CABINET 21 (24).

MEETING of the Cabinet to be held at 10, Downing Street, S.W.1., on Monday, March 17th, 1924, at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA.

1. SINGAPORE.
   (Reference Cabinet 18 (24) - Appendix).
   Copies of telegrams from the Dominion Governments, C.P. 178 (24) - (Already circulated).
   Note by the Secretary of State for India covering Telegram from the Viceroy, C.P. 166 (24) - (Circulated herewith).
   Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, C.P. 187 (24) - (Circulated herewith).
   Note by the Secretary to the Cabinet, C.P. 190 (24) - (Circulated herewith).

2. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE.
   Memoranda by the Minister of Labour, C.P. 169 (24) & C.P. 169A (24) - (Already circulated).
   Memorandum by the Minister of Health, C.P. 174 (24) - (Already circulated).

3. POOR LAW REFORM.
   Memorandum by the Minister of Health, C.P. 173 (24) - (Already circulated).

4. SAFEGUARDING OF INDUSTRIES LEGISLATION.
   Memorandum by the President of the Board of Trade, C.P. 165 (24) - (Already circulated).

5. INQUIRY INTO LUNACY ARRANGEMENTS.
   Memorandum by the Minister of Health, C.P. 185 (24) - (Already circulated).
6. NAVY ESTIMATES, 1924-1925.

Explanatory Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty,
C.P. 184 (24) - (Already circulated).
(Question to be raised by the Prime Minister).

7. NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE.

Memorandum by the Minister of Health,
C.P. 182 (24) - (Already circulated).

8. HOME AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.

Consideration of recommendations on the following subjects:

(i) Marriages (Validity) Provisional Orders Bill.

(ii) The Northern Ireland Land Bill.

(iii) The London Traffic Bill.

(iv) The Small Debt (Scotland) Bill.
Ref: H.A.C. 6th Conclusions (24), Minute 4.

(Signed) M.P.A. HANKEY,
Secretary to the Cabinet.

2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.1.
15th March, 1924.
CONCLUSIONS of a Meeting of the Cabinet
held at 10, Downing Street, S.W.1.,
on MONDAY, MARCH 17th, 1924, at 10.30 a.m.
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The Right Hon. J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.,
Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
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The Right Hon. Lord Parmoor of Frieth,

The Right Hon. J.R. Clynes, M.P.,
Lord Privy Seal.

The Right Hon. A. Henderson, M.P., Secretary of State for Home Affairs.

The Right Hon. Lord Olivier, K.C.M.G., C.B.,
Secretary of State for India.

The Right Hon. Viscount Chelmsford, G.C.M.G.,
G.C.B., G.C.I.E., G.C.B.E.,
First Lord of the Admiralty.

The Right Hon. John Wheatley, M.P.,
Minister of Health.

The Right Hon. Noel Buxton, M.P.,
Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

The Right Hon. William Adamson, M.P.,
Secretary for Scotland.

The Right Hon. Philip Snowden, M.P.,
Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The Right Hon. J.H. Thomas, M.P., Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Brig.-General The Right Hon. Lord Thomson, C.B.E., D.S.O.,
Secretary of State for Air.

The Right Hon. Sidney Webb, M.P., President of the Board of Trade.

The Right Hon. Charles Trevelyan, M.P.,
President of the Board of Education.

The Right Hon. Tom Shaw, C.B.E., M.P.,
Minister of Labour.

The Right Hon. Vernon Hartshorn, C.B.E., M.P.,
Postmaster-General.

The Right Hon. F.W. Jowett, M.P.,
First Commissioner of Works.

First three items only.

CONCLUSIONS of a Meeting of the Cabinet,
held at 10, Downing Street, S.W.1, on
MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1924, at 10:30 a.m.

SINGAPORE. 1. After consideration of the following documents in regard to the proposed naval base at Singapore —

(Previous Reference:
Cabinet 20 (24), Conclusion 4.)

- Telegrams from the Dominion Governments (Paper C.P.-173 (24):

A Note by the Secretary of State for India, covering a telegram from the Viceroy (Paper C.P.-186 (24):

A Note by the Secretary to the Cabinet, commenting on the telegram from the Viceroy (Paper C.P.-190 (24):

A Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, covering draft telegrams to the Dominions and a revised draft of the statement to be made in Parliament (Paper C.P.-187 (24)) —

the Cabinet agreed —

(a) To approve, for announcement in both Houses of Parliament, the revised Statement of Policy in regard to Singapore (attached to C.P.-187 and marked "B") (Appendix):

(b) To approve the draft message from the Prime Minister to the Dominion Prime Ministers in which it is explained that, after having carefully examined the replies of the Dominions, the Government feel bound to adhere to the policy already communicated to the Dominions, and setting forth the general lines of the statement that is to be made (Attached to the Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Colonies (Paper C.P.-187 (24)) and marked "A") (Appendix):
To authorise the Secretary of State for the Colonies to send to the Dominions the telegram attached to his Memorandum (Paper C.P.-187 (24)) and marked "C" (Appendix) immediately after the Prime Minister's message marked "A" has been despatched:

That the Secretary of State for India should telegraph to the Viceroy with reference to the latter's telegram of the 7th March, 1924 (Paper C.P.-185(24)) pointing out the extent to which India had been consulted in regard to the proposed naval base at Singapore, and asking if, on further examination of the question, he could not give some expression of the views of the Government of India:

That in regard to the publication of the telegrams from the Dominions on the subject of the Singapore base, the Prime Minister (in the House of Commons) and the First Lord of the Admiralty (in the House of Lords) should inform Parliament that the telegrams contained references to the attitude adopted by representatives of several of the Dominions at the Imperial Conference; that it had been agreed at the conference that nothing should be published without the approval of the Conference as a whole and under its direction (See Section VI of the Summary of Proceedings, Imperial Conference (Cmd.1367)); that in these circumstances the Government did not feel justified in promising publication of the telegrams, but that if Parliament should desire their publication subject to the excision of the paragraphs referring to the Imperial Conference, this should be done, provided the Prime Ministers of the Dominions would consent to this course; and that, if necessary, the deleted portions of the telegrams should be shown privately to the Leaders of the Opposition.
THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL, in regard to the Unemployment Insurance Bill:

A Memorandum by the Minister of Labour (Paper C.P. -169 (24)), in which his proposals were outlined.

A Memorandum by the Minister of Labour giving a summary of the financial effect of his proposals (Paper C.P. -169 A (24)).

An Interim Report by the Cabinet Committee (Paper C.P. -176 (24)).

The Cabinet were informed that the Government Actuary had been indisposed and had not been able to examine the proposals in their financial aspects, but estimated that their examination might require as much as a month. It was generally felt that this estimate of the time required was excessive, and that the matter should, if possible, be expedited.

The Cabinet agreed —

(a) That having regard, on the one hand, to the small amount of Parliamentary time available before April 16th, when, in the absence of legislation, large numbers of unemployed persons would be deprived of benefit, and, on the other hand, to the importance of not wasting a day, it would be impracticable to secure the passage into law of a single comprehensive Bill covering the various contentious proposals of the Minister of Labour before Easter; consequently, that the Minister of Labour should provide two Bills, one dealing with the coming "gap", and the other with the remaining proposals:

(b) That the comprehensive Bill should be prepared, printed and introduced, covered by a Memorandum setting forth the proposals in detail:

(c) That the Bill dealing with the "gap" should be accompanied by a Memorandum explaining, inter alia, that the time available before April 16th was insufficient for the passage of the larger measure, and consequently this stop-gap Bill had had to be introduced:

(d) That the Minister of Labour should be authorised to include in his Bill provisions for securing payment of benefit continuously without arbitrary limits to genuine workers so long as they remain unemployed, in the manner indicated in detail in the Appendix.
to his Memorandum (Paper C.P.-169 (24))

(Whie which includes, inter alia, the arrangements for ensuring that payments are made only to persons genuinely seeking work and unable to obtain it):

(e) That the Minister of Labour should be authorised to provide in his proposed Bill that the weekly rates of benefit for men and women should be increased to 15/- and 15/- respectively, and the rate for each child to 9/-; the 5/- for a wife remaining unaffected.

(In approving the above recommendation by the Committee, the Cabinet took note of the reaction which the contemplated increase in the rates would have on National Health Insurance.)

(f) That the financial implications of the Bill should be satisfactorily settled before the Bill is introduced.

(NOTE: The Prime Minister states that it was his intention that the finance of the Bill should come before the Cabinet.)

(g) That the Minister of Labour should be authorised to make provision in his Bill for the extension of Unemployment Insurance to juveniles as and when they begin to work for wages. The proposed Bill also to contain provisions to secure the following:

That, as a condition of receiving benefit, juveniles shall be required to attend Unemployment Centres, if available.

That payment of benefits should be made direct to parents.

The financial aspects of the scheme of Juvenile Unemployment were held over for further consideration.

(h) That the Minister of Labour should be authorised to make provision in his Bill for the abolition without compensation of the refunds of contributions in certain cases at the age of 60:

(i) That the Minister of Labour should be authorised to include in his Bill a scheme of compensation for cases where rights may be said to have already accrued, on the lines suggested by him, namely, the payment to persons who are over 50 years of age and have paid 50 contributions at least of the present value of the excess value of their contributions over benefit which they have received, plus compound interest at 2½ per cent.

(It should be noted that the Cabinet authorised the Minister of Labour to make provision for this scheme in his original Bill, and not merely to concede it if pressed in Committee, as suggested by the Cabinet Committee.)
(j) That the Minister of Labour should be authorised to make provision in his Bill for the removal of the present disqualification for benefit in cases where workpeople are thrown out of work owing to stoppage due to trade disputes at the establishment at which they are employed, although they are taking no part in the dispute.

(k) That the Minister of Labour should first consult the various interests concerned in regard to his proposal to make provision in his Bill for the abolition of the existing statutory power to form special schemes for insurance by Industry for the future.

(l) That the Minister of Labour, in consultation with the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries and the Secretary for Scotland, should be requested to ascertain the views of the agricultural interests as to the inclusion of agricultural workers in the Unemployment Insurance scheme, and, if so, as to the precise form which such inclusion should take.

(m) That the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Labour should be authorised to ascertain as soon as possible the views of the Railway Companies and the Railway "Conciliation" grades on the proposal to bring these grades in future into the Unemployment Insurance scheme.

(n) That, subject to further consideration of the questions of finance, both in regard to the Exchequer contribution and Juvenile Unemployment, as referred to above, the Minister of Labour should be authorised to prepare draft Bills in accordance with the above decisions, and to submit the Bills to the Cabinet Committee for detailed consideration as soon as practicable.
3. After consideration of a Memorandum by the Minister of Health (Paper C.P.-173 (24)) on the subject of Poor Law Reform, the Cabinet agreed —

Subject to the Prime Minister's concurrence, to approve the procedure proposed by the Minister of Health, namely:

(a) That the Minister of Health should at once set on foot enquiries to ascertain whether the Leaders of the other Parties are prepared to participate in a Conference between representatives of the three Parties in the House of Commons, with a view to arriving, if possible, at an agreed scheme of Reform:

(b) That the Minister of Health should have prepared a Memorandum to serve as a basis for discussion by the Conference:

(c) That the Memorandum should deal with the Poor Law question

(i) primarily as it affects London, and

(ii) as it affects the country as a whole,

and should be based on the recommendations of the MacLean Committee, subject to the departures proposed in the Minister of Health's Memorandum.
4. After consideration of a Memorandum by the President of the Board of Trade, on the subject of the Safeguarding of Industries Act (Paper C.P.-165 (84), the Cabinet agreed—

(a) That the provisions of that portion of the Safeguarding of Industries Act, 1921, which relate to "depreciated currency dumping", shall be allowed to lapse on their expiration, that is to say, on the 19th August next.

(b) That, in view of the decision recorded above in (a), the recommendation of the Committee set up by the late Government under the Safeguarding of Industries Act in July, 1923, in favour of a Duty of 53½ per cent. on imports of lace from all countries should not be adopted.

(c) That the President of the Board of Trade should be asked to advise the Cabinet as to the date at which he considered an announcement of this policy should be made.
The Cabinet had before them a Memorandum by the Minister of Health, on the subject of the proposed Royal Commission on Lunacy Arrangements (Paper C.P.-185 (24)).

The Lord Privy Seal drew the attention of the Cabinet to a letter from the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (who was unavoidably absent from the Cabinet) to the Secretary suggesting the inclusion, in item (ii) of the proposed Terms of Reference to the Royal Commission, of the words "or compulsory detention" after the word "certification".

The Cabinet agreed —

(a) That a Royal Commission should be appointed with the following Terms of Reference:

(i) To enquire into the existing law and administrative machinery in connection with the certification, detention and treatment of persons who are or are alleged to be of unsound mind:

(ii) To consider the extent to which provision is or should be made for the treatment without certification of persons suffering from mental disorder, and to make recommendations.

(The words underlined were added by the Cabinet to the proposal of the Minister of Health in C.P.-185 (24).)

(b) That the settlement of the composition of the Royal Commission should be left to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Health.
6. The statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty explanatory of the Navy Estimates 1924-25 (Paper C.P.-184 Explanatory (24)), had been placed on the Agenda at the request of the Prime Minister, who had been obliged to leave the Cabinet before this item was discussed.

(Previous Reference: Cabinet 10 (24), Conclusion 6.)

The First Lord explained that he had been in correspondence with the Prime Minister in regard to the statement, and he understood that the Prime Minister did not now wish to raise any question in regard to it.
7. The Cabinet had under consideration a Memorandum by the Minister of Health explaining the difficult position in which he was placed regarding the contracts with the Doctors under the National Health Insurance Scheme (Paper C.P.-162 (24)).

The Cabinet agreed —

(a) That the National Health Insurance Bill should be introduced by the Minister of Health as soon as possible, and that as a matter of extreme urgency the Bill, which is non-controversial, should, if possible, be passed into law before the 31st March.

(b) To concur with the Minister of Health that the Government are greatly indebted to the Approved Societies' Consultative Council for the assistance they have given to the Minister of Health.
MARRIAGES 6. After consideration of a Memorandum by the Home Secretary (Paper C.P.-160 (24), covering the draft Marriages (Validity) Provisional Orders Bill, and the recommendation of the Committee of Home Affairs thereon (H.A.C. 6 (24), Para.1), the Cabinet agreed —

To approve the introduction in the House of Lords of the Marriages (Validity) Provisional Orders Bill in the form of the draft annexed to C.P.-160 (24).
After consideration of a Memorandum by the Home Secretary (Paper C.P.-177 (24)) covering the draft Northern Ireland Land Bill, and the recommendation of the Committee of Home Affairs thereon (H.A.C. 8 (24), Para.2), the Cabinet agreed—

To approve the introduction in the House of Commons of the Northern Ireland Land Bill in the form of the draft annexed to C.P.-177 (24), on the understanding that if the Bill proves controversial it will not be proceeded with.
10. After consideration of a Note by the Minister of Transport, covering the draft London Traffic Bill (Paper C.P. -179 (24)) and the recommendation of the Committee of Home Affairs thereon (H.A.C. 6 (24) Para. 3), the Cabinet agreed —

To approve the introduction in the House of Commons of the London Traffic Bill in the form of the draft annexed to C.P. -179 (24), subject to the insertion of a provision to secure that any Regulations made under the Bill by the Minister of Transport which imposed duties on the Police should be subject to the prior concurrence of the Home Secretary.
THE SMALL DEBT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

11. After consideration of a Memorandum by the Secretary for Scotland, covering the draft of the Small Debt (Scotland) Bill (Paper C.P.—181 (24)), and the recommendation of the Committee of Home Affairs thereon (H.A.C. 6 (24), Para.4), the Cabinet agreed —

To authorise the Secretary for Scotland to arrange with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury for the introduction in the House of Commons of the Small Debt (Scotland) Bill in the form of the draft annexed to C.P.—181 (24), subject to the substitution of the words "consists of" for the words "is in respect of", in line 6 of Clause 1; the deletion of the words in brackets in line 7 of that Clause, and the substitution of the word "thirty-five" for "thirty" in line 3 of Clause 2.
The Cabinet agreed —

That, unless a Meeting was required to deal with some question of urgency, the next Meeting should take place on WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26th, at 11 a.m.

2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.1,
March 17, 1924.
Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

With reference to the correspondence with the Dominion Governments concerning the Singapore base included in C.P.178(24) and to Cabinet 20(24) Conclusion 4, I circulate to my colleagues, after discussion with the Prime Minister, the following papers:

(a) a draft message from the Prime Minister to the Dominion Prime Ministers (Marked A), which I propose should be sent immediately after its approval by the Cabinet.

(b) a revise of the draft statement for Parliament (marked B), amended so as to include a summary of the Dominion replies. This is intended for use if it is decided to make a single comprehensive statement in Parliament.

(c) A summary of the Dominion replies by itself (drawn up for convenience in the form of a telegram and marked C), to be used should it be found preferable to make the Government's statement of policy (as
circulated on March 6th) by itself, and to leave the Dominion views to be made clear at a later stage in the Debate.

I propose to send the telegram marked C to the Dominions, immediately after the Prime Minister's message marked A has gone off - unless my colleagues desire to make any alterations in its terms.

(Intd.) J.H.T.

Colonial Office,
March 14th, 1924.
A.

DRAFT TELEGRAM.

to five Dominions.

(Copy to go to Irish Free State by despatch.)

-------------


Following from Prime Minister for your Prime Minister begins. I brought your reply to my message of 5th March together with replies from the other Prime Ministers before Cabinet today. We are deeply sensible of sympathetic attitude which other parts of the Empire have shewn to the principles on which our proposed policy is founded even though all do not feel able to endorse the methods by which we consider that those principles can best be carried out. After having carefully examined replies we feel bound to make statement in Parliament following, with minor alterations, that in Secretary of State's telegram of 5th March.

We are proposing however also to make clear to Parliament tenour of replies to my message of 5th March and Secretary of State for Colonies is telegraphing to you separately text of proposed summary. This procedure seems preferable to publishing complete text of correspondence since latter to some extent indicates trend of confidential discussions at Imperial Conference. Question of fuller publication can, if necessary, be considered later. I am forwarding copies.

Communication to Parliament will be made on Tuesday afternoon March 10th. Similar message sent to other Prime Ministers. Ends.
STATEMENT OF POLICY IN REGARD TO SINGAPORE.

We have given careful consideration to the proposal to develop the Naval Base at Singapore. We have closely studied the reasons which led to the adoption of this project, and the arguments in support of its continuation urged upon us from the point of view of naval defence.

We had, however, to consider the matter in a wider relationship, and came to the conclusion that we could not ask Parliament to proceed with this scheme. We were convinced that if we were to do so our action would exercise a most detrimental effect on our general foreign policy. As we have repeatedly stated, we stand for a policy of international co-operation through a strengthened and enlarged League of Nations, the settlement of disputes by conciliation and judicial arbitration, and the creation of conditions which will make a comprehensive agreement on limitation of armaments possible. As stated in the Prime Minister's letter to Mr. Poincare of February 21st, - "our task meanwhile must be to establish confidence, and this task can only be achieved by allaying the international suspicions and anxieties which exist today."

It seemed clear, apart from any other considerations, that to continue the development of the Naval Base at Singapore would hamper the establishment of this confidence and lay our good faith open to suspicion. Whilst maintaining present standard in a state of complete efficiency, we take the view that it would be a serious mistake to be responsible for new developments that could only be justified on assumptions that would definitely admit that we had doubts in the success of our own policy. As a result we should almost inevitably drift into a condition of mistrust and competition of armaments in the Far East.

Having provisionally reached the conclusions which I have set out, we felt it our duty in view of the discussions at
the recent Imperial Conference to communicate with the Governments of
the self-governing Dominions. We therefore put the position
before them and invited their views. I propose to give the
House a summary of these views. The Canadian Government tell us
that they wish to refrain from any advice on the problem.
The Irish Free State has adopted a similar attitude. As
to Australia, New Zealand and Newfoundland I must explain quite
clearly that their Prime Ministers wish, and indeed urge, us to
proceed with the Base. The Commonwealth Government express cordial
sympathy with our international policy of conciliation. They
tell us that the desire in Australia is for a better understanding
among the nations and a definite reduction of armaments on every
possible occasion. They consider however that the action which
we propose, instead of assisting the policy in view, will
jeopardise it in that any reduction in the mobility of the
Fleet will reduce our influence in the Councils of the Nations.

If the development of the Singapore base (the intention to
proceed with which was, they point out, well understood at the time
of the Washington Conference) is now to be discontinued, Australia
would rather see this step taken as a means for securing further
international agreement for mutual reduction of armaments.

The New Zealand Government attach great importance to
development of the Base, their opinion being founded mainly on grounds
of naval strategy. Whilst laying stress on the view that its use is
for defensive and not offensive purposes, they feel that the
interests of the British Empire in the Pacific will be endangered
should our capital ships be unable to operate in those waters, and
that the time has not yet come to rely solely on the influence for
peace of the League of Nations.

I should add that the Commonwealth Government have
informed us of their readiness to submit proposals to their
Parliament for a substantial contribution to the development
of the base. New Zealand has already generously offered a first
contribution of £100,000 towards it.

Lastly from South Africa we have heard from General
Smuts
Smuts that our proposed policy which he describes as "a bold move towards enduring peace" meets with his wholehearted agreement. He feels that the authority of the British Empire as the protagonist of the great cause of appeasement and conciliation among the nations would be seriously undermined by the construction of the Singapore base.

From the above summary, I think I may claim that we have a large measure of sympathy in the Dominions with our international policy, even if all parts of the Empire do not feel able to endorse the methods by which we consider that policy should be carried out. The criticisms are founded, in the main, on the conception that the Singapore base is essential as part of a complete defensive Pacific strategy. Should the practical necessity for putting such a strategy into operation arise by reason of the condition of world politics and a return to attempts to provide Imperial security primarily by armaments, the whole question would have to be re-considered, but in the opinion of His Majesty's Government that has not now arisen, and it is the duty of His Majesty's Government to try and prevent its arising.

We have every confidence in our policy, and we feel that a decision not to proceed with the Naval Base at Singapore will give that policy the best possible chance of success and is an earnest of our good faith.
SECRET AND URGENT.
March, 1924.

Following is supplementary statement referred to in Prime Minister's message of today begins. "After we had provisionally reached our conclusions we felt it our duty in view of the discussions at the recent Imperial Conference to communicate with the Governments of the self-governing Dominions. We therefore put the position before them and invited their views. I propose to give the House a summary of these views. The Canadian Government tell us that they wish to refrain from any advice on the problem. The Irish Free State has adopted a similar attitude. As to Australia, New Zealand and Newfoundland I must explain quite clearly that their Prime Ministers wish and indeed urge us to proceed with the base. The Commonwealth Government express cordial sympathy with our international policy of conciliation. They tell us that the desire in Australia is for a better understanding among the nations and a definite reduction of armaments on every possible occasion. They consider however that the action which we propose, instead of assisting the policy in view, will jeopardise it in that any reduction in the mobility of the Fleet will reduce our influence in the Councils of the Nations. If the development of the Singapore base (the intention to proceed with which was, they point out, well understood at the time of the Washington Conference) is now to be discontinued, Australia would rather see this step taken as a means of securing further international agreement for mutual reduction of armaments. The New Zealand Government attach great importance to development of the Base, their opinion being founded
mainly on grounds of naval strategy. Whilst laying stress on the view that its use is for defensive and not offensive purposes, they feel that the interests of the British Empire in the Pacific will be endangered should our capital ships be unable to operate in those waters, and that the time has not yet come to rely solely on the influence for peace of the League of Nations.

I should add that the Commonwealth Government have informed us of their readiness to submit proposals to their Parliament for a substantial contribution to the development of the base. New Zealand has already generously offered a first contribution of £100,000 towards it.

Lastly from South Africa we have heard from General Smuts that our proposed policy which he describes as "a bold move towards enduring peace" meets with his wholehearted agreement. He feels that the authority of the British Empire as the protagonist of the great cause of appeasement and conciliation among the nations would be seriously undermined by the construction of the Singapore base.

From the above summary, I think I may claim that we have a large measure of sympathy in the Dominions with our international policy, even if all parts of the Empire do not feel able to endorse the methods by which we consider that that policy should be carried out. Ends.