

Times, 15. 12. 37.

Ministerpräsident Chamberlain teilte im Unterhaus am 30. Juli mit, daß der langjährige Kompetenzstreit zwischen der Admiralität und dem Luftfahrtministerium wegen der Verfügung über die Seefliegerwaffe (Chief Air Arm) von der Regierung in nächstemhendem Sinne entschieden sei:

1. Alle zu Schiffen gehörenden Flugzeuge werden künftig vollständig der Admiralität unterstellt sein, also nicht nur operativ und an Bord selbst wie bisher, sondern auch verwaltungsmäßig und an Land, z.B. auf künftigen eigenen Marineübungsplätzen, materiell und personell. Bezüglich dieser Flugzeuge behält das Luftministerium nur die Beschaffung und Ausrüstung neuer Flugzeuge sowie eine gewisse Mitwirkung bei der Ausbildung.

2. Die an der Küste stationierten, zur Zusammenarbeit mit der Flotte auf See bestimmten Marineflugzeuge, einschließlich Flugboote, bleiben nach wie vor ganz beim Luftministerium.

Sector C. Symater, der Marinemitarbeiter des Daily Telegraph, begrüßt die Entscheidung der Regierung mit folgenden Ausführungen (Nr. 25 638, 31. Juli, und Nr. 25 647, 11. August 1937): Die Neuorganisation bedeutet einen Markstein in der Entwicklung der englischen Seefliegerwaffe. Eine der ersten Durchführungsmaßnahmen wird das allmähliche Einrüden von Marinepersonal (z.B. Flugzeugführern) in sämtliche Stellen des Fluge- und Verwaltungs-personals der Seefliegerwaffe sein, von denen bisher 30 vH durch das Luftministerium besetzt wurden. Die für die kommenden Jahre geplante gewaltige Verstärkung der Seefliegerwaffe verleiht der Entscheidung der Regierung besondere Bedeutung.

Fünf große Flugzeugträger zu durchschnittlich etwa 23 000 t, also im ganzen rund 115 000 t, sind nach neuesten Plänen im Bau und werden in den Jahren 1938 bis 1940 in Dienst sein. Sie werden zusammen ungefähr 350 Flugzeuge mitführen; hierzu kommen 170 auf den älteren Flugzeugträgern und etwa 165 auf den Kampfschiffen nach deren vollständiger Ausrüstung, so daß die Seefliegerwaffe in wenigen Jahren im ganzen 685 Marinesflugzeuge umfassen wird gegenüber einem Bestand von zurzeit etwa 220. Zahlensmäßig wird sich demnach eine Verstärkung auf mehr als das Dreifache ergeben. Großadmiral Sir Roger Keyes, Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond und Admiral Sir Sydney A. Fremantle bezeichneten die Lösung der Unterstellungsfrage bezüglich der Küstenflieger und der Flugboote als unbefriedigend. Der erstere befürchtet ein Verlagen der Organisation im Kriege, der letztgenannte Admiral meint, kein noch so bereitwilliges Zusammenarbeiten zwischen Flotte und dem Luftministerium könne das fehlende tatsächlich einheitliche Fliegerstreitkräfte ersetzen. Die Admiralität werde sich unter der neuen Organisation im Kriegsfall, z.B. bei Überwachung der Straßen von Gibraltar und Dover, in einer außerordentlich schwierigen Lage befinden.

Aufnahmen: Associated Press (2), Weltbild (1).

PROGRESS OF REARMAMENT

SIR T. INSKIP'S REPLY TO "SLUMP" CRITICS

EMPLOYMENT TO BE INCREASED

Sir Thomas Inskip, Minister for the Coordination of Defence, speaking yesterday at the annual luncheon of the National Union of Manufacturers in London, said that had it not been for the active cooperation and help of manufacturers as a whole it would have been impossible for the Government to set going and to develop the programme which to-day was gathering fresh momentum every week and every day. It was a great satisfaction, moreover, that for some time past the nation had been united in the determination to carry out its rearmament programme.

He sometimes thought it would be a good thing if all appreciated the weight of the programme and the cost it would involve to bring it to a successful conclusion. In 1913-14 the country spent something like £77,000,000 upon the two Defence Services. In a typical year after the War, 1924, the cost was £113,000,000, and in the lowest post-War year after the depression the amount was £103,000,000 on what were then the three Services. In 1937 the expenditure had been £278,000,000, and in 1938-39, estimates of which had still to be prepared, the expenditure would be something between £320,000,000 and £340,000,000 with, in addition, £5,000,000 to £10,000,000 upon air raid precautions, and other additions in respect of necessary services such as contributions to steps that must be taken in connexion with essential services like gas, electricity, and the like. Those were formidable figures, and he hoped they would reveal that the programme demanded the efforts not only of the Government and the Chancellor of the Exchequer but also of the manufacturer and the taxpayer.

TRIBUTE TO MANUFACTURERS

Other figures showed how much the country was dependent upon the manufacturers. In 1913-14 the personnel of the two Defence Services was 337,000 men; in 1937, in spite of the great increase in cost, the personnel was about 350,000. The cost of the elaborate armaments and equipment was very remarkably more than it was before the War. The way British manufacturers had come to the rescue of the Government, and put at its disposal all their experience, ingenuity, capacity, and financial strength had made it possible for him to say, after 18 months in his present office, that the three Defence Services had made immense strides towards that time when the Government might say that the country had made up the leeway, and that it could rest content with only the duty and the task of maintaining the Services in the state of efficiency to which they had been brought.

He had never held the view, as some people did, that the Government rearmament programme had been mainly, if not alone, responsible for the degree of comparative prosperity which the country had enjoyed in the past two years. He had not examined the trade return as thoroughly as manufacturers were compelled to do, but he would have thought that the increase in expenditure on the three Services in 1937 compared with 1934 was trifling in comparison with the volume of trade outside the rearmament programme. But the curious fact was that some people, who told them that prosperity in the past two years had been entirely due to the rearmament programme, were now very anxious to hail any sign that they thought indicated the end of the

boom, when, as a matter of fact the rearmament programme had not attained anything like the volume that it would attain in about 18 months' time.

When he surveyed the list of undertakings, many of which were still in course of erection, for producing different parts of the equipment of the rearmament programme, he realized that it would be necessary to multiply by three, four, and five times the number of men and women employed before they reached the full capacity that had been planned for the programme. There were in many parts of the country new factories and new establishments in the earliest stage of preparation or of erection in which, he hoped, some thousands of men and perhaps women would be employed. Realization of that fact, Sir Thomas Inskip suggested, would perhaps make some of those who were telling them that a slump had come because rearmament was coming to an end correct their impressions and their public statements.

STRENGTH OF THE NATION

Emphasizing the need to maintain the nation's financial and credit structure by extension of trade, Sir Thomas Inskip said that the strength of the nation depended more than ever upon the ability of manufacturers and industrialists to develop that which ultimately was the one condition of successful war, if ever it came to such a period—to maintain the defences, as Lord Trenchard had said, over a short period when there could be no doubt at all as to the ultimate conclusion of any conflict. One of the most satisfactory features of the rearmament programme had been the way that skilled and semi-skilled labour had been recruited and trained. It was a tribute to both sides of industry that so much good will had been shown. With regard to the provision of raw materials, he would like to say in quite general terms that the Government had not been oblivious or blind to the problem that would arise if ever war unhappily came, but had taken steps, the details of which he did not propose to state there, to see that proper supplies were provided of everything that the country might need. (Cheers.)

SIR PATRICK HANNON, M.P., who presided at the annual meeting of the National Union of Manufacturers, said the union ardently desired to see the most intimate understanding and good will between this country and the United States, but it could not contemplate without deep anxiety changes in tariff policy which would increase the volume of mass-produced American manufactures into Britain.