

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

WEDNESDAY, 28TH MAY, 1919.

Vol. 34.—No. 47.

OFFICIAL REPORT.

[UNREVISED]



CONTENTS.

QUESTIONS—Land Settlement ; The Laszlo Case ; The Royal Commission on Agriculture ; Salaries of Agricultural Commissioners ; Imperial Institute (Occupation of Exhibition Galleries).

Official Solicitor Bill—Third Reading.

Local Government (Ireland) Bill—Second Reading.

No proofs of the Daily Reports are sent. Any corrections which Peers desire to suggest in the report of their speeches for the Bound Volume should be indicated in this Daily Report, and the copy of the Daily Report containing the corrections suggested must be received by the Editor of Debates, House of Lords, within fourteen days of the date of the Debate.

LONDON :

PUBLISHED BY HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

To be purchased through any Bookseller or directly from
H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE at the following addresses:
IMPERIAL HOUSE, KINGSWAY, LONDON, W.C.2, and 28, ABINGDON STREET, LONDON, S.W.1,
87, PETER STREET, MANCHESTER ; 1, ST. ANDREW'S CRESCENT, CARDIFF ;
23, FORTH STREET, EDINBURGH ;
or from E. PONSONBY, LTD., 116, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN

Price Three Pence Net.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 28th May, 1919.

The House met at a quarter before four of the clock, The LORD CHANCELLOR on the Woolsack.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

LORD COCHRANE OF CULTS.

The Hon. Thomas Horatio Arthur Ernest Cochrane, having been created Baron COCHRANE of CULTS of Crawford Priory in the County of Fife—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

LORD WYFOLD.

Sir Robert Trotter Hermon-Hodge, Baronet, having been created Baron WYFOLD of Accrington in the County Palatine of Lancaster—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

LORD DEWAR.

Sir Thomas Robert Dewar, Baronet, having been created Baron DEWAR of Homestall in the County of Sussex—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

CLOWES SETTLED ESTATES BILL. [H.L.]

Read 2^a.

BELFAST HARBOUR BILL.

DOVER HARBOUR BILL.

BLYTH HARBOUR BILL.

BRISTOL CORPORATION BILL.

DUBLIN PORT AND DOCKS BILL.

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BILL.

NEWPORT HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS BILL.

Read 3^a, and passed.

SWANSEA HARBOUR BILL.

Read 3^a; Amendments made; Bill passed and returned to the Commons.

(D 1199)

NEWARK GAS BILL. [H.L.]

POOLE CORPORATION BILL. [H.L.]

Read 3^a and passed, and sent to the Commons.

HOUSING, TOWN PLANNING, &c., BILL.

Brought from the Commons, read 1^a; and to be printed.

PREVENTION OF ANTHRAX BILL.

Brought from the Commons, read 1^a; and to be printed.

LAND SETTLEMENT.

THE DUKE OF SUTHERLAND had the following Questions on the Paper—

To ask His Majesty's Government—

1. Whether any estimate can be formed as to how many ex-Service men will be settled on the land in a year's time in England, Scotland, and Wales, under the present Land Bills before Parliament; whether the number is considered adequate in view of the large number of applicants with agricultural knowledge.
2. How many ex-Service men will be trained and turned out yearly by the agricultural colleges and institutions, and whether the number of holdings to be established will be sufficient to supply all these men.
3. How much of the £20,000,000 provided for land settlement will be allocated to Scotland.

The noble Duke said: My Lords, it is not my intention to-day, nor is it possible, for me to enter minutely into details regarding the Questions I have put down on the Paper. It is only possible for me broadly to indicate in your Lordships' House the lines which I think should be followed in what is known as land settlement. The Land Acquisition Bill, the Housing Bill, and the Land Settlement Bill are all part and parcel of this great reform. They are so long and extensive in their measures that only the broad outlines can be examined by us in debate to-day. What I wish to ascertain is, Do the Government really believe that these measures will be amply sufficient to deal with the situation

as it arises and fully to fulfil those pledges made by the Prime Minister and other members of the Government regarding ex-Service men at the time of the last General Election ?

From studying the Bills the impression is given that their scope is a very ample one and that they will cover all the ground required, but it is often found that the practical carrying out of measures of this kind is not always up to the expectations entertained. It is an extremely important thing that the practical working of these measures should fully carry out those pledges which were solemnly made and that the ex-Service men, returning from their arduous duties either at sea or in the field, should be treated honestly and with no niggardly hand. At the present moment there is a vast amount of unemployment in this country—a state of affairs unavoidable after the great war—and it is only by the greatest despatch and determination that these difficulties and troubles can be alleviated. We must look to these Bills which cover the broad terms of land settlement to establish a contented aftermath to the great war amongst the mass of demobilised Service men; to allay Bolshevism, unrest, and disorder in its many forms; to prevent the going out of our best blood to foreign countries; and, for the well-being of the country itself, to establish a class of contented, industrious people on the soil in which they can themselves personally take an interest.

I think, however, that after the experience of this war there is no doubt that men who wish to do so should be encouraged to go out to our Colonies if they prefer such a career. Nor will they be lost to us or to the Empire. It has been proved in this war that Colonials have been as useful to us as our own sons in this country, and I should be the last to discourage land settlement in our Colonies for those who wish to go. But when they go to foreign lands, alien to the British Empire, owing to the lack of a home or opportunity in this country, then they are indeed lost to us beyond recall. Land settlement in the British Isles and emigration to our Dominions should be part and parcel of the same scheme of Empire land settlement. I think the Colonial Office is wide awake to these necessities, but the great difficulty of sea transport, already overburdened with returning and demobilising soldiers and sailors, has still to be overcome, and it

The Duke of Sutherland.

will take some time at least before there will be sufficient shipping accommodation to deal not only with the men returning to their homes but also with the would-be settlers in our Colonies overseas.

The most reactionary amongst us will, I think, admit that it is far better for the stability, contentment, and well-being of this country that the largest number possible of our fellow-countrymen should be settled on the land in a practical and business-like manner; and for those who wish to remain in this country and have acquired or are the possessors of the necessary agricultural knowledge, sufficient holdings should be made available to make them contented and reasonably prosperous. I do not for a moment suggest that complete success can attend every undertaking or that all the settlers will make a successful living out of their holdings. In a great many cases a cottage with a small area of land is better suited to the man who knows a definite trade of another kind and can follow a subsidiary employment at the same time as he cultivates his homestead. Nor is there any use imagining that by the waving of a wand a successful and prosperous community of settlers can be established all over the country, or that there will not be disappointments and bitternesses in any great undertaking of this kind. But let us try to make those disappointments as few as possible and these bitternesses rare.

Money must be lost and people must be ruined in isolated cases in all businesses of which agriculture is only a part; but let us do all in our power to limit these instances. Let us make sure, while we have a chance, that all that can be done, in fairness to everybody and to every class of the community, is being done, especially for those men who so greatly merit at any rate a future of reasonable prosperity and a decent existence. Let us ensure this also by insisting that those who are to be settled on the land are men of knowledge in their profession. Let us further see that either they can provide sufficient capital for themselves or that this is provided upon easy terms by the Government or some local authority to give them a start in their new enterprise. The sum of £20,000,000 is mentioned in the Bill to be provided for land settlement—equivalent to three days' expenses of the great war—and I do not think that a less sum could reasonably have been provided. I should like to ascertain in what way this

money will be expended; how much will go towards the providing of agricultural colleges and technical schools (which I understand in Scotland at any rate have been started); how much will be allocated to the numerous other expenses that will be entailed.

Has the Government any plans for the proportion and division of this money amongst England, Scotland, and Wales, either in proportion to the areas of the different countries or to their population or to the number of potential settlers from each country. When I make a special plea for Scotland I do not wish to diminish the amount to be given to England and Wales. I only wish to ensure that the most difficult country to settle, where in parts the worst land exists and where more capital will be required to make a start, will be adequately dealt with. Grain in the northern parts at least does not ripen until late in the autumn, and winter storms play greater havoc than they do in the English shires. Here, often a severe snowstorm will kill off half a stock of lambs, and though the summer days are long the winter days are all too short. During the last five years men from this country have gone forth either to a dreary vigil in the cold gloom of the Northern Seas, or to those parts of the world where the greatest danger to the British Empire lay. I could say the same for every part of this country, and I do not think that this sum, equivalent to three days' war expenses, can be grudged to those who, having come unscathed through the perils that beset them, wish to live a life of decent industry, properly housed, sufficiently fed, and each with their own small stake in the country in a piece of land.

The housing question is fully as important as land settlement; they march hand in hand—one is interwoven with the other. Nobody wants a good piece of land and an uninhabitable house, nor do they want a good house without any land, even if it is only a garden. I do not think, from reading the Bills and their accepted Amendments as far as they have gone, that any class is being unfairly treated or favoured. But let us not waste too much time in quibbling over Amendments and discussing details; there is the greatest need for these Bills to be carried into immediate and practical effect. If there is further delay suspicions will be aroused, and Bolshevik tendencies increased through-

out the country. Worse than this, it will drive our best men to alien lands. The Government will, I hope, ensure that within a reasonable time the full Election pledges are carried out, and with fairness to all classes concerned.

In particular one would like to know on what terms the small holdings are to be granted, and whether the machinery to be employed will be the present Board of Agriculture machinery, or, if not, what will be set up in its place. Whatever machinery is employed, it should be of the speediest. Anything out of date or cumbrous should be scrapped. The clause of the Bill that deals with loans to settlers for stocking their holdings should be made ample for all requirements. I should like to see it made compulsory on the Board of Agriculture or county council to advance the money to a settler who could show himself worthy of the trust, and not merely give them power to do so if they felt so inclined.

The French Government have been very sympathetic as regards this question. They have passed a law under which loans may be granted to military pensioners and others who have suffered by the war up to 10,000 francs each (£400), exclusive of costs and the insurance premium. The period of repayment may not exceed twenty-five years, and the borrower may not be more than sixty years old when the last instalment is paid. The interest on the loan, exclusive of the sinking fund, is at the privileged rate of only 1 per cent. Moreover, realising that farms often do not give their maximum yield until after a certain number of years, and also that some of the applicants will sometimes lack means to enable them to make their first annual payments, provision is made to allow that the annual repayments may be unequal in amount in the first three years, or that, exceptionally, the payment of the first year's instalment may be deferred until the fourth year of the loan. The French Government has, for several generations past, taken a particular interest in the agricultural system and policy of their country, whilst in this country in the past not very great interest has been taken in these matters. Let us hope that in the future as much or more may be done, as is being done by the French Government for their returned soldiers and sailors.

In the last place I should like to mention what I think is a *sine qua non* for successful

settlement in England. In the first place a sufficient area, not less than 25 acres, is required to enable a man to obtain a very moderate livelihood for himself and his family; the land to be such as will readily respond to capable and generous treatment, and be mainly composed of well-established pasturage. On the land should be situate a house that has not less than three bedrooms, also out-buildings sufficient for the equipment of the little farm. The holding should be within reach of a large town or other centre of population possessing a market, where the smallholder and the customer could be brought into direct contact without the intervention of the middle man. The occupier should be a man of thorough experience in the cultivation of land and the management of live stock. From the latter item he should certainly derive the greater part of the profits on which he and his family must live, and also the manure necessary for the upkeep of the land. He must possess judgment, and be able correctly to price for sale or purchase any farm produce or live stock he may require or wish to dispose of—a *desiderata* partly the result of natural aptitude and partly an acquired one. Finally, he must have sufficient capital thoroughly to stock his little farm and to carry on until his first season's produce from crops and live stock is marketable.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (LORD ERNLE): My Lords, we have listened to a most interesting speech from the noble Duke, who has already shown in the most practical way his great interest in a subject which I am sure is very much in all our thoughts at the present moment. I owe the noble Duke a debt of gratitude, because he was good enough to withdraw a property which he had put up for auction and allow the Board to buy it for small holdings by special arrangement. The noble Duke has also placed the Secretary for Scotland under a debt of gratitude by a gift, for the purpose of afforestation and land settlement, of 12,000 acres, and also by allowing a farm to be sold to the Board by special treaty rather than by public auction. On all these grounds I can assure the noble Duke that what he has said has fallen upon a grateful ear, and his many suggestions will be welcomed.

I am not sure that it would be proper, at a time when the various Land Bills are

The Duke of Sutherland.

still under discussion and when it is uncertain in what shape they will reach your Lordships' House or emerge from it, to discuss the actual terms of those Bills. The question asked is one that, strictly speaking, it is very difficult for me to answer. The noble Duke asks whether any estimate can be formed as to how many ex-Service men will be settled on the land in a year's time in England, Scotland, and Wales, under the present Land Bills before Parliament. I think the House, and the noble Duke, would like to know what has been done in the direction of finding land for ex-Service men. In England and Wales the number of applications for land that we have received from ex-Service men is approximately 12,000, and the acreage for which they ask is 218,000; that is, an average of just over 18 acres for each applicant. Our experience at the Board has been that men are rather prone to ask for more land than they really want or have capital to manage, and a certain number of the applicants undoubtedly apply not for self-supporting holdings but for cottage holdings, with perhaps from 1 to 3 or 4 acres attached; in other words, they mean to depend for their livelihood not entirely on the proceeds of their holding but to supplement their wages by what they raise from their holding.

As regards the number of applicants who have the necessary knowledge and experience and can command a certain amount of capital—and it is only to men of those classes that we now offer small holdings—it appears that the proportion of well-qualified applicants is very large. It is something like 88 per cent. of the total number of applicants who up till now the county councils have interviewed and approved. Probably that high average will not altogether be maintained, but it is evident that a large number of men of energy, enterprise, and vigour, possessing capital, experience, and knowledge, are anxious to go into the agricultural industry as smallholders. That is a very desirable thing. If you take the number of applicants at 12,000, and assume for the sake of example that 10,000 of them are approved and have to be provided with 12 acres of land apiece—the average for small holdings in England and Wales being 13 acres, and a number of the small holdings for which they apply being of the small cottage-holding type, that would be a fair average to take—the total quantity of land required

for the applicants whom we expect to be approved is 120,000 acres.

Up to the present time the county councils in England and Wales have acquired this year—that being the first date at which we were able to go to work, owing to the necessity during the war of all the financial wealth of the country being devoted to the purposes of that war; therefore it is only from January 1 that we have been at work, and that not under the new Bills but under the existing powers—the county councils have acquired 23,000 acres, and the Board themselves have acquired 12,260 acres, making a total of 35,260 acres. At the same time negotiations are in progress by the county councils for the acquisition of a further area of approximately 80,000 acres, and the Board are in negotiation for some 10,000 acres in addition. If all this land is obtained it would approximately meet the present demand, which, as I said before, is 120,000 acres. Of course, our experience is that as soon as land is forthcoming the demand increases, and also there must be provision made for the men who remain to be demobilised and who will be applicants for land.

The principal difficulty is to provide land quickly, when in England most of the land is occupied and the tenant requires a notice to quit. Still more difficult is it in Scotland, where long term leases have in many cases to run out. Unless compensation is paid to the tenants to waive their notice or break their lease then there will be a difficulty in getting land before Michaelmas, 1920, except that small portion of land on which we are able to enter at Michaelmas, 1919. We hope that in the course of the present year, with or without the new powers of the Bills which are coming before this House, we shall be able to obtain something like 80,000 acres, of which possession will be obtained at Michaelmas, 1920. Another difficulty, of course, is that until we get possession we cannot begin to build cottages. That is a very serious difficulty, and if I may break the stipulation that I made at the beginning there is a clause in the Land Settlement Bill which provides for that particular case of difficulty.

I may say, so far as Scotland is concerned, that Scotland has made considerable progress under some of the many Acts which enable the authorities to deal with the question. Under the Small Holdings

and Colonies Acts they have obtained 7,394 acres; under gifts of land, including the gift of 12,000 acres from the noble Duke which I have already mentioned, they have 12,710 acres; under the Congested Districts Act they have purchased within the last few weeks something like 17,000 acres, and they are negotiating also for land under the Small Landholders (Scotland) Act, and settlers on all these estates will be settled at the earliest possible moment, subject, of course, to the necessity of building and of obtaining possession.

The noble Duke asks me also about the training that is now being offered to the ex-Service men. There are three classes of training offered by the Board of Agriculture. One is for men of high educational qualifications—a three years' course at a University or at an agricultural college; and the men whom we want to get are men who will be scientific inquirers and carry on the work of research into the many problems of farming. A Committee of Selection has been set up, and the thirty-two scholars have already been appointed. Then there are the future farmers or bailiffs, both officers and men, the only qualification being an educational one, and no distinction naturally being made in the rank of the men admitted to the training. That is carried out through the county councils, and the men are trained for two years on the farms under careful supervision by the county education authorities and the war executive committees. Under that 713 officers and men have been approved, and of those already 368 are in training. Our numbers are limited to 1,000. We hoped to get 1,500.

Then there are men without experience or capital who want to go into agriculture as an industry. We thought that there would have been a very large number of these men. They are men who would require a certain amount of training to enable them to obtain employment at district rates of wages. We have been rather disappointed in the results. We have at present only 200 of these men in training. We have set up training centres capable of taking a great many more, but there does not seem to be a great demand for these facilities. Among our training centres is one for motor tractor driving and the management of fruit and vegetable gardens. The rest are for the ordinary manual operations of farming, and provide a course of only six weeks. Farmers are

willing at the end of that time, as we have proved by experience, to take men into their employment. I am sure that your Lordships recognise that it is no good asking a farmer to take a man who is quite ignorant how even to handle a spade or fork, because the moment he does so he is obliged to pay to that totally unskilled man the same wages that he pays to the skilled man, and this creates enormous dissatisfaction among the farmer's ordinary labourers. We have tried to get over that difficulty by giving these men a preliminary training which at least makes them capable of earning wages and of being thoroughly useful. Similar courses of training are in force in Scotland. Unfortunately I have not any figures for Scotland, but all three forms of training are in progress. There is also training given in forestry. There are about 170 officers and between thirty and forty men being trained in various parts of the United Kingdom in forestry.

As to the allocation of the £20,000,000, I have received a note from the Secretary for Scotland which is in these words—

“The noble Duke may rest assured that the provision for Scotland will be made on lines which bear comparison with the provision made for England and Wales.”

I can assure the noble Duke that from my experience of the Scottish Office that Office will be certain to obtain fair treatment from His Majesty's Government, but there is no distinct allocation by mutual arrangement between the Board of Agriculture and the Secretary for Scotland. I think something like £2,500,000 will in the first instance be considered Scotland's share of the £20,000,000. That is calculated on the ordinary footing of the division, but it is quite a loose division, and we mean to spend the money to the best advantage of both countries and for the benefit of the men who have so gallantly fought, whether they come from Scotland or from England or from Wales.

LORD LOVAT: I should like to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether I heard correctly a statement that he made. He said that they had acquired 7,000 acres roughly in small holdings, and 2,000 from gifts, and 17,000 under the Congested Districts Board.

LORD ERNLE: Yes, that is so.

Lord Ernle.

LORD LOVAT: Has the Congested Districts Board sprung into life again?

LORD ERNLE: In reply, may I read the note that I got from the Scottish Office. I am afraid that I trusted to it. The noble Lord may be more right than I am. The note says—

“Under the powers of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Act recent purchases have been made of land to the total amount of 17,000 acres.”

I will make inquiries as to whether the note is wrong. It was furnished to me by the Scottish Office, and is my only authority.

LORD LOVAT: May I ask further in regard to applicants for land. The number for England was given. Could we have the number of applicants for small holdings in Scotland? And also could the House be informed how much of the 34,000 acres that have been acquired is arable land, because to compare that with the 35,000 acres acquired by the Board of Agriculture in England might give a wholly erroneous impression. I take it that the very large proportion of the 35,000 acres acquired in England would be arable land, and, as the noble Lord has pointed out, would be suitable for settlement at the rate of 12 acres to one individual, while a considerable portion of the 34,000 acres acquired in Scotland will simply be moorland waste. Obviously, therefore, the same proportion would not hold good. If the noble Lord could give us some information on that point it would be important. I would also press that the House is entitled to have equal information as regards Scotland concerning the question of education. The noble Lord gave us the number of men trained in England. Can he give us the same information respecting Scotland?

LORD ERNLE: I very much regret that I am not in a position to supplement the information in any respect, except that funds, I am told by the Secretary for Scotland, have been provided for the practical training on farms of 150 officers or men; but I have no evidence here how many men have been trained or are applicants for training. Neither am I, I regret to say, able to dissect the figure of 34,000 acres, but I entirely agree with the noble Lord that in all probability some portion of that land is moorland waste. I very much regret that I was unable to obtain further information. I think that

it is probably due to the fact that the Secretary for Scotland is absent on business in Scotland at the present moment, and that the note which I now have was the best that could be furnished by those who represent the Scottish Office.

LORD LOVAT: What is the number of applicants?

LORD ERNLE: I am afraid there is no information as to that either.

LORD LOVAT: With your Lordships' permission I should like to press this point a little further. We in Scotland have been singularly unfortunately treated for a very long time in your Lordships' House. I am sure it is within the recollection of you all how many times those who are interested in land in Scotland have asked questions in exactly the same way as I am doing at the present time, and we have had replies from noble Lords representing various Departments, but they have not been able to give us the information about Scotland that we desired. And, if the noble Lord (Lord Ernle) will pardon me, he has not had an opportunity of studying Scottish method. We always come up against the same thing; the answer is, "We do not know; the Scottish Office has given us this answer"—and there the matter rests. On the subject of Scottish land we are always brought up by the fact that no one on the Front Bench appears to have the requisite knowledge. I would suggest to His Majesty's Government that they might ennoble some of the gentlemen who stand outside the barrier and bring them in—Peers are frequently and rapidly created—so that we might have the information that is required.

The noble Lord has stated that there is a very large number of Small Holding Bills for Scotland, and we in Scotland are quite unaware at the present time what is going to be done for the men who fought in the war. We regard the position in Scotland as most unsatisfactory. Land has been given by the noble Duke and has been offered by other individuals for hire, rent, or purchase, and as yet, I believe, the number of men settled in Scotland since the beginning of the war—I do not say could be counted on two hands but it is ludicrously small.

Efforts have been made from time to time to pretend that this is the result of

the action of the brutal landlords who will not provide the land. As your Lordships are aware, at a meeting of Members representing both sides of Parliament over a year and a-half ago an offer was made that if a settlement could only be got on non-controversial lines the land would be at once forthcoming. Nothing has been done. Meetings were held between the Secretary for Scotland sixteen months ago and representative bodies of landowners, who said again that they were prepared to put the land at the disposal of the Secretary for Scotland. A Committee was formed at the Secretary for Scotland's request, and I need hardly say that the Committee, having been formed, has never been asked to function from that day to now.

I mention these facts because it is no doubt advantageous to His Majesty's Government not to have any one on the Front Bench who can speak with knowledge of Scotland, because their action has been so extraordinarily unsatisfactory as regards the settlement of the men who fought in the war. I would suggest to my noble friend the Duke of Sutherland that he should press for answers to his Questions. I was unfortunately not here when he began his speech, and so I do not know how far he went into the points. But certainly I think he has a right to an answer to the Questions he raised as regards Scotland, and I should advise him also to add to his list of conundrums a question about the number of soldiers who fought in the war who have been settled on the land during the period of nearly five years since the declaration of war. I would also appeal to those noble Lords who represent the Opposition, and especially the Scottish Peers, to press that His Majesty's Government should be asked to have in this House more certain representation of Scottish interests, especially by persons with more information on the subject of Scottish land.

THE LASZLO CASE.

LORD WITTENHAM: My Lords, under the new Procedure recently adopted by your Lordships' House, I ventured to put an asterisk opposite my Question as indicating that on this occasion I have no desire whatever to raise a debate, or indeed to make any speech. I ask my Question for purposes of information only. If I do say a word after the answer that the Government will make, it will only be by way of

what is called in another place a Supplementary Question in order to elucidate what the Government may state in answer to the Question on the Paper. I venture to read my Question. It is to ask His Majesty's Government whether Laszlo had become a naturalised British subject at the time when he committed certain offences against the safety of the Realm, and if so, why he was not tried for high treason instead of being interned; whether Laszlo is now interned; has his case come before the Committee appointed to deal with the question of the denaturalisation of enemy aliens naturalised after the commencement of the war, and if so, has the Committee reported on his case, and when will the Report dealing with his case, and the other cases referred to it, be published.

VISCOUNT DEVONPORT: My Lords, before the Question is answered may I supplement it by asking a further question which bears upon it. It is, Whether Laszlo applied to the Home Office for a public hearing in order that he might have an opportunity of answering in public the charges which are made against him, and what is the decision of the Government in relation to that request?

THE EARL OF JERSEY: My Lords, the noble Lord who has asked this Question has reminded your Lordships that he has very considerably placed an asterisk against it, and I will therefore act on the suggestion which is thereby conveyed and endeavour to reply to the Question as concisely and specifically as it is in my power to do. Mr. Laszlo was naturalised on August 29, 1914, and the question of the revocation of the certificate granted to him has been referred to the Certificates of Naturalisation (Revocation) Committee. The case has not yet been heard by the Committee, and the Secretary of State would prefer to defer his decision as to publishing any Report which the Committee may make until the Report is in his hands. But, as at present advised, he is disposed to publish all Reports of the Committee in cases under Section 7 of the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914.

As Mr. Laszlo's case is now under judicial consideration it would be improper to discuss the matters raised in the earlier part of the noble Lord's Question, but I must not be taken as admitting the accuracy of the noble Lord's suggestion

Lord Wittenham.

that there was evidence on which Mr. Laszlo could have been put on his trial for high treason. The internment order against Mr. Laszlo remains in force, but he was released on parole some time ago in view of the serious state of his health, as shown by medical certificates, and was placed under strict conditions and supervision, to which he is still subject.

With regard to the Supplementary Question which the noble Viscount has put, I am informed that Mr. Laszlo has asked to have his case heard in public. Therefore the answer to that part of the question is in the affirmative. I am not in a position to state what the Government's decision on the point may be. If the noble Viscount wishes to ask any further question I am afraid I must ask for notice. That is all the information that it is in my power to give at the present moment.

LORD WITTENHAM: May I ask whether it is not the fact that the question of Laszlo's guilt or otherwise, arising out of certain acts which he committed after the date of his naturalisation, is not now before the Committee at all? May I ask whether it is not the fact that all that is before the Committee is whether or not he ought to be naturalised? May I therefore ask the noble Earl whether he does not think that his answer, at any rate to that question, is insufficient, and whether he does not agree that I am entitled to an answer to the question why Laszlo, having admittedly committed certain offences against the safety of the Realm, was not put upon his trial for high treason, exactly in the same way as a British subject would have been if he had committed those acts? Secondly, would the noble Earl tell me whether Laszlo is now interned, and, if he is, whether he is in an internment camp, or whether he is still in the nursing home where he was at any rate this time last week? Thirdly, can the noble Earl say whether he has been able to feel the pulse of the Home Office sufficiently to tell us when the Report from the Committee dealing with this case is likely to be received?

LORD WEARDALE: My Lords, before the noble Earl answers the Supplementary Questions I may, perhaps, be permitted to express my great sorrow that my noble friend should have put this Question in the particularly vindictive and unfair terms in

which he has placed it upon the Paper. Mr. Laszlo is well known as a very distinguished artist. He has for a long time enjoyed the friendship and the respect of large numbers of people in this country; and what the noble Lord suggests by his Question is that Mr. Laszlo has been found guilty of an offence which amounts to high treason. I venture to say that the noble Lord has not a tittle of evidence on that point; that he has not the smallest ground for making a suggestion of that kind; and I therefore state that any noble Lord who takes advantage of his position here to make such suggestions about a very distinguished public man is doing a thing which I, for one, deeply deplore in the interests of the dignity of this House and the chivalry of English gentlemen.

Mr. Laszlo no doubt may or may not have been, for all I know, indiscreet in certain of his utterances. With regard to that the Committee or the Commission—I forget what it is—which is considering his case will doubtless give an expression of its opinion; but to attempt to pre-judge their decision by suggestions of this kind is, I think, a violation of all proper dignity, and I must protest absolutely against the action which the noble Lord has taken. I know very well that unfortunately a good deal of ill-feeling has been introduced into this case by a certain section of the artistic world. There are artists who are not particularly pleased to see the pictures of a foreign artist sold at much higher prices than their own, and I think that artistic jealousy has in a great degree prompted this virulence of sentiment with regard to Mr. Laszlo. What I ask is that, now we are approaching as I trust a composition of our hostility, when we are attempting to allay the angry feeling which the war has excited, we should at least approach these questions with a wholly different attitude. Let Mr. Laszlo's case be judged upon its merits; and I for one, knowing Mr. Laszlo well, can say that no one will be more glad than he will be to see all the facts published to the world and to refute entirely the suggestions of the noble Lord.

LORD WITTENHAM: In spite of my having put an asterisk against my Question, your Lordships will understand that after the observations of the noble Lord—

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE BROKE: Order, order.

LORD WITTENHAM: I do not wish to offend against the new rule. But I think every noble Lord must agree that there is nothing in the Question itself which might not fairly have been asked by any noble Lord. I ask why Mr. Laszlo was not tried, and then my noble friend opposite casts an aspersion upon my character; yet, because I have put an asterisk against my Question in order to save a discussion, a noble Lord says "Order, order," which means that I am precluded by my own act from replying to a personal aspersion upon my character.

THE EARL OF JERSEY: My Lords, I do not know whether it is your wish that I should reply to the specific Supplementary Questions that were put to me by the noble Lord, but with your permission I will endeavour to do so. I do not propose to make any observations whatever on the general subject. I will confine myself to the specific questions asked by the noble Lord to which he did not think my answers were adequate. He first of all asked a definite question which I thought I had answered—namely, whether Mr. Laszlo was now interned. I have already said that he was released on parole owing to his health, and that he is not at the present time in an internment camp, but that he remains "under strict conditions and supervision."

The noble Lord then asked whether I could say at what date the Reports of the Committee would be published, assuming that they are published. I am not able to answer that question. I have no information as to when the Reports will be available. As to the other question which the noble Lord pressed, why Mr. Laszlo was not tried for high treason instead of being interned, I can only repeat what I said in the beginning: that as the case is at the present time under consideration it would not be proper to judge it on either side; and I think that observation will apply equally to those who defend Mr. Laszlo and to those who hold the opposite view. I do not think it would be proper for me to express any further opinion on the matter.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON
AGRICULTURE.

LORD BLEDISLOE: My Lords, I rise to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he can now state the

constitution of and the terms of reference to the Royal Commission on Agriculture, and the date upon which it will commence its sittings. In putting this Question to the noble Lord, I may remind your Lordships that it was about two months ago that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Agriculture announced in the other House the intention of the Government to set up a Royal Commission to deal, apparently, with the economic conditions of the industry both present and prospective. Two months have elapsed since then, and so far no announcement has been made either as to the constitution of this proposed Commission, or its terms of reference, or when its sittings would commence. In the meantime the problem, which is a very urgent one, remains unsolved, and there is a growing restlessness, I think you will agree, amongst the farming community as to what their economic future will be in the event of the minimum wage fixed by the Central Wages Board for the agricultural labourer going steadily up—as indeed it is at the present time—without, apparently, any relation to the future prices of the products of that labour.

I am sure that the noble Lord realises that this is an urgent matter, and I do not think it is unreasonable to ask, this being so, that an announcement should be made either in this House or in the other House at the earliest possible moment as to what the intentions of the Government in this matter are. There is a growing impression—which I hope is not well founded—that the Commission itself will be constituted very much on the lines of the Coal Commission, and that it will be allowed to roam at large over all sorts of subjects connected with the tenure of land, the legal settlement of land, the relations between landowners and tenant farmers on the one hand and between tenant farmers and labour on the other, and, indeed, that they will be allowed to deal with that most difficult of all questions, the respective merits of private ownership of agricultural land and its nationalisation. I venture to hope that the noble Lord opposite will be able to give us some definite and reassuring statement to-day so that the feeling of unrest which is prevalent now amongst the agricultural community may cease, and that some definite announcement may shortly be made as to what the Government's agricultural policy is.

Lord Bledisloe.

LORN ERNLE: My Lords, I regret to say that, though I recognise the importance of having a definite statement as to the scope of the reference, the composition of the Commission, and the date of its first meeting made as speedily as possible, the matter is still under discussion. I hope, however, that I am going to Paris to see the Prime Minister on this matter either on Friday or early next week, and that I may then be able to report something quite definite to the noble Lord.

SALARIES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONERS.

LORD BLEDISLOE: My Lords, the other Question that I desire to put to the noble Lord is whether he will state the amount of the salaries about to be paid to the new Commissioners and Sub-Commissioners of the Board of Agriculture; and whether, in fixing these amounts, regard is being had to the responsible character of their duties and the altered value of money.

I am glad to note that an advertisement has appeared recently in the leading organs of the Press, including agricultural journals, asking for those suitably qualified to apply for the posts to which I refer in this Question, and the salaries which are set out there are from £600 to £800 for the Commissioners and from £350 to £450 for the Sub-Commissioners, together with travelling and subsistence expenses. These gentlemen are expected, as announced in this advertisement, to have a thorough training in estate management—and how very few of our estate agents have a thorough training in estate management—and practical experience in the valuation of agricultural land. It is further suggested that they would receive particular consideration if they possessed the Fellowship of the Surveyors Institution. I may remind your Lordships that £600 a year, which is the salary suggested as the minimum for a Commissioner, has a value of no more than £400 compared with the value before the war, and as to the £350 suggested for the Sub-Commissioners, it would not have more than a pre-war value of £200.

Unless the maximum figures are those which are going to be decided upon by the Board—and they are none too large—I venture to suggest that the noble Lord will not get the sort of officers who will be sufficiently well qualified to carry out the

very important duties that these men will be called upon to perform. It should be borne in mind that these gentlemen, in the course of their delicate as well as difficult duties, will be brought up against estate agents, presumably well-paid estate agents—and you cannot get a good estate agent unless you pay him well nowadays—many of them with long practical experience, and if you are going to ask a man receiving no more than the equivalent of £200 a year before the war to carry out these duties and be able to succeed in discussion, and possibly in somewhat hostile discussion, with the representatives of the larger landowners in this country, I think that the lack of qualification of some of these men will very soon become apparent. Of course these men, being temporary officers as I understand, will not even be entitled to a pension. If there were a Government pension to look forward to possibly you might, by these small salaries, attract into the service of the State rising, enterprising young men belonging to the valuers' profession; but without a pension I am rather afraid the noble Lord will not get men of sufficient practical experience to carry out efficiently the very difficult and delicate work they will be expected to perform.

LORD ERNLE: My Lords, the Question which the noble Lord has asked me was an addition to his previous Question that was down on the Paper, and I noticed it only as I was leaving my office to come here to answer Questions. The idea which the Board of Agriculture has is to arrange these outdoor technical officers in grades corresponding to those of the indoor staff, and we look forward in time to making all the clerks in the Board of Agriculture pass through one of these outdoor grades. That is the ultimate object which we have in view.

As to the salaries of these Commissioners, that of those who are in Grade 2 of the Civil Service—that is to say, those who would correspond with principal clerks and officers—is £850 a year. In Grade 3, which corresponds with the first-class clerks, it is £600 to £800, and in Grade 4, which corresponds generally with second-class clerks, £350 to £450. We have pointed out, in our application for the grants necessary to pay these salaries, that as these gentlemen will enter at a somewhat later age in some instances than the ordinary entries into the Civil Service, we

should be able to give them the maximum for their grade at once.

It is quite true, as the noble Lord said, that these officers will have temporary appointments only. That is to say, they are restricted in the case of the Land Settlement Bill by the duration of the powers of that Bill and in the case of the Corn Production Act by the duration of the powers of that Act. But we hope that for those who prove themselves of first-rate ability we shall be able to obtain permanent appointments, possibly carrying with them pensions. As to the Question whether we shall be able to get the class of man whom we want, I am grateful to the noble Lord for his warning, but I very much hope that we shall be able to do so. If we cannot secure the class of man that we want, then we shall have to apply to be allowed to pay higher salaries.

THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE.

LORD ISLINGTON rose to ask His Majesty's Office of Works in how many weeks or months the Exhibition Galleries of the Imperial Institute will be vacated by the clerical staffs of the Effects Branch of the War Office and of the Machine Gun Corps, in order that the exhibits of the resources of the Colonies, now stored in private houses in South Kensington, may again be available for commercial and public use.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, I desire very briefly to supplement the Question that I have placed upon the Paper, because I wish to express the hope that my noble friend who answers for the Office of Works will be able to give a definite and quite clear answer. I also desire to explain to your Lordships that the continued occupation by the clerical staffs of the War Office of these important and large Exhibition Galleries of the Imperial Institute is not only causing serious inconvenience to the administrative work of the Institute but is increasingly conducing towards commercial injury to Imperial interests. As my Question shows, the space in those galleries which are now occupied by these two staffs has necessitated the removal of very important collections of Colonial exhibits, which at this time are of the greatest possible importance in trade interests and in educational interests for future trade in the metropolis.

The exhibits are at present stored in three houses close to the Imperial Institute and are in cases, and therefore cannot render the use that they would were they in the galleries. It would appear, unless there is some good reason of which I do not know, that the very houses which are now accommodating these exhibits might well accommodate the staff that is now in occupation of the Imperial Institute. It has been said, I believe, by the authorities when the question has been put to them that the galleries at no distant period of time will be again available for the Institute, but that this cannot take place until other accommodation has been found. I believe it is suggested that buildings are to be erected in the suburbs for the accommodation of these staffs. I am, of course, asking now for the accommodation of the Institute, but I am bound to say (and I am sure your Lordships will share the feeling) that I hear with considerable concern that more buildings are going to be erected for clerical staffs, and I hope an opportunity will be given at an early date for the public to be fully informed on this additional expenditure and full justification given for it.

I urgently put this Question in the interests of the Imperial Institute, because it was very definitely undertaken by the Minister in charge of the Office of Works that directly the emergencies of the war were concluded these places in the galleries would once more be returned to the Institute. Now many months have passed and we are still without that space, and at present no definite undertaking is given for an early occupation. I hope that my noble friend who is charged with answering questions for this Office will be able to give me a precise answer, and one which will reassure those interested in the Imperial Institute that these spaces will at an early date be once more returned to their proper purpose.

LORD STANMORE: My Lords, I regret to say that it is quite impossible for me to give a definite date by which time the Exhibition Galleries at the Imperial Institute can be vacated by the War Office staffs. These galleries are at present occupied by 1,092 clerks of the War Office Effects Branch and by 350 clerks of the Machine Gun Corps Pay Office; these 350 clerks are part of a total staff of 1,700 who are accommodated in this neighbourhood. Possibly some relief may be

Lord Islington.

given in three months' time, when some portion of the hutting now being erected at Neasden will be completed. I hope that it will be possible to move the 350 clerks of the Machine Gun Corps Staff from the galleries.

My noble friend suggested that it might be possible for the houses in which the exhibits are at present being taken care of to be used for the purposes of the staff, but in the case of the War Office Effects Staff it must be of great importance that the whole of the staff should be in one building—it must greatly expedite the work. The House is aware that the First Commissioner of Works is doing everything possible to secure the release, not only of the Imperial Institute, but of the other Museums and Galleries at the very earliest possible date. If it is found possible to carry into effect the scheme which the First Commissioner has prepared it is confidently hoped that the Imperial Institute buildings will be vacated within six months.

VISCOUNT HARCOURT: My Lords, it is not intended as any reflection on my noble friend opposite if I rise to say that I consider the statement he has made to-day profoundly unsatisfactory and even alarming to those who have the interest of the Imperial Institute and other museums at heart. There is really no activity being shown in clearing out these redundant staffs from buildings which are extremely necessary for other and vital purposes. I know very well that there is no hope. It is admitted, indeed, by the Office for whom my noble friend replies that no relief can be given to the Imperial Institute for at least six months—until new buildings (which are alarming in themselves) are raised in the suburbs.

There is only one cure for this. The Prime Minister and the Cabinet, if there is such a thing to-day, should give definite instructions to these inflated Departments that within a few weeks their staffs must be reduced by 25 per cent., and that within three months they must be reduced by 50 or 75 per cent. Such an order from the Cabinet might possibly be obeyed; if the Cabinet cannot obtain obedience to their orders they must find other methods for governing the country. Until strong measures are taken with these inflated Departments, whose natural inclination and anxiety is to remain like limpets on

the soil they occupy, there is no hope for this country of getting rid of the swollen bureaucracy under which we are suffering.

OFFICIAL SOLICITOR BILL. [H.L.]

Read 3^a (according to Order) and passed, and sent to the Commons.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL,

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

VISCOUNT PEEL: My Lords, the object of the Bill is to apply the system of proportional representation to the election of all local authorities in Ireland—county councils, rural district councils, borough councils, urban councils, poor law unions, and town commissioners. Your Lordships will know that the system has worked very well in the case of Sligo, and owing to the peculiar political circumstances of Ireland it is thought desirable to extend the system to local authorities in that country. I do not know whether your Lordships take a great interest in the details of local government in Ireland, but I may say that nearly all these clauses are merely ancillary to the general principle, and introduce as little change as possible. They only carry the general principle of the Bill into effect. Among other things, fresh areas have to be arranged, and they will be defined by the Local Government Board in Ireland, in order that the system may work fairly in the larger electoral areas.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.—
(*Viscount Peel.*)

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I am delighted to find that this Bill has reached your Lordships' House. It is an excellent one, and will give a chance for respectable people who really have a stake in the country to be represented on these local bodies. It is well known to us who live regularly in Ireland that a certain body of men, whom I call republicans, were determined to capture the whole of the local bodies in Ireland if they possibly could. Under this Bill there is at all events a chance, by proportional representation, of respectable citizens, and I hope of loyal citizens, in Ireland being elected on these bodies. I therefore welcome the Bill with all my heart. I know that there is a feeling against it in Belfast, but in the South and West we appreciate the Bill immensely.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (LORD BIRKENHEAD): My Lords, as a very old supporter of proportional representation, may I be forgiven if I add a few observations. Like the noble Earl who has just spoken, whose contribution is very valuable having regard to what was said in another place, I welcome every application of the principle of proportional representation. I welcome it in municipal affairs and in national affairs, and I profoundly deplore that the most sagacious lead, as I think, given by your Lordships to another place in a much larger application a few months ago, was not accepted and adopted by them.

The observations made by the noble Earl who has just sat down will find an echo in many breasts, because there are many of us who have long since clearly reached the conclusion that our democratic institutions cannot efficiently or even safely be worked unless we provide that the assemblies called together, whether municipal or national are really accurate reflections of public opinion. There is no other method except proportional representation which can secure that result. Those of us who are concerned that there should be the most exact obtainable correspondence between the assemblies which claim to represent the people and the people they actually represent, will never cease our exertions until we have obtained, both in municipal and national institutions, the working of the only system which can secure that result—namely, proportional representation. As a small instalment, I welcome this Bill profoundly.

THE EARL OF SELBORNE: My Lords, it is with great pleasure that I have heard what the Lord Chancellor has said. Indeed I cannot but think that if he had not, most unfortunately, before the question of proportional representation became critical between the two Houses, been sent to America on State business, his influence might have led to a better judgment in another place; because I do not think that anybody who has dispassionately considered the proceedings of last year can think otherwise than this, that the House of Commons as a whole took a most narrow and short-sighted view of a great public question, and that the Government took an attitude, first of all in this House and then in the House of Commons, which defied even the ingenuity and courage of

my noble friend Lord Curzon adequately to defend and explain in this House. That the Government themselves now come forward with this extremely important contribution—with a proposal for the application of proportional representation to all matters of local government in Ireland—must be very gratifying to those like my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack, and to those who are proud to be associated with him in this matter in this House. That is all I have to say about this particular aspect, though it is a most important aspect of this Bill.

As I had the misfortune to be out of the House when the Second Reading of the Bill was moved by the Government, I should like to ask my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack what are the proposals of the Government with regard to future stages of this Bill. As he knows, I am the last person to be hostile to the principle of such a Bill as this, but I and my friends feel that it should be carefully considered by the House, and we are confident that it has been delayed many weeks in the House of Commons. Why is it suddenly brought up here with an intimation, after all this delay, that your Lordships are to have no opportunity adequately to consider it? Your Lordships are rather wont to be extremely complacent to the House of Commons in such matters, whenever there is a real public object to be served. You will always put public convenience before the private convenience of the House; but we are very jealous of the right of this House to give proper time to the consideration of such a Bill, and unless there is a reason for the demand which is obviously paramount, and a difficulty which could not be avoided in any other way, I do not think we are prepared to hustle this Bill through in a few hours.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I do not dispute the general view put forward by the noble Earl that the delay in sending the Bill to your Lordships' House has been considerable and irritating, and it will be for your Lordships to consider what is the right course to adopt; but there are some considerations in that connection which ought to be borne in mind. The elections to which this Bill applies take place in Ireland on June 1. It is from every point of view most desirable that the corrective influence of this Bill should be exercised, if and when the elections take

The Earl of Selborne.

place. One of the clauses of this Bill postpones those elections for a consideration period, and will avoid the taking of those elections in circumstances which certainly would not secure for the minority any representation at all, and would be followed by results which I think the noble Earl would agree would be very undesirable and of a mischievous character. I am not in the least demurring to the grievance, which the noble Earl states, as to the circumstances in and the date at which the Bill comes before your Lordships, but if your Lordships will be prepared to consider the Committee stage at an early date, and so become familiar with the provisions and details of the Bill, I think it will be desired that it should pass into law with the least possible delay.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am not sure that I understand the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. I recognise the very sympathetic way in which he has spoken in answer to the observations of my noble friend, and he has always in all the speeches he has made from the Woolsack since he has been a member of your Lordships' House shown himself very forward to recognise the legitimate demands of your Lordships to have proper opportunity for the consideration of Bills. But the noble and learned Lord on the present occasion, although very sympathetic, did not quite answer my noble friend's question, because my noble friend asked him what steps the Government proposed to take with regard to the future progress of the Bill.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I omitted to do that, although I think that the noble Marquess might have inferred an answer from what I did say. It is the intention of the Government to ask your Lordships to dispose of the matter before we part for Whitsun.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Before we adjourn for the Whitsuntide recess?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Yes.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

[From Minutes of May 27.]

MINISTRY OF HEALTH BILL.

Returned from the Commons, with several of the Amendments agreed to:

Several others disagreed to, with Reasons for such disagreement: The said Reasons to be printed, and to be considered on Thursday next.

LONDONDERRY PORT AND HARBOUR
BILL. [H.L.]

Committee (which stands appointed for this day) put off *sine die*.

SHOREHAM-BY-SEA URBAN DISTRICT
COUNCIL BILL. [H.L.]

BIRMINGHAM CORPORATION TRAMWAYS
BILL. [H.L.]

WEST HARTLEPOOL CORPORATION
BILL. [H.L.]

Committed: The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

EAST HAM CORPORATION BILL. [H.L.]

Committed.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders have not been complied with in respect of the Petition for the following Bill:

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements).

Also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:

Reigate Corporation.
Chepstow Water.
Fylde Water Board.
Milford Docks.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that His Majesty had (by Commission) appointed the Viscount Haldane, the Lord Buckmaster, the Viscount Finlay, and the Lord Birkenhead, Speakers of the House, in the absence of the Lord Chancellor, the Chairman of Committees for the time being, the Earl of Halsbury, the Earl Waldegrave, the Lord Ribblesdale, the Lord Balfour, the Earl Loreburn, the Earl Beauchamp, the Lord Denman, the Lord Colebrook, the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*), the Duke of Devonshire, the Lord Herschell, the Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*), the Lord Hylton, and the Lord Stanmore: The said Commission was read.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE
(SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Report from the Committee of Selection, that the Lords following be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act, viz.:

M. Dufferin and Ava;
E. Onslow;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly.

BRITISH MERCANTILE MARINE UNIFORM
BILL. [H.L.]

Second Reading (which stands appointed for Thursday next) put off to Tuesday next.

House adjourned at ten minutes
before six o'clock.

Peers wishing to be supplied with these Daily Reports should give notice to that effect to the Printed Paper Office.

The Bound Volumes will also—in addition—be sent to those Peers who similarly intimate their desire to have them.