CABINET 66 (36).

Meeting of the Cabinet to be held at No. 10, Downing Street, S.W.1., on WEDNESDAY, 18th NOVEMBER, 1936, at 11.0 a.m.

AGENDA.

1. FOREIGN AFFAIRS.
   (a) Preparations for the Five Power Conference.
       (Reference Cabinet 65 (36) Conclusion 1)
       German and Italian Objections to a Guarantee to the United Kingdom.
       Report by the Chiefs of Staff Sub-Committee.
       C.P. 302 (36) - already circulated.
       Memorandum by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom regarding the Agenda of the Five Power Conference, communicated to the Belgian, French, German and Italian Governments.
       C.P. 307 (36) - already circulated.
       Note by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs covering a redraft of a Memorandum containing the views of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, for communication to the Belgian, French, German and Italian Governments.
       C.P. 314 (36) - circulated herewith.
   (b) The Situation in Spain - (if required)
       (Reference Cabinet 65 (36) Conclusion 2)

2. BILL TO AMEND SECTION 282 OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1935.
   (Reference Cabinet 39 (36) Conclusion 10)
   Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India C.P. 313 (36) - already circulated.

3. LONDON NAVAL TREATY, 1930: CRUISERS DUE FOR SCRAPPING.
   Question to be raised by the First Lord of the Admiralty.

4. FACTORIES BILL - (if required)
   (Reference Cabinet 57 (36) Conclusion 4)
   Memorandum by the Home Secretary.
   C.P. 855 (36) - already circulated.
5. **UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) (AMENDMENT) BILL.**

(Reference Cabinet 58 (36) Conclusion 9 and Appendix)

Joint Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Scotland and the Minister of Health.
C.P. 311 (36) - already circulated.

6. **THE CORONATION: SEATS ON THE PROCESSIONAL ROUTE.**

(Reference Cabinet 62 (36) Conclusion 15)

Memorandum by the Lord President of the Council.
C.P. 310 (36) - already circulated.

7. **PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS.**

For Friday, November 20th, 1936.

(a) Marriage Bill. Second Reading. (Mr. De la Bere (U)).

(b) Coal Mines (Employment of Boys) Bill. Second Reading. (Mr. Charles Taylor (U)).

For Friday, November 27th, 1936.

(a) Annual Holiday Bill. Second Reading. (Mr. Rowson (La.))

(b) Hotels and Restaurants (Gratuities) Bill. Second Reading. (Mr. Holmes (LN))

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

2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.1.

November 17th, 1936.
CONCLUSIONS of a Meeting of the Cabinet held at 10, Downing Street, S.W.1., on WEDNESDAY, 18th NOVEMBER, 1936, at 11.0 a.m.

PRESENT:

The Right Hon. J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.
Lord President of the Council. (in the Chair).

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

Right Hon.
Anthony Eden, M.C., M.P.,
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

Right Hon.
Malcolm MacDonald, M.P.,
Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs.

Right Hon.
A. Duff Cooper, D.S.O., M.P.,
Secretary of State for War.

Right Hon.
The Viscount Swinton, G.B.E.,
M.C., Secretary of State for Air.

Right Hon.
Sir Samuel Hoare, Bt., G.C.S.I.,

Right Hon.
W.S. Morrison, M.C., K.C., M.P.,
Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Right Hon.
The Earl Stanhope, K.G., D.S.O.,
M.C., First Commissioner of Works.

The Right Hon.
The Viscount Halifax, K.G.,

The Right Hon.
W. Ormsby-Gore, M.P., Secretary of State for the Colonies.

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

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

The Right Hon.
Sir Thomas Inskip, C.B.E., K.C.,
M.P., Minister for the Co-Ordination of Defence.

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

The Right Hon.
L. More-Belisha, M.P., Minister of Transport.

The Right Hon.
Sir John Simon, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.,

The Right Hon.
The Viscount Swinton, G.B.E.,
M.C., Secretary of State for Air.

The Right Hon.
Sir Thomas Inskip, C.B.E., K.C.,
M.P., Minister for the Co-Ordination of Defence.

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

The Right Hon.
L. More-Belisha, M.P., Minister of Transport.

1. The Lord President of the Council informed his colleagues that the Prime Minister was keeping an official engagement in Glasgow and had asked him to take the Chair at the present Meeting.
2. The Cabinet again had before them the following documents on the subject of Preparations for the proposed Five-Power Conference:

- A Report by the Chiefs of Staff Committee (C.P.-302 (36)) on the German and Italian objections to a guarantee to the United Kingdom:

- A Memorandum by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom regarding the Agenda of the Five-Power Conference (C.P.-307 (36)), communicated to the Belgian, French, German and Italian Governments on November 4th, in which their attention was drawn to the chief points of difference between the Governments concerned in the preparations for the proposed new Western Pact:

  together with

- A Note by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (C.P.-314 (36)) covering the draft of a further Memorandum (as amended in the light of discussion at the Meeting mentioned in the margin) for communication to the Belgian, French, German and Italian Governments, containing the views of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom on the points of difference referred to above.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs explained in turn the various amendments that had been introduced in the revised Memorandum for communication to the Belgian, French, German and Italian Governments.

Discussion took place in regard to paragraph 14 of the revised Memorandum attached to C.P.-314 (36) and more particularly the following sentence in the middle of the paragraph:

"It appears, however, to His Majesty's Government to be essential to provide, as was done in the Treaty of Locarno, that guarantors, in deciding to intervene, should know that their decision is subject to a subsequent pronouncement by the competent body, so as to ensure that action without a previous finding by that body would not be taken except in cases where no reasonable doubt can exist."
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs explained that while the whole question was rather complicated, the Foreign Office believed that the German Government had in mind that the Five-Power Agreement should not come into force unless both the guarantor Powers agreed that it should. This would enable Italy to put the brake on action being taken. This, he thought, was not acceptable to us, and it was certainly not consistent with the existing Locarno Treaty.

The words "so as to ensure that action without a previous finding by that body would not be taken" was criticised on the ground that they were probably not correct.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs explained that these words had been introduced, first, because they were consistent with the existing Locarno Treaty, and, second, that they met some of the German objections to the Franco-Soviet Pact.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer recalled that he had raised this point at the last Meeting, and the re-draft did not meet his objection, which was that the League of Nations was in a tottering position and he would therefore prefer to base the whole paragraph on the Pact of Paris. He did not endorse the German proposal that action should be made conditional on the agreement of both the guarantors, but he would like the position to be that if Italy said that she was not bound to take action, we should be free to take our own decision.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs pointed out that that was a weakening of the guarantee to France and Belgium as compared with Locarno, which we had always interpreted as involving joint and several action in the event of a breach.
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs then suggested to substitute the word "desirable" for the word "essential" (underlined in the above quotation).

This was accepted.

The Secretary of State for Air reminded the Cabinet that in the draft Memorandum (paragraph 4) we were asking to receive guarantees from France and Germany.

He recalled that the Chiefs of Staff Committee, in making their recommendation that Belgium should not be asked to give a guarantee, had assumed that France would be in alliance with this country. This was very important from the point of view of Air action. If Belgium was to be neutral and we were not in alliance with France and could neither fly over her territory nor use French bases, the Royal Air Force would be very handicapped as regards access to German bombing targets. He asked, therefore, to have it placed on the record of the Cabinet that France as an ally was the basis of the Chiefs of Staffs' recommendation.

This was agreed to.

The Cabinet agreed—

(a) To approve the Memorandum attached to C.P. 314 (36) for communication to the French, Belgian, German and Italian Governments, including the deletions and amendments of the original Memorandum as set forth therein, subject to:

(i) In paragraph 14, line 16, the substitution of the word "desirable" for the word "essential":

(ii) Consequential on the omission of paragraph 5, which dealt with "The second question", a drafting alteration in the first words of paragraph 6, where "The third question" becomes "The second question"; and paragraph 10, where "The next and fourth question" becomes "The next and third question":

-4-
(b) To take note that in making their Report, contained in C.O.-302 (36), the Chiefs of Staff Sub-Committee had made the assumption of France being in alliance with this country, and that in C.O.-276 (36) they had stated we should be well advised to forget a guarantee from France and Germany if we could not get the Western idea on other lines.
3. The Cabinet were informed that the Admiralty now took the view that it would be an advantage to confer belligerent rights on both sides in the Spanish struggle, rather than to await the fall of Madrid, as contemplated in the Cabinet Conclusion on this subject referred to in the margin.

The First Lord of the Admiralty explained that, judging by some of the sieges that had taken place during the present civil war in Spain, it might be some time before Madrid fell. In the meanwhile the position was becoming increasingly difficult. For example, a case had recently arisen of a Russian merchant ship carrying Russian ammunition to the Spanish Government which had sailed under the British flag. In time of war this was a legitimate *ruse-de-guerre*, but it was not permissible in time of peace. In a sense, therefore, by allowing this misuse of the flag it could be said that we were recognising belligerent rights *de facto*, or, to put it differently, we were recognising one of the disadvantages of belligerency at a time when we did not grant belligerent rights.

The Cabinet were reminded that by conferring belligerent rights we should in effect be admitting to the Spanish insurgents that their waging of war had reached a point at which we recognised that they had sufficient force to stop ships proceeding to Spanish ports and that we admitted their right to search British ships — action which they could not otherwise take without committing an act of piracy.

The Cabinet agreed —

(a) To confirm the previous decision mentioned in the margin, that if and when the insurgents capture Madrid they should be recognised as belligerents, which would include the power to exercise belligerent rights at sea:

---

THE SITUATION IN SPAIN.

(Previous Reference: Cabinet 65 (36), Conclusion 2.)

BELLIGERENT RIGHTS TO.

(Previous Reference: Cabinet 58 (36), Conclusion 6.)

FR. 67(36)².
(b) That further information was required before taking a decision as to whether belligerent rights could be granted before the capture of Madrid:

(c) That the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs should circulate a Memorandum, before the next regular weekly Meeting of the Cabinet, on the Admiralty proposal.
4. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs reported that the International Non-Intervention Committee was continuing its work of examining alleged breaches of the Non-Intervention Agreement. In view of the many breaches, however, it was impossible to maintain the present position. To keep the Committee in being a scheme had been worked out by British Government Departments for exercising supervision over importation of arms in Spanish ports. It was an excellent scheme, but involved a very large personnel and a cost of £900,000 a year. Moreover, it could only be carried out with the approval of the parties concerned. The representative of the U.S.S.R. had declared that he was in favour of the scheme provided it would be effective, but it seemed probable that the tactics were to declare that it was not effective, so as to obtain freedom for the undisguised importation of arms. The representative of the U.S.S.R. also thought that the Spanish Government would accept the proposal, but in the Secretary of State's own view it was unlikely that either party would consent.

The Cabinet were reminded that telegrams were pouring in every day revealing a steady importation of arms into Barcelona from Russia, and to some extent to other ports from other countries. The Non-Intervention Agreement was being continuously broken, and it was suggested that to maintain the International Committee was a sheer farce.

While this was not contested, it was pointed out that it was the existence of the Committee that enabled the French Government to maintain a neutral position. If it disappeared they would hardly be able to escape from allowing the exportation of arms to the Spanish Government. The object of the Agreement had been to prevent the Spanish Civil War.
from spreading into the rest of Europe, and for this purpose it was still effective.

The general view of the Cabinet, therefore, was that it was desirable to keep the Non-Intervention Committee in existence at present. As the British scheme for making it effective had been heavily criticised on the ground of its cost, it was suggested that advantage might be taken of a French suggestion to draw up a more economical scheme, which could then be considered by the Committee.
5. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said he had had a conversation with the Italian Ambassador prior to the latter's leaving for Rome. Since then Signor Grandi had seen Sir Robert Vansittart and had given him a message expressing Signor Mussolini's "great satisfaction" at Signor Grandi's account of his interview with the Secretary of State. The Italian Ambassador had paid a second and final visit before leaving for Rome, in the course of which he had given an outline of Signor Mussolini's general ideas as to the form in which the relations between the two countries might be improved, namely, by a "Gentleman's Agreement" rather than a formal Agreement. The Secretary of State read to the Cabinet the passage which the Italian Ambassador had communicated to him. He added that the negotiations appeared to be progressing satisfactorily, and asked for authority to continue them on present lines.

The Lord Privy Seal expressed the hope that in considering these matters the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs would not press Signor Mussolini too hard about returning to the League of Nations.

The Cabinet agreed —

To authorise the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to continue his negotiations with a view to improving relations with the Italian Government.
6. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs recalled that for some time there had been rumours that Germany was seeking closer relations with Japan. Recently he had received a telegram from His Majesty’s Ambassador in Tokio that Germany and Japan were on the verge of reaching an understanding. Consequently he had seen the Japanese Ambassador and warned him, of a propos/tentative suggestions that the Ambassador had made for improving relations with this country, that we could not enter into a combination against any other country, and that if there was a combination between Japan and any other country against some third party it would make the Anglo-Japanese conversations more difficult. Relations with Japan would not be improved by a regrettable leading article in "The Times", which had not consulted the Foreign Office before writing it. A further complication was that he could not postpone beyond that very day making a statement on the recent Keelung incident, in the course of which he was bound to show that the Fleet could not visit Japanese ports until the matter had been cleared up. He added that the German-Japanese understanding was not thought to be directed against this country. It did indicate, however, that Japan might act contrary to our interests if Germany was at war with us. There was, however, no new factor there, as it had long been thought a possibility. One result of the understanding was that Russo-Japanese relations were likely to become more tense.

The First Lord of the Admiralty added, some information that had reached him as to the nature of the pact. He apprehended that in addition to an anti-Communist part of the understanding there might be a second part containing a military agreement. There were indications that moderate opinion in Japan was by no means
pleased with this arrangement, and one of the most regrettable aspects of the understanding was the probability that the moderates in Japan had once more been overborne.
pleased with this arrangement, and one of the most regrettable aspects of the understanding was the probability that the moderates in Japan had once more been overborne.
The Cabinet had before them a Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India (C.P.-313 (36)) seeking the approval of his colleagues to the submission to the Committee of Home Affairs of a short and formal Bill to amend Sections 292 and 293 of the Government of India Act, 1935, with the main object of making clearer the meaning of certain words which were intended to preserve intact the Indian Statute Book notwithstanding the repeal of the existing Government of India Act. The Secretary of State suggested that the Bill might be placed on the Order Paper of the House of Commons for all its stages along with the East India Loans Bill. The Cabinet agreed —

That the Secretary of State for India should submit to the Committee of Home Affairs a Bill on the lines suggested in his Memorandum (C.P.-313 (36)) and summarised above.
8. The First Lord of the Admiralty recalled the conclusion reached by the Committee of Imperial Defence on May 12, 1936 (C.I.D. 278th Meeting, Conclusion 5) authorising the Admiralty to carry out their proposals for reducing our total Cruiser tonnage to the limits permitted at the end of 1936 under the London Naval Treaty of 1930, which involved the scrapping of five small Cruisers. The Government had been severely attacked in Parliament for this decision, and it had been difficult to defend the scrapping of five Cruisers, that is to say, a reduction of the total number of Cruisers from 50 to 45, at a time when we were aiming at possessing 70 Cruisers. At that time it had looked as though, if these Cruisers were scrapped, Japan would be compelled to carry out her part of the Treaty and to scrap better and more numerous Cruisers. It had also been thought that the Americans would object to our invoking the "Escalator" Clause so as to avoid this scrapping, and would run out of the Cruiser "holiday". It now transpired that the Japanese, through having retarded their programme, would not be obliged to scrap any Cruisers of any value at all. A further point was that it was now found that these Cruisers could be made very valuable as convoy escorts. In addition, it had been ascertained that the United States Government would have no objection to our invoking the "Escalator" Clause and keeping the Cruisers, and that it would not affect their attitude to the 1935 Agreement. The Japanese would reply by invoking the "Escalator" Clause to enable them to maintain some destroyers. We might make a formal protest, but did not really wish to press an objection. If the Japanese objected to our
invoking the "Escalator" Clause they had no means of retaliating, since they were not signatories of the 1935 Agreement. He asked the Cabinet, therefore, to authorise a departure from the decision of last May, the approach to the United States Government, and the retention of the Cruisers.

In the course of a short discussion the Lord President of the Council recalled that when the Naval Treaty of 1930 had been drawn up provision had been made for the expiration of the Treaty. He felt certain that any International Court would uphold the action we now contemplated. He was anxious, however, that the matter should be put publicly in such a way as not to make it look as though we were doing anything at variance with the intentions of the Treaty.

The First Lord of the Admiralty said that any announcement would have to be on the ground of a deterioration in the state of the world.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs entered a caveat that the announcement should not be made until the Japanese had been given some time to reply to our last communication on the subject. He paid a warm tribute to the very helpful attitude of the United States Government. Under the Treaty they would not have to scrap any Cruisers, and in allowing us to invoke the "Escalator" Clause they were enabling Japan also to keep Cruisers. Their attitude, therefore, had been exceptionally friendly.

The Cabinet agreed --

(a) To approve the proposal of the First Lord of the Admiralty that, notwithstanding the Conclusion of the Committee of Imperial Defence on the 12th May, our policy should be to keep the five Cruisers, and that formal approach on the subject should be made to the United States Government.
That any announcement on the subject should be deferred, and that the matter should be arranged between the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

(b) That any announcement on the subject should be deferred, and that the matter should be arranged between the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
9. The Home Secretary reminded the Cabinet of the conclusion reached on the subject of the Factories Bill referred to in the margin to the effect that if it were decided to proceed with the Factories Bill in the present Session, a Cabinet Committee should be appointed which the Home Secretary could invoke on specific points of difficulty arising in the preparation of the Bill. He asked that the Cabinet should now implement the decision.

The Cabinet agreed:

That a Committee should be appointed composed as follows -

The Home Secretary (In the Chair),
The Secretary of State for Scotland,
The Minister of Health,
The Minister of Labour,
The President of the Board of Education,
The First Commissioner of Works,
The Parliamentary Under-Secretary to the Board of Trade.

which the Home Secretary could invoke on specific points of difficulty arising in the preparation of the Factories Bill.
10. The Cabinet had before them a Joint Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Scotland and the Minister of Health (C.P.-311 (36)) covering a draft Bill to authorise a continuance of grants to Public Assistance Authorities, for a period of twelve months to March 31, 1937, to meet the cost of relief of able-bodied unemployed who are on public assistance. After that date the Unemployment Assistance Board would become responsible for the persons in respect of whose relief these compensatory grants had been paid, and the necessity for the grants would then cease. The Chancellor of the Exchequer concurred in the above procedure, and the authors of the Memorandum asked that, as it was desirable that the Bill should pass through all its stages before Christmas in order that the Local Authorities might receive further grants as early as possible, and as there might be no meeting of the Committee of Home Affairs in the immediate future, the Cabinet should authorise the Bill without reference to that Committee.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had been asked by the Minister of Health to answer any questions that might arise on this Bill, said that it was proposed that the "hard cases" referred to in paragraph 4 of the memorandum should be met by means of levies on the gains of the more fortunate authorities.

The Cabinet agreed:

To authorise the introduction in the House of Commons of the Unemployment Assistance (Temporary Provisions) (Amendment) Bill attached to C.P. 311 (36) without reference to the Committee of Home Affairs.
The Cabinet had before them a Memorandum by the Lord President of the Council (C.P.-310 (36)) on the question of the accommodation which could be provided to view the Coronation Procession on that part of the route over which the Government had control. The matter had been considered by the Coronation Committee of the Privy Council, and at the end of his Memorandum the Lord President summed up their conclusions as follows:

1. Stands should not be erected on the west side of the East Carriage Drive in Hyde Park.

2. Seats on Government property should not be provided for indiscriminate sale to the general public, but should be allotted in accordance with a plan prepared in advance.

3. The price of seats on Government property should, in general, be cost price together with a sufficient margin of profit to allow of a sum being distributed to a charity or charities.

4. The allocation of seats should be in general accordance with the scheme for 85,000 seats outlined in the Appendix to C.P.-310 (36), on the understanding that the provision for Trade Unions, Friendly Societies, etc., should be about 10,000.

The Lord President of the Council explained the position on each of the above proposals in turn.

In connection with Conclusion (2), the attention of the Cabinet was drawn to the fact that the list of "Active Influences in the Life of the Nation" contained in the Appendix to the Memorandum did not include any body representative of agriculture.

The Lord President explained that this list was not a catalogue but only an indication of the kind of bodies for which provision would be made. As soon as the Cabinet had dealt with the question...
it would be reopened and there was no doubt that provision would be made for agricultural bodies.

Considerable discussion took place on the third Conclusion and on the question of principle, whether the prices charged for seats on Government property should include provision for a margin of profit to allow a sum being distributed to a charity or charities.

The First Commissioner of Works informed the Cabinet that since the meeting of the Coronation Committee tenders had been received for the construction of the stands. At the Coronation Committee he had hoped that the tenders would admit of a price of from 15/- to £1 a seat, but the tenders indicated that they would more likely cost from 26/- to 29/-. If the seats were sold at 30/- a piece therefore, there would not be much available for charity. In reply to a suggestion that these tenders indicated profiteering, he pointed out that the price of timber and of labour had already risen and that labour would easily ask for a further rise.

The Cabinet were also reminded that there was a building boom and that the provision of these stands involved contractors in a lock-up of considerable amounts of timber.

The discussion centred mainly on the question of whether it was desirable to make an extra charge for charities in a matter of this kind. One suggestion was that the seats reserved for the poorer members of the community ought to be provided gratis, the cost being raised by an increase for the other seats.

The Cabinet were reminded further that the additional cost was not likely to create difficulties with the Trade Unions as that could be arranged.
The Cabinet were informed that some anxiety had been expressed at the Coronation Committee as to the difficulty of selecting the charities to which any surplus could be given. Some of the hospitals which were on the route would already make large sums from letting seats. There might well be criticism, on a National and Imperial occasion of this kind, of allotting the bulk of the money to the hospitals of London. A proposal was preferred that any surplus accruing from an increased charge in the price of the seats should be given to the King George V Memorial Fund.

The Cabinet were reminded of the importance of not interfering with the Coronation Committee in the matter. The position was that the Government provided the seats but put them at the disposal of the Coronation Committee to deal with. They were entitled, therefore, to give that Committee an indication of their views.

No objection was felt to raising the price to £2 for an uncovered seat.

At the end of the discussion the Lord President informed the Cabinet that standing room within the precincts of Government accommodation was not to be charged for. Chairs would be charged for at the rate of 2/6.

The Cabinet agreed:

(a) To take note of the proposals of the Coronation Committee of the Privy Council which were generally acceptable to the Cabinet.

(b) That the Lord President should be requested to express to the Coronation Committee the view of the Cabinet that there was no objection to charging a margin of profit to allow of a sum being made available to some worthy object, but to ask that they should consider whether the best object would not be the King George V Memorial Fund.

(c) To take note that when the detailed allocation of seats in Government stands was being considered the claims of agricultural bodies would not be overlooked.
12. The Cabinet had before them the Marriage Bill, introduced by a Private Member and down for Second Reading in the House of Commons on Friday, November 20th.

The Home Secretary said that the Attorney-General had taken some soundings and looked at this Bill. He understood the Attorney's view to be that the Second Reading was likely to be carried. It appeared important that the Government should have some general idea as to their attitude and as to the general line to be taken by the Government Spokesman. He suggested that the Attorney-General should be asked to be the Spokesman for the Government on the Bill; that he should take up an attitude neither of approbation nor condemnation of the Bill; he might point out that there were some things in the Bill which were in line with the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes of 1912 and others that were not, e.g. the proposal in Clause 1. The Government should not adopt the policy of cold-shouldering the Bill at the present stage. The Attorney-General might, therefore, say that if the Bill was given a Second Reading, a Law Officer would be available to help the Committee upstairs.

The Home Secretary also suggested that there might be a private understanding between members of the Cabinet and possibly other Ministers.
as to what their individual attitude should be towards the Bill.

After a short discussion, the Cabinet agreed:

(a) That the Attorney-General should be asked to watch and deal with this Bill on behalf of the Government and that he should adopt the general lines suggested by the Home Secretary and summarised above.

(b) That there should be an understanding between Cabinet Ministers not to vote on the Second Reading of the Bill, but that this should not bind their action at any later stage.

(c) That the Attorney-General should be asked to adopt the same line as Members of the Cabinet in not voting on the Bill.

(d) That the above arrangements should not apply to other Ministers.
13. The Cabinet had under consideration the Coal Mines (Employment of Boys) Bill, introduced by a Private Member and down for Second Reading in the House of Commons on Friday, November 20th. As this Bill had not yet been printed and the Marriage Bill was certain to occupy the whole of the time of the House of Commons on November 20th, it was not discussed.
14. The Cabinet had under consideration the Annual Holiday Bill, introduced by a Private Member and down for Second Reading in the House of Commons on Friday, November 27th.

This Bill was not discussed as it had not yet been printed.
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15. The Cabinet had before them the Hotels and
Restaurants (Gratuities) Bill, introduced by a
Private Member and down for Second Reading in the
House of Commons on Friday, November 27th.

This Bill was not discussed as it had not
yet been printed.
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