CABINET 30 (22).

CONCLUSIONS of a Meeting of the Cabinet held at 10, Downing Street, S.W.1, on Wednesday, 22nd March, 1922, at 11.30 a.m.

PRESENT:-

The Right Hon. A. Chamberlain, M.P.,
Lord Privy Seal. (In the Chair).

The Right Hon. E. Shortt,
C.B.E., M.P., Secretary of State for Home Affairs.

The Right Hon. The Viscount Birkenhead, Lord Chancellor.

The Right Hon. The Viscount Peel, C.B.E., Secretary of State for India.


The Right Hon. Sir Alfred Mond,
Bart., M.P., Minister of Health.

The Right Hon. Sir Arthur Griffith-
Beacon, M.P., Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

The Right Hon. R. Munro, K.C.,
M.P., Secretary for Scotland.

The Right Hon. Sir Robert Horne,

The Right Hon. W.S. Churchill,
M.P., Secretary of State for the Colonies.

The Right Hon. Sir L. Worthington Evans, Bart., M.P., Secretary of State for War.

The Right Hon. S. Baldwin, M.P.,
President of the Board of Trade.

The Right Hon. H.A.E. Fisher, M.P.,
President of the Board of Trade.

The Right Hon. T.J. Maconochie,
M.P., Minister of Labour.

The Right Hon. Sir Hamar Greenwood,
Bart., K.C., M.P., Chief Secretary for Ireland.

Lt. Commander E.Hilton Young, D.S.O.,
D.S.C., M.P., Financial Secretary to the Treasury. (For Conclusion 4, 3)

Sir A. Watson, K.C.B., Government Actuary. (For Conclusion 6)


Mr. T. Jones, Principal Assistant Secretary.
With reference to Cabinet 16 (22) Conclusion 2, the Cabinet had before them the following documents on the subject of Unemployment Insurance:—

The Report of the Unemployment Committee (C.P. 3686) Appendix I.
The Draft of a Bill giving effect to the Committee’s Report, which was circulated during the discussion, (C.P. 3689)

The Minister of Labour gave the Cabinet a summary of the Committee’s proposals, namely, that the proposed legislation should provide for weekly benefits of 17/- for a married man plus 1/- for each child, 12/- for a single man and 10/- for a single woman; these figures comparing with 22/-, 15/-, and 12/- under the existing legislation; these reduced rates of benefit to become operative as from Thursday, April 13th. Emphasis was laid on two considerations: first, that the rate of benefit was to be reduced, and secondly, that there would be a hiatus of a week and a half in April during which no unemployment benefit would be paid. The cost of this scheme would involve an additional burden to the Exchequer of about £8,000,000, and would involve an extension of the maximum borrowing powers of the Minister of Labour by £5,000,000.

The Lord Privy Seal, as Chairman of the Committee, explained that the Committee were continuing the assistance to wives and children at the same rate of benefit, and in view of the fact that the State was giving an uncovenanted benefit to people who had exhausted their right they were justified in reducing the rates of benefit to the other beneficiaries.

The Secretary for Scotland pointed out the difficulty which the adoption of this scheme would cause in Scotland owing, first, to the small areas of administration in that part of the United Kingdom, and secondly, to the fact that Parliament had recently agreed that in Scotland the burden should be laid on the parish councils providing poor relief.
to destitute able-bodied persons out of employment. (The
Poor Law Emergency Provisions (Scotland) Act). If further
burdens were laid on these small authorities their machinery
would break down. They were already pressing the Chancellor
of the Exchequer for additional grants. In his view either
the benefits ought not to be reduced or the waiting periods
should be shorter.

This aspect of the question gave rise to a general discussion as to whether in the existing unemployment situation it
was wise to cut down the amount of the benefit at all. Warnings were given of the risk of grave disturbance if this
course was adopted. In this connection the Government Actuary
was invited into the room and informed the Cabinet that the
cost of maintaining the existing rates of benefit would
involve additional borrowing powers of £29,000,000, making
£29½ millions which, however, would probably be materially
increased as the result of the present disturbances in the
engineering and shipbuilding trade, perhaps to £32 millions.
If so large a deficit were reached it would make very problem-
atic its repayment because the contributors would refuse to
bear the high rates necessary for a long enough period.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER pointed out that there was
a widespread hope and anticipation that some reduction would
be made in taxation in the forthcoming Budget. This heavy
additional burden would militate against this desideratum.
He demurred to the proposal that the cost should be met by
increasing the capital liabilities of the country. Such a
course would involve borrowing which would be contrary to the
financial policy we had hitherto pursued of reducing rather
than increasing debt, and would result in lowering the credit
of the country to an extent which would entail losses far
beyond the addition to the debt.
In the course of further discussion it was pointed out that the scheme did not apply to Ireland, since the British Government's responsibilities in Northern Ireland had already ceased and would cease in Southern Ireland on 31st March 1922.

After considerable discussion the Cabinet agreed

(a) That the rates of Unemployment Insurance benefit should remain as at present.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer asked that his dissent from this conclusion should be recorded.

(b) That the Bill should be redrafted to give effect to this conclusion.

(c) That the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Health should be responsible for seeing that the Bill conforms to the decision of the Cabinet.

(d) That the Minister of Labour should have authority to introduce the Bill on Friday next.
(2) With reference to Cabinet 18 (22), Conclusion 8, the Cabinet had before them Memoranda by the Minister of Labour (Papers C.P.-3802 and C.P.-3864) dealing with the present position of the dispute in the engineering trade.

The Minister of Labour stated that the view he had put forward to the Cabinet as to the inexpediency of appointing a Court of Enquiry while the ballots of the other Unions were being taken, had been endorsed in the Debate in the House of Commons. Since that Debate the two parties had again approached each other. If the results of the ballots were adverse to the employers, he did not think there would be an immediate lock-out, but that discussions would continue. On the other hand, he thought it unlikely that the lock-out notices now in force would be withdrawn.
The Cabinet had before them Memoranda by the Minister of Labour (Papers C.P.-3810, C.P.-3856 and O.P.-3866) dealing with the present position of the dispute in regard to wages in the shipbuilding trade.

The Minister of Labour informed the Cabinet that the employers had posted up notices intimating a reduction of wages of 10s.6d. per week from March 29th, and a further reduction of 6/- at the end of April. The representatives of the men were to meet in conference tomorrow, and they would probably recommend that a ballot be taken on these notices, and perhaps ask for a postponement of their operation beyond March 29th.

The Cabinet agreed —

That the Lord Privy Seal, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary for Scotland, should be associated with the Minister of Labour in watching closely the course of the disputes in the Engineering and Shipbuilding industries.
(4) In view of the potential risks of a situation in which there are two million unemployed and serious disputes in the Engineering and Shipbuilding trades, the Cabinet agreed —

That a Cabinet Committee, composed as follows —

The Home Secretary (In the Chair),
The First Lord of the Admiralty,
The Secretary of State for War,
The Secretary of State for Air,
The Minister of Labour,
The Secretary for Scotland,
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport,
The Attorney-General,

Mr T. St. Q. Hill (Secretary) —

should be formed and summoned by the Home Secretary as required to assist him in any special emergency which might arise in connection with the maintenance of law and order.
(5) In connection with the foregoing Conclusion, the Secretary of State for Home Affairs informed the Cabinet that the Report on the re-constitution of the Supply and Transport organisation had been prepared in accordance with Conclusion 5 of Home Affairs Committee Meeting 101, and would shortly be considered by that Committee (Paper T.S.C.-169).
CALLING UP OF RESERVES IN TIMES OF CIVIL UNREST.

With reference to Cabinet 29 (21), Appendix 8 (5), the Cabinet had before them, and took note of, the following Memoranda dealing with the calling up of reserves in times of civil unrest:

A Memorandum by the First Lord of the Admiralty (Paper C.P.-5471),

A Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War (Paper C.P.-5646),

A Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Air (Paper C.P.-5806).
PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATURE OF STATE SERVANTS.

(7) The consideration of the Memorandum by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Parliamentary candidature of State servants (Paper C.P.-3807), was postponed until the Prime Minister could be present.
(6) With reference to Cabinet 53 (20), Conclusion 4, the Cabinet had before them a Memorandum by the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposing to remove the present embargo on Government advertisements in the "Daily Herald", inasmuch as it was a good medium for furthering the sale of Savings Certificates and that there had been a change in the personnel of the Board of Directors (Paper C.P.-5808).

The Cabinet agreed —

To adhere to the present policy.
NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE BILL.

(9) With reference to Cabinet 12 (22) Conclusion 4, the Cabinet had before them an extract from the draft minutes of a meeting of the Home Affairs Committee held on March 21st 1922 (C.P. 3870) dealing with a National Health Insurance Bill prepared by the Minister of Health (C.P. 3828).

The Minister of Health explained that as a result of a conference with the Consultative Council of Approved Societies it had been agreed that any increase at present in the rates of contribution would meet with strong opposition. In view, however, of the need for economy and the proposals of the Committee on National Expenditure, which had been endorsed by the Cabinet, the Societies had agreed to accept a scheme which would secure the economies desired by drawing on the surplus of the Societies instead of levying additional contributions. This was a departure from the precise method approved by the Cabinet. At the meeting of the Home Affairs Committee on the previous day, the Financial Secretary of the Treasury had objected that on the termination of the Minister of Health's scheme in Dec. 1923 there would probably be recourse to the Treasury for fresh grants and he asked the Committee to embody in the present Bill the principle that further grants from the Treasury would be barred. This he suggested could be done by repealing Section I of the National Health Insurance Act 1913.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that the objection of the Treasury was that the scheme simply postponed trouble to December 1923 and was a short sighted arrangement because after that period the Approved Societies would again look to the Treasury to make good the deficits.

The Minister of Health stated that it was impossible at present to increase the Health Insurance contributions owing to the high rate of Unemployment Insurance contributions, but if the latter are reduced by December 1923 it
would be easier to advance the former. To remove all State assistance above the statutory two-ninths would be to surrender the weapon which the State can use in dealing with the doctors and to hand them over to the Approved Societies. To do this would raise a storm of opposition in the medical profession and gravely endanger the structure of medical benefit now embodied in the Health Insurance Act.

The President of the Board of Education, as Chairman of the Home Affairs Committee, stated that except for the Financial Secretary to the Treasury the Committee were unanimously in favour of the proposals of the Minister of Health.

The Cabinet agreed -

To approve the proposals of the Minister of Health and authorised the introduction of the National Health Insurance Bill.
The Secretary of State for the Colonies asked that the Cabinet should be afforded an opportunity in good time to discuss the financial situation of the country in relation to the forthcoming Budget.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that it was proposed to introduce the Budget on May 1st.

The Cabinet instructed the Secretary to bring the request of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the notice of the Prime Minister.
(11) With reference to Cabinet 16(32), Conclusion 1, the Lord Chancellor stated that the prospects of the Irish Treaty Bill going through the House of Lords were extremely good if no grave untoward event took place on the border between Northern and Southern Ireland, and he wished to be assured that everything possible was being done to grapple with the situation on the border.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies said that members of the Irish Republican Army and of the Special Constabulary had been allowed to come dangerously near each other on the boundary. He himself had wished to follow the Silesian precedent and draw a cordon by means of British troops, but his proposal had been resisted by the late Chief of the Imperial General Staff. He still thought it would be possible to place troops at critical points, and understood that the Secretary of State for War was prepared to do this, and that such action would meet with the assent of the Governments of the North and South. He very much dreaded a collision. If we took the action suggested, it would then be possible for him to press Sir James Craig to meet Mr Collins in conference and to obtain from Mr Collins a repudiation of the revolts on the part of the Irish Republican Army.

The Secretary of State for War said that the question of securing something equivalent to a neutral belt was being examined by the General Staff.

The Cabinet agreed —

That the whole question should be considered immediately by the Provisional Government of Ireland Committee, and that the Lord Chancellor should be invited to attend.

The Cabinet took note that Viscount Peel had taken the place of Mr Montagu as a member of the Committee.
With reference to Cabinet 19 (22), Conclusion 2(ix), the Secretary of State for India, who was congratulated on his first attendance at the Cabinet, called attention to the decision of the Indian Legislative Assembly to reject the proposal to raise the Customs Duties, thereby increasing the deficit to about twelve crores.

The Cabinet agreed —

That a special meeting of the Cabinet should be summoned at an early date to consider the general Indian situation.
With reference to Cabinet 12 (28), Conclusion 6, the Cabinet had before them a Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War dealing with the reduction of the number of Cavalry Regiments contemplated by the decision of the Cabinet on the recommendation of the Committee on National Expenditure (Paper C.P.-3836).

The Secretary of State for War explained the proposals set forth in detail in his Memorandum, the chief of which provided that the First and Second Life Guards should be amalgamated to form one Regiment of four Squadrons, each of the existing regiments providing two squadrons, and the composite regiment to be called "The Life Guards". A similar policy of amalgamation was to be followed in the case of the Line Regiments. He also informed the Cabinet that the proposals had been submitted to His Majesty the King, and had the approval of the Chief of the Imperial General Staff and of Field Marshal Lord Haig.

The Cabinet approved the recommendations of the Secretary of State for War.
The Secretary of State for War stated that he wished to correct a statement he had made at a recent meeting of the Cabinet. The number of batteries of artillery which it was proposed to disband was 47, and this would leave 170 and not 162, as he had stated. The Estimates were not affected.
(15) The Cabinet took note of the following Conclusions of the Committee of Home Affairs:

Committee of Home Affairs 107, meeting held on March 9, 1922, at 4-15 p.m.:-

(1) Valuation and Rating Reform.
(2) Rating Machinery.
(3) Road Conveyance of Goods by Railway Companies.
(4) Harbours, Docks and Piers (Temporary Increase of Charges) Bill.
(5) Tramways Control of Charging Powers.
(6) Foot and Mouth Disease, Diseases of Animals Bill, 1922.

(Appendix.)
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SECRET.
H.A.C. 107th Conclusions.

CABINET.

COMMITTEE OF HOME AFFAIRS. 107.

Conclusions of a Meeting of the above Committee, held in the Ministers' Conference Room, House of Commons, S.W., on Thursday, March 9, 1922, at 4:15 P.M.

Present:
The Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, M.P., President of the Board of Education (in the Chair).
The Right Hon. S. Baldwin, M.P., President of the Board of Trade.
The Right Hon. Sir A. Griffith-Boscawen, M.P., Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.
The Right Hon. F. G. Kellaway, M.P., Postmaster-General.
Mr. E. Hilton Young, D.S.O., M.P., Financial Secretary, Treasury.

The following were also present:

Mr. Arthur Neal, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Transport (for Conclusions 3, 4 and 5).
Mr. Montague Barlow, K.B.E., M.P., Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
Sir Francis Floud, K.C.B., Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (for Conclusion 6).
Sir William Marwood, K.C.B., Ministry of Transport (for Conclusions 3, 4 and 5).
Mr. Carson Roberts, Ministry of Health (for Conclusions 1 and 2).

Mr. Pembroke Wicks, Secretary to the Committee.
Mr. R. B. Howorth, Assistant Secretary, Cabinet.
1. With reference to H.A.C. 85, Conclusion 3, the Committee had under consideration the Report of the Valuation and Rating Reform Committee (C.P. 3544) and Memoranda thereon by the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries and the Minister of Health (C.P. 3770 and C.P. 3819).

The Committee were reminded of the nature of the principles embodied in the Report, and it was suggested that, assuming acceptance of those principles, the question would arise whether in all the circumstances a Bill should be drafted. The drafting of such a Bill would mean heavy work for the Parliamentary Counsel, and it would be most undesirable to publish a draft Bill unless the Government were resolved to proceed with the measure. On the other hand, it was pointed out that it was very difficult to estimate the effect of the Committee's proposals without seeing them in legislative form.

The Minister of Agriculture informed the Committee that, while he was in general sympathy with much of the Report, he was convinced that the proposals, if adopted, would have the effect of increasing the present heavy burdens on agricultural land, and would accordingly meet with strong opposition both in Parliament and in the country. He would like to have more time to consider the proposals contained in the Minister of Health's Memorandum (C.P. 3819) as it seemed to him that his objections to the Report could probably be overcome either in the directions indicated in the Memorandum or in other ways. He did not object to the proposals in the Report relative to the part to be played by the Crown as regards valuation.

The Secretary for Scotland urged that the Committee should defer coming to any final decision until after the receipt of the Report of Lord Dunedin's Committee, which might be expected shortly.

The Committee agreed—

(1.) To defer further consideration of the Report of the Valuation and Rating Reform Committee (C.P. 3544) with a view to the examination by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, the Ministry of Health and the Treasury of the question whether, and, if so, to what extent, the agricultural objections to the Report could be met.

(2.) To request the Chairman to consult with the Lord Privy Seal as to the practicability of introducing legislation on this subject in the present Session.

2. The Committee had under consideration Memoranda C.P. 3563 and C.P. 3583 by the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries on the question of the rating of machinery.

The Committee were reminded of the desirability of removing the uncertainty as to the law on this subject and of placing English manufacturers on the same basis as regards the rating of their machinery as their Scottish and Irish competitors.

On the other hand, emphasis was laid on the opposition which would be raised to proposals such as those in the Bill annexed to C.P. 3563 by ordinary ratepayers in both rural and urban areas and on the objections to dealing piecemeal with items of rating reform.

The Committee agreed—

That it was undesirable that the Government should introduce legislation on the subject of the rating of machinery at the present time.
3. The Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport (C.P. 3785) from which it appeared that the North-Western and Midland group of Railway Companies were seeking power under a Bill to work a system of road vehicles in any district to which their lines gave access, for the conveyance of merchandise and passengers. Under the present law apart from any particular provisions in special Acts of Parliament, Railway Companies could only do so if the traffic originated on their own lines. The proposal was very controversial and had aroused opposition on the part of Carrying Companies and Local Authorities.

The Ministry of Transport asked for a decision on policy on the second reading of the Bill.

The view was expressed that though none of the safeguards provided in the Bill, or under existing legislation, afforded complete protection from abuse, their accumulated effect would be to safeguard the interests of traders, road transport undertakings and the general public.

It was recommended that the Government should state on second reading of the Bill in the House of Commons that they recognised the fears of traders, Local Authorities, and other transport undertakings; should point out the difficulty of deciding upon the principle of the Bill until the safeguards which could be devised to prevent the growth of a monopoly had been considered in Committee, and should reserve their final decision until the third reading.

In reply to a question whether the Government accepted the general principle that Railway Companies should carry on road transport business, it was pointed out to the Committee that some Railway Companies already had power to do so under their special Acts of Parliament, that the only reason why any Railway Company need come to Parliament was because road traffic business was outside their charter, and that the only persons who could bring an action to restrain them from carrying on road transport would be one of their own shareholders.

The Committee agreed—

That during the debate on the second reading of "The Railways-(North-Western and Midland Group) Bill, 1922," in the House of Commons—

(1.) A statement should be made on behalf of the Government—

(i.) That the Government recognise the fears of traders, of owners and users of mechanically-propelled vehicles, and of Local Authorities;

(ii.) That it is difficult to decide on the principle of the Bill until there has been detailed consideration in Committee of the safeguards which can be devised to prevent the growth of an oppressive monopoly;

(iii.) That the Government recommend the House to send the Bill to Committee, the final decision of the Government being reserved until third reading.

(2.) That the Government Whips should be taken off on the vote for the second reading of the Bill.
4. With reference to H.A.C. 99, Conclusion 1, the Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport (C.P. 3753), covering the draft of a Bill extending the increased charging powers of harbours, docks and piers owned by Railway Companies until the 15th February, 1923, together with a re-draft of the Bill (see Appendix), which was circulated at the meeting.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport stated that he had been in communication with representatives of shipowners and the Federation of British Industries, and as far as he was aware there would be no opposition to the Bill.

The Committee agreed—

To approve the Harbours, Docks and Piers (Temporary Increase of Charges) Bill, and to authorise the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport to arrange for its introduction in Parliament.

5. With reference to H.A.C. 99, Conclusion 1, the Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport (C.P. 3756), on the proposal to make permanent the present temporary legislation whereby charges for tramway undertakings are fixed by the Minister of Transport on the advice of a Committee.

The Home Affairs Committee had decided at the meeting above referred to that the question should be postponed for further consideration. A Bill was now submitted showing the exact effect of the proposals made, which, it was understood, were being supported by a large majority of the municipal tramway undertakings, to whom enquiries had been addressed. They also received the unanimous support of private tramway undertakings.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport stated that, as the result of further enquiries, he found that he could not now advise that any further steps should be taken than to include “The Statutory Undertakings (Temporary Increase of Charges) Act, 1918,” and “The Tramways (Temporary Increase of Charges) Act, 1920,” in the Expiring Laws Continuance Act. It was felt that strong opposition would be met with in Parliament to any proposal permanently to deprive Parliament of its right to hear applications from tramway undertakings, by way of private Bills or Provisional Orders, for permission to increase their charges.

The Committee agreed in the course recommended by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport.

6. With reference to Cabinet 15 (22), Minute 7, the Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries (C.P. 3821), covering the draft of “The Diseases of Animals Bill, 1922,” to remove temporarily the limit on monies provided by Parliament for the purposes of the Diseases of Animals Acts.

It was stated in the Memorandum that in consequence of the agreement sanctioned by the Cabinet, that the cost of the recent outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease should be divided equally between the Exchequer and the rates, it would be necessary to authorise the
payment of 500,000l. into the Cattle Pleuro-Pneumonia Account. At present a limit of 140,000l. was imposed by Section 18 of "The Diseases of Animals Act, 1894," on the monies which might be provided by Parliament for this purpose.

The Minister of Agriculture stated that the details of the Bill had been agreed with the Treasury.

The Committee agreed—

To approve the draft of the "Diseases of Animals Bill, 1922," and to authorise the Minister of Agriculture to arrange for its introduction in Parliament.

2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W. 1,
March 10, 1922.

APPENDIX.

HARBOURS, DOCKS AND PIERS (TEMPORARY INCREASE OF CHARGES).

Redraft of a Bill to Amend and Extend the Duration of "The Harbours, Docks and Piers (Temporary Increase of Charges) Act, 1920."

Be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

1.—(1.) Proviso (b) of Subsection (1) of Section 1 of "The Harbours, Docks and Piers (Temporary Increase of Charges) Act, 1920" (hereinafter referred to as "the principal Act"), shall not apply to any port, harbour, dock or pier forming part of the undertaking of a railway company, but in considering any modification of the statutory provisions regulating the charges to be made by any railway company in respect of any such port, harbour, dock or pier, regard shall be had to the charges in force at similar ports, harbours, docks or piers (whether forming part of the undertaking of a railway company or not), and to the cost of labour and materials, and no modification of such statutory provisions shall be authorised which would increase the charges beyond such amounts as the railway company were, at the passing of this Act, entitled to charge by virtue of Section 3 of "The Ministry of Transport Act, 1919."

[(2.) In this section the expression "pier" includes a wharf, quay or jetty.]

2.—(1.) This Act may be cited as "The Harbours, Docks and Piers (Temporary Increase of Charges) Act, 1922," and the principal Act and this Act may be cited together as "The Harbours, Docks and Piers (Temporary Increase of Charges) Acts, 1920 to 1922."

(2.) The principal Act, as amended by this Act, shall have effect until the 15th day of February, 1925, and Subsection (4) of Section 60 of "The Railways Act, 1921" (which continues the Rates Advisory Committee in existence so long as it may be necessary for the purposes of references under the principal Act), shall have effect accordingly.