Opposition (in South Africa and at 'headquarters') may release forces it is unable to control.

Mr. Churchill and Hiroshima

"The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg" which were to be published last Tuesday disclose the existence of a war-time Roosevelt-Churchill pact, terminated only in January, 1948, under which Great Britain had power to veto use by the United States of the atomic bomb. The source of this information is a Reuter message from Washington dated April 19.

Why was this power not used? The question is for Mr. Churchill.

Tit-Bit

"Nato itself is developing power and personality; indeed, one of the most remarkable things about it is the way in which it has out-stripped the organisation of Europe, about which there has been in the past far more discussion, research and propaganda. Being at this early stage primarily a military organisation, it has grown stealthily and at times has enjoyed all the advantages of being a cabinet without the disadvantages of being responsible to a parliament. It has developed novel methods of consultation and persuasion, and it has now come to the point where it will have a permanent headquarters in Paris and a central team to do its work." (*The Economist*, April 5.)

"Outgrowing Party System"

Mrs. Joyce Mew, Chairman of the British Housewives' League wrote to *The Scotsman* of April 15:—

"Sir,—A quotation from Coventry Patmore, written more than 80 years ago and reproduced in to-day's *Daily Telegraph*, forms a curiously apt comment on Mr. K. R. Middleton's letter in your issue of April 3.

"The widely extended impatience of women under the present condition of things is nothing but an unconscious protest against the diminished manliness of men.

"The men folk of to-day do seem to have fallen down somewhat on their primary duty of providing adequate housing and decent food for their wives and families. Had there been a 'Breadwinners' League things might perhaps have been better. As it is, we women, struggling in the economic blizzard through a welter of rules and regulations, sometimes feel as if the forces of death and darkness are ranged against us; hence the present malaise. Hence also, the emergence of the 'British Housewives' League' aiming at the restoration of the home and the family to that position of importance from which it should never have been allowed to recede.

"It is, and can be, no mere feminist organisation, for nothing is clearer than that the well-being of the home involves the happy and active co-operation of father, mother, and children alike.

"While it is true that in any community there are always those who want to move the piano and those who want to leave it as it is, the present party system seems to bear but little relation to these two main attitudes of mind. All political activity, it seems, is carried on with one eye fixed on an electorate functioning on a purely numerical, as against a qualitative, basis. If some system cannot be devised putting a premium on the responsible and adult-minded voter, we shall end up with not only a servile, but a puerile State.—I am, &c.

"Joyce Mew, Chairman,

"British Housewives' League."

No Rise?

"In the Orkneys, the trout won't look at a worm not purchased from a Registered Dealer." (*Planners' Comfort*, April 21.)

Education v. The Educationalist State

by DRYDEN GILLING SMITH.

(Concluded)

The co-ordination of schools into a system designed to serve a temporal power operated by men who accept as axiomatic these four beliefs (whose correspondence with metaphysical reality I have shown to be non-existent, though I doubt if any of the 'main political parties' would even bother to dispute them) can only hasten the break-up of the society which these beliefs threaten. The 1944 Education Act can therefore be said to attack what remains of our society rather than to serve it. The more unpleasant and unnatural the form of association into which that society is being twisted, the more it requires physical sanctions to hold it together, and the less will be the confidence of the individual (upon which, as Mr. Hewlett Edwards has told us, "a stable society must ultimately depend") that it is worth while. The Education Act was a social dis-service—with the qualification that it ought not to be called an education act at all, because it has nothing to do with education.

It merely provides for the arrangement of an instrument of control which we may regard as being either for the benefit of the 'state' or to assist the carrying out of the policy of those who, for practical purposes, control the 'state.' The kind of policy it may assist is illustrated by Mr. Jacks (*op.cit.*) "But the teaching of facts is not enough. There is a conception of world citizenship *which we must inculcate.*" (my italics). ". . . there is no such thing to-day as world citizenship: the federal systems of the United States of America or of the Soviet Union or the British Commonwealth of Nations are the nearest approaches to it, and we may look forward to the day when a complete world federation with a common citizenship will be created."

The so-called Education Act is merely an extension of conscription to most of the age-group below that of military service. Section 80. (1) of the Act requires that "The proprietor of every school . . . shall cause to be kept in accordance with regulations made by the Minister a register containing the prescribed particulars with respect to all persons of compulsory school age who are pupils at the school, and such regulations may make provision for enabling such registers to be inspected, for enabling extracts therefrom to be taken for the purposes of this Act by persons duly authorised in that behalf under regulations, and for requiring the persons by whom any such register is required to be kept to make to the Minister, and to local education authorities, such periodical or other returns as to the contents thereof as may be prescribed."

Of what use would such a system of records be for educational purposes? It is merely, like the rationing system, identity cards, the state disease service (also with its excuse for Medical Record sheets), state insurance, the state control of banking which demands reports on private deposits, and the recruitment of civilians as soldiers, useful to a central plan of control. Between school and military service 'young persons' are kept under periodic observation by compulsory attendance at a County College for the equivalent of one day a week or eight weeks a year. Section 45. (1)—(a) adds that "every young person who is not exempt

from compulsory attendance for further education shall at all times keep the local education authority in whose area he resides informed of his proper address." For children below school age, there are also similar provisions. For example Section 34—(1) allows that any local education officer "may by notice in writing served upon the parent of any child who has attained the age of two years require him to submit the child for examination by a medical officer . . . and if a parent upon whom such a notice is served fails without reasonable excuse to comply with the requirements thereof, he shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding five pounds."

The connection of the latter with education may be obscure; but we are informed by Mr. Jacks (*op.cit.*) that "to whatever category a school may belong, it should be first and foremost a health centre" and he lists as one of the five questions that should be asked in deciding how a child should be 'educated' after the age of 11—"What is his physical condition?" Liverpool University has recently made a similar statement about selection of undergraduates. Mr. Jacks adds that the 1944 Act ". . . provides the Minister with the necessary powers . . . with the aim will go the plan necessary for its accomplishment, and this will be a comprehensive plan assuring continuity from the cradle to the grave." Further measures would be purely administrative, measures likely to make the temporal government more sure in the possession of powers conferred by this Act. The sort of thing we may expect is outlined by Mr. Jacks later on in the same work. "Total Education would see at the centre a Ministry of Youth, in whose hands would be concentrated all the responsibilities for the welfare of young people up to the age of eighteen at present shared by the Ministry of Education with the Home Office, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Labour and any other Government Departments which may be involved. Physical development, the treatment of young offenders, the choice of employment, and the time to be spent in employment would thus be added to the more technically educational responsibilities of the present Ministry of Education and would fall under one authority." The strategical importance of putting 'youth' into a special compartment, controlling as much as possible of its environment, its varied contacts with older people, in ultimately getting it to perform what you want, has been recognised by many people, but its present day tactics have been analysed and explained most effectively by Mr. Wyndham Lewis in his suppressed work *The Doom of Youth* (1934). The reason for conditioning the environment is to provide the unreal surroundings necessary to stimulate in children the unreal ideas that will make them work for the unreal conditions (not in accord with the nature of things) that the Planners desire. Mr. Jacks (*op.cit.*) says that ". . . it is from whole situations that children learn, and through which they are almost infinitely suggestible. Plato was the first exponent of educational theory to draw attention to this suggestibility, and to base upon it a method of teaching which used the total environment of the child, but many writers since his time have emphasized and amplified this point. Thus Sir Joshua Reynolds wrote: 'The disposition, which is so strong in children, continues with us of catching the general air and manner of those with whom we are most conversant; with this difference only, that a young mind is naturally pliable and imitative; but in more

advanced state it grows rigid, and must be warmed and softened before it will receive a deep impression.'"

It is an unnatural state of affairs for a government to presume to a super-human existence, and to usurp the rights and responsibilities of parents for their children. The question "Whose children are they anyway?" asked at a meeting during the fight for the independence of the village school at Lindsell in 1949 is perhaps the comment, most to the point, that has been made on the implications of the 1944 Act.

How even the pretext of state schooling for anything to do with learning has been dropped is evidenced in the substitution of the "3 A's" for the "3 R's"—Section 36—"It shall be the duty of the parent of every child of compulsory school age to cause him to receive efficient full-time education suitable to his age, ability and aptitude, either by regular attendance at a school or otherwise." Like the substitution of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" for "Life, liberty and property" in the American Declaration of Independence, this change to words that can be made to mean anything in the hands of those whose job it will be to interpret them in action, is but another example of a modern state pretending to offer something in the form of a slogan charter but in reality appropriating greater power to itself for undefined ends.

The most savage part of this Act is that which deals with independent schools. In the past they have been attacked by those equalitarians who complain that people who are prepared to pay for it should not be able to buy a better education for their children than that provided for nothing in the state schools. What is the state, to criticise or to have any say in the policy of schools that are better than itself can provide? The opposite argument—that parents need protecting from bad schools rests on equally absurd grounds. The parent has the financial sanction of being able to remove his child from one independent school to another or to a state school, a sanction which he does not possess when dealing with the shortcomings of a school run by an L.E.A. In assessing the standard of a school he is free to remember the old proverb that "bricks and mortar don't make a school," such an assessment being far-removed from that made by the state which is mainly concerned with the condition of the premises.

The 1944 Act virtually transfers this final sanction of the policy of independent schools from the parents to the state. The schools have to accept the standards imposed by the state, whether or not they may coincide with those of the parents, thus closing one of the few escapes that still remained for those who did not wish their children to be placed in the environment and atmosphere desired by the state. Part III of the Act requires all independent schools to be registered except those in which "... under the provisions hereinafter contained, the proprietor is disqualified from being the proprietor of an independent school or the school premises are disqualified from being used as a school, or if the school premises are used or proposed to be used for any purpose for which they are disqualified If after the expiration of six months from the date of the commencement of this Part of the Act any person—(a) conducts an independent school (whether established before or after the commencement of that Part) which is not a

registered school or a provisionally registered school . . . he shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds or in the case of a second or subsequent conviction to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months or to both such imprisonment and such fine."

Once he has forced the school to be registered the power of the Minister extends to the lengths of being able to veto the appointment of any teacher. "If the Minister is satisfied that any registered or provisionally registered school is objectionable upon all or any of the following grounds . . . (d) that the proprietor of the school or any teacher employed therein is not a proper person to be the proprietor of an independent school or to be a teacher in any school as the case may be; the Minister shall serve upon the proprietor of the school a notice of complaint . . . the notice shall specify the measures necessary in the opinion of the Minister to remedy the matters complained of, and shall specify the time, not being less than six months after the service of the notice, within which such measures are required to be taken." He can in fact impose what conditions he likes, since the law gives him power to remove the school from the Register, which as we have seen is the equivalent to closing it. The clause on personnel neatly specifies the kind of measure that has been prepared to assist such "ideology purges" as our more extreme "Hegelian Statist" parties are no doubt preparing. The 1944 Act also gives the Minister power (Section 88) to veto the appointment of chief education officer made by any Local Education Authority.

The final respect though by no means the least important respect in which this Act serves the interests of the Hegelian State ("and it shall be the duty of the local education authority for every area, so far as their powers extend, to contribute towards the spiritual, moral, mental, and physical development of the *community*" (my italics) and undermines the principles on which our society depends for its existence is its use of delegated legislation, and the setting up, beyond the jurisdiction of the civil courts, of tribunals whose decision is final. The late Lord Chief Justice Hewart treated the implications of such action in his book *The New Despotism* (1929). In this he mentions specifically clauses in the Education Acts of 1902 and 1918 for their contravention of traditional English justice. Of the 1902 Act he says that Section 7 provided "that if any question arose under the section between a local education authority and the managers of a school not provided by the authority, the question should be determined by the Board of Education." Part III of the 1944 Act provides for the creation of an Independent Schools Tribunal which is the body to which appeals against the Minister's decisions must be taken. Section III of the 1944 Act allows that "Any order made or directions given by the Minister, the Minister of Health, or a local education authority under the provisions of this Act may be varied or revoked by a further order or further directions made or given by the Minister, the Minister of Health, or that authority as the case may be." We have more recently seen the Minister exercising powers that he ought never to have possessed with such a regulation as that fixing the age limit for the General Certificate of Education at 16 (no doubt a concession to the desire to impose equality, to reduce as much as possible the

practical effects of the natural advantages which some children possess over others).

Mr. H. C. Dent in his book *The Education Act 1944* mentions that when Section 68 was added to the Bill at a very late stage the opinion was expressed by Lord Rankellour "that this discretionary power of the Minister ought to be checked . . . either in the Courts (of Law) or by Parliament," and later an amendment was moved to the effect that any direction made by the Minister under this section (giving him power to intervene if he is satisfied that any local education authority or the managers or governors of any county or voluntary school are acting or proposing to act unreasonably) should, like the Regulations he makes, be laid before Parliament for 40 days, during which time either House might annul it. Mr. Dent continues "The amendment was rejected by the government, on whose behalf the Earl of Selbourne pointed out that under the Act the Minister of Education was charged with very great responsibilities, and that in effect this section constituted him a Court of Appeal" (my italics). Lord Selbourne's reply for the government expresses complete recognition of the omniscient state whose administrative convenience takes first place over any other claims whether they be justice, the traditions of our society or the rights of the individual—"My noble friends say that the Minister himself ought to be subject to the check either of Parliament or of a judge. But this is a matter of administration You could not administer this or any other Act under procedure of that kind" (*Hansard*, 18th July, 1944, Vol. 132, No. 72, cols. 960-1). What a perfect practical guide must our traditional procedure have been when it refuses to work for the type of law which infringes the constitution. The new procedures necessary are a means of forcing anything *ultra vires* upon the public's attention. But the public is asleep and/or drugged by the four new or not so new credos it has imbibed, the belief in the absolute importance of environment, the belief in equality, in the Hegelian super-human state, and the belief that knowledge should be acquired so that knowledge may be acquired.

If, after considering what has been done to our society in the name of education, and what has been done to education, there are some who are of the opinion that these measures have enabled certain men to learn things which they could not otherwise have had the opportunity of learning and which have been sufficiently related to main principles to enable them to act in defence of the Society which is everywhere being attacked, they would do well to consider also Erza Pound's salutary warning: "Wisdom resides less in the means than in the affirmation of ends. If there is the will to attain the end the means will be found. If the end is perfidious, no means can have in itself any inherent virtue capable of preventing the perversion of justice."

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

there is in North Wales a large supply of water at high levels which is not now and never will be required for domestic and industrial consumption. That assumption is questioned by the local authorities, by the National Farmers' Union in that part of the country and by a large range of technical experts, among whom is Mr. Frank Chapman.

As has already been mentioned, the rainfall there is

high, reaching as much as 180 inches a year. I come from that part of the world and I can testify to the very heavy rainfall which occurs there. But the point is that it is not susceptible to easy catchment because of the rock formation, which breaks up the pools. That is proved by the fact that the British Electricity Authority will have to do so much tunnelling to scoop together the water which is in theory available but in practice is very difficult to gather in reservoirs.

Consequently, although *prima facie* there is a good deal of water there, in practice very little of it is available for domestic, agricultural and other use. Indeed, we have come to this, that in 1945 the Caernarvon County Council asked Messrs. Howard Humphreys, the consulting engineers, of Westminster, to report on the availability of water for municipal purposes in their area, and the engineers felt bound to report that the county of Caernarvon was inadequately supplied. Part of the reason given was this extraordinary difficulty of collecting together what water did fall upon the topmost peaks.

It follows that if the availability of water in this part of the country is already inadequate, a large scale abstraction on the lines described in this Bill is going to set up very serious difficulties. Not the least concerned in this respect are those who earn their livings from the pastureland of the hills—the hill farmers—who rear thousands of sheep every year, producing wool and meat, and who are going to find their pastures subject to gradual drying up and also to impediment by the innumerable constructions for which the Bill provides.

Secondly, the farmers on the lower reaches of these mountains who, up to now, have had to depend upon sources of water such as streams and lakes, will find that the scooping up of the rainfall at a high level will tend to dry up or reduce the water in the streams and lakes, with results detrimental not only to the pastoral industry they follow but to health.

This is not imagination; it is what has happened whenever these not too plentiful sources of water have for some reason or another been interfered with. . . .

That is the view of the county council and it is my view, as one of the members for that county. I believe my colleague on the other side of the House, who represents the other part of the county, the hon. Member for Conway (Mr. P. Thomas), will go a very long way with me in agreeing that there is real danger to the livelihood and the work of the farmers and hill farmers in that part of the country from the magnitude of the proposals which the British Electricity Authority are putting forward. Time does not permit me to deal as fully as I should like with the water position.

There is just one more point—the feeling among the local inhabitants. I believe that this was mentioned by an hon. Member. If this Bill goes through, the local inhabitants feel that there should be some provision to ensure that they will benefit by the works put in progress. . . .

Mr. Philip Noel-Baker (Derby, South): I support the Second Reading of the Bill. Like the hon. Member for Woking (Mr. Watkinson), I completely reject the argument of the hon. Member for Kidderminster (Mr. Nabarro). If it were valid, it would have been decisive against the hydro-

electric schemes in Northern Scotland, which have, in fact, proved to be a magnificent investment for the nation. . . .

Mr. Peter Thomas (Conway): . . . We have heard about the value and the disadvantage of hydro-electric power. Both have been put very simply and exactly by my hon. Friend the Member for Kidderminster (*Mr. Nabarro*). I should like to speak about the effect of these three schemes on the community as a whole. First, I think we are entitled to have regard to the effect of these schemes on Britain; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, South, said their effect on Britain would be negligible.

Second, what is to be their effect on North Wales? We hope that at full capacity they will assist the industrial parts of North Wales, round Wrexham and the industrial border; but the effect will be practically unfelt, because all these schemes are small and cannot produce sufficient electricity to make any appreciable difference to that area.

Third, what will be the effect on Caernarvonshire and Merioneth? These schemes will all be within those two counties and I ask the House to consider exactly what it will mean to have a tremendous undertaking like this in what is in fact a rural area.

The objections to this Bill are well known to the House. I ask the House what benefit Caernarvonshire and Merioneth and their immediate areas will receive from the Bill, and what will be the disadvantages. We have heard about the supply of electricity to the rural areas of North Wales. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, South, mentioned that point, and said that in Scotland people are now happily provided with plenty of electricity and are looking forward to having television shows.

It is well-known that we need electricity in the rural areas of North Wales, especially in Caernarvonshire and Merioneth. If I thought that this Bill would bring electricity to those rural areas I should give it my very hearty support; but the problem in North Wales is not one of generating electricity. There are not many people in the rural areas of Wales, and the problem is, and has been for some time, one of distribution. It seems to me that the supply of electricity in the rural areas of North Wales will be set back further if this Bill goes forward, because if we embark on expensive schemes like this we shall defer distribution from our existing supply stations.

. . . As to the water supply, my hon. Friend the Member for Woking (*Mr. Watkinson*) mentioned that the British Electricity Authority are very happy to allow adequate compensation water and a minimum flow in the rivers, but if the Bill is studied one finds the following figures. In 11½ square miles of land to be intercepted by the River Eden in the Maentwrog scheme only 6 per cent. of the average daily flow will be left. In 5¾ square miles of land to be intercepted by the leat in the Dolgarrog scheme the amount of water in named streams—the unnamed will be completely dry—is to be 6 per cent. In the whole of the Ffestiniog area the water left in the streams is to be 7 per cent.

It is obvious that this is totally inadequate. One must have regard to the requirements of the riparian owners—the farmers—of that area. There is also another most important point. It is not just a question of people coming from England to view the beautiful scenery in North Wales;

it is an industry. We must have regard to the tourist industry, and it is essential that we should have at least one-third of the average daily flow left in the streams. . . .

. . . In conclusion, I would say that the Bill as it stands is open to serious objections. It has been a severe threat to the Snowdonia National Park and to some of the main principles of the National Park system, and I think it establishes damaging precedents for the future. I do not wish to object to a Second Reading, but I hope that the voice of the House will carry to the Select Committee so that the necessary Amendments can be made.

The Minister of Fuel and Power (Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd): . . . In this House we are not engineers or technicians. We normally proceed, as I think we must, on the basis of taking the expert advice we receive from the duly authorised technicians whom we are able to consult. It might interest the House if I said a few words on that aspect. I take the case of Ffestiniog because I think it is a good typical example which brings out the issues rather well. The capital cost of the Ffestiniog scheme is £3,325,000. For an equivalent steam installation, the capital cost would be £2,358,000. Therefore, the hydro-electric scheme costs about £1 million more. The running cost of the hydro-electric scheme is £21,000 a year. The running cost of the steam system, because of the cost of fuel, would be £265,000 a year.

In the case of Connah's Quay, if my hon. Friend were right the fuel would probably have to come from the Midlands and there would be the rather costly and difficult question of transportation, and I do not think we could get the problem solved with quite the ease which he suggested.

(*To be continued.*)

District Council want to Disband Powers Reduced, Say Members

On the grounds that they did not have enough work to do, Kirkcudbright District Council, says *The Scotsman* of April 15, made a suggestion recently that they should disband, and asked the County Clerk for a legal ruling as to how this could be done.

"The County Clerk" says the newspaper, "has now informed the District Council that they have exactly the same functions delegated to them as have other District Councils. He has pointed out that the Council could spend up to £1,000 annually, but their requisition over the past seven years had not exceeded £25 in any year."

Members of the District Council have complained that such matters as housing, poor law, water, scavenging, and drainage had been taken away from them, and they had only burial-grounds to administer. It was suggested that burial-grounds should also be taken away to leave them with nothing to do at all.

In that case, they could be duly elected but need never meet.

It was eventually decided to discuss the matter with the County Clerk to see if a joint approach could be made to the Secretary of State for Scotland with a view to having some of their former functions restored.