CABINET 40 (35).

Meeting of the Cabinet to be held at No. 10, Downing Street, S.W.1., on WEDNESDAY, 24th JULY, 1935, at 11.0 a.m.

AGENDA.

1. FOREIGN AFFAIRS  - (If required).

2. DISPUTE BETWEEN ITALY AND ABDYSSINIA (ETHIOPIA).
   (Reference Cabinet 39 (35) Conclusions 1 and 2).
   (i) Subsidiary Questions.
       Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
       C.P. 147 (35) - already circulated.
   (ii) Probable Procedure at Geneva.
       Memorandum by the Minister for League of Nations Affairs.
       C.P. 151 (35) - already circulated.
   (iii) Supply of Arms to Abyssinia.
       Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
       C.P. 138 (35) - already circulated.
       Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Colonies.
       C.P. 146 (35) - already circulated.

3. RE-ORIENTATON OF THE AIR DEFENCE SYSTEM OF GREAT BRITAIN.
   (Reference Cabinet 38 (35) Conclusion 2).
   Note by the Secretary, covering Report by the Committee of Imperial Defence Sub-Committee on Defence Policy and Requirements.
   C.P. 144 (35) - already circulated.

4. SINGAPORE DEFENCES.
   (Reference Cabinet 6 (35) Conclusion 4).
   Note by the Secretary, covering Report of the Committee of Imperial Defence Sub-Committee on Defence Policy and Requirements.
   C.P. 152 (35) - already circulated.
5. THE UNITED KINGDOM BEET SUGAR INDUSTRY.
   (Reference Cabinet 31 (35) Conclusion 9).
   Report of Cabinet Committee.
   C.P. 155 (35) - to be circulated.

6. PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.
   (Reference Cabinet 38 (35) Conclusion 8).
   Memorandum by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, covering draft Bill.
   C.P. 149 (35) - to be circulated.

7. CONCLUSIONS OF HOME AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.
   10th Conclusions (35) of Home Affairs Committee. Circulated herewith.
   1. Employment of Women and Young Persons Bill.
      (Reference Cabinet 38 (35) Conclusion 8).
      Memorandum by the Home Secretary, covering draft Bill.
      H.A. 27 (35) - already circulated.
   2. Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.
      (Reference Cabinet 38 (35) Conclusion 8).
      Memorandum by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, covering draft Bill.
      H.A. 28 (35) - already circulated.

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

2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.1.,
22nd July, 1935.
CONCLUSIONS of a Meeting of the Cabinet held at
10, Downing Street, S.W.1., on WEDNESDAY,
24th JULY, 1935, at 11.0 a.m.

PRESENT:
The Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin, M.P.,
Prime Minister. (In the Chair).

The Right Hon. J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.,
Lord President of the Council.

The Right Hon. The Viscount Hailsham,
Lord Chancellor.

The Right Hon. Sir Samuel Hoare, Bt., G.C.S.I.,
G.B.E., C.M.G., M.P., Secretary
of State for Foreign Affairs.

The Right Hon. The Viscount Halifax, K.G.,
G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., Secretary
of State for War.

The Right Hon. Sir Philip Cunliffe-Lister,
G.B.E., M.C., M.P., Secretary
of State for Air.

The Right Hon. Sir Godfrey Collins, K.B.E.,
C.M.G., M.P., Secretary
of State for Scotland.

The Right Hon. Walter Runciman, M.P.,
President of the Board of Trade.

The Right Hon. Anthony Eden, M.C., M.P.,
Minister for League of Nations
Affairs.

The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, M.C., M.P.,
Minister for Agriculture and
Fisheries.

The Right Hon. Sir Kingsley Wood, M.P.,
Minister of Health.

The Right Hon. Neville Chamberlain, M.P.,
Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The Right Hon. Sir John Simon, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.,
G.B.E., K.C., M.P., Secretary
of State for Home Affairs.

The Most Hon. The Marquess of Londonderry,

The Right Hon. J.H. Thomas, M.P.,
Secretary of State for Dominion
Affairs.

The Most Hon. The Marquess of Zetland,
G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., Secretary of
State for India.

The Right Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, M.P.,
Secretary of State for the
Colonies.

The Right Hon. Sir Bolton Eyres Monsell, G.B.E.,
M.P., First Lord of the
Admiralty.

The Right Hon. Lord Eustace Percy,
Minister without Portfolio.

The Right Hon. Oliver Stanley, M.C., M.P.,
President of the Board of
Education.

The Right Hon. Ernest Brown, M.C., M.P.,
Minister of Labour.

The Right Hon. W. Ormsby-Gore, M.P.,
First Commissioner of Works.

The Cabinet resumed their discussion on the general question of the dispute between Italy and Abyssinia, which had been adjourned at the previous Meeting in order to give the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs time to consider the matter further and to formulate fresh proposals. They again had before them a Memorandum by the Minister for League of Nations Affairs (C.P.-151 (35)) on the probable procedure at Geneva when the dispute comes before the Council towards the end of the month.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs brought the following new factors since the Meeting referred to in the margin to the attention of the Cabinet:

In Paris the French Government was showing more interest in the question as the Meeting of the Council of the League of Nations approached. He drew attention in particular to telegrams from the British Ambassador in Paris (Nos. 148 and 143) reporting French insistence on the sanctity of the Covenant and French loyalty to the League of Nations. These telegrams showed the desire of France to secure the representation of Italy when the Council met. The French Government also appeared rather keener than before on the proposed three-Power Conference.

In Italy there were no signs of a change of attitude. Signor Mussolini had not yet accepted the two pre-conditions of a Conference of the three signatories of the Abyssinian Treaty, namely, (1) that the Italian Government should be represented at Geneva, and (2) that they should not have recourse to war with Abyssinia while the Conference was sitting. The former condition, as the Secretary of State explained later, was very important, because otherwise Italy might succeed in keeping the League out of the
question altogether, in which case it was possible that neither France nor Italy would face up to the real issues and there might not even be a three-Power Conference.

It seemed probable that the Council would meet early next week. The discussion might begin on the narrow question of a fifth member to the Conciliation Commission, but **Seemed likely was bound to extend to the general question.**

The Secretary of State added that he was following up the suggestion made at the last Meeting, that a Despatch should be sent to the British Ambassador at Paris for him to hand to M. Laval, and he proposed that this Despatch should be the basis of the Ambassador's talks in Paris and of the preliminary talks with the French at Geneva. In this Despatch he proposed to deploy the whole case as to the dangers to European peace and security involved in an Italo-Abyssinian war, and to end on the note that the two Governments ought to agree a policy for averting war. His aim was to avoid crude questions being put by either side to the other as to whether they were prepared to carry out their obligations under the Covenant. The underlying assumption would be that both Powers realised their obligations and were therefore jointly interested to find a way out of the difficulty. He felt that it was necessary to give the Minister for League of Nations Affairs very wide authority to put all possible pressure on the French to join us in inducing Signor Mussolini to modify his present attitude.

The Cabinet were informed that the Little Entente were putting pressure on the French in the same direction as ourselves.
If the Italians should refuse to be represented at Geneva or should withdraw owing to the extension of the discussions beyond the Wal-Wal incident, it was thought that the Council would be bound, nevertheless, to consider the Abyssinian appeal.

The view was expressed, and met with a good deal of support, that we should be on our guard against proposals for a settlement which was not fair to Abyssinia, and that we should aim at a settlement acceptable to Abyssinia and within the general framework of the League.

The Cabinet were informed that such information as was available indicated that the Italians were faced with great difficulties, especially in Eritrea, on the military side of the problem, and might not be ready to begin operations even in October. If public opinion forced them to act prematurely they would be running great risk. This was understood also to be the view of the French General Staff.

There was general acceptance of the view that there were advantages, for the present, in playing for time, as the longer a catastrophe could be averted the greater would be the realisation by Italy of the difficulties by which she was confronted from many directions, and the hope of a weakening on her part — though the prospects were not bright at the moment.

The Cabinet agreed —

That the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs should proceed on the lines that he had indicated in his statement summarised above; that is to say, to continue efforts to induce the French Government to combine with ourselves in putting pressure on the Italian Government to modify their attitude; and that the Minister for League of Nations Affairs should give latitude to pursue the same policy at the forthcoming Meeting of the Council of the League of Nations.
2. The Cabinet further considered the question of the supply of arms to Abyssinia, and certain subsidiary matters, which had been postponed at the Meeting mentioned in the margin, and again had before them the following documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memoranda by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (C.P.-147 (35) and C.P.-138 (35)):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Colonies (C.P.-146 (35)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs informed the Cabinet that if licences were granted for the export of arms to Abyssinia within the next few days there would be fierce resentment in Italy and the door would be shut irrevocably to any hope of a settlement. In addition, the French Government would be upset at a unilateral decision on our part. His advice to the Cabinet was to carry out our definite obligations under the existing Treaties and to allow transit across British territory. This had the advantage of being in consonance with the French attitude.

On the question of export licences he inclined to the view that, if possible, this should be dealt with by the nations collectively, and that the matter might be raised in the most appropriate way, or soundings might be taken by the Minister for League of Nations Affairs, when the Council met. This would postpone a decision for ten days, after which a final decision might be taken.

The attention of the Cabinet was drawn to reports in the Press that we had already issued licences for the export of arms to Abyssinia, which had caused an outburst in Italy. It was felt that some public statement must be made to clear the matter up.
The Cabinet were informed that the Governor of Somaliland had now notified the Secretary of State for the Colonies that he did not consider it indispensable that arms in transit through the Protectorate should be accompanied by an escort, and that the larger the quantities of arms the less need was there for an escort.

The Cabinet were informed also that no licences for export of any arms to Italy had been given since March, when the crisis was not yet acute, and that at the present time all licences to both countries were hold up.

Difficulties were foreseen in the matter of raising the question of collective action at Geneva, owing to its probable repercussion on the Italian attitude towards the larger question, and owing to the difficulty the British representative would encounter in giving advice to other nations.

While the undesirability of British weapons being used to kill either Abyssinians or Italians was mentioned, the Cabinet were reminded of the adverse effect throughout Black Africa of a decision to refuse to the Abyssinians the means to defend themselves.

The disadvantage of allowing all orders from Abyssinia to be placed elsewhere instead of in this country, from the point of view of the capacity of our armament firms for production, was also pointed out.

Doubts arose as to the precise bearing, both from the legal and moral point of view, of the Treaty of August 31, 1930, regulating the importation into Ethiopia of arms, ammunition and implements of war, on the question of export. A suggestion was made that the legal question might with advantage be referred for an Opinion by the Law Officers of the Crown.
The attention of the Cabinet was drawn to the following Question that had been put down for answer in the House of Commons the same afternoon:

"Major Sir Archibald Sinclair,—To ask the President of the Board of Trade, what restrictions have been placed by His Majesty's Government on the export of arms, aircraft, or other military supplies to Abyssinia which do not apply to similar exports to Italy: and whether His Majesty's Government is taking any international action with a view to placing an embargo upon the export of such material to either or both of these countries".

The Cabinet agreed—

(a) That, in view of the probable adverse effect of a decision to issue licences for exportation to Abyssinia of arms and munitions of war on the attitude of Italy and France, and consequently on the critical negotiations in which we were engaged for the preservation of peace (as described in Conclusion 1), we should fulfil our obligations under existing Treaties to allow transit of arms and munitions of war across British territory, but should not for the present issue licences for the exportation of arms and munitions of war to either Italy or Abyssinia. Our eventual attitude must be governed by the principle of equal treatment to both countries:

(b) That the reply to the first part of Sir Archibald Sinclair's Question should be to the effect that no discrimination has been exercised as between Italy and Abyssinia, and since the situation became critical no licences have been issued for export of arms to either country. The reply to the second part of the Question should be that a statement would be made by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs within the next few days:

(c) That the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs should draft the Statement referred to above at the end of (b) in the light of the Cabinet's discussions on the subject and on the lines of Conclusion (a) above. He should avoid any suggestion of collective action, or that the question would be raised formally at the forthcoming Meeting of the Council, and should exercise caution in any reference to soundings that may be taken at Geneva:

(d) That the Secretary of State for the Colonies should have authority to endorse the attitude of the Governor
of Somaliland as to escorts for transit of arms and munitions being unnecessary, but should reserve sending his reply until after the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had made the Statement in Parliament referred to in (c) above.
3. The Cabinet considered the question of the protection of British subjects in Abyssinia, raised in paragraph 5 of the Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (C.P.-147 (35)).

The Secretary of State for India informed the Cabinet that he had agreed with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Statement to be made in India by the Viceroy relating to the protection of Indian subjects. Half the Indians in Abyssinia, including the representatives of one very wealthy and loyal firm, had refused to leave the country, and the question of their protection was therefore important.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said the suggestion was to concentrate British subjects in the Capital and to increase the guard. The Egyptian Government disliked the idea of sending a guard of Sudanese from the Sudan, and it might be necessary for him to ask for assistance from India in this respect.

The Cabinet approved the proposals in C.P.-147 (35), Paragraph 5) as a general guide for the present as to the protection of British subjects in Abyssinia.
4. On the suggestion of the Prime Minister, and in view of the approaching Recess, the Cabinet agreed —

That a Sub-Committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence, composed as follows —

Representatives of:
The Foreign Office (including the Chairman),
The Treasury,
The War Office,
The Dominions Office,
The Air Ministry,
The Colonial Office,
The Board of Trade,
The Admiralty,
The India Office (to attend when Indian interests are affected)

should deal with questions referred to it by Government Departments on Abyssinia. The Committee would work, mutatis mutandis, on the same lines as the Official Middle East Sub-Committee.
5. The Cabinet had before them an Interim Report of the Sub-Committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence on Defence Policy and Requirements, on the question of the Reorientation of the Air Defence System of Great Britain. Although the Sub-Committee were not yet in a position to make recommendations as to the rate at which the stages of the scheme should be completed, they had reached the following provisional Conclusions, which they submitted to the Cabinet for approval:

(I) To approve in principle that the final scheme, as laid down in paragraphs 35 and 36 on page 11 of the Report by a Sub-Committee on the Re-orientation of the Air Defence System of Great Britain and as illustrated in Map No.3 attached to that Report, is the scheme to be aimed at.

(II) Subject to the further consideration which is now being given to the rate at which the stages of the whole Scheme should be completed, to approve the completion by 1940 of that part of Stage 1 of the defences described in the following parts of paragraph 49 on page 13 of the Report on the Re-orientation of the Air Defence System of Great Britain:

(a) The partial provision of A.A. defences in the Inner Artillery Zone covering Greater London and consisting of 8 A.A. batteries and 6 searchlight companies;

(b) the provision of 9 of the A.A. batteries for the Outer Artillery Zone, of which 5 are to be located in the Thames and Medway area;

(c) the provision of searchlights in the Aircraft Fighting Zone and Outer Artillery Zone from Portsmouth to Huntingdon, except that the depth of the portion of the Aircraft Fighting Zone from Portsmouth to Godalming should be limited temporarily to 15 miles. This will require 36 searchlight companies.

(III) To reserve for further discussion and consideration that part of the proposals for Stage 1 (contained in sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 49) which relates to the raising and training of additional A.A. defence units for the second and third stages.
(IV) To take note of the fact that the proposal (contained in sub-paragraph (e) of paragraph 49) for the expansion of the Observer Corps Organisation had already been approved by the Committee of Imperial Defence at their Meeting held on the 16th April, 1935, when they had under consideration a Report on the Organisation and Expansion of the Observer Corps (C.I.D. Paper No. 205-A).

(V) To take note of the contents and conclusions of the Interim Report of the Sub-Committee on Air Defence Research (Paper No. D.P.R.-3).

Some doubts were expressed as to the expediency of adopting a scheme the effectiveness of which was subject to the limitations indicated in the Report of the Chiefs of Staff Sub-Committee; the manning arrangements for which had not yet been worked out satisfactorily, and which would cost a very large sum of money to complete.

The Cabinet were reminded, nevertheless, that the Chiefs of Staff Sub-Committee had approved the scheme as "the proper one to be aimed at"; that the Chiefs of Staff had taken part in the meetings of the Sub-Committee on Defence Policy and Requirements; and that the Sub-Committee on Air Defence Research had expressed the opinion that the recommendations should be accepted pending the practical development and the provision of the apparatus and weapons now being explored. The Cabinet were also reminded that they were only being invited to approve the final scheme in principle and not in detail as well as the completion by 1940 of part of Stage I of the plan "subject to the further consideration which is now being given to the rate at which the stages of the
whole scheme should be completed".

The suggestion was made that at any moment the question might be raised in Parliament or in the Press as to what provision was being made for air defence of this nature and that from a political point of view it was important to take a decision.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said that he was not at all happy as to the dates of completion for which the plans under consideration had been worked out. All the information he had at the Foreign Office pointed to the critical date being earlier than was anticipated in these plans; possibly indeed as early as 1938. He was concerned also at information furnished to the Defence Policy and Requirements Committee by the Chief of the Imperial General Staff and the Chief of the Air Staff as to the rate at which German preparations were being carried out.

The Lord President of the Council reported that the date at which we should aim in defensive preparation was under consideration by the Ministerial Committee on Defence Policy and Requirements and he would probably have to present a Report to the Cabinet on the subject at an early date.

The Cabinet agreed:

To approve the following recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Defence Policy and Requirements -

(I) To approve in principle that the final scheme, as laid down in paragraphs 35 and 36 on page 11 of the Report by a Sub-Committee on the Re-orientation of the Air Defence System of Great Britain and as illustrated in Map No. 3 attached to that Report, is the scheme to be aimed at.

(II) Subject to the further consideration which is now being given to the rate at which the stages of the
whole scheme should be completed, to approve the completion by 1940 of that part of Stage I of the defences described in the following parts of paragraph 49 on page 13 of the Report on the Re-orientation of the Air Defence System of Great Britain:

(a) The partial provision of A.A. defences in the Inner Artillery Zone covering Greater London and consisting of 8 A.A. batteries and 6 searchlight companies:

(b) the provision of 9 of the A.A. batteries for the Outer Artillery Zone, of which 5 are to be located in the Thames and Medway area:

(c) the provision of searchlights in the Aircraft Fighting Zone and Outer Artillery Zone from Portsmouth to Huntingdon, except that the depth of the portion of the Aircraft Fighting Zone from Portsmouth to Godalming should be limited temporarily to 15 miles. This will require 36 searchlight companies.
SINGAPORE DEFENCES.

Report of Sub-Committee on Defence Policy and Requirements.

(Previous Reference: Cabinet 6 (35), Conclusion 4.)

6. The Cabinet had before them a Report on Singapore Defences (C.P.-152 (35)) by the Committee of Imperial Defence Sub-Committee on Defence Policy and Requirements. The Conclusions and recommendations of the Sub-Committee were summarised at the end of their Report in the following terms:

(a) That without prejudice to the final scheme for the provision of Stage II of the Singapore Defences, the gift of the Sultan of Johore amounting to £500,000 should be distributed as follows:

(i) £400,000 to the War Office to be devoted to the completion of the 15-inch gun batteries at Bee Hoe (3 guns) and Buona Vista (2 guns).

(ii) £100,000 to the Air Ministry to meet the cost of accelerating the preparation of the second and third landing-grounds and for providing accommodation for the non-regular (spotting) flight at the civil aerodrome.

(b) That the Joint Overseas and Home Defence Committee should consider and report what further steps are required on the part of all Services to complete the defences of the base subsequent to Stage I.

The Cabinet approved the above recommendations.
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7. The Cabinet had before them the Report of the Cabinet Committee on Beet Sugar (C.P.-155 (35)), to whom the Report of the United Kingdom Sugar Industry Inquiry Committee (Cmd. 4871) had been referred at the Meeting held on May 32nd (Cabinet 30 (35), Conclusion 4). The Cabinet Committee had come to the conclusion that under present conditions there was no practical alternative but to provide a measure of State assistance for the industry, and recommended adoption by the Cabinet of a scheme (attached to the Report) proposed by a Committee of Officials as the best method that could be devised for dealing with the situation. The Cabinet Committee further recommended, if the proposals contained in their Report were approved in principle by the Cabinet, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries should be authorised to bring the industry into consultation before any announcement of the Government's decision was made, and to invite them to co-operate with the Government in carrying out their proposals.

The Prime Minister thanked the Cabinet Committee for their Report on this complicated question.

After hearing from the Chancellor of the Exchequer a comprehensive statement on the proposals of the Committee, the Cabinet agreed:

(a) To approve the proposals in C.P. 155 (35) subject to the modification of the last paragraph in (c) below:

(b) That the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries should be authorised to bring the industry into consultation:

(c) That the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries should be authorised early next week to make a statement in Parliament without further reference to the Cabinet.
8. The Cabinet had before them a Memorandum by
the Chancellor of the Exchequer (C.P.-149 (35)) asking
approval in principle of the Public Works Loans Bill,
1935, and authority to introduce it before the House
rises. The main purpose of the Bill was to fix the
maximum sum which might be issued to the Public Works
Loan Commissioners for the purpose of making loans
from the Local Loans Fund up to the date of the
passing of a further Bill.

The Cabinet approved in principle the
Public Works Loans Bill, 1935, and
authorised the Chancellor of the
Exchequer to introduce it before the
Recess.
9. The Cabinet had under consideration a Memorandum by the Home Secretary (H.A.-27 (35)) covering the draft Employment of Women and Young Persons Bill, the object of which was to place on a permanent basis the temporary provisions contained in Section 2 of the Employment of Women, Young Persons and Children Act, 1920, under which women and young persons may be employed in a factory or workshop on a system of two day-shifts: together with the following recommendation by the Committee of Home Affairs thereon (H.A.C. 10th Conclusions (35), Minute 1):

"To authorise the introduction in the House of Commons of the Employment of Women and Young Persons Bill, in the form of the draft annexed to H.A.-27 (35), subject to the amendment of Clause 4, and subject also to any drafting or other minor alterations that may be found necessary or desirable; it being understood that the Second Reading and subsequent stages of the Bill will be deferred until after the Summer recess."

The Cabinet approved the above recommendation of the Committee of Home Affairs.
10. The Cabinet had under consideration a Memorandum by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury (H.A.-23 (35)) covering the draft Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, which had been agreed with the Departments concerned and should become law by December 31, 1935: together with the following recommendation by the Committee of Home Affairs thereon (H.A.C. 10th Conclusions (35) Minute 2):

"To authorise the introduction forthwith in the House of Commons of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, in the form of the draft annexed to H.A.-23 (35), subject to any drafting or other minor alterations that may be found necessary or desirable; it being understood that the Second Reading and subsequent stages of the Bill would be deferred until after the Summer Recess."

The Cabinet approved the above recommendation of the Committee of Home Affairs.
11. The Secretary of State for India raised as a matter of urgency a question relating to the continuance of the Press Act and certain emergency legislation passed in 1932 to deal with the Civil Disobedience Movement in India. The legislation was due to expire in December of this year and if, as the Government of India proposed, it was to be re-enacted, very early steps would have to be taken in India for the purpose. The Secretary of State added that he had prepared a Memorandum on the whole question.

At the request of the Secretary of State for India, the Cabinet agreed:

(a) That a Cabinet Committee composed as follows:

The Secretary of State for India
(In the Chair),
The Lord President of the Council,
The Lord Chancellor,
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (if available),
The Secretary of State for War,

should meet to consider the question of the continuance of the Press Act and certain emergency legislation passed in 1932 to deal with the Civil Disobedience Movement.

(b) That, if the above Committee was in agreement, the Secretary of State for India should be authorised to proceed on its recommendations without further reference to the Cabinet.