CONCLUSIONS of a Meeting of the Cabinet held in Mr. Chamberlain's Room, House of Commons, S.W., on Monday, April 10th, 1922, at 4.15 p.m.

PRESENT:

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

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


The Right Hon. The Viscount Peel, G.C.B., M.P., Secretary of State for India.

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

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

The Right Hon. H.A.L. Fisher, M.P., President of the Board of Education.

The Right Hon. Sir A. Griffith-Boscawen, M.P., Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

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

The Right Hon. The Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, K.T., First Commissioner of Works.

THE FOLLOWING WERE ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. E. Hilton Young, D.S.O., D.S.C., M.P., Financial Secretary to the Treasury.

Mr. H.J. Wilson, C.B., C.B.E., Secretary to the Ministry of Labour. (For Conclusion 6).

Mr. Thomas Jones.................. Acting Secretary.

Mr. R.B. Howorth.................. Assistant Secretary.
(a) Private Letter to Mr. Collins.

With reference to Cabinet 23 (22) Conclusion 1 (c) the Secretary of State for the Colonies made a brief statement on the Irish situation. In his opinion the next ten days would undoubtedly be of critical importance and before a month had passed we should know whether the leaders of the Free State were prepared to fight or to endure without resistance the insults now being offered them. There were signs of a stiffening of the attitude of Mr. Collins in the last day or two.

Mr. Churchill, continuing, said he would like to be released from his undertaking at the last Cabinet to write an official letter to Mr. Collins. He thought it would be more helpful to write a private letter putting forward the considerations desired by the Cabinet.

(b) With reference to Cabinet 23 (22) Conclusion 1 (d) the Viceroy was present and in response to a suggestion that he should not return to Dublin at the present critical juncture Lord FitzAlan said his absence would not only be highly inconvenient in view of many social engagements already fixed but would also be hardly fair to the leaders of the Provisional Government. It was pointed out to Lord FitzAlan that while he was prepared to run considerable personal risk any untoward incident, such as seizure by enemies of the Free State, would place His Majesty's Government in a very embarrassing position, and it was therefore imperative that the Viceroyal Lodge should be properly safeguarded.

The Cabinet agreed:

(1) That the Secretary of State for the Colonies should send a private and not a formal letter to Mr. Collins.

(2) That the Secretary of State for the Colonies should request the G.C.C.Ireland to provide at once an adequate military guard for the protection of the Viceroy while in residence in Ireland.
The Cabinet had under consideration a Memo by the Chief Secretary for Ireland (C.P. 3931) covering the draft of a Bill to give legal effect, so far as is necessary, to the terms on which the Government have undertaken to disband the Royal Irish Constabulary. After the need for urgency had been emphasized, the Cabinet agreed:

1. To approve the draft Bill subject to certain drafting points to be settled by the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Financial Secretary to the Treasury in consultation.

2. To authorise the immediate introduction of the Bill in the House of Commons and to take steps to secure its passage into law as soon as possible after the Easter recess.

3. That pending the passage of the Bill into law, the Treasury should make arrangements to provide the requisite funds.
3. With reference to Cabinet 19 (22) Conclusion 3, the Cabinet had under consideration Memoranda (C.P. 3852 and C.P. 3898) by the President of the Board of Trade relative to the question of the exercise by the Board of Trade of their powers under the Safeguarding of Industries Act (Part II), to make an Order relative to Fabric Gloves and Glove Materials.

The Cabinet were informed that an immediate decision was desirable in as much as the whole of the policy on which the Act was based was to be criticised in the House of Commons on Wednesday next.

In the case under consideration the Committee had reported unanimously in favour of the exercise by the Board of Trade of their power under Part II of the Act to impose an import duty of 33 1/3rd on imported fabric gloves and glove materials. If the recommendations of this unanimous Report were over-ruled the whole case for Part II of the Act would disappear. It was, however, doubtful whether the Lancashire Fine Spinning Industry would be in any respect damaged if the order were made and it would be impossible to administer the Act if threats of retaliation by Germany were to prevail.

On the other hand, the Cabinet were reminded that the Law Officers had now advised that the power of the Board of Trade to make an Order under Section 2 (3) of the Act is discretionary and that if an order were made in the present case one of the great staple industries of the country would certainly be alienated, while it was doubtful whether the small glove industry would be benefited.
In these circumstances the Board of Trade should weigh the balance of damage and use their discretion by over-ruuling the Committee. No doubt the fears of Lancashire were exaggerated, but in the present state of the cotton trade the psychological effect of the threatened German action might be very prejudicial.

The Cabinet were also reminded that the Lancashire objections to the order did not come within the terms of reference of the Committee and were a factor for consideration by Government itself.

In the course of the discussion it transpired that of the seven Reports received by the Board of Trade three had been adverse to the industries and four had been favourable to the making of Orders and that the Board of Trade proposed to make Orders in three of the four cases, the remaining case being the one under consideration. It was pointed out that in these circumstances it could not be represented that Part II of the Act was a dead letter.

The Cabinet, by a majority, decided:--

That having regard to the very special circumstances of the case it was not desirable that the Board of Trade should make the proposed Order relating to fabric gloves and glove materials under Part II of the Safeguarding Industries Act.

Note. Subsequently at the express request of the President of the Board of Trade the Lord Privy Seal authorised action to be suspended on the above decision pending further consideration of the question by a fuller Meeting of the Cabinet on a later occasion.
The Cabinet had under consideration the following documents relative to the question of the future housing of the Imperial War Museum:

(Memo: by the First Commissioner of Works, CP.3948 (already circulated).
Memo: by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, CP.3977 (already circulated).
Memo: by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, CP.3980 (already circulated).
Memo: by the Minister of Health, CP.3992 (already circulated).
Letter from the High Commissioner of New Zealand, CP.3920 (already circulated).

The Cabinet were reminded that at present the Imperial War Museum was very badly and expensively housed at the Crystal Palace. The early termination of the lease made it necessary to move the collections elsewhere and it was out of the question to provide a new building for them. The Trustees of the Museum had reduced their indent for space by 60% and it was proposed to accommodate the collection partly in the Science Museum and partly in the Imperial Institute. The Imperial Institute was subsidised by the British Government to the extent of £25,000 a year, by the Crown Colonies and Protectorates to the extent of £21,000 a year, and by the Dominions to the extent of £8,000 a year. It was only proposed to take 3% of the space at the Institute for Museum purposes. The opposition of the Dominions had been headed by New Zealand and was consistent and regular. On the other hand emphasis was laid on the great difficulties of housing the Imperial War Museum at the Imperial Institute. It was impossible to force the proposal upon the Dominions against their will and there was great danger of the Dominions withdrawing altogether from the Imperial Institute, in which case it would be very difficult to persuade the Crown Colonies to continue their contributions. If this unfortunate event was to happen the whole of the contemplated savings would be lost.

Reference was made to the fact that when the University of London evacuated the Imperial Institute there would be ample space for expansion. Moreover, the tendency...
the tendency was for the Dominions to provide their own accommodation elsewhere. The presence of the Imperial war Museum in the Imperial Institute would undoubtedly attract the public and so indirectly benefit the Dominions and the Crown Colonies.

After some further discussion the Cabinet agreed:

(i) To approve in principle the proposals of the First Commissioner of Works for the future housing of the Imperial War Museum, provided that it was found possible to secure the acquiescence of the Dominions in the user to be made of the buildings of the Imperial Institute.

(ii) To authorise the Secretary of State for the Colonies to approach the Dominions with the proposal that His Majesty's Government would be prepared to pay a rent of £1500 per annum for the accommodation to be provided in the Imperial Institute and to make a further contribution towards the funds of the Institute; the Dominions to be notified of the advantages which would accrue to them from the presence of the Imperial War Museum in the Institute Buildings.
The Cabinet had under consideration a Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Colonies (C.P. 3906) relative to the maintenance of the Maltese Local Force. The Cabinet were informed that the Secretary of State for War had now agreed to provide a sum of £25,000 in the War Office Estimates for the current financial year for this service. The Cabinet took note of and approved this arrangement.
The Cabinet had under consideration a Memorandum by the Minister of Labour (C.P. 3814) on the subject of the schemes for training ex-service men in the building trade.

The Cabinet were reminded of the reasons for the failure of the fit ex-service men's scheme and of the desirability of persuading the employers and workmen to facilitate the schemes for training disabled ex-service men, which schemes were at present being jeopardised by the fit men's scheme.

Emphasis was laid on the desirability of obtaining some definite assurance from the employers and trade unions concerned that they would assist the disabled men's scheme in the event of the fit men's scheme being abandoned.

The Cabinet agreed -

1. That the scheme for the training and employment of fit ex-service men in the building trade should be abandoned.

2. That the Minister of Labour should make use of the Government's readiness to abandon the scheme in order to secure the maximum possible advantages for the disabled ex-service men.
The Cabinet took note of the following:

(i) Committee of Home Affairs 108, held on March 21st, 1922 at 4-15 p.m.

(1) OXFORD AND ST. ALBANS WINE PRIVILEGES BILL.
(2) NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE BILL.
(3) AUDIT (LOCAL AUTHORITIES) BILL.
(4) VALUATION AND RATING REFORM.
(5) LEAKAGE OF SECRET INFORMATION.

(Appendix I)

(ii) Committee of Home Affairs 109, held on March 30th, 1922 at 4-15 p.m.

(1) SUPPLY AND TRANSPORT ORGANISATION.
(2) SALMON AND FRESHWATER FISHERIES BILL.
(3) CANALS (CONTINUANCE OF CHARGING POWERS) BILL.
(4) CHILDREN OF UNMARRIED PARENTS BILL.
(5) POST OFFICE (PNEUMATIC TUBES ACQUISITION) BILL.
(6) CHAIRMAN OF FISHERY BOARD FOR SCOTLAND.

(Appendix II)

(iii) Committee of Home Affairs 110, held on April 4th, 1922 at 4-15 p.m.

(1) CHILDREN OF UNMARRIED PARENTS BILL.
(2) WOOLWICH ARSENAL. SHORT TIME.
(3) ALLOTMENTS BILL.
(4) EMPIRE SETTLEMENT BILL.
(5) AGRICULTURE HOLDINGS BILL.
(6) PREVENTION OF FRAUD (GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS) BILL.
(7) OIL IN NAVIGABLE WATERS BILL.
(8) UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) BILL, 1922.

(Appendix III)

...............
CABINET.

COMMITTEE OF HOME AFFAIRS. 108.

Conclusions of a Meeting of the above Committee, held in the Ministers' Conference Room, House of Commons, S.W., on Tuesday, March 21, 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. R. Munro, K.C., M.P., Secretary for Scotland.

Mr. E. Hilton Young, D.S.O., M.P., Financial Secretary, Treasury.

The following were also present:

Sir C. A. Montague Barlow, K.B.E., LL.D., M.P., Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Labour.

Sir A. V. Symonds, K.C.B., Second Secretary, Ministry of Health (for Conclusions 2 and 3).

Mr. W. M. Graham-Harrison, C.B., Second Parliamentary Counsel.

Mr. Alwyne Symonds, K.C.B., Government Actuary (for Conclusion 2).

Mr. Thomas Jones, Principal Assistant Secretary, Cabinet.

Mr. Pembroke Wicks, Secretary to the Committee.
Oxford and St. Albans Wine Privileges Bill.

1. The Committee had before them a Memorandum by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury (C.P. 3820) covering the draft of a Bill to abolish certain rights and privileges of the City of Oxford and of the City of St. Albans in connection with the sale of wine and the granting of licences therefor. It appeared that the privileges enjoyed by these two cities precluded the levy of ordinary licence duties. Both the Corporations had agreed to the surrender of these privileges and satisfactory terms of compensation had been arranged. The abolition of the privileges and application of the ordinary law would result in an increased revenue to the State.

The Committee agreed—

To approve the Oxford and St. Albans Wine Privileges (Abolition) Bill and, subject to the consent of the Whips, to authorise its introduction in the House of Commons.

National Health Insurance Bill.

2. The Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Minister of Health (C.P. 3838) covering a National Health Insurance Bill. The Bill had been prepared as a result of the endorsement by a Cabinet Committee of the recommendation of the Geddes Committee that the burden of National Health Insurance falling on the State should be reduced by increasing the total contributions from employers and employed by 3d. per week in each case (C.P. 3666, section 18).

The Minister of Health in his Memorandum stated 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 be seriously opposed. In view, however, of the need for economy, the Council had proposed a scheme which would give substantial relief to the Exchequer without imposing any additional contributions at the present time. The amounts in question are:

(a.) £1,700,000 per annum, special grants towards the cost of medical benefit in excess of the statutory proportion of two-ninths;

(b.) Part of the cost of the administration of medical benefit, amounting to £100,000 per annum;

(c.) The annual grant to the Women's Equalisation Fund, amounting in the present year to £350,000.

The Societies undertook to bear the whole of the cost of medical benefit, now met out of special Exchequer grants, as from the 1st April, 1922, to December 1923, when the present contract with the medical profession expires. The Societies further agreed to the proposal to abolish permanently the present annual grant to the Women's Equalisation Fund.

Attention was drawn by the Minister of Health in his Memorandum to clause 1(2) of the draft Bill, which provides that the State grant of two-ninths, of which the Societies would be temporarily deprived during the twenty-one months to December 1923, shall be credited to each Society with the accrued interest after the date of its next valuation. The draft Bill does not apply to Ireland, and there are certain minor modifications to make it applicable to Scotland and Wales.

The Minister of Health informed the Committee that the scheme had the support of the Approved Societies, the Insurance Companies, and the Trade Unions, and that they doubtless hoped it would be possible to reduce the remuneration of the doctors after December 1923, and thus make a demand for additional contributions unnecessary. With regard to the Women's Equalisation Fund, experience had shown that the incidence of women's sickness was less than had been
anticipated and the Insurance funds could bear the risk without State assistance.

The Government Actuary stated that the Societies had carried forwarded a substantial surplus at the last valuation, and were it not for the present widespread and prolonged unemployment there would not be the slightest danger in shouldering the proposed burden. In any case he was prepared to advise that they could bear it.

The Financial Secretary of the Treasury pointed out that the scheme proposed, while securing at present the savings contemplated by the Geddes Committee, did so by a method which was not before the Committee or the Cabinet and was a method which only gave temporary relief to the Exchequer. To carry out the Cabinet's decision it would be necessary to provide that, on the termination of the scheme in December 1923, there would be no recourse to the Treasury for fresh grants. There were two sources from which the money could be obtained: a reduction in the payments to the doctors or the raising of contributions. He asked that the Committee should embody in the Bill the principle that further grants from the Treasury were barred. This would, he contended, greatly strengthen the position of the Ministry of Health in dealing either with the doctors or the Approved Societies. It could be done by repealing Section (1) of the National Insurance Act 1913 (3 & 4 George V, c. 37). (See Appendix.)

The Minister of Health explained that the section referred to had been expressly introduced owing to an agitation on the part of the medical profession in order to enable the Government to contribute more than its proportion of two-ninths, and it had the effect of giving a certain elasticity to the Minister in bargaining with the various interests involved. To take away the power now would be to stir up afresh the controversy with the doctors and to imperil the whole scheme of medical service under the Act.

The Secretary for Scotland suggested that it might be possible to review the situation at a later period—before December 1923—but, inasmuch as the scheme had the support of the Ministry of Health, the Board of Health and Approved Societies, it ought not to be prejudiced in the way proposed by the Treasury, with the certainty of provoking great hostility in the House.

The Financial Secretary of the Treasury proposed, as an alternative method, that the Bill should provide for the suspension of Section (1) of the Act of 1913 until Parliament otherwise determined.

The Committee agreed—

(1.) That the scheme of the Minister of Health was the best possible for securing the economies desired by the Geddes Committee, having regard to the difficulty of increasing contributions.

(2.) That, inasmuch as the precise method of securing the savings differed from that endorsed by the Cabinet, the foregoing Conclusion should be reported to the Cabinet for their approval.

Audit (Local Authorities) Bill.

3. The Committee had before them a Memorandum by the Minister of Health (C.P. 3839), covering the draft of a Bill relating to the audit of the accounts of certain Local Authorities. The purpose of the Bill was to enable Rural District Councils, Boards of Guardians and Overseers, on the ground of economy, to have a yearly instead of a half-yearly audit. The Bill also provided a simple means of enabling Borough Councils to have their books audited by Government auditors instead of auditors appointed locally for the purpose, should they so desire. Borough Councils were at present only able to obtain Government audit where their special Act of Parliament permitted it.
The Committee agreed—

To approve the Audit (Local Authorities) Bill, and to authorise the Minister of Health to arrange for its introduction in Parliament.

4. With reference to H.A.C. 107, Conclusion 1, the Chairman stated that he had seen the Lord Privy Seal on the subject of the proposed Bill to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee on Valuation and Rating Reform. The Lord Privy Seal was of opinion that, having regard to the congestion of business, it would be quite impossible to get such a Bill through Parliament in the current session, and was, therefore, unwilling to burden the Government Draftsmen with the preparation of so complicated a measure.

The Minister of Health stated that, on the other hand, he had discussed the matter with the Minister of Agriculture. He understood that negotiations were in progress with the Treasury and that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was anxious, by means of a new Valuation Bill, to come to the assistance of agriculture. That aspect, he imagined, had not been presented to the Lord Privy Seal, and on that ground the matter would require further consideration.

After some discussion the Committee agreed—

That it was impossible for them to form an opinion on the matter until the Chancellor of the Exchequer's new proposals were before them.

5. The Chairman stated that his attention had been drawn by the Secretary to a reference in the press to a recent discussion before the Home Affairs Committee of a Bill relating to Motor Legislation. He had drawn the attention of the Department concerned to the matter, and on investigation it was discovered that the information had been given by an official to the press, who had not realised that in doing so he was disclosing information of a confidential character. Steps would be taken to prevent such leakage in future.

2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W. 1,
March 22, 1922.

APPENDIX.

National Insurance Act, 1913.

(3 & 4 Geo. V, cap. 37.)

1.—(1.) In addition to the moneys which under Part I of the National Insurance Act, 1911 (in this Act referred to as the "principal Act"), are required to be contributed out of moneys provided by Parliament towards defraying the cost of any of the benefits conferred by Part I of that Act or the expenses of administration of any of these benefits or otherwise for the purposes of that Act, there shall be contributed out of moneys provided by Parliament towards such costs, expenses and purposes, such additional sums as Parliament may from time to time determine, and the provisions of the principal Act as to the manner in which the cost of benefits and the expenses of administration are to be defrayed shall be construed as applying only to the balance of such cost and expenses after such additional sums have been applied for the purposes for which they have been provided.

(2.) Any additional sums so contributed for the purpose of medical benefit shall be applicable towards the payment of medical attendance and treatment of members of societies who are not insured persons mentioned in paragraph (a) of sub-section (2) of section 15 of the principal Act as amended by this Act (a) in like manner and to the like extent as if such medical attendance and treatment were medical benefit.
SECRET.

(H.A.C. 109th Conclusions.)

CABINET.

COMMITTEE OF HOME AFFAIRS, 109.

Conclusions of a Meeting of the above Committee held in the Ministers' Conference Room, House of Commons, S.W., on Thursday, March 30, 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. Sir A. MOND, Bart., M.P., Minister of Health.

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

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. the EARL OF CRAWFORD AND BALCARRES, K.T., First Commissioner, His Majesty's Office of Works.

Mr. HILTON YOUNG, D.S.O., M.P., Financial Secretary, Treasury.

Mr. LESLIE SCOTT, K.C., M.P., Solicitor-General.

The Right Hon. the EARL OF ANCASTER, Parliamentary Secretary and Deputy Minister of Fisheries. (For Conclusion 2.)

Mr. L. S. AMBREY, M.P., Parliamentary and Financial Secretary, Admiralty [Chief Civil Commissioner]. (For Conclusion 1.)

Mr. H. J. WILSON, C.B., C.B.E., Secretary, Ministry of Labour.

Mr. C. F. ROUNDELL, C.B.E., Supply Department [Ministry of Health]. (For Conclusion 1.)

Mr. H. G. MAURICE, C.B., Ministry of Agriculture. (For Conclusion 2.)

Mr. L. F. C. MACLEAN, Food Department, Board of Trade. (For Conclusion 1.)

Mr. H. PIKE PEASE, M.P., Assistant Postmaster-General. (For Conclusion 5.)

Mr. A. NEAL, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Transport. (For Conclusions 1 and 3.)

Lieutenant-Colonel G. C. GRAZEBROOK, C.M.G., D.S.O., War Office. (For Conclusion 1.)

The Hon. HUGH GODLEY, Third Parliamentary Counsel.

Major M. BROWNE, War Office. (For Conclusion 1.)

Mr. T. E. PRYCE-TANNATT, Ministry of Agriculture. (For Conclusion 2.)

The following were also present:

Mr. PEMBROKE WICKS, Secretary to the Committee.
1. With reference to H.A.C. 101, the Committee had before them a Report of the Executive Sub-Committee of the Supply and Transport Committee (C.P. 3800), containing a scheme which could be carried out in the event of an emergency arising, and recommending the nucleus organisation to be retained at an estimated cost of £1,750. (first year £1,900.). It was recommended that the trades and local authorities should be responsible for the maintenance of all local services, and that the Government should only assist in the case of certain special services indicated in the Report, and then only when the trade or local authorities were unable to deal with the situation.

It was proposed that the Supply and Transport Sub-Committee should continue in existence, and that the Chairman should be nominated from time to time by the Cabinet Minister in charge of the emergency organisation (at present the Home Secretary), that it should meet at least every six months to review the organisation, and that the general lines of the organisation should continue, viz., a series of Sub-Committees responsible for the various sections of the scheme. It was recommended that any expenditure on account of the nucleus organisation should be borne on the votes of the Departments concerned, and that any expenses which would not naturally fall on the vote of an individual Department should be charged to the Home Office vote.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport stated that the President of the Board of Trade had appointed an official to see that the nucleus organisation was kept constantly under review. The scheme would be based on the Civil Commissioners. The Chief Officer of the Civil Commissioners had been, and would continue to be, a General Inspector of the Ministry of Health. Some danger of publicity could not be avoided owing to the necessity of keeping in touch with the Chairmen of the Local Volunteer Organisations. The Executive Sub-Committee of the Supply and Transport Committee could no longer retain its name if the parent Committee had ceased to exist. Was it intended to keep that alive?

The Chairman referred to Decision (7) of H.A.C. 101, from which it was plain that the Supply and Transport Committee remained in existence and that the Home Secretary was responsible for calling it together pending further consideration of the matter.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport, continuing, stated that it was proposed that a responsible officer should be selected from each of the following Departments to deal with emergency matters:

- Home Office.
- Ministry of Transport.
- Supply Department [Department of Chief Civil Commissioner].
- Treasury.
- Mines Department.
- Ministry of Health.
- Admiralty.
- War Office.
- Air Ministry.
- Petroleum Department.
- Office of Works.
- Board of Trade (Food Department).

There had been some danger of mistakes in the past owing to the fact that the same persons had not always attended the Sub-Committee. It was essential that those present at the meetings of the Sub-Committee should be the officials actually responsible.
The Secretary for Scotland drew attention to the special arrangements which had been made with his approval for a separate organisation for Scotland.

Major Grazebrook, on behalf of the War Office, stated that the Army Council desired to draw the attention of the Home Affairs Committee to the fact that, owing to the recent reductions, there would not be enough military transport to move troops in the event of the railways failing. He handed a Memorandum to the Secretary of the Committee.

The Home Affairs Committee agreed—

1. To approve the scheme submitted by the Executive Sub-Committee of the Supply and Transport Committee.

2. To request the Secretary to draw the attention of the Executive Sub-Committee to the representations made by the Army Council on the question of military transport.

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill.

With reference to H.A.C. 92, Conclusion (4), the Committee had before them a Memorandum by the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries covering a draft of a Bill to Consolidate and Amend the Enactments relating to Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries in England and Wales (C.P.-3802). The Bill had been discussed with representatives of Angling Associations, and was expected to be substantially an agreed measure. It had been introduced in the preceding session, as directed by the Home Affairs Committee, for the purpose of inviting public discussion, and had since been amended as thought desirable. Under Clause 54 it was proposed to give to Fishery Boards, for the protection of fisheries in their districts, the same powers as a sanitary authority to institute proceedings under the Rivers Pollution Prevention Acts. At present proceedings might only be instituted on the grounds of public health, and not on the grounds of damage to fish. It was stated that the provisions for the prevention of pollution would apply to pollution by tar from roads which had been laid by local authorities.

Attention was drawn to the very drastic provisions contained in Clause 1 of the Bill, relating to penalties for throwing stones at fish and using lights at night for the purpose of facilitating capture of fish, particularly having regard to Sub-Clause 1 (2), under which a person would be presumed to be guilty of an offence against the Act unless he could prove that the acts alleged against him were done for the purpose of the preservation or development of a private fishery. It was suggested that the effect of the Clause might be to secure the conviction of innocent persons who had not been guilty of poaching or any real offence.

The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries stated that it was proposed to introduce the Bill in the House of Lords, and that he would have no objection to considerable amendment in the course of debate.

The Home Affairs Committee agreed—

1. To approve the draft Bill and to authorise its introduction in the House of Lords.

2. To request the Minister of Agriculture to re-examine Clause 1 of the Bill in the light of the above discussion.

Canals (Continuance of Charging Powers) Bill.

With reference to H.A.C. 99, Conclusion (1), the Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Minister of Transport (C.P. 3228), and a Memorandum by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport (C.P. 3885), covering the
draft of a Bill for the Continuance of Charging Powers in respect of Canal Undertakings of which possession was taken by the Ministry of Transport under “The Ministry of Transport Act, 1919.” It was proposed in the Bill that the increased charging powers should be continued until February 1924.

The Committee agreed:—

“To approve the draft Bill and to authorise the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport to arrange for its introduction in Parliament, subject to the consent of the Government Whips.”

4. With reference to II.A.C. 103, Conclusion (3), the Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Home Secretary (C.P. 3846), covering draft clauses of a Bill which had been prepared in accordance with the directions of the Committee, providing for legitimation by subsequent marriage.

Alternative draft clauses were submitted, it being assumed under one that titles and dignities would not be affected by legitimation, and under the other that they would be affected.

The Private Member’s Bill introduced in the House of Commons during the preceding session by Captain Bowyer had been followed on two points:—

(1.) The Bill was not restricted to persons who were legally capable of marrying at the time when the child was born, therein differing from the law of Scotland;

(2.) Legitimation would only relate to marriages taking place after the change of law, although children born before the passing of the Bill would be legitimated if their parents married after the Bill became law.

There were also various difficult technical questions arising on the Bill relating to settled property and other legal matters.

The Secretary for Scotland pointed out that under Scottish law it was not necessary for parents to have continued free to marry, provided they had been legally capable of marriage at the time of the conception and birth of the child.

The Attorney-General drew attention to the fact that the Bill as at present drawn applied to the child of a married man born in adultery.

The Committee were divided on the question whether such a proposition could be entertained. It was held, on the one hand, that public opinion would not tolerate such a proposal. It was felt, on the other hand, that the interests of the child were the only real consideration, and that on that ground the proposal should stand.

The Attorney-General asked the Committee to consider whether it was necessary to have the Bill at all. In the preceding Session Captain Bowyer’s Bill had received only cursory consideration in Committee in the House of Commons, and he questioned whether there was any real demand for it. Were it made a Government measure there would no doubt be strong protests.

The Chairman stated that before the Committee could come to a decision they must know to what extent the Government were pledged by the Home Secretary’s speech in the House of Commons during the debate on Captain Bowyer’s Bill.

The question was raised whether the Cabinet had given any direction in regard to this Bill.

With reference to Cabinet 88 (21), Conclusion (7), the Secretary reported that the Cabinet had requested the Home Affairs Committee
to consider and advise upon certain Private Members' Bills which were being pressed by the advocates of the Women's Movement in the House of Commons, viz., the Guardianship of Infants Bill and the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. On enquiry at the Home Office he had been informed that the Children of Unmarried Parents Bill should be included among the measures thus referred to the Committee.

Attention was drawn to the great opposition that would be received in the House of Lords if it were attempted to make legitimation effective for the purpose of succession to titles and dignities, and the suggestion was made that for that purpose legitimised children should be deemed the youngest.

It appeared that those members of the Committee who were supporting the Bill, sooner than lose the whole Bill, would be prepared to waive the question of succession to titles, and to assimilate the law to Scottish law, so that legitimation would only be effected if parents had been free to marry at the time of the conception and birth of the child.

The First Commissioner of Works stated that unless the Government had been actually pledged by the Home Secretary's statement he could not support the Bill.

The Attorney-General stated that, while he would not oppose on the broad question of legitimising children, he felt strongly that exceedingly complicated legal questions would arise, and was very loath to give his support for that reason.

The Solicitor-General, while admitting the legal difficulties, was prepared to support the Bill on the ground that the children must be the first consideration, but thought that the best plan tactically was to adopt Scottish law.

The Committee agreed—
To adjourn the consideration of the question to the following meeting in order that in the interval it might be determined to what extent the Home Secretary had pledged the Government.

5. The Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Postmaster-General (C.P. 3823) covering a draft of a Bill to confirm an agreement between the Pneumatic Despatch Company and the Postmaster-General for the acquisition by the latter of a disused Underground Tube running from the General Post Office to a point near the North Western District Office. Without legislation it was doubtful whether the Pneumatic Despatch Company, under their special Act of Parliament, had power to sell or the Postmaster-General power to buy. The Company had accepted an offer of £7,500. The saving to the Exchequer which would result from laying telephone cables in this Tube would be £40,000.

The Committee agreed—
To approve the draft Bill and to authorise the Postmaster-General to arrange for its introduction in the House of Commons subject to the consent of the Government Whips.
6. The Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Secretary for Scotland (C.P. 3840) to make provision with respect to the tenure of office by the Chairman of the Fishery Board for Scotland, in which it was proposed to make the office of Chairman of the Fishery Board an ordinary Civil Service post, instead of one to which the holder is appointed for five years.

The Committee agreed—

To approve the draft Bill and to authorise the Secretary for Scotland to arrange for its introduction in Parliament.

2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W. 1,
March 30, 1922.
SECRET.
H.A.C. 110th Conclusions.

CABINET.

COMMITTEE OF HOME AFFAIRS. 110.

Conclusions of a Meeting of the above Committee, held in the Ministers' Conference Room, House of Commons, S.W., on Tuesday, April 4, 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. Sir Alfred Mond, Bart., M.P., Minister of Health.
The Right Hon. R. Munro, K.C., M.P., Secretary for Scotland.

The following were also present:
The Right Hon. the EARL OF ANCASTER, Mr. L. S. Amery, M.P., Parliamentary and Financial Secretary, Admiralty (Civil Commissioner). (For Conclusions 3 and 5.)
Mr. R. S. Metcalfe, C.B., Deputy Controller of Supply Services, Treasury.
Mr. J. A. Corcoran, C.B., Director of Army Contracts, War Office. (For Conclusion 6.)
Mr. Thomas Jones, Principal Assistant Secretary.
Mr. R. B. Howorth, Acting Secretary to the Committee.
1. With reference to H.A.C. 109, Conclusion 4, the Committee further considered the question of a Bill to deal with legitimation by subsequent marriage, and had before them a memorandum by the Home Secretary (C.P. 3846).

The Home Secretary gave an account of the position taken up by the Government in the House of Commons in regard to proposals for a Bill, and in particular to the following question and answer given on the 14th February:

"Mr. N. Chamberlain asked the Home Secretary whether he has considered the recommendations of the Departmental Committee on Child Adoption, presided over by Sir Alfred Hopkinson, K.C.; and whether he proposes to introduce any legislation upon the subject in the course of the present Session?

"Mr. Shortt: I hope a Bill may be introduced to give effect to the Committee's recommendation as to the legitimation of children by the subsequent marriage of their parents; but there appear to be very great difficulties in the way of carrying out the proposal for the legalisation of adoption."

In the course of the discussion it was stated that there was a demand on the part of women's organisations especially for this Bill, as it would remove a stigma which, in the opinion of many, rested unfairly on the children in question, and it was generally agreed to be undesirable to leave a Bill which raised so many complicated legal issues to a private member; on the other hand, in order to mitigate opposition the scope of any Bill for which the Government made itself responsible should be restricted to the narrowest limits, and should broadly aim at bringing the law of England into harmony with that of Scotland.

The Committee agreed—

That a Bill should be drafted on the lines indicated above by the Home Secretary, in consultation with the Law Officers, for consideration by the Committee.

2. The Financial Secretary to the War Office informed the Home Affairs Committee that a demand had been made by the Shop Stewards at Woolwich Arsenal that short time should cease, and that full time should be worked. If this were done it would be necessary to discharge 1,500 men, who could be retained if the present short-time arrangements were continued.

The Committee agreed—

That the existing short-time arrangements should remain in force.

3. The Home Affairs Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries (C.P. 3910), covering the draft Allotments Bill.

The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries stated that this Bill had been promised in the King's Speech, and was based on the unanimous report of the Departmental Committee on Allotments, which had been appointed jointly by the Secretary for Scotland and himself. The Committee had comprised representatives of the Local Authorities and of the allotment holders. Having regard to the very great extension at present of the cultivation of allotments as compared with the pre-war state of affairs, it was most important that the existing powers respecting the acquisition of land, &c., should be maintained, and in some directions strengthened, if the present number of allotments was not to be seriously diminished.
The two main features of the Bill dealt with the easy acquisition of land and security of tenure. In particular, it was necessary to provide that the allotment holder should not be deprived of his land during the cropping season. On the other hand, he was to be compensated only in respect of crops on the ground and manure put into the ground since the last crop, but he was to receive no compensation for labour applied since the last crop or for disturbance, under "The Agricultural Act, 1920."

With regard to the acquisition of land, the Committee were reminded that during the war much vacant land in urban areas had been taken over under D.O.B.A. powers, and, in the absence of further legislation, this land would be handed back to the owners on or before the 31st March, 1923. The Bill proposed to confer upon Local Authorities the powers of entering upon vacant land, including any vacant land which has been taken by the Ministry under D.O.R.A. during the war, but the provision had been inserted to secure that an owner could resume possession on giving one month's notice if the land was reasonably required for any other purpose than agriculture. Under Clause 4 an allotment authority could continue for one year from August 1922 to make orders for the compulsory acquisition of land without the delay and expense of obtaining confirmation by the Minister. Clause 7 limited the obligation of borough and urban authorities to provide allotments to the provision of allotment gardens not exceeding 20 poles; while Clause 8 required allotment authorities in boroughs or urban districts to maintain, unless exempted by the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, Allotment Committees, comprising a substantial portion of co-opted members representative of allotment holders. Clause 10 provided that a local authority, owning its own trams or buses, could give facilities to allotment holders to get to their allotments, thus enabling cheaper land to be provided; and Clause 11 maintained the principle that the allotments undertaking of an authority is to be self-supporting, subject to certain particularised exceptions. Clause 14 dealt with a special difficulty which had arisen in the New Forest, and the effect of the Clause would be that, while the owners and the public would lose nothing which they at present enjoyed, no additional land would be devoted to the cultivation of allotments in the Forest.

The Secretary for Scotland stated that the proposals in the Bill closely followed the recommendations of Lord Ancaster's Committee. On behalf of Scotland, he wished to thank Lord Ancaster and the Committee for the very valuable work which had been done. He had convinced the Leader of the House that it would be necessary to have a separate Bill dealing with the Scottish aspect of the allotments question.

The Minister of Health drew attention to certain drafting alterations in Clause 1 (b) of the Bill.

The Committee agreed—

To approve the draft Allotments Bill subject to the drafting amendments necessary to meet the points raised by the Minister of Health, and to authorise the introduction of the Bill in the House of Lords.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty informed the Home Affairs Committee that the Cabinet had referred the question of the provision to be made for Empire Settlement to a Cabinet Committee presided over by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which Committee had fixed the maximum annual amount to be found by
the Exchequer at £1,500,000 for the current financial year and £3,000,000 in subsequent years, with a definite time limit of fifteen years. As it was very desirable to introduce the Bill before Easter, he had obtained the leave of the Leader of the House to bring the question before the Home Affairs Committee instead of to the Cabinet. The financial provisions in the Bill had been accepted by the Treasury.

The Committee agreed—

To approve the Empire Settlement Bill (C.P. 3922) and to authorise its immediate introduction in the House of Commons.

5. The Home Affairs Committee had under consideration a Memorandum (C.P. 3918) by the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries relative to the consolidation of the enactments relating to agricultural holdings in England and Wales and in Scotland respectively, and stating that a Bill for this purpose relating to Scotland had already been introduced. As the Bill was purely a consolidating measure and involved no alteration in the existing law it was not proposed to circulate a draft of the Bill to the Committee.

The Committee agreed—

To approve the introduction in the House of Lords of the proposed Agricultural Holdings Bill.

6. The Home Affairs Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War (C.P. 3791) covering the draft of the Prevention of Fraud (Government Contracts) Bill.

After some discussion had taken place as to the precise need for this Bill the Committee agreed—

(1.) To adjourn the further consideration of the Secretary of State for War’s Memorandum until a future meeting.

(2.) To request the Solicitor-General to discuss the scope and object of the Bill with Mr. Guy Stephenson, an Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions. Mr. Stephenson to be invited to attend the Committee on the occasion when the subject was next under discussion.

7. The Home Affairs Committee had under consideration a Memorandum by the President of the Board of Trade (C.P. 3871) covering the draft Oil in Navigable Waters Bill.

The President of the Board of Trade informed the Committee that this Bill was designed to meet a growing evil and that it represented an agreement reached by all the interests concerned. Under Clause 1 it would in future be an offence to discharge oil or allow oil to escape into any waters to which the Act applied. He did not anticipate that there would be any opposition to the Bill.

After the Home Secretary had raised certain points on Clause 7 of the Bill, the Committee agreed—

(1.) To approve the Oil in Navigable Waters Bill subject to the settlement of any points of detail on Clause 7 by the Home Secretary and the President of the Board of Trade in consultation.

(2.) To authorise the President of the Board of Trade to introduce the Bill after obtaining the concurrence of the Government Whips.
8. The Home Affairs Committee had under consideration a Memorandum (C.P. 3885) by the Secretary for Scotland covering the draft of a Bill approved by the four Scottish Universities to confer powers upon the University Courts with regard to age limitations and superannuation in the case of principals and professors and with regard to the admission of Lecturers and Readers to the Senatus Academicus, and also to provide for the admission ex officio of Lecturers and Readers to the General Councils of the Universities.

The Committee were informed that the Bill would be non-contentious and would involve no charge on public funds.

The Committee agreed—

To approve the draft Universities (Scotland) Bill, 1922, and to authorise the Secretary for Scotland to arrange with the Government Whips for its introduction.

2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.,
April 5, 1922.