

The Week

6^D

- CO-OP DEMOCRACY
- A PLAN FOR DOCKS
- £1 A WEEK MINERS
- WEST INDIES
- BANKS PROSPER UNDER LABOUR

GERRYMANDERING IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Subscription rates: 13 weeks 10/-
26 " £1
1 year £2

Volume 3 No. 21. May 27th, 1965

Students 25% discount.

CONTENTS

Page 229	Editorial.
" 230	Banks prosper under Labour.
" 231	Students disaffiliate from Labour.
" 232	North-West C.N.D. Rally.
" 233	Manchester forum on Labour's foreign policy.
" 234	Socialist Parties knock U.S. over Dominica.
" 235	Attacks on civil liberties in West Indies.
" 236	South African reports.
" 237	Co-operative democracy.
" 238	A plan for the docks.
" 239	" " " " " "
" 240	How the Tories keep in power in Ulster.
" 241	" " " " " " " "
" 242	Jack Lynch's first Budget.

A TIME TO FIGHT

No serious member of the Labour Party can be in doubt about the danger the Labour Government is in. Election experts have calculated that it is a mathematical certainty that during the next nine months or so enough by-elections in Labour-held seats will take place to give the possibility of Labour's majority being eroded away. As critical as many party members are of the Labour Government, they realise that the return of the Tories, under present conditions, would represent a very serious defeat for the British working class. Demoralisation in the ranks of Labour, combined with Tory confidence and arrogance, would clear the decks for really vicious attacks against the British workers and their organisations. It is precisely because the left wing realise this that they are opposed to so many aspects of present Government policy.

They are other warning signals, too. In our present issue we report the disaffiliation of the Bristol Labour Club from N.A.L.S.O. and the Labour Party. Whilst there may be special circumstances and, moreover, students are usually much more volatile than other sections, let no one underestimate the danger of a certain demoralisation taking place which can hinder not only the Labour Party in general, but the left wing in particular.

Now is the time to fight, to convince people that there is a perspective of success, both against the Tories and right wing policies. The tendency to retreat, as evidenced in discussions around the race Bill and the Finance Bill, is the very worst path Labour could take. Instead it should polarise political thought by launching an attack on Tory seats of power. It is a disgrace that even so mild a Bill as Mr. W. Hamilton's move to abolish the delaying powers of the House of Lords is to be opposed by the Government. It is elementary that Mr. Wilson and his Cabinet should launch a campaign against the gerrymandering and electoral manipulation in Ulster which gives the Tories 12 extra M.P.s.

Most sections of the community (apart from pensioners) have suffered a cut in their standard of living since the return of the Labour Government, but for one section the policies of the Government have proved to have been an unmixed blessing: banking interests. If you think that this is merely the opinion of extreme left-wingers you are wrong. This Monday, the Financial Times issued a 74-page survey of banking. The editor of The Banker, Wilfred King, contributed an article entitled "The Banks and the Squeeze - some unexpected twists," here are some key quotations:

"On a short view, the monetary policy of the past 6 months has been very much in the interests of the banks. During 1964...the net deposits of the clearing banks rose by $6\frac{1}{2}\%$...The whole counterpart of this rise was in advances, always the highest yielding of the banks' assets...the average Bank Rate in 1964 was, at 5.06%, $\frac{1}{4}$ as much again as in 1963. On top of that, the banks had been steadily edging up the level of many of their advances ^{charges} relative to the Bank Rate. These two factors taken together.... raised true bank profits very sharply in 1964, almost certainly to a higher point than the previous peak, reached in 1961, in spite of a sharp rise in costs.

"It will be surprising, however, if the net interest earnings do not reach a still higher point this year. Now that the 7% Bank Rate has run for $\frac{1}{3}$ of the year, it would require an improbably quick and steep fall in the rate to reduce this year's average below 6% - and at that level the average rate returned by advances would probably be up by not less than one-sixth on the average for 1964. Moreover, unless the squeeze produces a marked down-trend in advances...their average volume for the year as a whole will probably show some gain on last year's record volume. The banks may deplore the long-run implications of direct credit restraints...but they have certainly reaped some substantial short-run compensation from the latest unexpected twists in monetary policy."

BUILDERS WANT NATIONALISATION

from a special correspondent

Building must be reorganised as a public service under public ownership, said Mr. John Leonard, President of the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers, when opening his union's annual conference in Scarborough, last week. He added that the building supply industries should also be nationalised because "they have failed the nation and in their present state are likely to continue doing so." Their inability to produce enough materials for a full year's work during last year's good weather was fantastic. Moreover, Bricks, cement, plaster board, copper piping were all in short supply.

TWO MORE PRINT UNIONS PLAN TO AMALGAMATE

from an industrial correspondent

Two of the largest unions in the printing industry: the National Union of Printing, Bookbinding and Paper Workers (170,000 members) and the National Society of Operative Printers and Assistants (45,000 members), have agreed in principle to amalgamate. Their membership will vote by ballot later this year on the issue. The new union would be called the Society of Graphical and Allied Trades. NATSOPA announced last week that its executive and the leaders of the Paper Workers had decided ^{planned} unanimously on "central principles guiding their amalgamation." If this and other amalgamations take place the number of printing unions will be reduced from nine to five.

On Tuesday, 18th May, a meeting of the Bristol University Labour Club decided by a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority to reorganise itself as the Socialist Society, disaffiliating from NALSO and hence from the Labour Party. On the whole, the decision was not thoroughly and consistently thought out, since it was made clear that it is not intended to turn activities away from the Labour Party completely, and the advantages of the new arrangement are not, in the view of this correspondent, crystal-clear.

Nevertheless, it does indicate the revulsion and disgust which present Government policies are causing in the movement. In particular, there is strong feeling about Vietnam, Dominica and the gyrations of George Brown on Steel. The damage which wrong policies can do to the party cannot be over-emphasised.

STEEL REBELS UNDER FIRE

Alec Acheson from Leicester reports: At the end of the Leicestershire Miners' annual conference, a resolution submitted by the delegate from Snibston colliery threatening to withdraw support from Mr. Woodrow Wyatt unless he supported the Government on steel nationalisation, was carried unanimously. A young miner from Snibston, Ken Smith, moved the resolution; he said: "That this renegade is a Labour M.P. is very much due to the support and assistance of the Leicestershire miners...the people who voted for him were all aware that the Labour Party programme included the nationalisation of steel..."

Meanwhile the Coalville Labour Party have petitioned the Bosworth CLP to ask the management committee to seek permission from Transport House to adopt another Labour candidate. Mr. John Hollick, president of the CLP and a member of the executive of Coalville Labour Party said, "I can speak as a miner. I mix with miners all day, and I know that they have had enough of Woodrow Wyatt and would be glad to see the back of him."

Tom Nicholls reports: An emergency resolution from Labour Party members in Abertillery was passed by the annual meeting of the Welsh Council of Labour, calling upon Mr. Desmond Donnelly to accept fully the Government's policy on steel nationalisation or to resign his seat. The meeting of the Council was attended by 200 delegates from all over Wales. The resolution has been referred to the Parliamentary Labour Party and the National Executive.

STEEL CONFERENCE RECALL

from a special correspondent

At the private meetings of steel workers held in Sheffield last February, it was agreed to meet again shortly after the Government's proposals for Steel Nationalisation were announced. Now that the Government White Paper on Steel Nationalisation has been published and the Prime Minister has declared his determination to go ahead with introducing a Bill into Parliament to implement the proposals, it has been decided to recall the conference. The conference will take place this Sunday, 30th May in Sheffield. All those who have taken part in the discussions on steel nationalisation are invited. Applications for full details should be made to: Councillor W. Meade, 31, Far Lane, Sheffield 6. It should be noted that the conference is not just for steel workers, but active Labour Party members and trade unionists. In view of speculation about possible delay in introducing the Bill, it would be most apt for this conference to be as successful as possible.

The British Labour Party is virtually alone among the parties of the Socialist International in supporting the U.S. over their intervention in the Dominican Republic. The Chairman and Secretary of the International, Bruno Pittermann and Albert Carthy, issued a statement on May 12th in which they said: "Socialists everywhere are disturbed at the chain of events in the Dominican Republic since the rising on April 24 which sought to restore the constitutionally elected President, Juan Bosch....The Socialist International believes that the Government headed by Juan Bosch had the will and the capacity to cope with the problems left behind by dictatorship.....It does not believe that the allegation of the presence of Communism justifies the distortion of that process....."

The presidents of Venezuela and Chile issued a statement on May 1st denouncing the U.S. landing as an invasion. Venezuela's governing party is in the Socialist International. Other member parties of the Socialist International in Latin America, including the Argentine Socialist Party, Apra of Peru, the P.L.N. of Costa Rica, and others have expressed strong opposition to the U.S. intervention. The Socialist Party of the U.S.A. stated the American action was a violation of the charters of the U.N.O. and the O.A.S., and urged "Socialists and other defenders of democracy throughout the world to protest.."

Claude Fuzier, the editor of Le Populaire, official journal of the French Socialist Party, wrote in an editorial on May 5th: "Johnson's intervention...is an abandonment of the spirit of Kennedyism...." Henri Dusant, wrote in the same issue: "Johnson's policy is no more than the 'big stick' policy so dear to Theodore Roosevelt..." An article in Vorwaerts, the official weekly of the German Social Democratic Party, commented, on May 5th, "...Neither the U.S. excuse of protecting their nationals nor of preventing a Communist takeover hold much water..." Arbeiderbladet, the official daily paper of the Norwegian Labour Party: "....One had thought that the use of marines as an instrument of U.S. policy in Latin America was a closed chapter" At a press conference on May 11, the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Halverd Lange, said: "The Norwegian Government shares the disquiet expressed recently in the Norwegian press about the American action in the Dominican Republic...."

Stockholm-Tidningen, the official daily paper of the Swedish Social Democratic Party, said in an editorial on May 4th: "...American policy...is a policy which reacts automatically, or rather compulsively, to the shadow of suspicion that another Cuba could arise in the vicinity of the U.S.A. It is an old-time power and prestige policy...." Aktuelt, the official daily paper of the Danish Social Democratic Party, said in an editorial on May 4th, that U.S. military intervention "...ensured victory to a Right-orientated junta just when things were pointing to its losing ground.." Arbeiter-Zeitung, the official paper of the Austrian Socialist Party, carried an article by the paper's foreign editor on May 4th, in which he said: "...it is not for President Johnson's advisors to arbitrarily decide who is a Communist and who is a Democrat..." Writing in the official organ of the Italian Social Democratic Party, Socialismo Democratico, its editor said: "...all too often has the United States been in situations where it has supported petty reactionary politicians against reformers..." Victor Larock, former Foreign Minister of Belgium, wrote in Le Peuple, the official paper of the Belgian Socialist Party, on May 11th: "It is clear that in the U.S. anti-Communism implies the same aggressive rejection, almost to the point of frenzy, of everything that is 'Socialist', 'radical', 'liberal'..." Even Luxemburg's Social Democrat party expressed similar sentiments.

At a recent meeting at the West Indian Students' Centre, the policies of the Governments of Trinidad and Tobago which threaten public liberties in the West Indies were severely condemned. Speakers at the meeting were: George Lamming (West Indian writer); Cleston Taylor (trade unionist) and John La Rose (journalist). The meeting denounced the action of the Williams' Government of Trinidad and Tobago in confining C.L.R. James, the well-known West Indian writer, to house arrest.

The meeting, convened under the joint auspices of the West Indies Students' Union (London) and the Standing Conference of West Indian Organisations adopted a resolution which deplored the attacks on civil liberties in the West Indies and which pledged West Indian workers and students in London to support those attacked. The resolution also asked West Indians to do all they could to circulate the text of the statement listing attacks on civil liberties in the West Indies.

In Jamaica since independence, the Government has carried out an entirely reactionary policy by:

- (1) banning marches and demonstrations by workers;
- (2) curtailing freedom of speech on the radio;
- (3) using the armed forces to intimidate the population; and
- (4) introducing a system of work permits which have represented an attack on the academic freedom of the University of the West Indies.

In Trinidad and Tobago, the economy is still in the hands of foreign imperialists. While the regime has failed to break up the colonial set-up, it has acted with the colonialists against the fundamental rights of the people. It has taken the following steps:

- (1) Established a Commission in 1963 to investigate the trade unions, youth organisations and public services. Criticism of the Government has been branded subversion by this Commission;
- (2) then the Government discovered a 'plot' to subvert the unions, which were in the forefront of the struggle against the status quo. Militant trade unionism became subversion;
- (3) for the first time in ten years the Government proclaimed a state of emergency to break up a workers' strike and protect corrupt trade union officials from the wrath of the workers;
- (4) passed the Industrial Stabilisation Act which gives the Government and employers a free hand to act as they like towards the workers and the unions.

* West Indies News Bulletin can be obtained from: W.I.N.B., 51, Upland Rd., London N.8.

IMPORTANT REMINDER

Although a large number of people have verbally intimated that they are going to attend the school on Africa at Whitsun, so far we have had only a small proportion of them register. It is very important for the organisers that they should know definitely who is coming early on in the course of organising. This is especially so for people outside of London who require accommodation, instructions as to how to get to Africa Unity House, etc. Please, please, don't delay, write now to Mrs. Connie Kirkby, 27, Thursley House, Holmewood Gardens, London S.W. 2 (T.N. TUL 6984).

At a meeting at the University of Witwatersrand on May 12th, Professor Julius Lewin drew attention to some shocking facts about South West Africa. The meeting was to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the United Nations and was organised by the students. Professor Lewin gave the following illustration:

- The average African wage in mining in South West Africa is about 2 Rands a week. Yet:

- One South African diamond-mining company in the territory had made more than 100,000,000 Rands in profits - after taxation - between 1958 and 1962.

- An American company mining base minerals had also made more than 100,000,000 Rands profit in the last 13 years.

N.B. a Rand is equal to 10/- sterling.

TRANSKEI AFRICANS FACE STARVATION from a Johannesburg correspondent

A revealing light is cast upon one of Verwoerd's "showpiece" Bantustans by the following report which appeared in the Rand Daily Mail of May 14th:

"Africans in some parts of Transkei are at the point of starvation, the Transkeian Territories Civic Association was told in Umtata on May 13th...if the Transkei Government did not act immediately it would find itself ruling a country incapable of supporting its existing population and riddled by starvation, malnutrition and political unrest, said delegates. The Rev. E.V. Lean...said "No words can exaggerate the situation that is going to exist in future months. The next crop will only be ripe for harvesting in a year's time and already African peasants are hungry and at the point of starvation. We are dealing with a most severe emergency..."

The Rev. Lean added, the Chief Minister, Kaiser Matanzima had proudly announced that 200,000 Rands is to be spent on drought relief. "But this is only 15 cents (1/6d) for each person during a year. It amounts to chicken feed. Millions of rands will be needed before the end of the year."

SOUTH AFRICAN STUDENTS' UNION UNDER ATTACK from the Rand Daily Mail (15 May)

NUSAS - the National Union of South African Students - came in for a another fierce assault on May 14 when the Government was urged to take action against universities where NUSAS functions. The attack was launched by Senator P.J. Van Nierop...He urged that two steps should be taken "for the love of the fatherland" against the body representing 17,000 students. These were:

- Cuts in Government subsidies to universities where NUSAS existed;
- Professors, lecturers or university heads who were ineffective in preventing "undermining influences" on the campus, should be ousted from their posts.

He urged the Minister of Education, Arts and Science, Senator De Klerk, to adopt these steps when speaking to the Minister's policy motion in the Upper House.

Editorial comment: It would be a good thing if British students could find some way of expressing their solidarity with the heroic members of NUSAS: in face of a possible intensification of the witch hunt.

The Sunday morning session of the Industrial Democracy school was opened by Mr. Hilton, research officer of the N.F.B.T.O.. He began by defining co-operative democracy as "any experiment of any group of workers who combine together to attempt to control their own destiny." He said that it was morally right for people to aim for industrial democracy as well as for political democracy. He regarded this as the main argument for nationalisation as distinct from the "efficiency" argument.

The main part of his contribution was taken up with an analysis of the experience of building co-operatives in Britain since the 1830's. He felt that the early Robert Owen experiments had harmed the development of the building industry trade unions. However, at later dates there had been successes. In particular, Mr. Hilton drew attention to the growth of building trade workers' guilds around 1920. By 1922 they had, £3million of property; the guilds functioned democratically in their everyday activities with the workers electing their foremen on the building sites. But these successes were short-lived as most of the guilds folded by about 1925 mainly due to the lack of capital resources.

Mr. Hilton did not feel that these failures should be taken as an indication that such experiments in co-operative democracy were now out-dated. He was optimistic that the ideas of co-operative democracy could be applied in local areas, especially in the building industry, if there was less reluctance on the part of local groups of socialists, workers and local authorities to take up the challenge. He suggested that these were areas where political action could be taken now, without having to capture the allegiance of a major political party.

Although the British Co-operative movement was experiencing economic difficulties, with their trading position declining relative to that of private firms, Mr. Hilton was sure that it was possible to have successful co-ownership organisations in a predominantly capitalist society. The Government should be prepared to assist in this by making a pool of money available for genuinely socialist, co-partnership schemes.

Paul Derrick, the second main contributor, began by taking up Mr. Hilton's last point. The Labour Party had not done much to assist co-operatives in recent years, whereas in France there are 700 productive co-operative societies helped by public funds.

However, he said it was difficult to imagine that co-operative enterprises could drive capitalist organisations out of business by competition. Rather, socialists should make a direct attack on private companies. Further nationalisation should be an important part of this strategy but he felt that this was insufficient in itself. Combined with further nationalisation, there should be an attack on the legal character of the limited liability company. Profits taxes will not achieve this, its operation even failed to limit dividends.

Dividends should be rigorously limited by the Government, Such a change could make an incomes policy effective.

A SOLUTION TO THE DOCK PROBLEM*

Whilst the following plan needs enlarging in detail we believe that a scheme for the National Docks, if we are to attain an efficient port system throughout the United Kingdom, must be on the following lines:

- (1) We endorse the findings of the Rochdale Report, stating that the problems of dock labour arise from the casual nature of employment. This arises from a complete lack of planning of:
 - (a) the distribution of work among the labour force;
 - (b) the allocation of shipping between the available labour forces; and
 - (c) the development and improvement of port facilities.
- (2) We propose that Britain's port industry be vested in and operated by a single National Authority or National Port Authority (hereinafter referred to as the N.P.A.).
- (3) The N.P.A. will give 50% representation to the public interest, and 50% to port workers, through a system of elected lay representatives. The elections will be carried out by the trade unions.
- (4) There will be three levels of committee, all of which shall give equal representation to port workers and to the public interest:
 - (a) Port Committees;
 - (b) Area Committees (i.e., the United Kingdom divided into 7 areas);
 - (c) National Committee.
- (4a) Port Committees will consist equally of port workers elected from and by workers' councils and representatives of other interested bodies.
- (4b) Area Committees will be elected from and by Port Committees on the same basis of representation.
- (4c) The National Committee will be elected from and by Area Committees on the same basis of representation.
- (5) The N.P.A. will be responsible for capital investment and the operation of the port system throughout the United Kingdom.
- (6) All shipping entering British territorial waters shall come under the control of the Authority. If it appears likely that a ship will be seriously delayed at its port of preference, then the Authority shall have power to direct it to the nearest suitable port. This pre-supposes an integrated transport system with a level of charges fixed in terms of ultimate destination, i.e., the total charge for shipping goods from Rotterdam to London will be fixed whether the Authority decides that the ship will dock at London or Dover.

It will also be the responsibility of the N.A.P. to ensure that all developments be viewed on a wide national scale, and not in piecemeal fashion as has been the practice in the past.

continued over/

* This paper was submitted by the Dockworkers Voice to the London school on industrial democracy.

docks' plan continued/

Whilst the Authority will be responsible for capital investment and the operation of the National Port System, the National Dock Labour Board (hereinafter referred to as the N.D.L.B) will become the employer of all dock labour.

(8) The N.D.L.B. will have complete control of all workers including supervisory grades, and will deal with all labour problems including discipline.

(9) There will be three levels of boards:

(a) Port Boards;

(b) Area Boards (i.e., the United Kingdom divided into 7 areas);

(c) National Board.

(9a) The Port Boards will consist equally of port workers elected from and by workers' councils and representatives of other interested bodies.

(9b) Area Boards will be elected from and by Port Boards and on the same basis of 50/50 representation.

(9c) The National Board will be elected from and by Area Boards and on the same basis of representation.

WORKERS' COUNCILS

(1) Workers' Councils will be established on a local or sector basis, from lay representatives of dock workers engaged in the industry, and elected through their trade unions.

(2) All workers representatives on boards or committees must be members of the workers' council, and must have been elected by same.

(3) Workers' representatives will be elected for a term of three years, but can stand for re-election at the end of each term.

(4) All workers representatives will lose their position should they leave the industry.

TRADE UNIONS

Trade unions will continue in their present capacity, and indeed will be invaluable in helping to ensure democratic operation of workers' councils, to supervise the education and training of workers' representatives, to maintain panels of qualified persons to fill elected positions at all levels, to control the system of promotion and grading on the basis of a scale of qualifications mutually agreed between unions and management, and to operate schemes for welfare and industrial safety.

ANNOUNCEMENT: The special supplement of *The Week* devoted to industrial, with reference to the London Conference, will be available next week. Please place your orders for extra copies at your earliest as this will help us to plan our work.

The Northern Ireland Labour Party has prepared a document giving many details of the election anomalies and malpractices which take place in Ulster. The following is a summary of the main points concerning Stormont elections and local government.

The Stormont Parliament

The Commons: It was laid down by the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, that the House of Commons should consist of 52 members (4 from Queens University and 48 from other constituencies) to be elected by proportional representation....The Act also provided that, after the lapse of 3 years, the Northern Ireland Parliament might alter the law. These powers were exercised in 1929, when proportional representation was abolished except in the university seats. The number and boundaries of the seats have remained unchanged since then - a lapse of 36 years - despite massive population movements during the period.

These laws were consolidated in the Electoral Law Act, 1962, the Ulster Unionist Government refusing intransigently to accept any amendments put down by Labour and Nationalist M.P.s. The Bill being forced through by the ruthless use of guillotine procedure after several all-night sittings. There are numerous discrepancies between the law governing Stormont elections and those governing Westminster elections.

The University vote: 13,763 electors - the graduates of Queens University - have the right to choose one-thirteenth of the entire House of Commons. The electoral quota for other constituencies is 13,192; but in the University constituency, there is one M.P. for every 3,440 electors. As if this were not enough these are second votes - those graduates who live in Northern Ireland also enjoy the right to vote in the constituency in which they reside.

The Business vote: The occupier of business premises in any constituency - and, incredibly enough, his spouse also - are each entitled to an additional vote in every Stormont election. In 1964, there were 12,663 business votes on the Parliamentary Register, 8,942 of them in Belfast. 1,952 of these are in the Belfast Central constituency. In the 1962 Stormont General Election, the overall majority of the Unionist candidates in the ten seats contested by the Unionists and Northern Ireland Labour was only 5,180. It is evident that the existence of the business vote could easily determine the outcome.

Qualification for voting: In order to vote, an elector must be a British citizen aged 21 or over and must have either been born in Northern Ireland or must have resided in the United Kingdom for a continuous period of 7 years. For Westminster there is no such residential qualification. For Westminster, young voters who attain 21 within 6 months after the qualifying date are entitled to be registered as "Y" voters, and to exercise voting rights after a specified date. No machinery for "Y" voters exists in Northern Ireland elections.

Number of seats, and boundaries: Amendments to abolish the 4 University seats were ruled out of order on the grounds that such a course would have been ultra vires the Government of Ireland Act. There is room for considerable doubt whether this view is correct. Even if it is accepted as correct, however, an enabling Act should be sought from the Westminster Parliament to permit redistribution of the seats. The discrepancies between the numbers of electors in different seats has reached grave
continued over/

How the Tories keep power in Ulster continued/

proportions. The figures for the three largest and for the three smallest constituencies are:

Biggest	1. Mid-Down	41,402	Smallest	1. Dock	7,621
	2. Carrisk	38,910		2. South Fermanagh	8,799
	3. South Antrim	33,133		3. Central	9,719

It is widely believed that the boundaries of some parliamentary constituencies are gerrymandered. While this is not so evident as in the case of local government boundaries, some of the parliamentary boundaries are - to say the least - peculiar.

Administration of elections: The representation of the People Act, in Britain, provides that candidates should have the right to use schools for election purposes. A request for similar facilities in the Stormont elections was refused in 1961, despite the almost complete absence of suitable meeting places unconnected with political organisation in country districts of Northern Ireland. The hours of voting for Westminster are 7.00 a.m. to 9.00 p.m., but for Stormont 8.30 a.m. to 8.30 p.m. As most elections are held on Thursday and Thursday is a day on which many workers are expected to work late, this provision unfairly favours the more leisured classes.

The Senate: The Senate of Northern Ireland consists of 24 Senators elected on the principle of proportional representation by the members of the Commons, and holding office for eight years. There are also two ex-officio Senators, the Lord Mayor of Belfast and the Mayor of Londonderry. The effect of this system has been to intensify the strength of the majority party and to minimise the strength of small parties. In practice, five first preference votes are required to elect one senator; and accordingly no party with less than five seats in the Commons can by itself secure representation in the Senate.

Local Government: At present, the law relating to local government elections contains the most glaring undemocratic and indefensible features to be found in any sector of life in Northern Ireland.

Qualification for voting: Apart from business and company votes, only the occupier of a dwelling-house and his spouse are entitled to vote. Their children over 21, their sub-tenants, their lodgers, etc., are all disenfranchised. Of the 891,107 adults who are Westminster electors in Northern Ireland, only 648,417 are entitled to vote in local government, thus meaning that 242,690 have been disenfranchised (or well over one-third).

Business and Company votes: Additional voting weight is given to the business community: the occupier of business premises with a valuation of £10 or over is entitled to a second vote in respect of these premises, and a company may secure registration of up to six local government electors - one for each £10 of the rateable value. There were 6,467 business votes and 3,894 company votes, on the local government register for Northern Ireland at February 15th, 1964. (it is curious that there are 1,179 registered company voters in Londonderry, while there are only 651 in Belfast.)

Boundaries: There can be no doubt that the manipulation of local government boundaries takes place in Northern Ireland on a big scale. The glaring example of Derry will suffice: 37% of the population is protestant, and with two wards, elects 12 councillors, all Unionist; 63% of the population is Catholic, and with one ward, elects 8 councillors, all Nationalists. The largest ward in Belfast (Pottinger) has 22,728 voters; whilst the smallest (Smithfield) has 3,247 voters.

On Tuesday, May 11th, the new Irish Minister for Finance, Mr. Sean ("Jack") Lynch, introduced to Dail Eireann the Finance Bill for 1965. Quite apart from the usual significance of the occasion, the Bill and the debate thereon are of interest in that they are pointers to the intent of the Irish Government to act according to its hints on social welfare at the recent General Election and to the intent of Fine Gael, the main opposition party, to act as a left-wing body.

In the event, the clues remained ambiguous. The Budget itself is a timid step forward from the position taken by its predecessors; the expenditure on housing, education, health and agricultural grants is increased, while various social welfare benefits (but not children's allowances) are raised more than they were raised regularly in previous annual budgets, although there is a new and retrograde means grading in the Old Age Pension system. These increases are to be financed from larger impositions on petrol, alcoholic drinks, cigarettes and tobacco. On the other hand, the scope of death duties is to be narrowed.

That this Budget represents real social progress merely shows how little social progress there has so far been in Ireland. Yet the fact remains that it does represent at least an increased tempo for the Government's welfare programme. It seems as though the pace will be maintained; Kevin Boland, the Minister for Social Welfare, has announced his intention to raise welfare benefits still further, while Lemass, who is, in fact, more responsible for the Budgets than his Finance Ministers, has declared categorically that a review of Irish Health Services should be ready during the year. On the other hand, it is extremely doubtful whether all the cost of the benefit increase has been met: it is extremely likely that there will be an increase in contributions to meet the extra sums required; above ^{all} there has been avoidance of such problems as rural rates which affect directly the welfare of the small farmer. Such lacks are national complements to the bourgeois and elitist economic and social principles within which the Irish Government has chosen to run economic policy.

What does Fine Gael offer instead? A number of separate, and, in themselves, quite useful, ideas and changes in emphasis within the same context as is accepted by the Government. The most radical proposal made by the Party's new leader, Liam Cosgrave, was unconnected with the Budget, but concerned the possible creation of a Select Committee of the Dail to deal with state-sponsored bodies. It was interesting to note that it was Cosgrave's predecessor, the right-winger, James Dillon, who came near, at one stage of his speech, to pinpointing one of the weaknesses inherent in the Government policy of encouraging capitalism in a country situated off the shores of a land where capitalism is already highly developed.

All in all, then, Fine Gael's proposals varied between the "responsible" (which will no doubt be taken over by Fianna Fail) and the "demagogic". A significant example of the latter was in the party's handling of the agricultural question; T.F. O'Higgins, its official spokesman on finance, speaking on Budget day itself, was most critical about the proposed increase in the cost of petrol, and divided the Dail on the matter; it was not until the National Farmers' Association had spoken out against the Government's neglect of the rating question that Fine Gael spokesmen attacked on the matter.

But more saddening was the plight of the Labour Party. Corish, in his speech to the Budget, did attack on redistributory principles. But he never got beyond this to explain or publicise the only way in which principles could be adequately realised in Irish conditions. The successive Labour speakers (two of whom are, by no means, moderates) restricted themselves to individual ways in which the Bill offended. The Labour Party seems to have been hurt severely by Noel Browne's loss to it in the Dail; it is doubtful whether his election to the Seanad can adequately fill the gap.