cause has already been shown for thinking otherwise. But, no. One explanation of the very close resemblance shown in their exhortations to the workers is, that the office of the Ministry for Industry seems as persistently haunted by a song as is the heart of that British Labor Minister, Mr. Shinwell. And that song, we believe, goes something like this:

> **"Oh, working class, the Minister is calling**
> **For you to work a damn sight harder. He said,**
> **The boom has gone and profits now are sliding,**
> **'Tis you — 'tis you — must work and eat less bread."**

(Needless to say, this is now sung to the air of "Danny Boy.") And Lemass has well plugged the song since he gave his first public performance in 1932. Would that some day we might have the pleasure of hearing Morrissey and Lemass in a duet! (Anything you can do, I can do better!) But till then, let's hear a ilttle of that most promising harmony. Lemass (Oct. 11, 1947):

> **"Our problem.... is that we are endeavouring to consume more than we produce...."**

Morrissey (Apr. 7, 1948.):

> **"When the national income is as low as ours, when many of our people are producing scarcely enough to maintain themselves, the margin within which re-distribution of income can take place is a narrow one."**

Now, that's not bad at all for a Huguenot descendant and an ex-Labor Party member. Whether "Danny Boy" Morrissey, however, will be a greater success at out-swooning the workers than that great artist, Sean Lemass, remains to be seen.

"Consuming more than we produce..."? "People... producing scarcely enough to maintain themselves..."? Let's look back over the years for a moment and see whether or not the facts bear out these statements. Fact No. 1: The Census of Production report for 1944 showed that, in that year, 43% of the men and 95% of the women engaged in all industries and services were earning less than £3 per week; over half the youths and 90% of the girls, less than 30 shillings weekly. No. 2: The total amount paid in salaries and wages for the six years, 1939 to 1944, in all industries producing transportable goods was £84,648,000. Relate these two facts to our old friend, "the cost of living index figure," which was app. 70% higher in 1944 as compared with 1939, and the picture revealed is indeed a pretty black one. But have we here got a view of the whole picture? Far from it — this is a one-sided picture so far. To the above two facts we must align two others, side by side, and then we'll see the whole picture. One: in the year 1942-43 there were 222 persons in receipt of an annual income of £2,486,000 — a weekly average of £215 — and of these 66 had an average of £440 per week. (From the annual reports of the Revenue Commissioners.) Two: The item, profits: for the six years 1939-44, £51,063,000 net. And now how is the picture? Still pretty black, its true, but not wholly so. There's a glint of sunlight discernable — or, perhaps, a "glint of gold" would be a more accurate and realistic description.

Yes, we cannot but agree with Lemass when he says that there are people who are consuming more than they produce. But this is no judgement applicable to the great bulk of the people. On the contrary, its an indictment of the people who — in Eire, as elsewhere — have been enabled to accumulate huge masses of wealth while producing *nothing*.

THE DE VALERA POLICIES

And it is the actions and policies of the "Lemasses" of the world that have facilitated such accumulations. Was it not Mr. Lemass who sponsored the Wage Stand-still Order, which froze wages during the war, while allowing profits to soar to unprecedented heights? Was it not Mr. Lemass who, shortly after the Trade Union split in March, 1945, declared in Parliament that "the government would welcome.. one central organization of Irish trade unionism, an organization with which it could consult in confidence.. and related only to our national circumstances" — adding "If that. . . should result from a voluntary withdrawal of British trade unions from activity within this State, the government would have . . . every reason to welcome it."? (Irish Times, Jan. 28, 1945.) Was not this official benediction for the disruptive tactics of the Irish Transport Union clique — the "Bill" O'Brien faction? Here, Lemass freely gave his (undisguised) blessing to the despicable efforts of these small and mean men who, in their seeking after place and power, would — *and did* — willingly sacrifice the hard-won unity of Irish trade unionists. But why shouldn't Lemass have gratefully welcomed this division in the ranks of the trade unionists? (Not that he was wholly unexpecting it or was totally unaware of what was taking place.) If the T. U. Movement could be harnessed behind his industrial expansion drive, what wonderful prospects opened out for for capital investment! All these "foreign" and antiquated notions about bettering wages, hours and working conditions could be easily removed and it would be "full steam ahead" for the industrial capitalists of Eire.

These actions of Eamen De Valera's right-hand man are incompatible with any other but the desire to serve the interests of the industrial capitalist class of Eire — they who "own but do not produce".

In case it may be thought that, after all, Lemass and the other members of the Fianna Fail government were actuated by no more base a motive than that of desiring the industrial development of Ireland by Irishmen, and that therefore their actions during their sixteen years of political rule were undertaken with this "high national aim" in view — if there are any who think this, then they had better think again. Its true that on June 8, 1932, shortly after the Fianna Fail Party came to power sixteen years ago, it was Lemass who said:

> **"We intend to secure the development of Irish industry by Irish capital under Irish control. We are going to prevent any more Ranks from coming into this country."**

That's true enough. But let it be known, here and now, that Mr. Lemass, apparently, suffers from a very poor memory; for, since 1932, the nationality of any enterprising capitalist was never an over-riding factor when it came to a question of capitalising an industry. There is an abundance of facts and figures to hand which clearly demonstrates the enormity of this "foreign" penetration of the Irish capitalist field, but here we must content ourselves with a few interesting examples. We can do no better than begin with "The Best Years of Our Lives", which began its Irish premiere on Easter Sunday on the occasion of the opening of Dublin's new palatial, de-luxe cinema, the Metropole, owned by none other than Lemass's symbol of "foreign capital", Rank. J. Arthur Rank, cinema mogul, director of at least 44 companies, now owns or controls 15 cinemas and 2 theatres in Eire through Odeon (Ireland) Ltd. Here it is of some interest to recall that J. Arthur's brother (Pretender to the title, "King of the Irish flour-milling industry") — 'that other Rank" — was the subject of an embarassing question asked of the government in Parliament on July 1, 1943. No answer is recorded to the question:

> **"Did (the Govt.) inform the people of the amount that Ranks, the firm that received £2 million by way of subsidy here, gave to the Fianna Fail party?"**

This so-called subsidy was, in effect, no more than an "emigration grant" to Rank, the price of his exclusion from the Irish capitalist domain. And now...! But is not a Rank for a Rank merely part of the plot? J. Arthur is now finding that his brother's shoes fit him just as well.