Pricking the Bubbles of Political Legend*

By Dryden Gilling Smith.

In the age of demos, we are constantly faced by the products of the schoolmaster-child (or more accurately nursemaid-infant) relationship. In the age of Demos a perpetual minor, demos, instructs his government to carry out the orders which he himself has received via his tutors, the press and state education. The most eye-catching of these products is the political mythology (though this is a gross degradation of the word mythology) which manufactures colossal barrage balloon figures in which politicians appear, with a high emotional content (good or bad), to their child-like public. A slight effort of the intelligence will deflate these figures as effectively and immediately as a pin-prick deflates their prototypes. Such action, far from being a whimsical vanity on the part of mischievous ‘muck-rakers,’ is necessary before anyone can examine political phenomena on a matter of fact basis. Why certain events have taken place that need not have taken place; how far these events can be laid at the door of certain politicians who could have refused to carry out the policies which caused them; and what were the motives which led these politicians to behave in the way they did; these are questions which are commonplaces in the study of a Shakespeare play. Yet, when the mind turns its attention from *Julius Caesar* or *Measure for Measure* to the contemporary scene, it commonly ceases to ask the same questions, or asks them on a very different level. Had Roosevelt been no more than a character in a play, a student of literature, who attempted to explain his actions as those of “a genial old soul who was simply taken in by Uncle Joe,” would be told to go away and write his essay again, being asked to explain how such a simple genial old soul could have had the cunning necessary to arrive at the position of being world arbiter. Mad perhaps, most certainly possessed (this word covers both possibilities). Any literary treatment of such a crack-pot showman would have to include a consideration of Who helped him to power? Who knew his weak spots and the way to handle him? And who in the long run profited by his actions? This would not be an important work of criticism but a routine exercise.

What prevents the real application of this critical faculty to the behaviour of politicians, is the fact that these are no longer thought of as persons but as balloons, or as gods whose ways are as inscrutable as those of providence. Discussion of their doings turns into a twisted form of theology. Are you of the faith or following of . . . ? Do you believe in him or not? Do you believe in Hitler? Do you believe in Winston Churchill?


We are often tempted to wonder what a Statesman would say when he saw the antics of the politicians or ‘new statesmen’ that occupy positions of state. Herr von Papen answers this speculation. He was a Statesman. His 600 page apologia is in fact the ‘Statesman’s Tragedy’ of our time. It is exceedingly well written and so stripped of all accidental matter that it has a much wider significance than any personal biography. It shows how any statesman who tries to serve his nation when the latter has abandoned its sovereign, finds himself in the position of a butcher who remains in service after the family mansion has passed into the hands of a fish and chip magnate. He tries to serve his new master as he once served his old, but he can’t help being sensitive to the differences.

It is for this reason that Herr von Papen gives us the most credible picture of Hitler that has so far been put on record. It is not that Von Papen deliberately deflates the god or demon balloon that has attached itself to the name of Hitler, but that this propagandised spectre never for one moment entered his mind, or got in the way of his understanding of what Hitler was actually doing. In his capacity as head of the German state Hitler owed a great deal to Von Papen’s tact and skilled diplomacy. The latter however always saw Hitler, the man and party leader, as a different kettle of fish from Hitler the Chancellor. He saw him as the man who talked to everyone who came to see him in one long disconnected emotional torrent of words. This was the hypnotic gift that had brought him success at mass meetings. Private audiences sometimes worked the same way. At other times the visitor knew how to keep quiet and look impressed, and after about three quarters of an hour, when Hitler had played himself out, convinced him quite easily of the point he wished to make. In these circumstances Hitler’s decisions were often those of the last person who had spoken to him.

Von Papen’s chief objection to Hitler’s rule was his progressive identification of the Party (of which Von Papen had never been a member) with the nation, and it was a great disappointment to him to find the victorious western powers thinking in exactly the same terms as Hitler, either not understanding or deliberately obscuring these differences. Herbert Morrison writing in the *Sunday Times* for January 18, 1953 still shows that he considers the late war as one “against Fascism and anti-Semitism.”

This obscuring of differences is a necessary part of the child-like balloon politics of which we have been speaking. To make dems fight a war you have to convince him that it is a religious war between the gods and the devils. Once roused he becomes the most reckless battle-monger of the lot, with no ability to relate the cost in human life, etc., to any given objective. Although there was nearly as much
information about conditions in Soviet Russia available in the years 1941-45 as in the years 1948-52, the child-like population of these 'dollarous' islands believed the Russians to be gods who could do no wrong in the first period and demons who could do no right in the second. Again if this were in a drama, not even Bradley could explain the psychological state of muts who roamed the streets carrying banners for a "Second Front Now."

Two further characteristics of 'John Bull,' when added to his indulgence in the politics of balloon personalities, stand between him and the appraisal of any first-hand analytical reporting of the situation with which he is faced. The first is his famous 'sense of humour' which is characteristically the expression of the 'compulsory resignation of the underdog.' This is not the hard-hitting satire of Molière or Swift, based on a conception of reality beside which the specimens treated are seen as mere piggies, but the reverse of this. It is the slave, parasitical, or collectivist mentality of this. It is the slave, compost, or collectivist mentality which finds everything beyond its ken bizarre. Its epitome is 'Punch,' which, as Mr. Pound has remarked, has never been on the side of a minority. "It is for all its pleasantness and nice behaviour, the most cowardly organ in England ... Punch, originally a broken nose, broken-backed cuckold is strangely overblown; has strangely puffed himself up into a symbol of national magnitude."

The second national weakness of this 'mysterious Mr. Bull' is his sentimentalism. Who first harnessed this to politics is not clear, but I suspect the superior skill of Disraeli. At any rate a transformation occurred about the time of his period of eminence in the dominant attitude towards foreign affairs. Before then the aim of English foreign policy had been to be a nimble off-stage figure who could appear in a moment as the grain of sand that turns the scale. The colonies had nothing to do with politics. In fact the only time politicians had stuck their noses into colonial affairs the result had been the loss of our American possessions. Trollope's political novels about the 1860's show a 'Society' totally unconscious of overseas possessions. We enjoyed the fruits of the latter without exciting the neighbours' animosity by 'showing off.'

Was Disraeli an agent provocateur who led the English into an ostentatious display of their 'imperial' wealth and power, which could only excite the rivalry and hate of other powers, and cause endless battles to keep by force what a few men had gained by using their wits? Certainly the conception of a large part of the world painted red and a mighty empire was just the thing to be lapped up by English sentimentalism, with disastrous effects on any realism in foreign policy from then onwards. Instead of the nimble use of the grain of sand which turns the scale, we find the foreign policy of the heavy footed world policeman, who, between bawling 'Land of Hope and Glory' at the top of his voice, goes around tapping neighbouring potentiates on the shoulder with a "Wouldn't you do it if I were you, 'Old England' won't allow it!" The development of such sentiments has blinded the bulk of even the supposedly intelligent English population to the absurdity of getting involved in three unprofitable wars. Once developed, the same 'bobby' sentiments were quite easily transferred to such things as the 'League of Nations' and U.N.O.

Mixed up with this sentimental attachment to 'Empire' as an entity in itself is the same virus which makes people accept the omnipotent state of socialist practice. Where the sovereign is really the head of the state, loyalty is to the sovereign, and not to some glorified idiot. The prospect of such a sovereign as a person should sober up any exaggerated nationalism on the part of members of that country. Where the king is dethroned we get the fanatical worship of an idol ('La France' appearing with the French revolution). The jingoist's 'Old England' is of this order, though it slipped into use without the legal deposition of the monarchy.

Getting the habit of mind of 'world bobby,' and the habit of thinking of countries as if they were super-human-beings, these sentimental Englishmen became walking victims for anyone bent on wiping out western Europe as the operative factor in world affairs. To get them into a war you had not to prove that they had anything to gain, but rather the reverse, that 'We got nuffink ter get artovit.' Mr. Wyndham Lewis describes how the 1914-18 war appeared to the sentimental Englishman 'in the street.' "He really believes that 'England' is very angry with big bully 'Germany' (and he never looks behind that abstraction-America is 'Uncle Sam,' a lean man of middle age in the costume of 1800, Russia is a bearded Moujik and so on) and when 'Old England' sees 'Germany' invade poor little Belgium, well she gets very cross and goes out to Flanders to put a stop to it." Once in the mess, his customary 'sense of humour' keeps him 'smiling through,' and makes a butt of anyone who 'can't accept things' or tries to do something to stop 'Old England' throwing away manpower worth a million times the strategy value of Flanders. 'Old England' don't think in low calculating terms of strategy.

Mr. Lewis adds: "That there is any intrigue of a mercenary or really cold-blooded political order behind such a calamity as the war he (the 'man in the street') cannot believe. If, in spite of himself, he should get a glimpse from time to time of such an unromantic fact, his customary sentimentalism thrusts it quickly back into forgetfulness.

Such is the lacuna in that part of the Englishman's mind which deals with 'foreign policy.' At the head of their affairs for most of the years between the wars the English tolerated Stanley Baldwin, who, according to his biographer, G. M. Young, never concealed his impatience of foreigners from the said foreigners and went to sleep whenever his Cabinet discussed foreign affairs. According to Von Papen, Neville Chamberlain knew how to handle Hitler the man. He could wait till Hitler had 'talked himself out' and then argue with him where Churchill would probably have shouted back. But the English were not interested in a Prime Minister who took his job as seriously ('no sense of humour') as that, and attempted to understand these 'foreigners.' They preferred to go and play bobbies and burglars with Winston Churchill. If a man or country was not helping you he was a burglar, or obstructing the law; if he helped the police he was a gallant Russian ally.

Such is the mentality which accepts Mr. Morrison's definition of a war 'against Fascism and anti-semitism,' which explains the acceptance of 18B and Nuremburg, and the waste of troops, badly needed to protect our colonial sources of raw materials, in a barren and strategically useless place like Korea. The foreign statesman who attempts to find some rhyme or reason behind British foreign policy is unlikely to find it in Great Britain. When he publishes a book in England designed to explain to the English reader
something of the social dynamics of Germany, to give a lucid account of the part played by Germany in world affairs during the last 50 years, as seen by someone who lived on the same level as the headline political balloons, and was in possession of a great deal of information not even available to the brighter journalists (such as Douglas Reed) who tried to nose into European affairs; the stock response of the English reader will be “Is he a fascist?” the answer to the question providing the emotional response by which the book is judged. As Mr. Lewis observes: “The life of the rank and file intellectual (who is about as intellectual as a sparrow) revolves about half a dozen childish epithets, and the emotions aroused by their utterance.”

For the benefit of any sane Islanders who have really made an effort to escape from the pea-soup fog of current ideas about foreign politics, or current ideas about any politics, I would recommend an examination of Von Papen's Memoirs in fairly great detail. There is so little attempt to make his own role shine as that of a star, and no comprehensible motive in his playing up or down of other figures, other than that of making a just record, that there is very little which has to be taken with the proverbial grain of salt. What for example could Von Papen gain at this stage by his praise of Mussolini as behaving far more like a statesman than Hitler? The ‘allies’ considered the word ‘Fascist’ to be a far greater term of abuse than ‘National-Socialist’ and the neo-Nazis are hardly likely to thank him for such a comparison! Von Papen seldom writes outside the range of his own experience. When he talks about Churchill, Roosevelt or Warburg he politely echoes the adulations that have been poured on such figures in their own country, and only ventures to criticise specific points of their policies dealing with Germany. On the whole there is little to discount, even as ‘German point of view’ in this remarkable history of European affairs.

To give one final point of comparison. Supposing that Great Britain had lost the recent war, and that the victorious power had proceeded to ‘try’ military leaders, diplomats, all members of Parliament (including Captain Ramsay) for aiding and abetting a Churchill-Morrisson-Roosevelt-Stalin-Baruch & Co., conspiracy to establish a world financier-socialist state. Supposing they found documents and other evidence to prove that there had been something in the nature of a conspiracy among these politicians, and from this deduced that even a person who had fought in the ‘Battle of Britain’, joined the Home Guard or manufactured Sten guns, was automatically a party to this plot and was guilty of punishment (ranging from death to loss of civil rights). The fate of such victims of ‘Victor’s Justice’ would be exactly on a par with that ministered to countless Germans from 1945 onwards.

Beth Din

For the first time in its history Beth Din is to have one of its decisions challenged in an English court.

Writs have been issued against Beth Din, its president, the Very Rev. Israel Brodie, Chief Rabbi of the Commonwealth, its clerk, Mr. Marcus Carr, and three individual dayanim, or assessors, by a West End restaurateur, Mr. Norman Isow, 28, who asks for an order to be made to include his premises in the list of approved caterers issued by Beth Din.
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From Week to Week

The Scotsman on March 16 published a column article, "Alberta's Social Creditors: Success of 'Funny Money' Party," from Stephen Barber, The Scotsman's Special Correspondent at Edmonton, Alberta.

Macleans on the day before published the second article within six months ("Now, as his [Aberhart's] Social Credit Party prepares for its first national campaign") and calls it "A Maclean Flashback: Aberhart, The Man and the Shadow." It is by Barbara Moon: two full pages and scatterings over three more.

We learn from The Scotsman that "So far, the big banks and investment houses of Canada, preoccupied with the country's huge post-war expansion have looked with a kindly disinterested eye upon the activities of the Social Creditors [sic]. With an election looming up—prophets in Ottawa are speaking of August or September this year as likely dates—it may well be time for them to wake up to the fact that the 'funny money' men are not so funny after all. They take themselves seriously."

From Miss Moon's syntax, it is not clear who was the hero of an anecdote she relates: Aberhart, teacher of a giant's mind and confused him. "Wdh," I said "if that is so, do you not think that David was foolish, after he got that idea into the giant's head, to take a sword and cut his head off?"

We hope the President of the Bank of Canada will have no difficulty in explaining the joke to Mr. Barber.

As with some other citizens of uncorrupted allegiance and an ability which seems to us to be not seriously diminished by the educational transports of the last quarter of a century, we are considerably puzzled by the strategy, or lack of it, displayed by eminent members of the Bench and the Bar concerning matters of which they are the acknowledged masters: matters which closely concern them, as they concern us all. Why don't they take a hand with Mr. Churchill in the discussion of the judges' salaries? You have, as so often the case, only to notice who it is desires to fetter the Law to the tax-gatherer, to know which side of the argument has any claim at all to private respect.

Dr. G. C. Sheldon, of Reigate, and Dr. Allan Yorke, Consultant Dermatologist to the North-West Metropolitan Regional Hospital Board, contribute a special article to The Lancet of March 21, entitled "A Syndrome Associated with the Ingestion of Chemically 'Improved' Flour."

The syndrome (i.e., a collectivity of symptoms of disease) occurred in "an intelligent housewife of 50" and was first noticed in October, 1940, continuing unchecked until April, 1952, when the cause was first suspected. The writers of the paper in The Lancet had the lady under their care jointly after 1947. The syndrome comprised (1) eczema, (2) mental disturbance and (3) anorexia (i.e., loss of appetite for food).

Having traced the disorder apparently to the use of chemically-treated flour, the doctors, in June, 1952, "consulted Mr. X., an authority on the chemistry of milling, seeking his advice and help, which he has given most generously." Her ailment now under control, the patient subjected herself voluntarily to an exhaustive series of experiments until it was proved beyond doubt that within a few hours agensised flour, whether she knew she had taken it or not, or if she had only touched it, was related to the development of her symptoms. The same was proved later for flour treated with chlorine dioxide (the alternative 'improver'); but in this case the effects were in some respects more severe (i.e., deeper mental depression, more profound loss of appetite and a greater appearance of illness). The authors conclude: "The question arises: Is this a rare case of allergy, or merely the first recognition of a common disorder?"

It may be of interest to record the list of foods communicated to the patient which might contain agene-treated flour:

- Tinned soups
- Soup powders and cubes
- Tinned meats
- Gravy thickeners
- Lemon curd
- Cocoa and inferior makes
- Chocolate
- mustard mixtures
- Certain sweets
- Some blancmange and custard powders
- Meat Pastes
- Semolina

In a leading article devoted to the subject, The Lancet says:

"We . . . do think the time has come for a full and frank explanation in terms that everyone can understand. Doctors, in particular, would like to be in a better position to form their own opinion on what may well prove to be an important medical issue."

Expert estimates of the incidence of virtually undiagnosed skin disorders in association with mental symptoms (generally labelled 'neuro-dermatoses') are as high as 50 per cent. of cases seen in special clinics,
Ambassador Page

By H. SWABEY.

(Concluded)

Page regarded Bryan, the Secretary of State, as “the extreme expression of an irrational sentimentalism that was in danger of undermining the American character,” and protested to his son, “We are in danger of being feminised and fad-ridden.” He was not sorry when Bryan resigned.

Page wrote on January 3rd, 1916: “If English respect be worth preserving at all, it can be preserved only by immediate action.” He believed that the severance of diplomatic relations would have brought the war to an end. He considered the President had a real opportunity. He wrote of the English in June, “It’s the one race in the world that’s got the guts.” In July he was summoned to Washington. He believed that an early peace alone would keep the States out of the war. The submarine campaign had been suspended to give the States time to persuade Britain and France. Bernstorff, German ambassador in America, cabled his government that, “the submarine war, being over Mr. Wilson’s head like the sword of Damocles, would compel him at once to take in hand the task of mediation.” Page noted to House that the Germans, in search of Belgian loot, levied monthly taxes, and “made the town government borrow money to pay it.” As for the British, “They’re after the militarism of Prussia—not territory or other gains.”

Grey mentioned, in a parting interview in July, the possibility of “mediatorial service” being done by a neutral, adding that “none of the Allies could mention peace or discuss peace till France should express such a wish.” Page lunched with Asquith on August 1st. (“One does not usually bring away much from his conversations.”) When he mentioned Mexico, Page told him to think of Ireland.

Back at Washington, the ambassador deplored the lack of “social sense” at the White House, where the President invited “few or no distinguished men or women, (except no doubt Mr. McAdoo, his son-in-law).” The President, in Page’s view, had surrounded himself with very small fry, and his insistence upon personal neutrality “suppressed free thought and free speech.... Right here is the President’s vast failure.” The President, in fact, shewed little interest in Page’s visit, and all the ambassador heard was small talk. His London assistant reported that Germany was determined to ask for an armistice. Wilson kept Page waiting five weeks before seeing him, and the ambassador failed to bring the President round to his point of view. Soon after Wilson’s re-election, he sent in his resignation, but Wilson again kept him dangling. Meanwhile, Germany sent Britain a “peace note” through Page, which the President resented as anticipating his own note of December 18th. It irritated the British, and Page called Wilson’s words “insulting.” In January, 1917, the Germans decided to resume unrestricted submarine warfare. A few days later, the President recommended “Peace without Victory.”

Yet within a month, the States broke off diplomatic relations with Germany, and in April declared war. Balfour led his Mission, and explained to Wilson the “secret treaty” made with Italy in 1915. He hurried also to see McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury. Britain had overdrawn her account with J. P. Morgan to the extent of $400,000,000, which the American Government finally paid out of the proceeds of the first Liberty Loan.

In July, the submarine war was menacing Britain, and Page complained to the President that Lloyd George was “too much inclined to yield his judgment to political motives.” He emphasised to his son, “that all the facts must be brought out to show the kinship in blood and ideals of the two great English-speaking nations.” In August, 1920, the chief clerk of the United States census wrote that of the 95 million white people of the United States, 55 million traced their origin to England, Scotland and Wales. Page had little patience with the Irish and German Americans and their anti-British campaign. He selected Hoover for the Belgian Relief post. Unlike Wilson, Page kept good company, and Henry James frequently visited the embassy.

Pope Benedict XV wrote to the powers in August, 1917, urging them to end the war. Wilson replied that the Hohenzollern dynasty was unworthy of confidence. Lansdowne caused a sensation in November by a letter to the Daily Telegraph, in which he said that the war had lasted too long and suggested that the British should restate their war aims. At the same time, a team of American speakers, which included the Presidents of several universities, and was headed by ex-President W. H. Taft, prepared to visit England. But when Taft called on Wilson, the President “seriously questioned the desirability of drawing the two countries more closely together.” Taft protested that the Ambassador had originated the idea, and the President snapped back, “Page is really an Englishman and I have to discount whatever he says about the situation in Great Britain.” House was unable to change the President’s mind on the tour.

Page could not take the Zionist movement seriously, and had never met a Zionist who was going to Palestine. “I think the thing is chiefly a sentiment and nothing else. Morgenthau is dead right.” He judged Lloyd George’s cool attitude to a League of Nations more concisely: “He sees that such a league might mean, in theory at least, the giving over in some possible crisis of the British Fleet to an officer of some other nationality. That’s unthinkable to any red-blooded son of these islands.” He complained that the Morning Post had even opposed the idea, because it would involve the sacrifice of nationality: “The typical Tory mind in general sees no good in the idea. The typical Tory mind is the insular mind.” Meanwhile, some of Asquith’s friends were suggesting that he might support a modification of Lansdowne’s formula. Perhaps Lansdowne wanted Europe to settle her own affairs. Page commented, “Political victory in Great Britain doesn’t now lie in that direction.” The German offensive opened in March. (1918.)

Page commended Jefferson’s letter of 1823, in which he wrote, “With Great Britain we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more, side by side, in the same cause.” And he wrote to the President in May: “As leader and spokesman of the enemies of Germany—by far the best trumpet-call spokesman and the strongest leader—your speeches are worth an army in France, and more, for they keep the proper moral elevation.” This must have grati-
fessed the President often referred to as the Great White Chief.

The Ambassador refused to leave his work, in spite of failing health, and only went home to die at the end of 1918. We may contrast his desire that America should lead Britain deeper into democracy with F. D. Roosevelt's determination that the British Empire should not survive, even if it meant Soviet predominance in Asia and Europe. (This is Chester Wilmot's view). Wilson's partial anticipation of F.D.R. suggests that the Democratic Party has had an important function.

The volume concludes with some scraps that Page wrote from time to time. He records Henry James's remark, without endorsing it, that nobody could afford to miss the experience of being in England. Page described Churchill, May 1915, as "too restless and erratic and dictatorial and fussy and he runs about too much." As for Lloyd George, "The Prime Minister is—American in his ways." Kipling early in 1918 remarked to him, "Your coming into the war made a new earth for me."

Not long after, C. H. Douglas began to reveal the obstructions to a new earth, and the methods of dealing with them.

PARLIAMENT—(continued from page 3).

Major Lloyd George: My Department does not itself undertake investigations of this nature. Its work in this field is carried out through continual consultation with the Health Departments and the Medical Research Council and by close co-operation with the industrial research associations and other technical bodies concerned.

Mr. Wade: Does the Minister agree that in recent years there has been an alarming increase in the use of chemicals in the production and processing of food? Does he agree that there has been no adequate inquiry into either the short-term or the long-term effect on the health of the nation?

Major Lloyd George: I do not think I can accept the hon. Gentleman's description of "an alarming increase." Chemicals need not necessarily be a cause for alarm, because they have been used for many years in foodstuffs. Very careful investigation indeed is going on into very important aspects of this matter, as subsequent Questions will show.

Mr. Woodburn: Is the right hon. and gallant Gentleman telling us that the medical advice which he has received is that it is better to put chemicals into food than to leave the natural vitamins in the food? Is he prepared to give an assurance that he has had the advice from the Medical Research Council that he ought to take more of the vitamins out of the food and put in more chemicals?

Major Lloyd George: I do not know from where the right hon. Gentleman got that idea. I have never said anything of the sort. I simply said it was not necessarily a matter for alarm that there were chemicals in food. Indeed, many of the natural vitamins to which the right hon. Gentleman referred are themselves chemicals.

Flour Improvers (Investigations)

Mr. Wade asked the Minister of Food to state what progress has been made in the investigations into the existing methods of treatment of flour; and whether he will give an assurance that the process of agenisation will be abandoned.

Lieut.-Colonel Hyde asked the Minister of Food to take steps to counteract the harmful effects produced by the use of agene in the manufacture of flour and bread.

Major Lloyd George: These complex and important investigations into possible alternatives to agene as a flour improver are requiring considerably more time than was originally thought necessary. They are being pursued with all possible speed but it would be premature to take any action until they are completed.

Mr. Wade: Does the Minister agree that on 31st March, 1952, referring to the Report of the Scientific Committee, he said:

"in view of its deleterious effect when fed in large quantities to certain animals it was felt that the use of agene should be discontinued."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 31st March, 1952; Vol. 498, c. 1162.]

Is it not time that it should be discontinued?

Major Lloyd George: My first answer to a Question on this matter was to the effect that my information was that it would be at least a year before the Committee investigating this matter could possibly reach a conclusion, first of all, as to whether agene was harmful, and, secondly, what possible substitute could be used in its place. Since the investigations have started, one or two possible alternatives have been presented, but it is obvious that very careful research must be undertaken before either can be accepted.

Mr. Nicholson: Can my right hon. Friend say whether it has been accepted that agene is a contributory factor to hysteria in dogs?

Major Lloyd George: That is one of the things which the Committee are investigating. I would point out, however, that agene has been used in bread in this country for over 30 years.

House of Commons: February 16, 1953.

Meat Rationing

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Food if he has considered the representations which have been made to him
by the Imported Meat Trade Association on the stocks of meat at present held in this country; and when he proposes to take meat off the ration.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food (Dr. Charles Hill): These representations are being considered. In reply to the second part of the Question, I would refer my hon. Friend to the reply to my hon. Friend the Member for Morescambe and Lonsdale (Sir I. Fraser) on 11th February.

Sir W. Smithers: When will the Minister of Food realise that bulk purchase is a disastrous policy? Would he remember that if we restrict consumption we also restrict production. If we do that we shall not get any more meat.

House of Commons: February 17, 1953.

Highland Development

Lord Malcolm Douglas-Hamilton asked the Secretary of State for Scotland, in view of the continuing depopulation from the Highland counties, what action he is taking to create greater opportunities for employment in the area, not only to arrest depopulation, but to achieve repopulation, and to reach a degree of Highland prosperity and development which could be an increasing asset to the whole of Britain.

Mr. Henderson Stewart: The purpose of the programme of Highland development which is being carried out as quickly as the resources of the country allow is to encourage more people to live in the Highlands by making it possible for them to find there suitable and productive employment and to enjoy modern amenities.

Mr. John MacLeod: Is it the Government’s intention to encourage industrialists to come into this area although there may not be the raw materials in the area for such an industry? Many industries which come into the Highlands do not need raw materials within the area.

Mr. Stewart: Yes, of course. We want to encourage everybody who wishes and can be persuaded to come into the Highlands.

Lord Malcolm Douglas-Hamilton: Is it not clear from the population figures for the Highlands that depopulation is still going on; is my hon. Friend aware that until we reverse this trend we cannot begin the development of which the Highlands are capable; and would it not be very much in the interests of the whole United Kingdom that we should begin this?

House of Commons: February 18, 1953.

Ration Books

Mr. Nabarro asked the Minister of Food what foodstuffs still remain rationed; what space is regarded as the irreducible minimum in the ration book for the coupons or dockets that these rationed foodstuffs need occupy, as compared with the standard ration card as used during the last few years; what steps he is taking to reduce the size of the present ration book; and what economies can be anticipated by the substitution of a modified and simplified ration card, in view of the curtailment of foodstuffs’ rationing.

Major Lloyd George: Meat, bacon, sugar, butter, cheese, margarine, cooking fats and eggs are still rationed. The ration book for the year commencing next May will contain eight pages less than the present book. Any further reductions which are practicable will be made as soon as possible.

Mr. Nabarro: Does my right hon. and gallant Friend

North Hydro-Electric Board

Mr. Nabarro asked the Secretary of State for Scotland the average load factor of all water-driven hydro-electric works owned by the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board during the 12 months ended 31st December, 1952.

Mr. Henderson Stewart: I am informed by the Board that their total expenditure at 31st December, 1952, on generation works, including hydro, steam and diesel generating stations, main transmission, works acquired at vesting date and works under construction, was £62 million, and the aggregate installed capacity at that date was 560 megawatts. In addition, expenditure on distribution works amounted to £19 millions.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to The Social Crediter has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 67, Glanmore Road, Slough, Bucks.
realise how greatly the general public will welcome de-rationing; and as an earnest of the desire of Her Majesty's Government to scrap all food rationing at the earliest possible minute, will he introduce the smallest possible ration book and endeavour to impose a time-table to get rid of rationing at the earliest possible minute?

Mr. J. T. Price: Is it not becoming increasingly obvious to the House and to the nation that the function of the Minister is that of being official receiver to wind up the affairs of the Ministry?

Major Lloyd George: If it is of benefit to the country, I could not agree more with the hon. Gentleman.

Sugar Rationing (Staff)

Mr. Nabarro asked the Minister of Food the number of persons employed by his Department in the administration of sugar rationing; and what financial saving, in respect of salaries and overheads, would result from abolition of such rationing.

Major Lloyd George: About 300 staff are employed. If sugar rationing were abolished the salary saving would be about £100,000. Other savings cannot be estimated.

Mr. Nabarro: Flushed with the great success of his earlier de-rationing measures, will my right hon. and gallant Friend bear in mind that the greatest single service he can perform to the housewives of this country is to de-ration sugar at the earliest possible moment, and further to extinguish himself and his Ministry?

White Flour

Mr. H. Hynd asked the Minister of Food if he will defer the introduction of the new white flour until the House has had an opportunity of discussing this subject.

Major Lloyd George: No, Sir.

Mr. Hynd: Has the right hon. Gentleman considered distinguished medical opinion warning the public about the harmful effects of the white flour, as given by the Radio Doctor on two occasions? Will he give us the opportunity of discussing the scripts of the broadcasts, which I have in my possession before the new flour is put on the market?

Major Lloyd George: The hon. Gentleman should put down a Question to my hon. Friend the Parliamentary Secretary on that. The National flour is available to anybody who wants it and the white flour is also available to those who want it. Whatever is added to the white flour is added only as a result of advice after investigation by the medical authorities concerned.

Mr. Fernyhough: On a point of order. May we have your guidance, Mr. Speaker, as to how we may put Questions to Parliamentary Secretaries as the Minister has now invited my hon. Friend to put a Question to his Parliamentary Secretary?

Mr. Speaker: I heard what transpired, and I thought the subject-matter of the Question which it was suggested might be asked of the Parliamentary Secretary had nothing to do with the Ministry of Food but was concerned with some broadcasting scripts.

Miss Lee: Will the Minister reconsider his answer? The kind of bread for which they pay money is an important matter to housewives. They are often greatly perplexed. Will the Minister give the housewife some information in simple non-technical terms so that she may know the value of the different kinds of bread?

Major Lloyd George: The National loaf will continue as it is today. Those who wish to have white flour—I understand there are a number—can get it. But the National loaf remains the same.

Mr. Shinwell: As the right hon. and gallant Gentleman has invited us to ask his Parliamentary Secretary a Question on the subject of white flour, might I now ask the Parliamentary Secretary to state his views on that subject?

Mr. Speaker: That would be quite irregular.

Mr. Hynd: In view of the unsatisfactory nature of the reply, I beg to give notice that I shall raise the matter on the Adjournment.

Bankruptcies

Mr. Lewis asked the President of the Board of Trade to publish in HANSARD a table showing the number of bankruptcies in England and Wales in each of the years from 1945-52.

Mr. P. Thorneycroft: The figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bankruptcies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>2,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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