PLANNED ART

By B. M. PALMER

"From our experience of war planning, and from the lessons we were learning now, a pattern for the future was emerging. We must find a way in peace, when abundance should have succeeded scarcity, to retain our war-time gains of fair shares, fair prices, and a healthy simplification in the ways of living and in the design of goods in common use" —From The Times report of Hugh Dalton’s address at Caxton Hall on November 3.

The forecast of an age of planned abundance has already been given in a Times leader. The Socialist President of the Board of Trade now indicates details of it.

It was once cynically observed that the truth is great and must prevail when none cares whether it prevail or not. The Fabian Socialists continue to postpone the dawn, acting on the principle that people will believe anything if it is repeated often enough.

According to the Oxford dictionary, “abundance” means “more than sufficient, plentiful and rich.” A planned abundance is a contradiction in terms. Unfortunately the vast majority of people have no idea what abundance is. They are unable to conceive of a state of civilization in which food, for instance, might be so plentiful that it would be perfectly absurd to corner more than one could eat, because of the utter impossibility of doing anything with the food, except eat it. (A lot of things can be done with food to-day, that go far beyond its legitimate uses.) There is not the least doubt that those listening to Hugh Dalton were labouring under the scarcity complex, like thirsty men sailing on Lake Superior, unable to believe it to be a fresh-water lake.

Is it surprising if they also believed his statement that one of our war-time gains is a healthy simplification of living, when every evidence of their senses must tell them that life is made more unduly complicated than ever before in the history of civilization? What is a simple life?

It is interesting to note that Dr. Dalton did not use the word “simplicity”—something which is “not compound, involving only one operation, not divided into parts,” but the complex abstraction “simplification” which means “made simple, made easy to do or understand”—vide the new ration books. And in as much as the Socialists have developed to an extent greater than ever dreamed of the principle of “Thou shalt not”—any future simplification is likely to take the form enjoyed by Gulliver, when he was shackled to the ground by the Lilliputians. So much for freedom—the power to choose one thing at a time.

But the last item on Dr. Dalton’s agenda (not the people’s) a healthy simplification of the design of goods in common use—has never been attempted before. It is planned art.

In “peace” time, unbridled industrialism, in its constant attempt to sabotage last year’s production and create a market for next, offered motor cars full of unnecessary gadgets, Hollywood furniture and fashions, household china only fit for Aunt Sally. Against this flood real engineers and artists struggled with a certain degree of success, most marked when the money vote was most effective. Speaking generally it might be said that when people could afford them, they preferred things of good design and that the level of taste was on the whole higher than say twenty years ago.

It is incontrovertible that the only way to bridle industrialism without destroying individual freedom is to place an effective money vote in the hands of every citizen, and leave them the power of developing their own taste by a process of trial and error. That this solution would involve their freedom from economic wage-slavery has been recognised by the Fabian planners; but it has been laid down that work must be found for all, not chosen by all; and taste should be developed, not by individual choice, but by a superior junta who will destroy ugliness by the “simple” process of forbidding all designs which have not received official approval.

This plan has now been completed in all utility goods; china, furniture, household and dress goods, fashions—the whole world of women’s life, and some way is being sought to continue it after the war.

Some short-sighted artists are rejoicing at what seems a temporary improvement in form, they do not recognise the wolf in sheep’s clothing. The nearest analogy can be found in the creed of birth control and eugenics—the arguments appear incontrovertible to the purely intellectualist, but fail completely when applied to such an unknown quantity as life.

The artists—and with them the engineers and musicians—will soon have to decide whether they wish to be an organic part of the national life or do they intend to live in Ernest Newman’s secret world of light and warmth—for a little while only; for even that world is only lit by reflections.

There is no doubt of the answer. However faulty their reasoning may sometimes be, all artists worthy the name have sound intuitions, and any attempt to impose restraint on creative growth will lead to rebellion. The State controlled art will become static—this is no attempt at a pun—there is an underlying meaning common to the two words.

An extract from Thomas Russell’s book Philharmonic
in the Radio Times is significant:—

"It is quite clear from past experience that whatever assistance may be given to music, it will have to be justified in advance. [My italics.] Little or nothing will be forthcoming for the encouragement of musical activities; a much greater and wider public must first be won. It is this organisation of the public which should be an important preoccupation of those responsible for creating and presenting music; when it has been achieved, we may possibly hope that the fact will be duly noted by those responsible for dispensing the national wealth, and that music will no longer be left to the vagaries of private charity and public appeals."

Despite such planning, the real creative life of the nation, while it is a nation will somehow, in spite of poverty, degradation and oppression, continue to struggle into being. When that spirit dies, the nation will be no more. There is no such thing as international art.

Initiative

The Patriot for November 5 makes mention of an article dated New Delhi, 23 September, which appeared in the New York Times, from its correspondent Mr. H. L. Matthews. This writer, on the spot, has some idea of what is happening in India. He gave the result of an interview with Sir Udai Bhan Singh Lokindra Bahadur, the Maharaj-Rana of Dholpur, an orthodox Hindu with a genuine feeling that there has been given him in trust a State to rule it as a religious man would rule. The Maharaj-Rana’s idea is that the only feasible solution to India’s problems is a return to personal autocratic rulers. The following is quoted from this interview:

“The Maharaj-Rana believes that a monarch is divinely chosen. He says the people of India recognise such a relationship. Therefore, if Great Britain wants to settle the Indian question within a few months, he argues, all she need do is place power for direct settlement in the hands of the British Crown.

‘Let the King take direct command, make his own appointments and take personal interest in India,’ he said. ‘Indians would understand that, and various factions would soon compose their differences.

‘There is no feeling for democracy in India, but there is complete understanding, acceptance and desire for a personal ruler.’"

That is something very different, says The Patriot, from our idea of fastening on India the most unsuitable of all forms of Government, that which we call Democracy. The journal goes on to say: “There are many in this country who have the same belief as the Maharaj-Rana, and the idea that a member of the Royal Family could be sent to India to take up permanent residence there and be responsible to the Crown might well turn out to be the best solution for keeping India on the path of progress which has hitherto accompanied British rule.”

The really important word in that sentence is, in our opinion, the word “sent.” When Kings (and others) begin to “go” instead of being “sent” the dawn of better things may be in sight. Who does the sending does the ruling and the policy determining.

THE RISING TIDE

An extract from the Linen Trade Circular, October 24, 1942, is of considerable interest as indicating the state of mind prevalent in the Cotton Trade, and no doubt, reflected more or less exactly in many other trades.

I think the chief ingredients of this mood are, first, a deep sense of frustration of the war effort by centralisation, which is a fundamentally inefficient method of obtaining the best response—from British individuals at any rate.

And second, a growing conviction that there are conscious forces at work exploiting war conditions for ulterior and after-the-war purposes. Here is the extract:

“Merciless’ Mill Closing: Resignation of the chairman of the Cotton Board (Sir E. Raymond Street) and the Cotton Controller (Mr. Frank Platt) was demanded in a resolution passed by more than 800 Lancashire business men in Manchester.

“The resolution, to which there was only one dissentient, also called for the abolition of British Overseas Cottons Ltd., and the substitution for the three of one controller, preferably a chartered accountant, aided by a deputy and advised by a representative panel from the cotton industry.

“The meeting, at which Mr. Hugh V. Stowell, a Liverpool cotton merchant, was addressed by Mr. J. Wentworth Day, and has been advertised under the heading, ‘Bureaucracy, the menace to trade and industry.’

“He described one of the ‘injustices’ he referred to in his speech as the ‘merciless’ closing down of mills without any reason or any share in the profits of other mills being given. Mr. Stowell said they were afraid that if the Control, as it now existed, were not broken up there would be a ready-made combine for after the war with a full knowledge about everything and everybody. ‘The Control should control and leave the administration, distribution and general handling to the trade,’ he added.” (My italics)

It looks as if all Manchester’s energy and indignation would be squandered in mere protest. Surely the proper channel for such a resolution, backed by people in a position to make themselves felt at election time, was to Westminster via their own representative there.

Overseas Cottons Ltd. is the centralised trading organisation under, I think, the Chairmanship of the Earl of Carlisle, apparently set up to get hold of all overseas distributing organisations and contacts of the Cotton Trade while the war is in progress. It is not surprising that it is unpopular, for like all things of the kind in as far as it is not controlled for their own ends by individuals within itself, it is certain to be preponderantly influenced in their favour by the biggest concerns in the Trade, and the smaller firms sense that. — N. F. WEBB.

“There are men who would suffer a very syncope if you should pay all their debts, bring it about that their engagements had been kept, their letters answered, their perplexities relieved, and their duties fulfilled, down to one which lay on a clean table under their eyes with nothing to interfere with its immediate performance.”

— WILLIAM JAMES.
**“PLATO’S BLUFF”**

Nay, some I have seen will choose a beehive for their sign and gloss their soul-delusion with a muddled thought, picturing a skep of straw, the beekeeper’s device, a millowner’s workshop, for totem of their tribe; Not knowing the high goal of our great endeavour is spiritual attainment, individual worth, at all cost to be sought and at all cost pursued, to be won at all cost and at all cost assured; not such material ease as might be attain’d for all by cheap production and distribution of common needs, we all life level’d down to where the lowest can reach: Thus generating for ever in his crowded treadmills, man’s life were cheap as bees’; and we may see in them how he likewise might live, if each would undertake the maximum of toil that is found tolerable upon a day-doled minimum of sustenance; and stay from procreation at that just number of men, hard-workers and small-eaters, who could crowd on earth under the shadow of this skeleton of happiness. And since life must lose value in diminution of goods, life-time must also itself be in due proportion abridged; and both diminishings must at some point be stay’d, lest by slow loss they come dwindling in the end to nought: then, when to each single life the allotted span is fix’d, the system will be at balance, stable and perfected.

The ground-root folly of this pitious philanthropy is thinking to distribute indivisibles and make equality in things incommensurable: forged under such delusions, all Utopias are castles in the air or counsels of despair. So Plato, on whose infant lips—as it is told—bees settled where he lay slumbering in his cradle, and honour’d with their augury man’s loan of praise—ev’n Plato, when he in fear and mistrust of selfhood denyeth family life to his republicans, fell, bruized; tho’ cautiously depicting Socrates fell, bruized; tho’ cautiously depicting Socrates reluctant to disclose the offensive absurdum of his pretentious premises—when, being forced to admit that in his free community of women and children no child would ken its parent, no parent his child, he sought to twist the bull’s horns with a sophistry—arguing that mother’s love and home-life being the source of such inestimable good, ‘twer wise that law should forbid privat property in their benefits: Nay, so ’twould set his state above other states, be suchlike indispensable privileges rescued from ownership, and for the general use distributed equally among the citizens. For surely (said he) a bastard nursed in a bureau must love and reverence all women for its mothers; and likewise every woman, being in like default, would love all babies as her only son. May-be Plato was pleased to launch his whole Utopia safely in absolute dreamland; but poor Socrates, on whom he father’d it, was left in mibibus where Aristophanes in good jest had set him some twenty years afore: and our sophists, who lack claim to any shred of great Plato’s glorious mantle of wisdom, hav secured a good lien on his bluff.

—ROBERT BRIDGES.

**PALESTINE LAND PURCHASE**

“An acquaintance of mine—a Christian woman, who 26 years ago married a Jew, who has since deserted her and her children, told me of an interesting event which happened some 18 months ago. She received an invitation (by reason of her Jewish surname) to a meeting at Manchester, with regard to Jewish activities in Palestine. The meeting was addressed by a gentleman who was appealing for funds for the purchase of land from the Arabs. In her words, the gathering was told of the progress made, and maps were shown with plots purchased and to be purchased marked on them. The lecturer said that although the British Government had prohibited the purchase of land from the Arabs, the Arabs are so urgently in need of money that they are flocking to the Jews, begging them to buy, and so the sale goes on faster than ever. He pointed out that although it is forbidden to send money abroad to Britain, it had been arranged that ‘unlimited’ money could be sent to the Jews in Palestine. At this information a wave of great satisfaction spread through the meeting. The meeting ended with the assurance that all monies received would be guaranteed to reach Palestine and be used for the purpose described—in fact, subscribers were able to choose their plot on the map.” —Extract from correspondence.

A “Passover 1942 Appeal” distributed stated that “we send all monies direct to Jerusalem. We are sending money over by cable by Government Permit and receiving acknowledgments from Jerusalem.”

If for Charities, why not for other purposes?

**WASHINGTON JEWS**

“Jews have become concentrated in a few Government agencies, where they are disproportionate, where they are conspicuous for their numbers, where they have intimate contact with the public. These agencies are: The Securities and Exchange Commission, the Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, the Social Security Board, and some offices of the Department of Justice. Here the Jews are so numerous it is no wonder that the public which deals with them gets the idea that Jews are quite as numerous in the whole government.”


**NOW READY:**
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By C. H. DOUGLAS

Major Douglas’s Liverpool Address, October, 1936.
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The New Phase

What is it that has separated the words 'disciple' and 'discipline'? The first is still an honourable word. The second has been degraded until the thing it stands for is repudiated as an instrument of 're-orientation' and dictatorship. If a disciple were one who merely professed to receive instruction from another, while covertly perverting all he received, disciple and sneak would have come as close to one another as discipline and cruelty seem to have done in some minds.

Like the answers to so many questions in Social Credit, the answer to this one lies in the sphere of policy. Discipline is the process whereby disciples are brought to completion. Missing the issue, people talk of self-discipline as a virtuous escape from a pathogenic discipline 'imposed from above.' Discipline cannot be imposed. A policy can be imposed, and by one or other of the late Lord Stamp's modern weapons of psychology, people can be made to want to do what they had much better not want to do and to teach themselves to do it. The limits are by no means narrow, so, if control-imposing is the reason why the war is being fought, it's a walk-over, and might as well stop at once!

If too high a barrier is raised against learning what the individual prefers not to learn, the prevailing multiplicity of the things belonging to this class leads by certain stages to a noticeable resistance to learning anything at all. The pyramid of action has a very broad base, and all that distinguishes the sum of the multiplicity of tiny acts which lead to the successful spanning of the Zambezi or the economical distribution of a crop of oats from that which prepares any other enterprise is a difference, very significant but not in any way mysterious, in the selection of the isolated movements and their arrangement in a particular order. But the individual must learn to move, to select and to arrange. Among the subversive doctrines of which Social Crediters have now made so imposing a pile, is the subversive doctrine that a game is necessarily a bad game because you can't or won't play it. It is not improbable that, before we have done our job, many another cherished notion of our creaking society will be seen adorning the rubbish heap of detected social poisons.

But, to return (if indeed there has been any departure from it) to this matter of discipline and disciple, the war seems to have entered upon a new phase, and we are being exhorted to blossom out as optimists. Such invitations can-not be meant for us. We have been, for a quarter of a century, almost if not quite the only tangible ground for optimism in either ourselves or the general population of the entire globe, and with a considerable access of fresh optimism occasioned by the subterranean rumblings of our increasingly self-conscious political underworld, of which this last strident cry is not the least significant echo, we would say 'hold tight!' Listen to Mr. Wallace!

The best way to do anything is the easiest way. That's the right way, and it is the only way. "My yoke is easy and My burden light." Let a crowd anywhere watch a master at work, and the observation is inevitable: "It looks easy, doesn't it?" It looks easy because it is easy. But the ease is come by last. The apprentice begins by employing the most awkward and unsuitable means, means which are not veridically means at all. So the job is never done. Some other job is done, a botched job, truthfully reflecting the botched effort. Slowly, the apprentice disciplines himself, bends his heavy-handed botchery into the easy movements of the master, and the result is satisfactory to both.

It is reported, with what truth we cannot say, that when first the Germans saw a tank, panic seized them. It was as though the earth had risen up to swallow them, and the discipline which had kept them steady under a rain of mere projectiles, things with a defined spacial and temporal locus, which could not anyhow be in two places at once, cracked. The army discipline is crude. It does not envisage the awful contingency of the unknown. We may soon see whether the discipline of Social Credit does.

T.J.

A Rooseveltian Experiment

Extract from Washington Wonderland—The Reader's Digest, July 1942.

LIQUIDATION:—Washington seldom has seen a brighter vision than Arthurdale, the forgotten West Virginia mining camp which Mrs. Roosevelt undertook in 1934 to transform into a model community—one, she hoped, which might point the way to a new mode of abundant living for all America. A going, taxing 1000-acre buckwheat farm was acquired by Subsistence Homesteads, and promptly plowed under. Into the sprawling 22-room stone house on the hilltop moved army engineers, Geological Survey crews, soil chemists, city planners, and specialists in sanitation, recreation, community singing, nutrition, crops, and handicrafts. In the White House, the First Lady, assisted by Rex Tugwell, drew plans. At various points WPA, NRA, CCC, and FSA helped. The Treasury paid out $2,697,157 in cash, not counting free services rendered by 14 federal agencies.

By 1938, 165 homestead of three acres each emerged, surrounded by luxurious community houses, a school, factory, and co-operative exchange. But during the next four years no substantial industries came to Arthurdale. Farming was poor. The co-operative exchange languished in the red. Another Utopia got stuck in the mud. Early this year the project was abandoned. It is to be sold, on credit—no down payment—to the former tenants for $175,000.

FSA once had 197 of these rehabilitation projects of all sizes. The total government investment is $136,168,980. One fourth of the projects already have been liquidated, and 38 more will go through the wringer this year.
DESIRE

By W. WILSON

All human action is motivated by desire, either conscious or sub-conscious. I believe that if, with our deepest-rooted instincts, we did not desire to remain alive, our hearts would cease to beat and we should die. Desires are the most precious, the most potent and, for that reason, the most vulnerable of our spiritual possessions. By the obstruction or perversion of desire all evil manifests itself. Conversely, the way to overcome evil is to control desire, and, to do this, it is necessary to make desire conscious.

I have described desire as seed. This is not mere analogy. Desire is seed, just as truly as spermatozoa are seed. It can be planted in the mind, and once planted it will grow and bear fruit. Conception also has as real a meaning psychologically as physiologically. The human dynamic which I have described in my past articles is, quite simply, a process (the process) of mental self-fertilisation. What I have called in turn de-hypnotisation and three-dimensional thinking is the result of successful fertilisation. The name for it in Christian doctrine is baptism. We have only to look at the clergy (good fellows as many of them are) to realise that baptism as practised to-day is abortive. The reason is not far to seek.

The preparation for baptism, when stripped of its symbolism, can be shown to be nothing more nor less than an unnecessarily elaborated (and therefore almost universally misunderstood) system for obtaining a just balance of desire. The candidate is told that through atonement and faith his sins will be forgiven him, and he is exhorted to pray for grace. What does this mean psychologically?

Atonement amounts to a 'purification' of desire by means of a conscious reviewing of ones conduct (the results of past desires). This is an exemplary exercise, one from which most individuals would profit. The almost inevitable result is the formulation of counter desires—good resolutions. Add faith, and we come very near to the true dynamic.

The theological definition of grace (Concise Oxford Dictionary) is "unmerited favour of God, divine regenerated, inspiring and strengthening influences (also state of grace) of being so influenced, divinely given talent." Now (and readers must take my word for it) this is a remarkably accurate description of the condition in which one finds oneself after passing through the initiating experience. It is certainly something worth praying for. Why, then, does not every young clergyman arrive at a state of grace?

I believe the answer is in the implication, which permeates all orthodox thought, that desires should be controlled because they are sinful. Just as the Jews took it for granted that secrecy is the correct background of virtue, so do Christian initiates base their entire code upon the control of desire. The means becomes the end: instead of controlling desire in order to use it, the devout student controls in order to gain more control. So, even if his desire is granted, it amounts to nothing better than a spanner in the works.

This raises an extremely important point. The subconscious mind seems to have an uncanny knowledge, not only of what is the essence of ones desire, but, on occasion, of the words one uses. I have every reason to believe that if a child could be induced to pray with devotion for grace, even if he had never heard the word and had not the faintest notion of what it meant, he would stand a very good chance of achieving true grace. On the other hand, the initiate who has provided himself with an emotionally incorrect concept of what grace is, will most probably get what he imagines it to be. To anybody who wishes to experiment scientifically upon the dynamic, I strongly advise that the desire be formulated with at least as much care as a demand to ones M.P.

Before leaving the word grace, I do not think it can be over-emphasised that a three-dimensional realisation of the reality of other people leads naturally, inevitably, to the condition of 'loving thy neighbour as thyself.' You cannot help it. At the same time, when it comes to any sort of moral turpitude, you hate yourself as your neighbour.

From all this a stimulating fact emerges. By concentrating year after year upon the reality of social problems, Social Crediters have added an immense three-dimensional wing to their consciousness. It is probably not exaggerating to say that, entirely without the use of theological thought or symbolism they have given themselves a more perfect preparation for Christian initiation than the church at its best has ever provided. (Or should I say that Douglas has given it them?) They have learned to suspend desire in the conscious mind, and they have acquired as a natural habit the faculty of loving their neighbours as themselves. "Ye are the salt of the earth."

All that remains is for each one of us to learn how to use desire as power. I have already told you how, but I must add one point which I should have made clear before. Never ask anything of your sub-conscious mind without using the word 'I.' This is not the first place in which it has been written that in interpreting "anything you may ask in my name..." my name is I. It is the three-dimensional 'I' which includes your neighbour. (This is perfectly expressed in "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them." I + I = 1!) Thousands may pray (for instance) that the war may end, without receiving any concrete evidence that the prayer has been answered, but let only a handful of people ask their inner I, with real desire and real faith, "What can I do towards ending the war" and I believe that surprising things will begin to happen.

From Our Letter Box

"... The laboratory is run jointly by the Government and the University. They have just worked out all the methods of drying vegetables there. As in all the work done on food and diet, the aim is sabotage. The ultimate object is to see how far it is possible to interfere with the diet of the nation, in order to maximise profits, prevent the people having direct access to supplies of fresh food (which would, of course, teach them how easily and cheaply food can be prepared) and to increase the sum total of labour involved while at the same time preventing any too obvious depression of the standard of physical well-being..."

The Evening Standard has been speculating concerning the next Viceroy of India, in succession to Lord Linlithgow. It suggests one of the following:—Sir John Anderson, Lord Greene, Lord Harlech and Mr. Casey. The last named certainly seems to have left Australia for good.
Timber Clearances in Scotland

(House of Lords Debate, October 21)

The Duke of Sutherland had the following Notice on the Paper: To ask His Majesty's Government, whether, in view of the immense clearances of timber, especially soft wood, that are taking place in the Northern Highlands, a plan is being formulated by His Majesty's Government for replanting after the war, when the country will be practically denuded of trees; and whether His Majesty's Government think it a good plan, in view of the intense cold of the northern winters, to employ for this purpose large numbers of native foresters from the Tropics instead of Canadians who have hitherto done the work so well; and whether in view of all these problems it would not be advisable to form a separate Forestry Commission for Scotland; and to move for Papers.

The noble Duke said: My Lords, I do not raise this question of timber clearances in Scotland in any spirit of criticism. On the contrary, we are fully alive to the dire need of timber for winning this war, timber which cannot now be imported in the same quantity as heretofore owing to the shortage of shipping space. No one objects to his timber having to go for the purposes of victory. But what we would like to know is that the Government are planning ahead in this matter, and that when the time comes, as it surely will, when the whole of Scotland is practically denuded of soft wood timber, the Government will have a big scheme ready by which these vast but necessary depredations on our home-grown timber can be eventually made good. A big scheme of reforestation will be necessary all over Scotland, and plans for this necessity should be put in hand now.

The other question I have to raise is the way the Forestry Commission or the Timber Control Board, or whoever the authority may be, is setting about the method of cutting down these great woods. During the last few years we have had splendid work done throughout the Highlands by many thousands of the Canadian Forestry Corps. These hardened and picked men from Canada have been able to stand our northern winters and have made great strides in clearing the great timber resources of the north. Now it is proposed, instead of adding to the numbers of these magnificent Canadians already on the ground, who are proving so satisfactory, to send natives from British Honduras, in the region of the equator in Central America, to do this cutting. They are expected to arrive here at the beginning of the northern winter, and huts have been built for them on high ground fully exposed to the north-easterly gales and blizzards which usually begin to blow early next month, with heavy snowfalls.

I do not suppose these natives of the tropics have ever seen snow before. Yet they will be shipped straight from the tropics to these arctic snowbound heights and expected to be out in all weathers cutting the timber. These men—probably fine men—who are used to cutting the mahogany forests of British Honduras, where no doubt they do magnificent work, will surely perish with cold or spend their winters in the local hospitals, adding to the troubles of our already overburdened hospital staff. On the surface the whole thing seems to be sheer lunacy, and that is what has given me doubts as to the judgment and capability of a purely English Forestry commission to understand and grapple with these purely Scottish problems. A few more Canadians added to the numbers already there would have done the whole job in a much shorter time, and without the risks of illness and death that will surely attend this rash experiment. I am told on very good authority that the presence of Honduras foresters was tried in Dumfriesshire (a much warmer county than ours) and has not been an unmitigated success, and has, in addition, caused many complications of a different kind, as it naturally would.

I now come to another aspect of this question. There are to-day about 270 forests under State control in the United Kingdom. Almost one-half of these, 125, are in Scotland. The affairs of the Forestry Commission are directed from England, although almost one-half of the forests are in Scotland. If there should be, as in all probability there will be, a vast development of State forests after the war, Scotland's basic industry of agriculture might be placed in jeopardy by a Commission the vast majority of whose members are not conversant with Scottish agricultural needs and operated from far outside Scotland's boundaries. Scotland's foundation sheep stocks, and in some areas the cattle-breeding industry, might be menaced. The practice of the Forestry Commission is to plant up to about 1,000 feet above sea level. This obviously leaves the highest altitudes unplanted and the greatest care would have to be taken to ensure that these higher altitudes were not left as breeding-grounds for vermin.

The agricultural interests in Scotland must be paramount, and the Agricultural Minister in Scotland that is, the Secretary of State for Scotland—should be answerable to Parliament for all agricultural affairs. Under present arrangements he is personally divorced from any say in the administration, direct or indirect, of large tracts of forest land or forestable land. In Northern Ireland forestry was originally allotted to the Forestry Commission, but has later been transferred to the Agricultural Department in Belfast, as a result of hard experience. In the United States, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Belgium and Japan, forestry is closely associated with agricultural administration. Scotland's experience in government by these Commissions and Boards has not been too happy. The Boards of Health and Agriculture were superseeded in 1929 by Departments under the Secretary of State for Scotland, and in 1937 the Committee of Inquiry, over which the late Sir John Gilmour, then Secretary of State, presided, declared unanimously that the Fishery Board should also give place to the ordinary type of departmental organisation. This was done in 1939.

The present position is that a Back-bench Member of Parliament, who is not necessarily associated with the Government of the day, answers any questions on forestry in the House of Commons. This is obviously ludicrous. Questions should be answered for Scotland by the Secretary of State for Scotland, and for England and Wales by the Minister of Agriculture. It seems to me, therefore, that it would be a much more practicable move to form a fully Scottish Forestry Commission, which would be completely under the control of the Scottish Office and the Secretary of State for Scotland, or, better still, become a Department of the Scottish Office, as the Scottish Board of Agriculture and the Scottish Board of Fisheries have now become. Englishmen cannot be expected to run forestry in Scotland, or to understand and properly work out purely Scottish problems. This instance
of sending men from the Tropics to work in a northern winter is a case in point. I feel sure also, from what I have heard, that His Majesty's Government would welcome such a proposal as I have made, in the interests of all sane development in Scotland, especially after the war. Of the nine members of the existing Forestry Commission, I understand only two live in Scotland and have knowledge of Scottish problems; that is to say, there are seven Englishmen to two Scotsmen.

Obviously, preparations must be made now if there is to be a big scheme of reafforestation after the war. Seeds from trees take time to collect and to extract, and the yield is erratic. Plants derived from the seeds have to be tended in nurseries for at least three years before they can be transplanted to the hills. All this emphasises the need for thinking now about what will have to be done after the war, when labour will again be plentiful. No other country would have allowed its timber resources to be neglected as we have neglected ours. Development of our woodland resources is sufficiently important to be put in charge of a responsible Minister, which it is not at present. Scotland offers greater possibilities for reafforestation than does England or Wales, by reason of its great stretches of moorland and mountain suitable for reafforestation. Scotland's problem is a completely different one from that of England and Wales, and should therefore be looked after by a separate authority, fully conversant with Scottish problems.

I should like to quote from a letter that I received to-day from a member of your Lordships' House, the noble Earl, Lord Powis, who wrote to me on forestry problems. He wrote chiefly on the problem in England and Wales, but I thought the letter was so much to the point that I will read a part of it. This is what he says:

"I am sorry that I cannot be in London on Wednesday to support your Motion in the House of Lords as to reafforestation areas that have been recently felled. The subject of denuded woods in the Highlands applies also to England and Wales, though the forests are not individually as large generally. There are hundreds of acres of denuded woods which require replanting and which owners are either unable or unwilling to replant. The Government apparently take no interest in the replanting of the derelict areas. Owners who are endeavouring to replant are hampered by their woodmen being tempted away by temporarily higher wages, and the men who should be employed in replanting give up permanent employment, and in some cases a future pension, to fell trees for the Government or contractors who have bought the owner's woods.

Of course, felling is most necessary, but I view with grave anxiety these thousands of acres lying derelict for several years and growing scrub and weeds to the detriment of the soil, now rich in humus. I also fear that with so much felling the climate may be affected, and possibly serious droughts occur—probably not so serious as those which have occurred in America and elsewhere through reckless cutting of timber. Even if the Government require all man-power for the Armed Forces and munition works, use should be made of the Italian and German prisoners, so that a beginning should be made and not left entirely till after the war.

I understand that the Forestry Commission are also actively engaged on our own home-grown timber. We are destroying capital investment of the timber of which we are stripping ourselves now, and for reafforestation generally after the war. War conditions are quite inevitably making devastating demands upon our own home-grown timber. We are destroying capital to an appalling extent, and there will be a vital need for replanting after the war. The Paymaster-General, who is in general control of post-war planning, has got this matter very much in his mind, and plans are under active consideration. The Forestry Commission are also actively engaged in working out plans in detail for submission to the Government.

Lord Mottistone: When I was a boy they started sending troops from India to occupy the Portsdown forts near Portsmouth, and we were told then—I remember it well—that the medical authorities said it was very bracing for them. I suppose the noble Duke was told that it would be bracing for the people of British Honduras in Scotland, but he was too wise to introduce that argument. I warn the noble Duke he had better get these men from Honduras out quickly because of what happened in the case of the Portsdown forts. There the men got on very well being braced during the months of September, October and November, but when it came to the month of December they began to die of pneumonia, and when it came to the second December disasters followed. That was long before the present Paymaster-General had anything to do with such a matter. Our authorities had to abandon the whole plan and it has never been adopted since. I make this prophecy, that unless the Government give up this experiment, which was described
by the noble Duke of Sutherland, as being sheer lunacy, they will be landed into the same controversy.

The Earl of Rosebery: ... As the Duke of Devonshire says, we have no one here to answer for the Commission in this House, and I do not know who answers in another place. The Paymaster-General—it seems a peculiar title for anybody who is looking after the Forestry Commission—is said to be going into the whole matter.

Viscount Mersey: ... As your Lordships know, without a certain amount of wire fencing it is quite impossible to replant in rabbit-infested country; and the time which it takes to get leave from the Ministry of Supply to obtain wire fencing frequently delays planting. In my own case I was thrown out a whole year by the long correspondence which I had with the Ministry of Supply. The Forestry Commission want replanting to be done, and they should surely be able to influence another Government Department to see that that policy is carried out.

The Earl of Radnor: ... There was nothing in the nature of State forestry when the Commission was originally set up. To-day there are actually 246 State forests, both large and small. The acreage that has been acquired by the Forestry Commission is a matter of some 1,144,000 acres, of which 714,000 will ultimately be forest, and of that figure 434,000 acres have already been planted. That is a fairly substantial increase in the course of twenty years or so. It is a very large-scale transfer of land from private ownership to public ownership, and a very large change in the uses of that land. I think it is fair to say that that considerable transfer of land has been achieved with a minimum of friction...

In addition to what has been done by the Forestry Commission, there has been in operation a system of planting grants for private owners, and under that some 126,000 acres have been planted by private woodland owners. Forest workers' holdings, to which I have already referred as being rather an important part of the policy of the Forestry Commission, amount to-day to some 1,471. The system of allowing a forest worker a house and a small acreage of land and guaranteeing him a certain number of days' work a year on forestry work has, on the whole, worked extremely well...

In addition to that, the Forestry Commission have created four national forest parks. Of the 246 State forests 112 are in Scotland. I think it was the noble Duke, the Duke of Sutherland, who assumed that half the afforested area in the hands of the Forestry Commission was in Scotland. That is not quite so. The actual acreage in Scotland is 276,000 out of 714,000, approximately just over one third... It has happened in this war that timber has been moved from Scotland to England, English timber has gone to Wales, Welsh timber has gone to England, and completing the roundabout, I believe England has even had the temerity to export some timber to Scotland. It would create rather a difficult situation should there be a separate Scottish Forestry Commission which gave to Scottish landowners and woodland owners more favourable conditions than those which English landowners could obtain... Interrupting Lord Radnor, the Duke of Sutherland said that every single tree in his county (i.e., every soft-wood tree) had been removed.