



(c) crown copyright

injustices and inequalities must be created in cases falling just outside the fixed figure.

He therefore believed that it was very much better to include the assurance in the White Paper and not to attempt to incorporate it in the Regulations.

In conclusion, he trusted that the Committee's recommendations would receive the unanimous approval of the Cabinet.

The Lord President of the Council said that he felt some doubt whether the Committee had been supplied with all the necessary figures, but if the Secretary of State for Scotland was satisfied in this respect he (the Lord President) would not press the point further.^{**} He personally was satisfied both in regard to the proposals for liquidating the Standstill and for ensuring flexible administration by the Board and the local Advisory Committees. He was willing to accept the decision of the Cabinet and to support the recommendations of the Committee. It was imperative, however, that the Government should present an absolutely united front in the House of Commons.

The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries said that he was not in agreement with many of the points which had been made. In his view the danger lay in the House of Commons, which would compare the new Regulations not with the previous Regulations but with the present practice throughout the country. The problem was very largely the problem of the distressed areas. Under the scale an adolescent aged 18 to 21 would receive 8/-. This compared with 10/- now being paid in Edinburgh and Glasgow, 11/- in Lanarkshire, and 12/- in Fife. For adolescents under 18 the scale rates were also below those now paid in many Scottish areas.

^{**} The Secretary of State for Scotland said that broadly speaking he was satisfied with the figures supplied.

It was going to be very difficult indeed to persuade the House of Commons to agree to cutting these adolescents up to 3/- a week. The effect would be an enormous steepening of the Means Test. This was shown by the fact that the Minister of Labour had claimed that the benefits of the new Regulations would mainly go to older persons and to households without resources.

The basic scale for a man and wife was to be cut from 26/- to 24/-. It was true that in many areas in England 24/- was the normal figure; but in the industrial areas in Scotland it was 26/-; and it must be remembered that many of those now receiving 26/-, who might be in work when the new Regulations came into operation, would next year be applying for relief and would only get 24/-. Some of the scale allowances were worse than the cuts in transitional payment made in the crisis of 1931. For example, a single man in lodgings in 1931 received 15/3 as against 15/- under the new Regulation.

The Home Secretary had claimed that the new proposals fulfilled the Election pledges. Had he (the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries) stated at the Election what was now proposed, he doubted whether he would have been returned. The Election, however, had not been fought on this basis at all.

It was certain, of course, that the extremists would offer violent opposition to the proposals. The question was, could the Government persuade ordinary reasonable persons to accept them? When one looked at the internal position in France and Belgium one would hesitate perhaps to embark on a course which might well lead to civil commotion and possibly bloodshed in parts of the country. He quite