

1288/1292

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.
HOUSE OF COMMONS

TUESDAY, 6th AUGUST, 1918.

Vol. 109.—No. 95.

OFFICIAL REPORT.



CONTENTS.

WAR.

MONDAY, 5th AUGUST, 1918.

[Continuation of Proceedings.]

Consolidated Fund (No. 3) Bill: Read Second Time.

Petroleum Production Bill: Read Second Time; Considered in Committee; As Amended, Considered; Read Third Time, and Passed.

TUESDAY, 6th AUGUST, 1918.

Questions to Ministers.
Enemy Financial Levies.
Ireland—Committee of Intermediate Education.
Enemy Submarines—Murder of Fishermen.
Aliens—Jonas Colmer and Co.

East India Revenue Accounts: Indian Constitutional Reforms—Mr. Montagu's Statement.

Lotteries (War Charities) Bill [Lords]: Second Reading Negatived.

British Nationality and Status of Aliens Bill: Lords Amendments Considered.

Education Bill: Lords Amendments Considered.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.
Can be purchased in the manner indicated on the back of this Wrapper.

Price 3d. Net.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 5th August, 1918.

[OFFICIAL REPORT.]

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 3) BILL.

Motion made, and Question proposed,
"That the Bill be now read a second
time."

[Continuation of Official Report, from col.
1066, Monday, 5th August, 1918.]

Mr. T. WILSON: I would like to endorse what the last speaker has just said. I know of young men who joined the Army at the age of eighteen or eighteen-and-a-half who made an allotment of 6d. per day from their pay, and now after serving eighteen months or two years they will not be included in the contribution of the State. They claim, and their parents claim, that if they had served a year or eighteen months or more in the Army, and they had been contributing 6d. per day and the State had been making no contribution at all, that the State ought to take over the responsibility for the 3s. 6d. per week. It seems to me, if a boy has served twelve or eighteen months, and the only contribution that the parents have received has been the 6d. per day out of his pay, that the State ought to take over the responsibility as well as make the flat rate contribution of 5s. per week. The Financial Secretary to the War Office, in reply to a question last Thursday, said that the State could not take over the responsibility. In my opinion, they ought to do so. They will pay the flat rate of 5s. to the dependants of men who have never been to the front at all, but they refuse to contribute the 3s. 6d. which the soldier has allowed from his pay to his parents for men who have been fighting in the trenches for eighteen months. It is not fair. There is another point. Mothers who have married between the date of their son's enlistment and the date on which their sons have been killed are not recognised as persons to whom pensions should be granted. I cannot see why. I will give a case which came to my knowledge yesterday. A soldier had made his

mother an allowance of 3s. 6d. per week from his pay, and the State had allowed 9s. After the soldier enlisted, the mother got married again. Subsequently, the soldier was killed. The Government said that the only compensation to which she was entitled was £16 5s. At the time the soldier was killed, the mother was receiving 12s. 6d. per week allowance. Afterwards, the State repudiated all responsibility so far as the mother's pension was concerned. Personally, I cannot see the logic of it at all. I think the State ought to recognise that this woman is entitled to a pension. I would like to say that I am afraid that the various Government Departments cannot, or will not, recognise that their action in cases of this kind has something to do with industrial unrest. The civil workman has cases of this kind brought to his notice, and he sees that the Government are not treating equitably the parents of men who have been killed. These cases are brought to the notice of men at mass meetings.

They have undoubtedly a certain influence on the minds and the votes of men who are interested in industrial questions. If the Government would simply recognise that, and deal with the cases I have mentioned in a just and equitable manner, it would very probably avoid industrial disputes. I would press on the right hon. Gentleman the necessity of recognising the fact that men who joined the Army eighteen months ago, and who, because they were apprentices when they joined, only contributed 12s. or 14s. a week to the household expenses, and therefore on account of that their mothers or sisters or fathers were not allowed more than the allotment of the soldier, would now be contributing probably 25s. or 30s. a week to the upkeep of the home. I urge the necessity of the Government recognising that by taking over the responsibility of paying the soldiers' allotment of 6d. a day. If they would do that they would do a great deal to allay industrial unrest, and would simply be doing justice and equity to the boys or men who, under circumstances over which they had no control when they enlisted, were not contributing the same amount to the upkeep of the home as men engaged in unskilled operations. Therefore I do hope the right hon. Gentleman will give some consideration to the points I have mentioned. If he does that he will simply be doing an act of justice—I will not say generosity—to the parents of those boys who were unable,

[Mr. T. Wilson.]

at the time of their enlistment, to contribute more than a small amount to the home expenses.

Mr. SCANLAN: I do not want to delay the House for long, but I think, as the subject is a very important one, none of my hon. Friends on the Benches opposite will feel impatient if I venture to address a few words to the House. I feel certain that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen upon the Treasury Bench recognise the importance of this subject and the degree to which it interests everyone who is anxious to secure fair and just treatment for those serving and those at home who are dependent on them. There is one branch of the subject which interests me very much, and that is the position of apprentices, and the way in which they are at present treated. I agree with everything which the hon. Gentleman who last spoke said on this subject. He has stated the position so clearly that I certainly hope that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Pensions, if he is replying, will see fit to make a declaration on behalf of the Government that it is their intention to give fairer recognition to the position of apprentices whose pay, it is true, was small when they joined the Army, but who, if it had not been for the circumstances of their fighting, would be receiving wages to a very considerable amount at the present time. I wish to point out something which, in my own experience of the Pensions Ministry, deserves consideration, and I think I may ask the representative of the Pensions Ministry to pay attention to this point. I believe a great improvement in the position has been made since the Pensions Ministry was set up, but abuses are as liable to creep into the Pensions Ministry as into any other Department of the State, and I should be surprised if the Pensions Minister or his Parliamentary Secretary felt themselves immune from legitimate criticism in this House. I have known various cases in which a request is made to the Ministry of Pensions for the consideration of a case, for consideration of the claim, say, of a mother, a widow, a sister, or of some other dependent, as the case may be. The first thing that happens is something like this: A member writing to the Ministry receives a printed acknowledgement saying that the letter will receive immediate consideration. No consideration, as a matter of fact, is given to it

for, say, three months. It may be six months, because I have known cases to be so long delayed. At the end of that time the Ministry of Pensions say "We now recognise this case, and we realise that the claimant is entitled to a pension." The rate is fixed at 3s. 6d. or 5s. per week. That is not made retrospective to the date when the claim for a pension or gratuity arose. That is a flagrant injustice. We should have a declaration from the representative of the Ministry of Pensions that when such cases arise the pension or gratuity will be made retrospective. I have known several cases where a man, who was obviously of a low medical category, was taken into the Army and, after a few months, was found to be unfit for further service and discharged. When an application has been made by him for a pension he has been told that his disability was in no way due to his service with the Forces. It ought to be acknowledged as a principle by the Government and the Ministry of Pensions that once a man is accepted for service and has served a certain time—he being *ex hypothesi* and by their decision a fit man—the fact that he has become unfit after a short period of service should entitle him to a pension or gratuity, and the War Office or the Ministry of Pensions should not be able to say "Your condition was bad when you joined. Your service with the colours has had nothing to do with your present illness or incapacity." I trust that we shall have an assurance that these considerations will receive attention.

Major TRYON: I feel with regard to the question of allowances, particularly to the families of men serving overseas and also in respect to the question of apprentices, that this fact ought to be taken into account by the House. There is undoubtedly industrial unrest in the country at the time. A great deal of that unrest is caused not so much by the actual amount of the payment received, as by the very great contrast there is between what one man is receiving and what is received by another. That has been responsible for some of the strikes. But the contrast with industry is nothing compared with the contrast on a broader basis which exists between the payment given to those who are fighting for their country and those who are in munition works. Those men who are fighting will go on doing their duty whatever their pay, but it is not desirable in the interests of the

country and of justice that their families should be so much worse off than the families of men who are doing work which is not so important for the country and is very much safer. A larger increase was made recently in miners' wages, which falls on the whole community in the form of a tax through the increased price of coal. I would urge that if any future increases are to fall on the country they should not go to people at home but to the families of the men who are fighting overseas.

Mr. CARADOC REES: Under the Workmen's Compensation Act if an

apprentice gets injured and his compensation is fixed at the rate of wages he is earning at the time he is injured, when he becomes twenty-one the compensation is raised and the Court takes into consideration the amount of wages he would have been earning at the age of twenty-one. I should think the same principle might well apply to apprentices who are in the Army.

Question put, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The House divided: Ayes, 90; Noes, 26.

Division No. 79.]

AYES.

[11.29 p.m.]

Agg-Gardner, Sir James Tynte
Ainsworth, Sir John Stirling
Allen, Arthur A. (Dumbartonshire)
Amery, L. C. M. S.
Baird, John Lawrence
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick
Barnett, Capt. Richard W.
Barnston, Major Harry
Boscawen, Sir Arthur Griffith-
Bowerman, Rt. Hon. Charles W.
Bridgeman, William Clive
Bryce, John Annan
Bull, Rt. Hon. Sir William James
Cator, John
Cecil, Rt. Hon. Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Collins, Godfrey P. (Greenock)
Colvin, Brig.-Gen. Richard Beale
Cotton, H. E. A.
Craig, Col. Sir James (Down, E.)
Craig, Norman (Kent, Thanet)
Craik, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Currie, G. W.
Dalziel, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H. (Kirk'dy)
Denman, Hon. Richard Douglas
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Fell, Sir Arthur
Fisher, Rt. Hon. W. Hayes (Fulham)
Forster, Rt. Hon. Henry William
Foster, Philip Staveley
Gibbs, Col. George Abraham

Gilmour, Lt.-Col. John
Gretton, John
Gulland, Rt. Hon. John William
Haslam, Lewis
Henry, Denis, S. (Londonderry, S.)
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hope, Lt.-Col. Sir J. (Midlothian)
Jackson, Lt.-Col. Hon. F. S. (York)
Jardine, Ernest (Somerset, East)
Jones, J. Towyn (Carmarthen, E.)
Jones, Wm. Kennedy (Hornsey)
Jones, William S. Glyn- (Stepney)
Kellaway, Frederick George
Law, Rt. Hon. A. Bonar (Bootle)
Layland-Barratt, Sir F.
Lewis, Rt. Hon. John Herbert
Lloyd, George Butler (Shrewsbury)
Locker-Lampson, G. (Salisbury)
McCalmont, Brig.-Gen. R. C. A.
McNeill, R. (Kent, St. Augustine's)
Maden, Sir John Henry
Maitland, Sir A. D. Steel-
Malcolm, Ian
Marshall, Sir Arthur Harold
Munro, Rt. Hon. Robert
Newman, Sir Robert (Exeter)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease, Rt. Hon. H. P. (Darlington)
Perkins, Walter Frank
Phillips, Sir Owen (Chester)
Pryce-Jones, Col. Sir E.

Pulley, C. T.
Rea, Walter Russell
Rees, G. C. (Carnarvon, Arfon)
Richardson, Alexander (Gravesend)
Robertson, Rt. Hon. J. M.
Samuel, Rt. Hon. H. L. (Cleveland)
Samuels, Arthur W. (Dublin U.)
Sanders, Col. Robert Arthur
Scott, A. MacCallum (Bridgeton)
Shortt, Edward
Somervell, William Henry
Stewart, Gershom
Strauss, E. A. (Southwark, W.)
Terrell, Henry (Gloucester)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tryon, Capt. George Clement
Walker, Col. W. H.
Walsh, Stephen (Lancashire, Ince.)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton)
Weston, John W.
Wilson, Rt. Hon. J. W. (Worcs., N.)
Wilson, Lt.-Col. Sir M. (Bethnal Green)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wilson-Fox, Henry (Tamworth)
Wood, Sir John (Stalybridge)
Worthington-Evans, Major Sir L.
Wright, Henry Fitzherbert
Younger, Sir George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Lord E. Talbot and Mr. Pratt.

NOES.

Boland, John Pius
Crumley, Patrick
Cullinan, John
Devlin, Joseph
Doris, William
Duffy, William J.
Hackett, John
Harbison, T. J. S.
Hazleton, Richard
Joyce, Michael

Keating, Matthew
Kilbride, Denis
King, Joseph
Lundon, Thomas
M'Ghee, Richard
McNeill, J. G. Swift (Donegal, South)
MacVeagh, Jermiah
Molloy, Michael
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, J. D. (College Green)

Reddy, Michael
Scanlan, Thomas
Sheehy, David
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, Philip
Whitty, Patrick Joseph

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Hogge and Mr. Jowett.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTION BILL.

Order for Second Reading read. Motion made and Instruction proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. CURRIE: I understand that certain legal doubts have arisen as to property rights, and that these questions are all postponed. I think that is a very convenient course. I would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill to repeat an assurance given to the House some time ago, and that bears upon the proposal made earlier to introduce a system of royalties. The House turned

[Mr. Currie.]

down the proposal, and an assurance was given that no such royalties should be introduced except with the authority of the House. The Bill contained no reference to royalties but it does give power to the Ministry to issue licences.

I wish for an assurance from the Government that these licences will not be capable of being used in such a way as to introduce, without definite discussion in this House, any system of royalties whatsoever. I take it that the Minister in charge of the Bill can give such an assurance without any difficulty.

Mr. PRICE: I think that it is not very creditable to the Government that an important Bill like this should be brought forward to-night. Some time ago we had a discussion on a similar Bill for three nights in this House and that Bill was rejected. Now we have this Bill introduced, and we are asked to pass it. I do not think that that is a creditable thing. In business we should consider it dishonourable. The principle of this Bill was rejected by this House on a Division which was challenged by the Government, who issued a three-line Whip asking members to support it, and yet now at this late hour of the night we have this Bill put into our hands and the Eleven o'Clock Rule is suspended in order to have it passed. I understand that some arrangement has been come to, but so far as I am concerned I wish to enter the strongest possible protest against the way in which the Government is treating the House.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE: I desire to reinforce the protest of my hon. Friend the Member for Central Edinburgh. I wish that the Government had seen their way to bring in this Bill at an earlier stage of the Session, instead of the last moment, because it is a Bill which does need very careful consideration. I join also my hon. Friend the Member for Leith in his request that there should be a definite undertaking that certain provisions in this Bill are not to bring in royalties in any way by a side wind. This House has decided against them, and until the matter comes up for the free decision of Parliament it should not be prejudiced one way or the other, and as royalties have been rejected by the House they should not be brought in directly or indirectly by any Departmental Act. At the beginning of Clause 1 of the last Bill there was a declaration in very simple words

that His Majesty's Government should have the exclusive right of searching for and boring for and getting petroleum within the United Kingdom. That is a plain statement, not of the right of the Crown to petroleum, but of the exclusive right of the Crown to bore for petroleum. There is a very considerable distinction between the two. I am not saying that that position may not be involved in the first Clause of the new Bill, but I regret that it was not continued, because if it had been continued any doubts on the subject would have been removed. There are various other matters which I might mention, but they are rather Committee points, and I would join in the appeal which my hon. Friend the Member for Leith has made, that we should not have in this Bill petroleum royalties brought in by a Departmental act, directly or indirectly.

Captain BARNETT: My hon. Friend the Minister of Blockade, in introducing this Bill, expressed the hope that he had avoided all controversial questions. He has certainly, in drafting this Bill, removed many causes of controversy. He has postponed until after the War the question whether there is property in oil, or if there is, whether it belongs to the owners of the land on which the bore happens to have gone through, or whether the adjoining owners have any claim, or whether the discoverer of the oil is the person entitled to it. That question has been removed to the happier times when my right hon. Friend the Minister of Reconstruction will be deciding whether these questions of *meum et tuum* will be governed by the Ten Commandments, or by some more modern code. While all of those questions have been left for consideration after the War, I feel bound to say that those of us in this House who are interested in petroleum feel a great unrest and disquiet at the slow progress that is being made in developing the home supplies of petroleum. Here we are, at the beginning of the fifth year of the War, and practically nothing has been done to develop the supplies of oil which are known to exist in this country. This is a Bill for drilling for petroleum. That is one method of getting it, but whether it is the best method of utilising the labour and the material which are available now is a problem which gravely exercises the minds of those who are most interested in petroleum. There are quantities of sub-

stances which will yield petroleum by distillation. One of the difficulties which we have in Bills of this sort is to know exactly where they emanate from and on whose advice the Government is acting. There is a mysterious Petroleum Executive which is supposed to look after these things, and when the Petroleum Bill was introduced last October it was backed by the Petroleum Executive, the Colonial Minister's name was on the back of it, and the Board of Trade was the Government Department which was to grant the licences for boring for petroleum. Now, there is a change in the kaleidoscope, and we find that the Bill is backed by the Ministry of Munitions, and if anything were to happen to this measure and a third incarnation of the Petroleum Bill were to come forward, we should not be surprised to find that the Stationery Office or the Shipping Controller was the competent authority. The Petroleum Executive works in a mysterious way. We do not know what the present position of affairs is; only at intervals we have measures of this kind brought forward, which do not seem to have been fully thought out. We ask ourselves what has happened to the Petroleum Research Department in this country, which, under a geologist of European reputation, was engaged in inquiring into these matters of petroleum research. That Department seems, to judge from a reply given by my hon. Friend the Member for Hereford (Mr. Hewins) the other day, to have disappeared into thin air, but instead of it we have another Department, called the Mineral Oil Department, which seems to produce anything but mineral oil. It has taken the supplies of cannel coal in this country, which are intended for the production of petroleum; it has sent them to the gasworks, and it is producing there something that certainly is not mineral oil. The petroleum goes up in flame at the high temperature of distillation, and the petrol, the motor spirit, is absolutely lost, and the product of this gasworks distillation is something that might be very useful with which to make roads, but which will certainly not have much value as fuel for the Navy.

What are we told about? We have had a report this last week from the Committee presided over by the Marquis of Crewe, and we are told that that material produced at the gasworks has been subjected to tests at the naval depot at Haslar, and that it is proved that with a

certain admixture of petroleum it is useful as a fuel. That is equally true of mud. If you do not use too much mud, and if you use enough petroleum, you will get a compound which can be used as a fuel. But my submission is that we are neglecting the means of getting the petroleum that are to our hand in the distillation of these substances which exist in large quantities in this country, and we are going in for a policy of tapping for oil. Petroleum mining is a very speculative form of mining, and to look for petroleum with a drill in this country is what is called wild-cattling. I have done some wild-cattling by drilling myself in various parts of the world, not without success, but it is one thing to drill for oil in a country where petroleum is found already in large quantities and it is another thing to drill for oil in this country. You may come to a new district, put down your bore, and you may find oil in large quantities, or you may not, and the odds are that you may not. It is quite another thing to put down your bore in a country where the existence of petroleum in commercial quantities is a matter of the gravest possible doubt and to hope for the results which seem to be hoped for by the promoters of this Bill. You cannot dogmatise on these matters. I remember a case in which an undertaking with which I was associated decided to put down or bore at a place where the greatest geologist in Europe said there was no oil. Indeed, he went so far as to say he would drink all the oil to be got there. He was a German, and his capacity for drinking was probably large, but the first well we put down produced a thousand tons a day, which would have been rather too much for his consumption. But that was a case of wild-cattling in a country where every few miles you got an oil field, and when you propose to drill in this country and to expend labour and material which are more valuable now than money, you have got really to ask yourselves this question: Can we use that labour, or can we use that material, for better effect?

While I should be sorry to see this Bill refused a Second Reading to-night, I hope that before it goes through its final stages the Minister in charge will give us his assurance that there is to be no diversion of labour for the work of distilling oil from cannel coal, and that there is to be no diversion of material either. Do not let us grasp at the shadow and lose the sub-

[Captain Barnett.]

stance. In introducing this Bill, my hon. Friend said that the main object of the measure was to protect oil pools by preventing indiscriminate and wasteful boring. I do not believe that that is the real motive. I think the real motive of this Bill is to give security of tenure to certain people with whom the hon. Gentleman's Department have been negotiating. We want to know what this firm, which is going to spend over £100,000 in wild-cattling in this country, is going to get for it. We are not philanthropists, and we want to know the conditions of the bargain that is being made with these people, because there is nothing whatever that can be done under this Bill that could not be done under the Defence of the Realm Regulations. The only thing that we get here is security of tenure after the War. [Mr. MACVEAGH: "Where do we get it?"] We want to know, and I think the House is entitled to know, what the position is, and what bargain is being struck with this firm if they are to have a monopoly. I wish them well of their monopoly, and I hope they will succeed in finding petroleum. I myself should not be too hopeful of it, but I put this point most strongly to my hon. Friend who is in charge of the Bill, that he will give an assurance to the House that if this Bill is passed into law there will not be a single ton of material taken away that could be utilised for the purposes of the distillation of oil from cannel coal, and that there will not be any outlay diverted from that necessary purpose to this more speculative purpose. Having said that, I hope the hon. Gentleman will get the Second Reading of the Bill to-night, but that the Government will not ask now for the other stages of the Bill.

Mr. CHANCELLOR: We have already lost nine months in dealing with this subject. We are told that the object of the Bill is to prevent waste in the development of the industry in this country. The last Bill was rejected because of one Clause which it contained—a Clause which set up the system of royalties. We are told by the hon. and gallant Member in charge of this Bill that it reserves all these questions of ownership in the oil, and that it is not intended to create any new vested interests pending the settlement of this question. That I take to be a pledge that the Bill will prevent negotiations or agreements of any kind

between the owners of the land and the discoverers of the oil, involving any payment of royalties which in their turn would impose a permanent burden on the industry and a permanent addition to the cost of the oil. We are all agreed as to the desirability of getting petroleum wherever it can be found, and even the last hon. Member who spoke—hostile as he seemed to be to this measure—agreed that we should try to make ourselves independent in this country of foreign supplies of this important article. I think this Bill should be allowed to go through on the understanding that no new interests are created, and all these disputed questions are postponed for settlement until after the War. On these lines I support the Second Reading of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMSON: I regret that the motion for the Second Reading of this Bill has been brought on at this late hour. The subject is worthy of being discussed at much greater length than is possible now. Before we agree to the Second Reading there are several questions I would like to put to the Minister in charge. As already stated, we rejected the Petroleum Bill in October last because it maintained the principle of royalties, and I am confident that if this Bill had embodied a similar provision it would have shared the fate of its predecessor. Indeed, it is just possible it may meet the same fate unless the right hon. Gentleman in charge is prepared to make perfectly clear the intentions of the Government on this subject. I want first to ask as to Clause 2, which lays it down that the Minister of Munitions, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, may grant licences to search and bore for oil, etc., to such persons and on such terms as he may think fit. I want to be told clearly what are the powers which this Clause confers on the Minister of Munitions. Is the power to grant royalties included? That is a point on which the House desires an assurance. In the next place, I should like to know if it will be possible, in the event of this Bill becoming law, for the landlord to apply for damages under the Defence of the Realm Act in consequence of having lost his right to mining royalties? These are points which, I think, require to be cleared up before we grant the Bill a Second Reading. I am at one with the Government that we ought to do everything in our power to test the oil-bearing possibilities

of the country. As a matter of fact, they ought long ago to have been tested, and doubtless would have been if the question of royalties had not been there. The hon. Member who spoke a while ago seemed to think that here was very little chance of petroleum being got in this country. It is just possible that though there may not be much to be obtained in the form that he had in mind, I am certain of this that a considerable quantity of oil could have been secured had the right steps been taken long before now. That would have been a very useful thing for the country. It would not only have kept money in the country, but it would have saved shipping transport. The House, I think, would have been quite willing to give a Second Reading to this Bill if they can be assured that the question of royalties is entirely eliminated, and that the powers of the Bill to be vested in the Minister of Munitions are of such a character that he cannot grant royalties to anyone whose land may be tapped for petroleum purposes. I should like also for him to assure the House that the landlord, under the Defence of the Realm Act, is not able, by a side-wind, to get any until the question comes before the House, and, as he pointed out on his First Reading speech, before the House decides whether or not the royalties are to be paid.

Mr. WRIGHT: I should like to join in the protest that is being made at taking a Bill as important as this at this late hour and in so thin a House. I approach the question from another different standpoint to that of the hon. Member
12.0 M. who has just spoken, and which other hon. Members have also taken. I approach this question from the point of view of the landowner. Just as the hon. Gentleman who has resumed his seat says that it is not fair to commit the Labour party to royalties to the landowner during the War, I say, from the point of the landowner, it is not fair to commit him during the War to any Act of Parliament which will permanently deprive him of any chance of showing in the Law Courts that he has a right to a royalty on mineral oil just as he has a right to a royalty on minerals. I do not believe for one moment that hon. Members below the Gangway wish to steal a march upon any interests of the country during the War, and especially on a class that one may clearly hope have, during the War, given everything and taken nothing.

In the same way landowners are quite willing that this question should be left in abeyance.

Clause 1 of the Bill provides

“No person other than a person acting on behalf of His Majesty, or holding a licence under this Act for the purpose, shall search or bore for or get petroleum within the United Kingdom.”

This takes away from the owner of the land the right to develop his own land, and whatever may be under the surface, without a licence from the Minister of Munitions. If such a provision applied to coal, clay, ironstone, or any other substance which lies beneath the surface, there would be a great outcry against the deprivation, which up till now had been considered the right of the owner of the land, according to the laws of the country. It has been said that this Bill, which was urgent in October, 1917, is now still more urgent. In his First Reading speech the right hon. Gentleman, in introducing the Bill himself, admitted that the Government have power under the Defence of the Realm Act, both to search and bore for oil, and also to enter upon and secure the land. Thus there is no necessity for this Bill. The only reason for it that I can see is, as the hon. Gentleman (Captain Barnett) said, there has been a claim that certain firms who have made offers to the Government should be given security of tenure after the War. For that reason Clause 1 has been introduced. Most mining and geological experts think that this scheme of boring for oil in the United Kingdom is one likely to be productive of little. But there are experts on the other side, so that there is a chance of finding oil. If, then, there is that chance, why did not the Government some three or four years ago, in view of the situation, take upon themselves under the Defence of the Realm Act, to search and bore for oil at the expense of the Imperial Exchequer, and find out how the matter stood? Now, after three or four years, they are bringing in this Bill and so raising this controversial matter. I hope the Government will not press the Bill beyond the Second Reading. I for my part wish to put down Amendments, one of which in Clause 2 is that the matter shall not be left to the Minister of Munitions, but should be left to a greater authority; or to the Cabinet. Another Amendment would be in paragraph 2 of Clause 2.

[Mr. Wright.]

Here it is stated

"Where a licence is granted under this Section a copy thereof shall be laid before Parliament as soon as may be after the grant thereof."

So that this House shall have an opportunity of considering it before it is granted. Under this Bill there may be a chance of giving royalties to the landowner, and there is an equal chance of this Bill conferring an absolute monopoly upon one firm to work whatever oil there may be in Great Britain. I do not like monopolies any more than the hon. Member below the Gangway likes royalties, and from a different point of view I join with him in the distrust with which he regards this Bill. I hope that we shall hear from the hon. Member, when he rises to give an explanation of Clause 2 in connection with the proviso, whether it means that. It is quite clear that it means that the owner must not bore for oil without a licence. It is not clear whether it means that under this Bill the licensee may enter upon somebody else's land and search and bore for oil. I hope that my hon. Friend will explain that and tell us the exact position. I quite agree that every effort should be made to develop home resources and home supplies. Up till now nothing has been done by the Government, and in raising Amendments on the Committee stage I do not wish to stop the Government developing home supplies and home resources. On the other hand, I think that this should have been done two or three years ago. The Government have had complete powers under the Defence of the Realm Acts.

Mr. A. WILLIAMS: The hon. Gentleman has raised the whole question of whether petroleum, if it exists under the soil, belongs morally to the nation or to the owner of the surface. I am not going to pursue that question. I take it that the object of this Bill is to hold the question in suspense until we have leisure to discuss it after the War, and, meanwhile, if possible, to make some effort to develop the petroleum in the national interest. We wish to be assured that the Bill in working will do what it purports to do, and for that purpose I want to ask the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill if he will not only tell us what the form of the licence is going to be, but if he will actually read the words of the proposed form of licence, so that we may

be able to judge whether the Bill in practice will really carry out the intention which I have no doubt it honestly has and which we so strongly desire to see carried out.

The MINISTER OF BLOCKADE (Sir Laming Worthington-Evans): I think that the comments of hon. Gentlemen to-night show that on the whole we have succeeded in avoiding the really controversial points which were raised on the last occasion. There have been five points raised, and I propose to deal with each one in order. First, I am asked to give an assurance that Clause 2, Sub-section (1), does not include royalties to be brought in indirectly. If hon. Members will consider the Clause, they will see that the terms and conditions referred to are the terms and conditions which may be made between the Government and the licensees or those who bore. They are not terms and conditions to be made with the owner. They refer to something quite different, and I can safely say that there is no intention whatever under the Clause, or, indeed, at all, of introducing the royalty question as was suggested indirectly. Then the question was asked as to whether a landlord can apply for compensation under the Defence of the Realm Act, because he does not get royalties. The position is this: There is no power under the Bill for the licensee or the Government Department to enter on or to compulsorily acquire land. The power exists to-day under the Defence of the Realm Regulations, and that is the power that will be used for the purpose of entry in order to enable the licensee to bore. The landlord will have whatever claim he has under the Defence of the Realm Regulations and no other. He will be treated in that respect exactly as he is treated now in other matters which come under the Defence of the Realm Regulations.

Mr. ADAMSON: It means that he can apply to the Commission and get damages?

Sir WORTHINGTON-EVANS: He can apply to the Defence of the Realm Losses Commission and receive payment for losses. That is an entirely different thing.

Mr. H. SAMUEL: This is a very important point. It is not suggested that the Defence of the Realm Losses Commission should decide the extremely difficult and very controversial point whether or not a landlord should receive payment in respect of oil which has not previously been discovered.

Sir. L. WORTHINGTON-EVANS: I cannot say that no landlord would put in such a claim before the Commission, but I do say that the powers of the Defence of the Realm Losses Commission to give compensation for loss are limited in a way which my right hon. Friend knows quite well. It must be remembered that it is only for the War. All claims or legal rights, if there be any, in respect of the petroleum obtained will be dealt with after the War and not by the Defence of the Realm Losses Commission.

Mr. WRIGHT: If a claim for loss is brought by a landowner before the Defence of the Realm Losses Commission will not the Commission, in determining the claim, have to settle the question of title?

Mr. WORTHINGTON-EVANS: I am not in a position to say whether the Losses Commission will go into the question. If a landlord makes a claim he will have to prove a loss, because, so far as I know, that is the limit of the power of the Defence of the Realm Losses Commission. It concerns the period of the War, and the period of the War only. If after the War a landowner sets up a claim to a royalty it will not have been prejudiced under this Bill. Under this Bill the claim is postponed for settlement after the War. We have not attempted to deal with it. I give the undertaking that we do not and will not indirectly pay royalties under this Bill.

Mr. MacVEAGH: Have not the Commission held that compensation should be given unless the Act of Parliament expressly says that compensation should not be given?

Sir L. WORTHINGTON - EVANS: That is a legal question which I cannot answer in general, but so far as this Bill is concerned the landlord, in claiming under the Defence of the Realm Act for any loss sustained—there no doubt will be loss, damage to surface rights, for example—will have to prove his loss before he receives compensation. So far as I know, that is the extent of the claim that he can put forward.

Mr. C. DUNCAN: He could not lose what he had never had.

Sir L. WORTHINGTON-EVANS: I should have thought not. My hon. Friend behind me suggests that the case is prejudiced by after the War. That is

precisely what I deny. No legal question of that sort can be raised. We are bound to come back to Parliament for further legislation, and Parliament will then have the opportunity, and will be bound to consider all legal claims that can be put forward.

Mr. WRIGHT: If a property owner applies for a licence to bore under this Bill, is it likely that he will obtain a licence?

Sir L. WORTHINGTON-EVANS: I was just going to deal with that point, because the hon. Member for St. Pancras suggested that a monopoly was going to be created under this Bill; and I rather think the hon. Member for Hereford himself suggested that some sort of monopoly was being created under it. That is not the intention. It is perfectly well known that a very well-known firm, one of the expert firms dealing with oil, has made a very generous offer to the Government. They have offered to put at the disposal of the Government their experience, their knowledge, their plant, and their experts. My hon. Friend the Member for St. Pancras wanted to know what they were going to get out of it. They are going to get nothing out of it; nothing at all during the War.

An HON. MEMBER: After the War.

Sir L. WORTHINGTON-EVANS: As to after the War nothing has been done. We are not prejudging the position in any way after the War. But they have offered their services, the services of their experts, and their expert knowledge to the Government for the purposes of seeking for oil, if they can get oil, during the War. That they have offered to do without remuneration at all, and it seems to me an extremely generous offer which the Government will do well to accept. There is no intention whatever of creating a monopoly. Other firms have asked for licences. One licence has actually been granted; one or two others are under consideration; and any would-be licensee's application shall be considered. But it is only fair to say that the whole object of the Bill is to protect the oil pools, if there can be found oil pools in the country, and therefore you cannot have a multiplicity of licences without one damaging the other. I was asked to say why Clause 1 was inserted at all, because it takes away the right to bore. It is inserted for the very purpose of

[Sir L. Worthington-Evans.]
protecting the industry itself. If everyone has a right to bore you will reproduce the conditions which exist to-day in America, and a large amount of oil, if there is oil in Great Britain at all, will be wasted by unnecessary bore-holes going down.

The hon. Member for Hereford indicated two Amendments that he would wish to propose, and perhaps the House would allow me, as I am going to ask them to give me the Bill to-night, just to say what I would do with regard to these Amendments. My hon. Friend suggests that the Ministry of Munitions should not have charge of the administration of the Bill, but that the War Cabinet should. Neither the War Cabinet nor the Cabinet have the administrative officers or the Department to enable them to carry on the charge of the Bill, so that Amendment cannot possibly be accepted. Then, my hon. Friend suggests that the Licence should be laid on the Table of the House before it is granted. Supposing this Bill is passed this Session, before the Adjournment, what that would mean would be that we should have immediately two months' delay before we could go on with any of these licences, because the House would not be sitting. So, unfortunately, we are not able to accept these two Amendments. I have indicated to him, however, one or two other Amendments to the Bill as proposed which I am able to accept. They are Amendments which, if the House will give me the Committee stage, I will undertake will not take more than a very few minutes in getting through. Now, I would ask the House to give me the Second Reading and, if possible, the Committee stage.

Sir JOHN AINSWORTH: I will only detain the House a moment, but I should just like to say that I think the Government, if they are anxious to proceed at once with the search for oil, will proceed much more easily and safely under the Defence of the Realm Act. Under that Act they can put holes down for oil or anything else wherever they decide to do so, and therefore they will have no expense in the meantime in compensating the owners of the surface for any damage they do. That is all they do when searching for oil. But when they begin to work for oil—I do not mean to say that I can explain how that can be done—they will have to take the trouble to find out to

whom the oil belongs, if it belongs to anybody at all. The House probably knows the meaning of royalties on minerals, and everything of that kind, simply that the ownership of the mineral goes with the ownership of the surface, and if the tenant has not the right of searching for and of mining any minerals, he then pays as he may agree to the owner of the mineral for the working. The whole question divides itself into two matters. First you have to find the oil; that you can do now by making an arrangement with the owner of the surface under the powers of the Defence of the Realm Act, and by compensating him. When you go on to work the oil you must go into the whole question of ownership and the royalty, which is a very large question, and probably one which, having regard to the development of the country, ought to be put in a broader position than it stands at present. At the same time, I should like to point out to the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill one thing, namely, that the question whether a fluid is a mineral is a point of law. If the Government act wisely they will proceed at once under the Defence of the Realm Act and search for the oil they need. There will be plenty of opportunity to consider and deal with all these other things as time goes on. If the right hon. Gentleman is anxious to have his Bill at once he ought to proceed under the Defence of the Realm Act.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Resolved, "That this House will immediately forthwith resolve itself into the Committee on the Bill."—[*Mr. J. Hope.*]

Bill accordingly considered in Committee.

[*Mr. JAMES HOPE* in the Chair.]

Clause 1 (*Prohibition of Persons other than the Crown Getting, Etc., Petroleum*) ordered to stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 2.—(*Powers of Minister of Munitions*).

(1) The Minister of Munitions on behalf of His Majesty may grant licences to search and bore for and get petroleum to such persons and upon such terms and conditions as the Minister of Munitions may think fit:

Provided that nothing in this Act shall be construed as conferring on any person any right to enter on or interfere with land for the purpose of searching or boring for or getting petroleum which he does not enjoy apart from this Act.

(2) Where a licence is granted under this Section a copy thereof shall be laid before Parliament as soon as may be after the grant thereof.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE: I beg to move, in Sub-section (1), after the word "licences," to insert the words "conferring authority."

The first Clause of the Bill says that no person shall bore for petroleum without a licence. If it is a mere licence it might seem to be like making an exception to the prohibition. I desire to make it clear that the licence, in fact, confers authority, and therefore move this Amendment.

Sir L. WORTHINGTON-EVANS: I accept the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WHITE: I beg to move, in Sub-section (2), to leave out the word "a" ["Where a licence is granted"], and to insert instead thereof the words "any such."

The reason for the distinction is this: The Minister in charge of the Bill remarked on a previous occasion that some licences had already been granted. I want to make it clear that the terms of the licence are to be laid before the House, whether it had been granted before this Bill were passed or afterwards. That is the object of my Amendment.

Sir L. WORTHINGTON-EVANS: I accept that.

Amendment agreed to.

Further Amendment made: Leave out the words "under this Section" ["When licence is granted under this Section"].—[*Mr. White.*]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. CURRIE: I wish to ask my hon. Friend to clear up a small point. I think he intended in his answer to me about royalties to cover the whole ground but he put his explanation in this way: "We will not pay royalties." I wish to ask him, in the event of a licensee coming to terms with a landlord, the one being willing to pay and the other to receive royalties, will that be allowed, or must it be postponed until after the War altogether?

Sir L. WORTHINGTON-EVANS: It must be postponed until after the War. The point cannot arise. The licensee will never have to make terms with the landlord during the War, because during the War, having power under the Defence of the Realm Act, we can put the licensee in possession without having to put upon him the duty of making terms with anyone.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clauses 3 (*Powers to Inspect Plans of Mines*), 4 (*Interpretation*), 5 (*Savings*), and 6 (*Short Title*) ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported; as amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

The remaining Orders were read, and postponed.

It being after Half-past Eleven of the clock on Monday evening, **Mr. SPEAKER** adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at Twenty-seven minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 6th August, 1918.

[OFFICIAL REPORT.]

The House met at Twelve of the clock,
Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Cannock Gas Bill (by Order),

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed,
"That the Bill be now read a second
time."

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN of WAYS
and MEANS (Sir Donald Maclean): I
propose to move all these Bills, except the
Ipswich Dock Bill, over till to-morrow,
when I hope we shall be in a position to
make some announcement with regard to
the question as to whether they can be
proceeded with or not.

Sir W. ESSEX: Will the right hon. Gen-
tleman make the announcement at this
part of the sitting?

Sir D. MACLEAN: Yes.

Hampton Court Gas Bill, Liverpool Gas
Bill, Longwood and Slaithwaite Gas
Bill, Cardiff Gas Bill, Hastings and St.
Leonard's Gas Bill, Newcastle-upon-
Tyne and Gateshead Gas Bill, Plymouth
and Stonehouse Gas Bill, Richmond Gas
Bill, Southampton Gas Bill, Swansea
Gas Bill, York Gas Bill, Basingstoke
Gas Bill, Rhymney and Aber Valleys
Gas and Water Bill, Alliance and Dublin
Gas Bill (all by Order),

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

Ipswich Dock Bill [*Lords*] (by Order),

Second Reading deferred till Thursday.

Local Government Provisional Order (No.
5) Bill,

Lords Amendments considered, and
agreed to.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

WAR.

ENEMY FINANCIAL LEVIES.

2. Colonel Sir FREDERICK HALL
asked the Secretary of State for Foreign
Affairs whether he can indicate the total
amount of indemnities and levies
exacted by Germany in occupied terri-
tories up to the present time; and
whether, when the terms of peace pro-
posed by the Government come to be
discussed, they will include the repay-
ment of all such moneys to the countries
and cities concerned?

The ASSISTANT - SECRETARY of
STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord
R. Cecil): I have no exhaustive figures,
but, as an example, I may mention that
the War contribution levied on Belgium
by the German Governor-General
amounts by itself to 2,330,000,000fr.
from November, 1914, to November,
1917, apart from enormous fines im-
posed on localities, firms, and private
persons. These monstrous exactions
will certainly have to be taken into
account when peace terms are being
arranged.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: May I ask
whether we have levied any indemnities
or levies on German East Africa, and if
not why not?

Lord R. CECIL: I am afraid I must
ask for notice of that question.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Why should not
we do to them what they do to us?

MILITARY SERVICE.

CONVENTION WITH AMERICA.

General MCCALMONT asked the Secre-
tary of State for Foreign Affairs whether
an agreement has recently been concluded
with the United States under which
American citizens resident in the United
Kingdom are required to serve either in
the British or American forces; and
whether the Government of the United
States made any representations with a
view to the exemption of American
citizens resident in Ireland?

NS.

ALL
eign
otal
vies
erri-
and
pro-
be
pay-
ries

of
ord
res,
hat
lum
eral
Ofr.
er,
im-
ate
ons
nto
ing

ask
ies
l if

ust

not

re-
er
ed
ch
ed
in
rd
ed
a
un

Lord R. CECIL: The Convention with the United States of America of 3rd June, which was laid before the House on 30th July, makes liable to military service American citizens in Great Britain. American citizens resident in Ireland are therefore not affected.

SKILLED MEN (LOW MEDICAL CATEGORY).

6. Mr. TYSON WILSON asked the Under-Secretary of State for War if he is aware that at many depôts and camps there is a large number of highly-skilled workmen of low medical category who are engaged doing work of the most menial kind; and whether, with a view of utilising the skill of these men to the best advantage, he will adopt some system of combing them out and transferring them to shipbuilding or aircraft work?

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Macpherson): Very complete instructions have been issued to ensure that low category men are placed at their trades in the Army as and when vacancies occur. Particulars of any cases where low category men would be better employed at their trades in the Army or in civil life will, if brought to notice, be carefully examined.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Will it be possible to transfer back to civil life colliers who are graded B 1 and under?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I believe the whole question of transferring them back to their work is now being considered.

LABOUR CORPS (PRIVATE NORRIS).

16. Mr. REDDY asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether he will inquire into the case of Private John Norris, No. 30258, Labour Corps, who has served three years in France, is suffering from chronic rheumatism, and, having deformed feet, is unable to march; whether he is aware that two of his brothers have already been lost, one of them leaving six children whose mother is also dead; and whether, under these circumstances, he will consider giving Private Norris home service?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I am making inquiry, and will write to my hon. Friend as soon as possible.

CIVILIAN SERVICE (CONTRACTS).

53. Sir FORTESCUE FLANNERY asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the intention of the Government as to the proposed legislation, already promised, to protect the position of men called up under the Military Service Acts as regards their contracts for civilian service with their employers; whether the Government have been advised that recent legislation does not include the carrying forward over the war period of contracts for civil employment; and whether the omission can now be made good?

The CHANCELLOR of the EX-CHEQUER (Mr. Bonar Law): I am advised that there is some doubt whether the contract of service of the nature indicated by my hon. Friend is put an end to by the calling up of an employé or merely suspended during the period of his military service. I shall consider, however, whether it would not be possible when further emergency legislation is introduced to include a provision declaring that such contracts are, in fact, suspended.

MILITARY GRADING (ONE-MAN BUSINESSES).

78. Mr. TREVELYAN asked the Minister of National Service whether steps will be taken to carry out his promise that proprietors of one-man businesses who, on entering the Army, are reduced to Grade 3 shall be returned to civil life?

The MINISTER of NATIONAL SERVICE (Sir A. Geddes): I am afraid that I do not understand precisely the point which the hon. Member wishes to raise. All men are medically graded by National Service medical boards before being posted for service. The arrangements as to Grade 3 one-man business proprietors are set out in the Local Government Board Circular R 167. I have no knowledge of having given any promise to the effect stated, and would be glad if the hon. Member would give me further information.

APPEALS (WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE).

79. Mr. TREVELYAN asked the Minister of National Service whether he is aware of the discontent caused in the West Riding of Yorkshire by the practice of the National Service representative of challenging most of the decisions of the local tribunals and obtaining a reversal

[Mr. Trevelyan.]

of their decisions at the Appeal Tribunal where local conditions are unknown; whether he is aware that twenty-one cases out of twenty-four were so reversed from the Barnsley Tribunal; and whether he will instruct the National Service representative to moderate the number of his appeals?

Sir A. GEDDES: I am not aware that there is any general discontent of the kind suggested. I am inquiring as to the cases at Barnsley. If the hon. Member will refer to the answer that I gave to the hon. Member for Bradford on the 17th of July last, I think he will agree that the result of the appeals shows that the action of the National Service representatives has not been unreasonable, and I am, therefore, unable to adopt the course suggested by the hon. Member.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

31. Mr. SNOWDEN asked the Home Secretary if he has received petitions about the case of Leonard S. Smith, a conscientious objector now undergoing his third sentence of imprisonment in Walton Prison, Liverpool, asking that there should be a re-hearing of his case to judge the genuineness of his conscientious objection, seeing that the only reason why the central tribunal refused to regard him as genuine was that he had, under a misapprehension, attested under the Derby scheme; and will he give favourable consideration to the petition?

The **SECRETARY of STATE** for the **HOME DEPARTMENT** (Sir G. Cave): I have received a petition from the prisoner, and have forwarded it to the Central Tribunal. It is for that tribunal to say whether they will allow the case to be reopened.

32. Mr. SNOWDEN asked the Home Secretary if an application has been received from Walker Bailey, Llanddysant Camp, Llangadock, who has had twelve months' unblemished service under the Home Office scheme, to be allowed to take up the exceptional employment scheme, and who has submitted work to the Home Office Committee and has not been allowed to take up the scheme; and will his request be granted?

Sir G. CAVE: This case is at present under the consideration of the Committee.

IRELAND.

ARMY COMMISSIONS.

General McCALMONT asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that advertisements have appeared, and are appearing, in the Irish Press inviting Irish candidates up to thirty-four and a half years of age to qualify for commissions by service in Officers' Training Corps irrespective of whether they have served overseas; whether numbers of Irishmen who have served, or are serving, in the ranks overseas have already been recommended for cadet battalions with a view to commissions; whether the Regulations have hitherto required such service from candidates; and whether he will take steps to ensure that those who have served and are recommended will be given an opportunity of being trained before those who have no previous overseas service?

Mr. MACPHERSON: Advertisements of this nature have not been sanctioned by the Army Council who have ordered their discontinuance. As regards the latter part of the question, if a soldier is serving overseas and is recommended he is sent home by the Commander-in-Chief for admission to an Officer Cadet School. A limited number of candidates with experience of active service are also invited from General Officers Commanding-in-Chief at home. These are dependent upon the vacancies in the Officer Cadet Schools, and at present the numbers are very few. There are no regulations on the subject, but demands are made periodically on Commanders-in-Chief, according to the requirements of the Service, and preference is given to those who have experience gained on active service in the field.

General McCALMONT: May we take it that preference in every case will be given to those in the field, and is my right hon. Friend aware that these advertisements were still appearing as late as last Saturday? I have a copy of an Irish paper of Saturday last in which the advertisement appeared.

Mr. MACPHERSON: I have discussed this, as my hon. and gallant Friend knows, with the authorities, and we have issued orders discontinuing it.

Mr. ROCH: Who inserted them?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I cannot say, but I think they were inserted in the Irish papers by the Chairman of the Committee in charge of recruiting.

Colonel Sir J. CRAIG: How many commissions were actually granted as the result of these advertisements?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I cannot say off-hand, but I shall be very glad to make inquiries.

Mr. KING: Does this not show that there is considerable friction or lack of understanding between the War Office and the recruiting authorities in Dublin?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I do not think it does. This recruiting committee in Dublin was not in actual touch with the authorities concerned in granting commissions in the War Office.

IRISH POST OFFICE (SECRETARY).

87. **Mr. NUGENT** asked the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that dissatisfaction exists in Ireland with the action of the Government in appointing Mr. Forsyth as Secretary to the Irish Post Office; if he will state what Irish experience Mr. Forsyth has and the length of his service in Ireland and in Great Britain; if he is aware that it has been announced that Mr. Forsyth was a prominent Mason, as if that was his chief qualification; if he is aware that this is the reason given for passing over Mr. J. J. Coonan, who has discharged the position of assistant-secretary with efficiency and exceptional ability; if Mr. Coonan has been passed over because he is a Catholic; and if he will state the postal service of Mr. Coonan and why he was passed over?

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Illingworth): I am not aware of any general dissatisfaction in Ireland with this appointment. Mr. Forsyth has spent thirty-three years in the Post Office service in Ireland and one in England. His Irish service included ten years in Limerick, twenty years in Dublin and three years in Belfast. I have no knowledge as to whether he is or is not a Mason. Mr. Coonan has had thirty-four years' service in the Post Office in Ireland. I appointed Mr. Forsyth because I considered he was the best qualified officer for the post.

Mr. NUGENT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Mr. Coonan acted as

assistant secretary for a number of years, having, therefore, greater experience than Mr. Forsyth, and, according to the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman, longer service; that it has been publicly announced in the Press that one of the reasons for the appointment of Mr. Forsyth is that he is a prominent Mason, that three-fourths at least of the staff of the Post Office in Ireland are Catholics, and that this matter has already created a very serious feeling in Ireland?

Mr. ILLINGWORTH: I cannot be responsible for what is published in the Press. I am not aware that he is a Mason. I am certainly not one myself. I may say that I have received a letter from Mr. Coonan protesting against the interference of hon. Members in his private affairs.

Mr. NUGENT: The right hon. Gentleman has stated that Mr. Coonan has longer service and he has greater experience because he has occupied the position of assistant secretary, and can the right hon. Gentleman give any reason for his being passed over? It is a matter of indifference to me whether Mr. Coonan likes it or dislikes it. I want to see fair play.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH: He is passed over because Mr. Forsyth is more suitable.

Mr. REDDY: The hidden hand!

POSTAL DELIVERY, LONGFORD.

88. **Mr. J. P. FARRELL** asked the Postmaster-General whether arrangements will be made to have a delivery of letters received by the mail trains which arrive at Longford station about 4 p.m. each day instead of holding over the same till the following morning, in view of the fact that when cross-Channel mails are late there is a special delivery after the 1.30 train from Dublin?

Mr. ILLINGWORTH: I am making inquiry, and will communicate with the hon. Member.

EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGE CARETAKERS (WAR BONUS).

89. **Mr. SNOWDEN** asked the Minister of Labour why the war bonus which was recently given to employes in the employment exchanges was not extended to caretakers; and will he take steps to see that this oversight is remedied at once?

The **PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY** to the **MINISTRY of LABOUR** (Mr. Bridgeman): Cleaners and caretakers engaged in employment exchanges at pre-war rates of wages have received a war bonus proportionate to their hours of work upon the scale of the war bonus granted to permanent full-time employes by the Award No. 17 of 17th December, 1917.

COAL SUPPLY.

92. Mr. **NUGENT** asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he is aware that hardship at present exists in Dublin amongst the working classes and people of small incomes, and that this hardship, if the Regulation recently made regarding the reduction in the supply of coal is not altered, is inevitably bound to increase; whether he is aware that, since the beginning of the War, the classes referred to, owing to the increased cost of living, were compelled to reduce their consumption of coal to the lowest possible point, and that reduction on the lines now suggested would mean that many homes would be deprived of fuel for several days each week either for the purpose of heating, cooking, or other domestic necessities; in view of the hardship which the Order in question is calculated to inflict, especially on the aged, the enfeebled, and the infants, will he take immediate steps to secure that any reduction will be based on the number of apartments in each dwelling after securing the full complement for the kitchen supply of each home; and whether he will see that the interests of the purchasers of small quantities are safeguarded?

The **CHIEF SECRETARY** for **IRELAND** (Mr. Shortt): As I have already informed the hon. Member the whole question of the distribution of coal in Ireland is being very carefully considered by the Coal Controller and myself.

ULSTER VOLUNTEERS (ARMS).

93. Mr. **FIELD** asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he can state, approximately, the number of rifles and machine guns in the custody of the Ulster Volunteers?

Mr. **SHORTT**: It is believed that the Ulster Volunteers are in possession of 50,000 rifles of different patterns and eleven machine guns.

ALLOTMENT-HOLDERS.

94. Mr. **FIELD** asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he has made inquiries respecting the demand of Irish plot-holders to obtain the grant of £2 per acre given to British plot-holders; and whether security of tenure will be guaranteed for increased food production?

Mr. **SHORTT**: I have made inquiries into this matter, and as regards the demand of Irish plot-holders for a grant, I would refer the hon. Member to the full reply given to his question on this subject on the 18th July by my hon. and learned Friend the Attorney-General for Ireland. So far as lettings under the Defence of the Realm Regulations are concerned, the tenure is as secure in Ireland as in England; and as regards lettings made under the Local Government Allotments and Land Cultivation (Ireland) Act, 1917, the continued operation of this Act after the War is one of the matters to be dealt with by general reconstructive legislation.

Mr. **FIELD**: Is it not a fact that this grant is paid to English allotment-holders, and will it be paid to Irish allotment-holders?

Mr. **SHORTT**: My information is to the contrary.

Mr. **FIELD**: Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiry?

Mr. **SHORTT**: Yes.

CIVIL SERVANTS (WAR BONUS).

95. Mr. **NUGENT** asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he is aware that the Conciliation Arbitration Board recently made a further award of war bonuses to Civil servants of 5s. per week, but that in this award a distinction is made for those between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one, who only receive a war bonus of 1s. per week; and, seeing that the cost of living has increased as much for those under twenty-one as over that age, will he also consider the claims of these persons?

Mr. **BALDWIN** (Joint Financial Secretary to the Treasury): The award referred to was arrived at by the Conciliation and Arbitration Board, to whom the question had been referred by His Majesty's Government, and I am not prepared to discuss it.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.

96. Sir E. CARSON asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland if he is now in a position to make a statement with reference to a bonus for Irish national teachers and the arrears due to what are called paper-promoted teachers?

Mr. SHORTT: The Treasury have intimated their willingness to adjust the payment of war bonus in cases where at present teachers suffer loss of income as the result of promotion. The Treasury have not, however, up to the present, seen their way to agree to the concession sought in the case of "paper promoted" teachers, but I am still in communication with them.

Sir J. CRAIG: Is there any possibility of having this matter arranged before we break up for the Recess?

Mr. SHORTT: So far as I am concerned there would be, but perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend will put down a question to the Treasury.

Sir J. CRAIG: Perhaps my right hon. Friend would bring his more weighty pressure to bear on the Treasury?

Mr. SHORTT: Not more weighty, certainly.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (PERMITS).

97. Mr. DILLON asked whether the Order compelling Members of the House of Commons representing Irish constituencies to obtain a police permit to enable them to attend the House of Commons for the discharge of their Parliamentary duties has been abolished; and, if not, what is the reason for the delay in taking this course?

35. Sir R. COOPER asked whether any restrictions have recently been imposed on Members representing Irish constituencies desiring to travel between their constituencies or their homes and this House in connection with their Parliamentary duties; whether such restrictions are imposed by Statute or by some other form of authority, and, if so, what authority; whether the proper legal advisers were consulted beforehand as to the effect of the Statute or other form of authority on the privileges of Members of this House; and, if so, what advice was received?

Sir G. CAVE: Under Regulation 14 of the Defence of the Realm Regulations,

which came into operation on the 21st May last, any person proceeding as a passenger from Great Britain to Ireland is required to obtain a permit. Arrangements were made soon after the Regulation came into force under which any Member of Parliament may, on application at the Permit Office, in London, obtain a pass enabling him from time to time to go to Ireland without molestation. No permit is required by a person proceeding from Ireland to Great Britain.

Sir J. CRAIG: Do these permits not facilitate Members getting to and fro?

Sir G. CAVE: That is so.

Mr. DILLON: Is it not a fact that under this permit system it is in the power of the Executive Government to prevent Members of Parliament attending to their duties? It is the principle we object to.

Sir G. CAVE: I do not think that that is so. No permit is required to come to Great Britain. A general pass is issued at once to any Member who desires to go to and fro.

Mr. KING: If those Members of Parliament from Ireland who are at present interned in England apply for a permit will it be immediately granted?

Sir G. CAVE: Certainly, when they are released.

Mr. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Irish Members of Parliament are prevented from going to their homes in Ireland without a special permit, and are therefore unable to attend to their Parliamentary duties, because they must pass through their homes on their way to London?

Sir G. CAVE: I suppose that that question relates to some regulation in Ireland, because there is nothing to prevent them coming to Great Britain.

Mr. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Members of this House are unable to leave their homes in Ireland without getting permits?

Sir G. CAVE: I am not aware of that.

Mr. FLAVIN: Of course you are not.

Mr. SWIFT MacNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a Member of this House is entitled to go to and fro between his home and the House without molestation, and may I ask whether, on

[Mr. MacNeill.]

a point of this kind, it is not the Chief Secretary for Ireland who is responsible, so far as that country is concerned, for giving permission, and not the Home Secretary?

Sir G. CAVE: It is in order to give effect to these passes that they are submitted to me.

Sir J. DOUGHERTY: May I ask whether facilities will be given for any of the families of Members to return with them?

Sir G. CAVE: I am sure there will be no difficulty, and if an application be made it will be attended to.

Mr. MacNEILL: I possess a permit now, but if I refuse to use it what would the right hon. Gentleman do with me?

PUBLIC MEETINGS (PROHIBITION ORDER).

98. Mr. DILLON asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he has considered the effect produced by the Order prohibiting the holding of meetings in Ireland for the discussion of political topics or for the purposes of amusement or recreation unless such meetings be authorised by a police permit; whether the Order prohibiting Members of the House of Commons representing Irish constituencies from addressing their constituents without a police permit has yet been abolished; and, if such Order has not been abolished, will immediate steps be taken for its abolition?

Mr. SHORTT: The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the remainder of the question, I might point out that it is difficult to differentiate between meetings where the Members of the House of Commons address their constituents and any other political meeting, and I am accordingly unable to act on the hon. Member's suggestion.

Mr. DILLON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he intends to maintain in Ireland the Regulations prohibiting the holding of any political meeting whatsoever, without application to the police for a permit?

Mr. SHORTT: The Proclamation has taken that form, but, so far as an hon. Member of this House is concerned, the organiser of the meeting has only to intimate that to the police and the permit will be issued as a matter of course. It must take that form.

Mr. DILLON: Is not this a most objectionable provision to apply to Members of this House. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that under all the coercion Acts applied to Ireland for the last thirty years, and in times of the wildest excitement, no Regulations of this kind have ever been enforced?

Mr. SHORTT: Yes, but during that thirty years we have not been at war.

Sir J. CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these Regulations apply equally to the North of Ireland, and that they have caused absolutely no inconvenience whatever?

Mr. KILBRIDE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he can tell the House whether Regulations of this character are in force either in Germany or in Austria?

Mr. SPEAKER: That question must be put to the Foreign Secretary.

Mr. NUGENT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a series of meetings of Unionists is to take place in Ulster on the 15th of August, and that those demonstrations are being attended by various Members of Parliament; and, in view of the fact that on the 1st July similar Unionist demonstrations were held, and absolute liberty given for processions and demonstrations?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman must put down some of those questions.

COAL CONTROL.

101. Mr. J. P. FARRELL asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether in rationing coal for private consumption in Ireland steam coal is included in the quality rationed; whether he is aware that the 200 tons commandeered by the Irish Coal Controller from the supply for Mullingar Asylum was Welsh steam coal and did not come within the terms of the Irish Coal Order at all; and will he therefore direct that Messrs. Guinness send it on to its original destination, Mullingar Asylum?

Mr. SHORTT: No rationing scheme for coal with respect to Ireland has been issued by the Board of Trade or the Controller of Coal Mines. The coal which was recently ordered by the Mullingar Asylum, and which was stopped, was Welsh steam coal, and the reason it was stopped was that the asylum had then a

very large stock of coal on hand. This coal, I am informed, was delivered by a Dublin merchant to Messrs. A. Guinness, Son and Company against the orders of the Coal Controller, and the merchant has since explained that this was due to a clerical error.

Messrs. Guinness, Son and Company have been notified by the Coal Controller that when it becomes necessary they will be asked to give up part of their stock of coal for other purposes. The Mullingar Asylum on the 1st instant had 1,100 tons of coal in stock, and the Wolfhill Collieries are prepared to supply them with any further quantities they require.

COMMITTEE OF INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.

Sir J. CRAIG (*by Private Notice*) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he is now in a position to give the names of the persons appointed to, and the terms of reference of, the Committee on Intermediate Education; and whether he can make a statement regarding the Grants to Irish National school teachers, about which anxiety is being evinced in Ireland, and if he is not in a position to do so to-day will he use his best endeavour to reply to a similar question before the House rises?

Mr. SHORTT: I will answer this and similar questions put by hon. Members below the Gangway. The following persons have accepted the invitation to serve on the Committee of Intermediate Education.

Rt. Hon. T. F. Molony (Chairman) (Lord Chief Justice of Ireland).

Rt. Hon. W. J. M. Starkie, Litt.D.

Sir J. Larmor, D.Sc., F.R.S., M.P.

Rev. P. Canon Marshall, Killarney.

Rev. T. Corcoran, D.Litt., University College, Dublin.

Rev. Brother Hennessy, Dublin.

Professor J. M. Henry, M.A., Fellow Trinity College, Dublin.

Professor R. M. Henry, M.A., Queen's University of Belfast.

Mr. J. Thompson, M.A., High School, Dublin.

Miss H. M. White, LL.D., Alexandra College, Dublin.

Miss M. Ryan, M.A., University College, Cork.

Mr. W. J. Williams, B.A.

Mr. C. R. Beavan, Chairman of Ireland Branch Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools, Campbell College, Belfast.

Miss A. McHugh, Assistant Mistress, 70, Stephens Green, Dublin.

Miss E. Steele, Assistant Mistress, Belfast.

Mr. G. Fletcher, F.G.S., Assistant Secretary in respect of Technical Instruction, Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, Ireland.

Mr. E. Ensor, M.A., Inspector of Intermediate Education Board.

Mr. M. Headlam, Treasury Remembrancer in Ireland.

The terms of reference are as follows:

To inquire and report as to any improvements which may appear desirable to be made in the conditions of service and in the methods of remuneration of Teachers in Intermediate Schools in Ireland, and in the Distribution of the Grants made from public funds for Intermediate Education, and as to the best means in the public interest of effecting such improvements.

With regard to the latter part of the question, I would refer my hon. and gallant Friend to the reply which I have just given to a question asked on this subject by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dublin University.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE (SHELL FACTORY).

Mr. NUGENT (*by Private Notice*) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he is aware that a dispute exists at a shell factory as a result of which about 1,000 men and girls are out of work; whether he is aware that the dispute originated in the dismissal of two engineers on their return to work after illness; that the dismissed men had taken part in the recent dispute which was referred to arbitration, and that it is the allegation of their fellow workers that they were victimised because of this; whether he is aware that, following their dismissal, fifty other engineers struck work, and then 300 labourers and 600 girls were locked out; and whether he will state what action he proposes to take in the matter?

Mr. SHORTT: I have just heard from the officer in charge of the Dublin office of the Ministry of Munitions that he is sending full particulars of the dispute to the Minister of Munitions to-day, to whom I would refer my hon. Friend for the information he requires.

VENEREAL DISEASE (COMMITTEE).

9. Mr. ROCH asked the Under-Secretary of State for War if he can give the names of the members of the Committee, over which he presides, appointed to consider the question of venereal disease; if he can give the terms of reference to this

[Mr. Roch.]

Committee; if he can state, in particular, if it is open to this Committee to consider the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts; and whether the Report of this Committee and the evidence given before it will be published?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I would refer my hon. Friend to my answer to the hon. Member for Northants on 25th June, when I gave the names of the Committee. There are no terms of reference. The answer to the last part of the question is in the negative.

Sir J. D. REES: Is the Committee which is to report on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill to report whether the Bill is to be proceeded with or to proceed with the Bill?

Mr. MACPHERSON: The Committee reporting on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill is a Joint Committee of both Houses. The Committee to which my hon. Friend the Member for Pembroke (Mr. Roch) refers is an informal Committee, over which I preside in the War Office and which includes representatives of almost all the Allies, to see how best we can combat venereal disease in the Army.

Mr. ROCH: Did my right hon. Friend give all the names of the Committee? Did he not omit to give the names of members of religious denominations?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I do not think so, but I am quite willing to give the names—the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Bourne or Bishop Bidwell, Dr. Myer or Professor Garvie.

DEMOBILISATION (OFFICERS' EXPENSES).

10. **Mr. HUGH LAW** asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether any steps have been taken with a view to the reduction of officers' expenses after demobilisation, having especial regard to the fact that during the War many men have obtained commissions in regiments in which a high rate of expenditure has hitherto been considered necessary?

The **FINANCIAL SECRETARY** to the **WAR OFFICE** (Mr. Forster): The importance of this point is recognised, and it will not be lost sight of; but I do not

think any definite announcement can be made until we know more definitely what the post-war Army will be.

GALLIPOLI OPERATIONS (DECORATION).

11 and 12. **Colonel LESLIE WILSON** asked the Under-Secretary of State for War (1) whether General Sir Ian Hamilton and Lieutenant-General Sir William R. Birdwood will receive the decoration to be issued by the War Office to the Dominion troops for the Gallipoli operations; (2) whether it is proposed that Imperial troops will receive the decoration for the Gallipoli operations which is to be issued by the War Office; and, if not, whether the Army Council will strongly urge the Government to reconsider this decision, so that Imperial troops engaged in the same operations as Dominion troops, all under command of an Imperial officer, will receive equal treatment?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I would refer my hon. and gallant Friend to my reply on Thursday last to my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for the East Riding Division of Yorkshire, to which I have nothing to add.

Colonel WILSON: Is the House to understand that not even any member of the 29th Division will receive a decoration for their service; is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this division and other divisions were precluded from receiving the Mons Star because they were fighting in the East, and does he not think it only fair that Imperial troops should receive equal recognition with Dominion troops?

Mr. MACPHERSON: This decoration is a decoration given by certain of the Dominions to their troops. The War Office in this case is simply the distributor of this decoration, which has had the approval of His Majesty. I do not think that the parallel is at all complete between this particular decoration and the Mons Star. This particular decoration is given by the Dominions, as I understand it, to commemorate the first appearance of Dominion troops in a European conflict.

Sir M. BARLOW: Will the War Office consider the question of instituting a special decoration for the English troops,

especially the gallant Lancashire troops, in whom I am particularly interested, who took part in the landing at Gallipoli, in view of the fact that the Lancashire landing will go down as famous for all time?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman should give notice of that question.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: In view of the fact that there are not many of the 29th Division left—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and gallant Gentleman should give notice of that question.

15. **Sir A. SHIRLEY BENN** asked the Under-Secretary of State for War if the Government will consider the advisability of issuing to the British troops who served in Gallipoli a decoration similar to that about to be issued by the War Office to the troops from the overseas Dominions who also served in Gallipoli, in recognition of the fact that it was the first time when British troops from the Mother Country fought side by side with their brothers from other parts of the Empire in a European war?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I would refer my hon. Friend to the reply on the 20th March last to my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Melton.

19. **General McCALMONT** asked the Under-Secretary of State for War how it is proposed to avoid the award of an extra medal to Colonial troops who serve on other fronts after serving in Gallipoli, while Imperial troops only receive one medal for similar service; and what will be the Regulations as regards the award of the Colonial medal to the Imperial officers who served with Colonial troops in Gallipoli?

Mr. MACPHERSON: The decoration for Australian, New Zealand, and Newfoundland troops, referred to in my reply on Wednesday last, will only be awarded to those individuals who fulfil certain conditions, and I would ask my hon. and gallant Friend to await the issue of the Regulations dealing with the matter.

General McCALMONT: Are not the Colonial troops bound to be entitled to two medals, and is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, in addition to the other

divisions which have been mentioned in other questions, the 10th (Irish) Division is also concerned in this matter?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I cannot add anything to the answer I have given.

Colonel LESLIE WILSON: Are we to understand that Colonial troops will receive two decorations and the Imperial troops one?

Mr. MACPHERSON: Yes, the Dominion troops will receive two decorations.

General McCALMONT: Is not that contrary to what the right hon. Gentleman said two days ago?

GERMAN SISAL PLANTATIONS, EAST AFRICA.

42. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will make inquiries from East Africa as to whether German sisal plantations are now being operated by Greeks more or less in trust for their German owners; whether these people are now trying to get for their crops the price that the British Government pays for sisal; and, if so, will he urge that the plantations be taken over altogether and worked for the benefit of the State?

The **UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Hewins):** I have no recent information as to the first and second questions. As regards the third, I am not prepared to copy the German method by confiscating private property in occupied enemy territory.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is it confiscating private property to work these plantations in the interest of national efficiency and to put the funds, as they are doing in connection with German banks here, into a pool?

Mr. HEWINS: The hon. and gallant Gentleman is rather an expert in these matters.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Why not adopt in German East Africa the same principle towards German businesses that you adopt in this country?

Mr. HEWINS: It is an entirely different matter in an occupied enemy country.

ALIENS.

COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS WITH ENEMY SUBJECTS.

44. Sir EDWARD CARSON asked the President of the Board of Trade how many licences have been granted to enable commercial transactions to be carried out with enemy subjects during the years 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, and 1918, respectively; and whether any record is available showing the reasons of granting such licences?

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. Wardle): As my right hon. Friend was informed in reply to his question on the 17th July, the Board of Trade are in communication with the various Departments concerned. The replies, however, are not complete, and I am therefore not yet in a position to let him know the result. I fear that in any case it will be difficult to furnish any information of value in a statistical form, owing to the varied nature of the cases dealt with.

Colonel Sir J. CRAIG: Will as much information as can be made available be sent to my right hon. Friend?

Mr. WARDLE: I will inquire into that.

JONAS, COLVER AND COMPANY, LIMITED.

50. Sir F. HALL asked the Prime Minister if his attention has been called to the recent trial and conviction of Sir Joseph Jonas, a naturalised German, and of Charles Alfred Vernon, son of Carl Auguste Hahn, for supplying information to Germany connected with the mechanism and construction of a new German rifle intended for use by the British Army; whether Vernon is, or ever has been, in the service of the Ministry of Munitions; and if the names of these two persons will be submitted to the Committee to be set up under the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Bill, should it become law?

Mr. BONAR LAW: The answer to the first and second parts of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the last part of the question, the case of Sir Joseph Jonas will be submitted to the Committee. Vernon, however I am informed, is a natural-born British subject.

83 and 84. Mr. JOYNSON - HICKS asked the Minister of Munitions whether

he is aware that the firm of Jonas, Colver and Company, Limited, had, prior to the War, one of the best reputations in Sheffield as steel makers, and during the whole of 1915 and the early part of 1916 were practically the sole suppliers of aeroplane cranks and crank steel for air engines, but that their reputation for good steel changed, and that owing to the bad steel supplied by this company the principal machining firm in Sheffield was occupied on machining 80 per cent. of defective stuff to the prejudice of the engine programme of the Air Board; whether any compensation in respect of bad steel paid to machining firms came out of public funds; whether an analysis showed that much of the steel was such that it never could have met the tests required; whether he is aware that in the middle of 1917 the chief steel maker to Jonas and Colver left and that Mr. Robert Jonas is now in charge of the steel-making plant; whether the Air Board has recently installed a Government steel specialist at the works, and what experience of steel making has this expert (2) whether he will explain why, in spite of the repeated output of defective steel by Messrs. Jonas and Colver, they still have the largest allocation for the production of high-grade steel of any firm in Sheffield; and whether he will cause a full independent inquiry to be made into the transactions of this firm since the War began?

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the MINISTRY of MUNITIONS (Mr. Kellaway): The replies to these questions will necessitate the examination of a large number of documents at Sheffield. This examination is proceeding, and I hope to be in a position to reply to my hon. Friend on Thursday.

HOLZAPFELS, LIMITED.

63 and 64. Mr. PENNEFATHER asked the President of the Board of Trade (1) whether the products manufactured by the concern at Bergen in which Holzapfels, Limited, hold shares are in any way available for the use of enemy warships or other vessels owned by or trading with the enemy; and

(2) Whether supplies are sent to the Holzapfel concern at Bergen from any Holzapfel concern other than the concern in England; and, if so, whether an effective undertaking is given in each case that such supplies will not be used for the direct benefit of our enemies?

The **MINISTER of BLOCKADE** (Sir Laming Worthington-Evans): I am telegraphing for a report on the business of the Bergen concern, and will communicate with my hon. Friend as soon as I receive it.

65. **Mr. PENNEFATHER** asked what means Holzapfels, Limited, have of ascertaining the facts and enforcing the undertaking given to them by the concern at Bergen with which they are connected to the effect that supplies sent from England would not be diverted to enemy use?

Mr. WARDLE: In the event of any breach of the undertaking given by the company at Bergen to Holzapfels, Limited, coming to that company's notice any further supplies would be withheld.

INTERNMENT.

33. **Mr. KING** asked the Home Secretary whether he has received a copy of a letter from a soldier of the Middlesex Regiment No. 30890, now serving in France, stating that the writer and his only brother are soldiers in the British Army, their mother a British woman, and that their father who severed his connection with Germany in his boyhood, thirty-six years ago, is now interned at Alexandra Palace, and requesting the release of the father from internment; whether he has made inquiries into these statements; whether he will request the Aliens' Advisory Committee to consider the application for release; whether, if no release be granted and The Hague exchange of prisoners becomes operative, the father will be repatriated to Germany against his will; and whether, in view of the probability that if repatriated this man would be condemned as a traitor to Germany, he will give an assurance that this father of two British soldiers shall not be made a victim to Prussian militarism?

Sir G. CAVE: If the hon. Member will give me the name of the interned man to whom he refers, the case shall be considered.

34. **Mr. KING** asked the Home Secretary whether he is aware that in Wakefield internment camp there are about 200 men, nominally German, who, through long absence from Germany, ignorance of the German language, and many various ties of long standing, are intensely averse from the idea of being sent to Germany; whether he has made, or will make, inquiries in the various internment camps

as to the number of such cases; and whether he will indicate the authority to which the pro-British interned alien enemies of pro-British sympathy should apply?

Sir G. CAVE: I have no information which would enable me to confirm the hon. Member's statement, and do not think it necessary to make the inquiries he suggests, as any interned German civilian whom it is proposed to send to Germany, but who wishes to remain in this country, can make a representation to the Advisory Committee, who will consider it and make a recommendation to me.

Mr. KING: Are they to make those representations now or will an opportunity be given to them later?

NAVAL AND MILITARY PENSIONS AND GRANTS.

NEW SCALE OF ALLOWANCES.

58. **Mr. WING** asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if the new scale of allowances to soldiers' dependants comes into operation on 1st November; if so, is he aware of the disappointment at the delay; and if he will bring the scale into operation at a much earlier date?

59. **Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD** asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will reconsider his decision that the new scale of separation allowances should begin in October instead of immediately, so as to diminish the continued hardship of the present scale.

Mr. FORSTER: The new scale dates from 1st October. I am afraid I can add nothing to the statement made by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Debate last night.

Mr. WING: Does that mean that they will be paid on the 1st October or that they will be paid as from the 1st October?

Mr. FORSTER: They will be payable as from the 1st October. I do not think my hon. Friend realises the enormous difficulty of bringing a very large number of allowances into course of payment, but every effort will be made to make the payment as soon as possible.

21. **Sir J. BUTCHER** asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office why a

[Sir J. Butcher.]
 soldier without children, who is living apart from his wife, receives 11s. 1d. for pay and 22s. 2d. for ration and other allowances, making, with the wife's separation allowance of 12s. 6d., £2 5s. 9d. per week for the maintenance of himself and his wife, while a soldier without children who is living with his wife receives 11s. 1d. for pay and only 21s. 6d. family allowance, making £1 2s. 7d. for the maintenance of himself and his wife; and whether the whole question of family allowances will be reconsidered?

24. **Captain BARNETT** asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is now in a position to state if the consolidated family allowance payable in the case of married men living at home is in effect separation allowance, plus 7s. per week for the keep of the soldier; whether the increase of this family allowance, which was under consideration on 21st February and 12th June, is still under consideration; and whether such increase, if and when granted, will be made retrospective, so as to compensate so far as possible for the hardship which many soldiers have been suffering for months past owing to the enhanced cost of living?

Mr. FORSTER: I cannot understand the figures contained in the question No. 21, but my hon. Friends will be glad to know that it has been decided to make an increase in the rate of family allowance.

Sir F. HALL: Will it bring it up to the separation allowance?

Mr. FORSTER: Yes; I think it will.

26. **Mr. CRUMLEY** asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office why the pension awarded to Mrs. Bridget M'Enerney, Queen Street, Enniskillen, in respect of her late son, Private Patrick Joseph M'Enerney, No. 70300, Machine Gun Corps, has been discontinued, although she is in extremely poor circumstances; and will he take steps to have her case reconsidered?

The **PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the MINISTRY of PENSIONS** (Sir A. Griffith-Boscawen): The original documents in this case were destroyed in the fire at the Dublin Pay Office, and as there appeared to be some doubt as to whether Mrs. M'Enerney had really been dependent on her son before mobilisation, the

question was referred to the Special Grants Committee, who decided that she had not been so dependent. Payment therefore ceased. The case, however, will be considered for parents' special pension, in view of the statement that Mrs. M'Enerney is in poor circumstances, and the hon. Member will be informed of the result.

Mr. CRUMLEY: This poor woman lost her son, and I am sure the House will consider she should be compensated for her loss.

Sir A. GRIFFITH-BOSCAWEN: I have said the circumstances were doubtful as to whether there was dependence, and it was decided against her. But if she is in poor circumstances, even without dependents, a special pension may be given, and that is now being considered.

25. **Mr. SNOWDEN** asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he will make inquiry into the reasons for the delay in granting separation allowance to the father of Gunner W. Pickering, No. 247746, Royal Field Artillery?

Mr. FORSTER: I will make inquiry into the case, and inform the hon. Member of the result.

27. **Mr. HACKETT** asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that Gunner C. Gill, Royal Field Artillery, British Expeditionary Force, France, allowed his mother 8s. per week, and was provided with food and clothes by his employer, and that for the past two years since his enlistment Mrs. Gill has been in receipt of only 3s. per week allowance; and whether he will state the reasons which prevent Mrs. Gill from receiving a larger allowance?

Mr. FORSTER: I will inquire into this case, and inform the hon. Member of the result.

29. **Mr. STEWART** asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he has now made further inquiries into the case of the late Private Ledsom, of Heswall, Cheshire; and whether he can see his way to consider favourably that an allowance be granted to Private Ledsom's mother?

Mr. FORSTER: My hon. Friend has no doubt now received my letter of 3rd August about this case?

RHODESIA.

41. Sir W. ESSEX asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in the event of any change taking place in the government of Rhodesia, he will not permit any arrangement which will impose any financial liability upon the United Kingdom without having first laid proposals therefor before this House and obtained its sanction in the matter?

Mr. HEWINS: No change is at present in contemplation.

GENERAL STAFF (ARTILLERY OFFICERS).

14. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether, except in very limited numbers, Artillery officers are debarred from appointment either to the General Staff or to the Adjutant-General and Quartermaster Branches of the Staff, and that this is causing a block in promotion both in the Artillery Staff and in the appointment to Artillery Staffs; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that there are many young Artillery officers capable of commanding battalions and of relieving more senior officers for service on the Staff, he will consider the desirability of appointing Artillery officers more freely to the General Staff?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I would refer my hon. and gallant Friend to my reply on the 4th July last to my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Leominster. Artillery officers are in no way debarred, and are given appointments on the Staff as opportunity offers.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Has the position improved?

Mr. MACPHERSON: I do not know whether it has.

RAILWAYMEN'S CONVALESCENT HOME, WALLASEY.

17. Captain BARNETT asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether he is now in a position to state when the Railwaymen's Convalescent Home, Leasowe Castle, Wallasey, will be restored to its proper use; and if any reason exists why the German prisoners at present housed there should not be lodged elsewhere or placed under canvas?

Mr. MACPHERSON: Every endeavour is being made to arrange so that the Convalescent Home shall be given back to the railwaymen as early as possible, but I cannot at present fix any date for its return. The Committee of the Home will be given the earliest possible information.

Captain BARNETT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is intense dissatisfaction among the railwaymen that this convalescent home is used as a barracks for German prisoners?

Mr. MACPHERSON: Yes; I understand that is so, but it was almost impossible to get any other place of the kind.

1914 STAR.

18. General McCALMONT asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether he is aware of the dissatisfaction at the conditions under which the 1914 Star has been awarded; and whether, in view of the number of officers and other ranks who are to receive the Star without having had any fighting experience, he will consider the advisability of extending its general issue and adding a clasp for those who were within certain geographical fighting zones either in France or elsewhere in 1914?

Mr. MACPHERSON: As regards the first part of the question, I would remind my hon. and gallant Friend that no medal or decoration has ever been granted where the conditions of award did not cause some dissatisfaction. The answer to the last part of the question is in the negative.

General McCALMONT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there are many hundreds of men who missed this medal by a matter of minutes, whereas there are many hundreds who received it without being in the least entitled to it?

Sir F. HALL: Will the War Committee take into consideration the granting of some decoration to all those men who voluntarily joined up in 1914—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and gallant Gentleman should give notice of that question.

DECORATION OF COLOURS.

20. General McCALMONT asked the Under-Secretary of State for War

[General McCalmont.]

whether, in view of the decoration by the French of the Colours of American regiments, steps will be taken to ensure that the Colours of British battalions which are not carried on service are not precluded from receiving similar honours (by the decision of the Army Council to postpone all consideration of such matters until the conclusion of hostilities, or whether that decision can be reconsidered?

Mr. MACPHERSON: This question will be borne in mind.

STAFFORD INFIRMARY (WAR OFFICE CONTRIBUTION).

22. Sir W. ESSEX asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can now give the hon. Member for Stafford a reply to his request for a larger contribution to the Stafford Infirmary towards the cost of maintenance and treatment of wounded soldiers, in view of the straitened finances of that institution and the substantial inadequacy of the Grant now made per bed to meet the costs thereof?

Mr. FORSTER: I regret that the local inquiries into this matter are not yet complete and that I am not yet in a position to reply fully. I will write to my hon. Friend as soon as possible.

Sir W. ESSEX: A question as to the net cost and the amount allocated by the War Office could be answered in two minutes.

Mr. FORSTER: I am very sorry I cannot give a full answer till I have made further local inquiries.

IMPERIAL WAR CONFERENCE.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES (DENOUNCEMENT).

45. Colonel YATE asked the Prime Minister whether, considering that the Imperial War Conference, has now been brought to a conclusion, he will take the necessary steps to carry out at once whatever decision has been arrived at with reference to the denouncement of the commercial treaties containing Most-Favoured-Nation Clauses, as has already been done by the French Government?

Mr. BONAR LAW: I can add nothing to the previous replies on this subject.

PARIS ECONOMIC RESOLUTIONS.

46. Sir F. HALL asked the Prime Minister if his attention has been drawn to the speech recently made by the French Ambassador, M. Cambon, as to the importance of taking steps to prevent Germany obtaining a similar control over industrial interests in the Allied countries to that which she had secured prior to the outbreak of the War, which control had contributed so largely to the length of the present struggle owing to the resultant unpreparedness of the Entente Governments to meet the German attack; if any communication has been received from the French Government on the subject and as to the necessity of pressing forward a decision, in view of the time that has elapsed since the late Prime Minister pledged the Government to give effect to the Paris Economic Resolutions; and whether the Government will fully adhere to the principles embodied in those Resolutions?

Mr. BONAR LAW: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As to the second and third parts, the policy of the Government remains the same, and includes close co-operation with their French and other Allies, with whom they are in communication on the subject.

BOARD OF TRADE EMPLOYEES, LIVERPOOL.

61. Mr. PENNEFATHER asked the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been drawn to the position of the temporary employés of the Board of Trade at Liverpool; and, if so, what steps will be taken to improve the bonus payable to these men?

Mr. WARDLE: My attention has been called to the position of these temporary employés, and the matter is now being dealt with, in conjunction with the Treasury.

INFANTILE DEATH RATES, LANCASHIRE.

62. Mr. SNOWDEN asked the President of the Board of Trade if he will give a Return showing the infantile death rates of the Lancashire boroughs and Lancashire urban districts during the five years 1913 to 1917, inclusive?

The **PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. S. Walsh)**: My right hon. Friend has asked me to reply to this question. The figures are published annually by the Registrar-General, but I am sending to my hon. Friend a statement containing the information.

FOOD SUPPLIES.

BULLOCKS COMMANDEERED.

70. **Mr. T. WILSON** asked the Food Controller whether it has come to his knowledge that the Mayor of Lydd commandeered two bullocks some months ago at a time when the Romney Marsh Food Control Committee were refused permission to requisition cattle, which resulted in a shortage of meat in the district; whether sanction was given to the Mayor of Lydd by his Department; and, if not, what action he proposes to take in the matter?

The **PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the MINISTRY of FOOD (Major Astor)**: The Mayor of Lydd is the authorised Government agent for the purchase and allocation of live stock in the Rye market district. Owing to a serious local shortage of meat on 17th January, this officer, in pursuance of his powers as deputy-chairman of the market district, and under the authority of the Ministry of Food, obtained two beasts from a local farmer and allocated them to Lydd. It has not hitherto been thought advisable to confer requisitioning powers on local food control committees.

MEAT SUPPLY ASSOCIATIONS.

72. **Sir FORTESCUE FLANNERY** asked the Food Controller whether he is aware that the Ministry of Food formed six months ago wholesale meat supply associations and appointed them Government agents to supply dead meat to retail butchers, the Government guaranteeing them against loss or leakage of every kind and in addition paying them a commission of 2½ per cent. on their turnover; and that the Ministry of Food requested these retailers, who had hitherto bought their own live stock and slaughtered them, also to form retail associations for the purpose of procuring supplies under Government control, but with no guarantee or commission; whether he can now state what has been the aggregate cost to the Ministry

of the wholesale meat supply associations for the six months of its existence; what has been the cost on the turnover per hundredweight and per head of cattle and sheep so sold; and will he state the corresponding costs of the retailers' associations during the same period; whether he is aware that, by reason of Government subsidies to the wholesale associations, retailers have been supplied by the Government agents at lower prices than those at which the ready-money live-stock buyers have been able to procure their supplies; and that their associations have been compelled in consequence to buy of their members to make up their losses, although both classes of retailers are compelled to keep to the same scale of prices in selling meat; and whether, seeing that the present system operates also against farmers who fatten stock, it will be reconsidered?

Major ASTOR: Members of wholesale meat supply associations are required to give up trading on their own account and they buy and sell solely for the Central Live Stock Fund. They are guaranteed against loss and receive a fixed commission of 2½ per cent. Retail butchers, who have been formed into group committees or joint buying associations, continue to trade on their own account; they therefore take the chance of profit or loss on the grading of beasts purchased by them on the live-weight basis. In point of fact grading losses are frequently offset by the profit on offals, which the retailer who receives dead meat from a wholesale association does not obtain. It is too early at present to form any trustworthy estimate of the comparative cost of these various associations. The present system can only operate adversely to farmers who fatten stock in the rare cases where cattle are graded too low on the live-weight basis. The remedy for this is the purchase of all stock on the dead-weight basis, and in many districts farmers are inclined to welcome the extension of this method.

Sir F. FLANNERY: Is there complete agreement between the Board of Agriculture and the Department which my hon. Friend represents upon this question in relation to farmers and butchers in their respective interests?

Major ASTOR: The Departments concerned are in constant consultation on these matters.

Sir F. HALL: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the London butchers are still suffering very great inconvenience in regard to the quality of meat that is supplied.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is another question.

GAME AND VENISON.

71. Mr. HOLT asked the Food Controller whether the occupiers of sporting rights may present game or venison for sale at bazaars in connection with war charities; and whether such game or venison may be sold without coupons or restriction of price?

Major ASTOR: Occupiers of sporting rights may present game and venison for sale at bazaars in connection with war charities, and, in respect of such sales, the usual rationing requirements and restrictions of price may in approved cases be modified by special licence issued by the Food Commissioner. The forms of licence now in use provide in each case for the removal of price restrictions; but the purchaser is either required to present his ration book to the vendor for detachment of the appropriate coupons, or he must himself detach such coupons from the ration book and preserve them for production to his Food Control Committee if required. The new rate of coupon values for game and venison is quite liberal; it was published in the Press on 30th July.

GENERAL ELECTION (SOLDIERS' VOTES).

75. Mr. TREVELYAN asked the President of the Local Government Board whether, as it has been decided that, in the event of a General Election, the votes cast at home will not be counted before the arrival of the ballot papers marked by the soldiers who are away from home, the soldiers are to vote on an earlier date than the General Election, or whether all over the country several days are to elapse between the poll and the counting of the votes?

Mr. S. WALSH: Section 23 (3) of the Representation of the People Act contemplates the postponement of the counting of the votes cast at home for a period not exceeding eight days after the close of the poll, so that the counting of all

the votes, including the absent voters' votes, may take place at one and the same time.

MUNITION WORKS (POISONOUS FUMES).

76. Sir FORTESCUE FLANNERY asked the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received a copy of the resolution passed by some of the inhabitants of a town complaining of the injury to their health by the emission of poisonous fumes from munition works in the town; and whether he has been able to arrange for an abatement of the fumes without injury to the processes of munition making?

Mr. S. WALSH: My right hon. Friend has received a representation on this subject, and has been in communication with the local authority. The matters complained of appear to arise out of conditions due to the War, but he has directed an investigation into the question whether improvements can be effected without prejudice to the supply of munitions?

CUSTOMS WATCHERS, LIVERPOOL.

77. Mr. PENNEFATHER asked the Secretary to the Treasury if his attention has been drawn to the position of the extra Customs watchers at Liverpool; whether any of these men are in any circumstances only in receipt of 6d. per hour overtime; whether merchants are charged 9d. per hour for such overtime services; and will he explain why the men should receive 3d. per hour less than the charge paid by the merchants?

Mr. BALDWIN: The Board of Customs and Excise sent instructions to Liverpool on the 26th June last that the extra men employed there were to be paid overtime at the rate of 8d. per hour. They have now telegraphed to Liverpool directing that, if in any case this was not done immediately, arrears are to be paid forthwith.

PROMOTION (ROYAL NAVY).

80. Sir FORTESCUE FLANNERY asked the First Lord of the Admiralty if promotion in every rank and rating up to the rank of post-captain is by merit and selection; if promotion above that rank in the

Navy still continues to be made by seniority alone; and, seeing that that system of seniority has been in use for three centuries, whether, in view of the changed conditions of naval service, a reform will be now considered, so that all promotions to every rank shall be based upon merit and selection?

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Dr. Macnamara): As far as ratings are concerned, seniority plays a large part in advancement. The same is true of officers in a varying degree. In promotion from lieutenant to lieutenant-commander, for example, seniority alone is taken into account, and promotion up to fleet-paymaster in the Accountant Branch depends almost entirely on seniority. In other cases seniority plays a greater or lesser part, but it is never entirely lost sight of.

Promotion on the Flag List and from captain to rear-admiral is by seniority in the sense that when an officer reaches the top of his list he is promoted automatically in the next vacancy, but this is to some extent modified in practice by various rules as to qualifying service, retirement for non-service, etc. The Board also, in the case of an officer whom it is decided not to employ as a flag officer on the Active List, have the power to place him on the Retired List as soon as he is promoted to rear-admiral, and fill up the vacancy so caused by another promotion. This, with the power of granting higher acting rank where necessary, has been sufficient to meet present-day requirements satisfactorily.

General McCALMONT: Do the Board make use of that power of placing rear-admirals on the Retired List?

Dr. MACNAMARA: Speaking offhand, I should say yes.

ENEMY SUBMARINES (MURDER OF FISHERMEN).

81. **Sir F. HALL** asked the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been drawn to the deliberate murder, on the 26th July, of four fishermen who formed part of the crew of two sailing trawlers, one British and the other Belgian, which were sunk by a German submarine off the East Coast; whether the crews were placed on board the submarine and, on the approach of a

patrol boat, she submerged, leaving the crew struggling in the water; and, if so, whether steps will be taken to bring such action before the Allied and neutral countries in order that they may have fresh indication of the manner in which the Germans carry out war upon defenceless fishermen?

Dr. MACNAMARA: The answer to the first and second parts of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the last part, the account of this unforgettable horror has been published in the Press and the necessary material supplied to the Ministry of Information.

National Health Insurance (Sickness Benefit).

73. **Mr. SOMERVELL** asked the Comptroller of the Household, as representing the National Health Insurance Commissioners, what steps, if any, have been taken to inform the general body of persons insured under the National Insurance Act of the recent regulation which requires notification of sickness within three days of its commencement; and if, in view of the general ignorance of this rule, some further method of information will be adopted?

Colonel GIBBS: The provisions of the new Act have been notified to the Press and to approved societies, but it has not been practicable to send individual notices to each one of the 14,000,000 insured persons. Since the commencement of the principal Act, the rules of all approved societies have required prompt notification of sickness to be given, breach of rules being punishable by fines at the discretion of the society; the new provision merely attaches a definite penalty to any unreasonable breach of this rule.

Mr. SOMERVELL: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that a great many insured persons are suffering loss continually through this provision? There is a very inadequate knowledge of it.

Colonel GIBBS: I am not aware of that. Perhaps my hon. Friend will put down a question.

Mr. E. HARVEY: Could notices of this be given in the post offices?

Colonel GIBBS: I will make that suggestion.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed.

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

WAR.

MINISTERS (BUSINESS INTERESTS).

Sir R. COOPER asked the Prime Minister whether the principle that no Member of this House shall hold a position of trust and responsibility in any State Department which has dealings with any business in which the Member has any direct or indirect financial interest has been ignored in many cases during the War; and, if so, does he intend to take steps at the conclusion of the War to re-establish the principle?

Mr. BONAR LAW: I am not aware that the general principle stated in this question has been ignored.

GENERAL ELECTION (SERVICE MEN).

Mr. OUTHWAITE asked the Prime Minister (1) whether, in view of the probability of a General Election at an early date, provision will now be made for the distribution of election literature amongst the soldiers abroad whose votes will be recorded; and (2), in view of the probability of an election at an early date, whether he can state what steps will be taken to enable candidates to ascertain the means of communicating their views to voters who are on naval or military service?

Mr. BONAR LAW: I cannot add anything to the answer which I gave to my hon. Friend the Member for Exeter on the 25th July.

TITLES (CANADA).

Mr. MARTIN asked the Prime Minister (1) whether the Government intend to carry out the Resolution unanimously passed by the Canadian House of Commons that no hereditary titles be conferred on Canadians; and (2) whether the Government intend to act on the Order in Council passed by the Canadian Government and approved by the Canadian House of Commons, asking that no titles be conferred on Canadians except on the recommendation of the Canadian Government?

Mr. BONAR LAW: The Government are in communication with the Canadian Government in regard to this question.

IMPERIAL WAR MUSEUM.

Sir JOHN BUTCHER asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any scheme has been prepared and sanctioned by the War Cabinet for the establishment and maintenance of an Imperial War Museum which defines its nature and objects, the place or building to be occupied, and the nature of the exhibits; whether the details of such scheme will be submitted to the House of Commons for consideration; and whether he can give an assurance that, until such scheme has been approved by the House, no sums will be expended in connection therewith except those already specified in the Estimates and passed by the House?

Mr. BONAR LAW: In March, 1917, the War Cabinet authorised the First Commissioner of Works to proceed with the collection of material for an Imperial War Museum, and to form a small Committee with that object. The necessary expenditure is provided for in Estimates which have been approved by this House, and all subsequent expenditure on this service will, of course, also need the prior approval of Parliament.

OLD AGE PENSIONS (WAR LOAN INTEREST).

Sir R. COOPER asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he has considered the encouragement to the working classes to invest their earnings in War Loan that would be given if the interest on War Bonds were excluded from the income which disqualifies people from receiving the old age pension?

Mr. BONAR LAW: I cannot undertake to introduce the legislation that would be necessary to carry out this suggestion.

ENLISTED POSTAL OFFICIALS (MILITARY PAY, ETC.).

Mr. DUNCAN asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer (1) whether, in view of the industrial unrest, his attention has been called to the action of the Government, which in 1914 promised postal servants certain inducements to enter the Army, and in 1917 published a document repudiating the promise; whether he is aware that such breach of contract has had a bad effect upon the members of the whole Civil Service, causing Government servants to feel that they cannot rely upon the pledges given by Departmental heads; and whether the Treasury will reconsider the decision;

(2) The Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the Post Office circular, 29th September, 1914, appealing for recruits to join the Army stated that Post Office servants enlisting as office telegraphists in the Royal Engineers, Regular Army, or in the Royal Engineers, Special Reserve, Signal Section, would be allowed full civil pay in addition to military pay when called up for service; whether such a promise was in conformity with the past practice of the Government when seeking trained men at quick notice from the Post Office; whether thousands of men joined the Colours in response to the appeal; whether in 1917 the Treasury and the Army authorities, without consultation with the Post Office officers concerned, issued an Army Council Instruction nullifying this promise and reducing very considerably the military emoluments promised in 1914; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter; and

(3) The Postmaster-General whether he is aware of the ill-feeling and unrest caused by the repudiation by the Treasury of the promises contained in Post Office Circular, 29th September, 1914, relating to the terms of enlistment of Post Office officials in the Royal Engineers; whether he recognises that such action tends to destroy confidence in the administration; and whether he will place no impediments in the way of legal action being taken in the Law Courts for breach of contract by the trades unions whose members have been adversely affected?

Mr. ILLINGWORTH: In the announcements inviting recruits for the Royal Engineers, Signal Section, it was stated that full civil pay would be allowed in addition to military pay and allowances, thereby placing the men who enlisted in a better position than other Civil servants, who only receive the balance of Civil pay over military pay and allowance. When increases in the rate of separation allowances were sanctioned in 1917, it was not thought right to improve still further the relative position of these men; and it was decided that the increases in the allowances should, as in the case of other Civil servants, be deducted from Civil pay. The effect is that the men concerned continue to receive the exceptionally favourable rates of pay granted to them on enlistment, but, in common with other Civil servants, they are excluded from the increases referred to above. As those men are already receiving considerably more than their Civil emoluments I do not consider they have any legitimate grievance; but I propose to consult the Law Officers as to whether there is any legal ground for their claim that they are entitled to benefit by any subsequent increase in the rate of military pay or allowances.

CIVIL SERVICE PENSIONERS.

Mr. ROWNTREE asked the Secretary to the Treasury whether any additional pension or war bonus has been granted to Civil Service pensioners since the commencement of the War; and, if not, whether he can see his way, owing to the high cost of living, to increase the scale of pensions or grant some war bonus?

Mr. BALDWIN: I have nothing to add to the numerous answers which I have given to similar questions on the subject this Session.

FOOD SUPPLIES.

MEAT.

Colonel THORNE asked the Food Controller what are the grounds on which it has been decided to be necessary to increase the price of meat to the public; whether he will state how his Department would estimate a bullock of 10 cwt. live weight to work out; what would be the yield in beef, weight of hide, head and

feet, intestines, liver, heart, tongue, lights, etc.; what would be the wholesale return for each and the total for the animal; how would this compare with the cost; and what are the details of the estimated departmental charges against the animal?

Major ASTOR: An increase in the price of meat to the public is required in order to meet the increased cost of meat imported from the United States, and to cover the distribution charges which are at present borne by the Ministry of Food. The particulars asked for in the second part of the question are of too hypothetical a character to be usefully embodied in a Parliamentary answer, but I have caused an estimate to be prepared and sent to my hon. Friend.

ABERYSTWYTH AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE
(EXECUTIVE OFFICER).

Mr. DUNCAN asked the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is aware that the Aberystwyth District Agricultural Committee recently invited applications for the post of executive officer at a salary of £125 per annum and travelling expenses; that amongst the applicants were three discharged soldiers who were experienced in agriculture, one of whom holds a gold medal for ploughing; and that eventually the post was given to a farmer and dairyman who already held the position of machinery officer under the same committee; whether he will urge upon agricultural committees the advisability of appointing discharged soldiers whenever possible; and whether he will make representations to the Aberystwyth Committee with regard to this particular appointment?

Mr. PROTHERO: I am inquiring into the facts of this case, and will let my hon. Friend know the result as soon as possible. If it should be desirable to take any steps in the direction indicated in the last parts of the question, that shall be done.

POTATOES.

Mr. W. YOUNG asked the Secretary for Scotland whether, in view of the importance of the Scottish potato crop as a source of food supply for the coming year and of the fact that the harvesting of potatoes involves more strenuous and heavy labour than the harvesting of the grain crop, he can say that the pledge that no more men will be taken from agricul-

ture for the Army till the end of the harvest embraces the safe ingathering of the Scottish potato crop?

Mr. MUNRO: Yes, Sir.

GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND.

Sir W. NUGENT asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether the Government have abandoned all intention of introducing a measure of self-government for Ireland based on the majority Report of the Irish Convention or on any other lines?

Mr. SHORTT: I regret I am not yet in a position to give a definite reply to the hon. Member.

AIRSHIP CONSTRUCTION (SKILLED WORKERS).

Mr. C. DUNCAN asked the Secretary to the Admiralty if large rigid airships are urgently required for His Majesty's Navy; if so, if any reason can be given why the firm that has carried out all the pioneer work in rigid airship construction and built the first successful rigid airship should now be in a position necessitating a large reduction in the number of their skilled workers whilst other firms who had not the same experience were fully employed; whether he is aware that resentment is felt by the trade unionists of this firm who, at considerable sacrifice, have given every possible assistance in teaching the work to female labour and now find that a large proportion of girls will shortly be without employment or put on other work where their special training will not be utilised; and if any reason can be given for the stoppage of construction of a new airship building shed for this firm on which a large sum of money has been expended?

Dr. MACNAMARA: The firm to which I understand my hon. Friend to refer is at present building a rigid airship, but the constructional shed which they have at the present time, though big enough for the ships they are building, is not sufficiently large for future requirements. Moreover, building sheds already in existence elsewhere are sufficient to meet present requirements. As regards the third part of the question, there is sufficient need for labour in the district to keep everyone in full employment. As regards

the last part of the question, which refers to another shed altogether, the stoppage of construction referred to was due to the fact that the labour and material which would otherwise have been absorbed were needed for other and more important undertakings.

OLD SOLDIERS (PENSIONS INCREASED).

Major **NEWMAN** asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether he is aware of the hardship that the rise in the price of living is inflicting on old soldiers of the Crimean campaign and onwards, who now find their pensions, whether invalid or not, entirely insufficient for their wants; and will steps be taken to allow these pensions to be supplemented by way of war bonus or otherwise?

Mr. **FORSTER**: The following steps have been taken by the War Office and Ministry of Pensions: Campaign pensioners under seventy have been given a war addition of 2s. 6d. a week. The pensions of old soldiers totally disabled through former wars have been raised to the present war scale.

LABOUR COMPANY (PRIVATE HOLLINGUM).

Sir **JOHN BETHELL** asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether Private Hollingum, No. 83055, of a Labour Company, British Expeditionary Force, has recently been court-martialled and, if so, for what offence; what is the nature of his sentence; and where is it being served?

Mr. **MACPHERSON**: My inquiries in this case are not yet complete, but I will write to my hon. Friend as soon as possible.

ALIENS.

KRAHN.

Sir **R. COOPER** asked the Under-Secretary of State for War if Krahn, who was employed as a clerk in a record office, was at any time employed at the War Office; and is he aware that this man was convicted at Birmingham in 1913, sentenced to five years' imprisonment, and recommended for deportation?

Mr. **MACPHERSON**: I have made all the inquiries I can. The answer is in the negative.

DE LASZLO.

Sir **R. COOPER** asked the Home Secretary if De Laszlo is still interned; has he been removed from his original internment camp; if so, for what reason; and is he now in a camp or in a boarding house?

Sir **G. CAVE**: The internment order in this case is still in force, but, in view of the very serious medical reports I received as to the state of De Laszlo's health, I authorised his temporary release on parole to a specified nursing home in London, on condition that he should not go outside the nursing home or (except by special permission) communicate with any person other than his family, and medical attendant, and the staff of the home. He is still in the nursing home in question.

MILITARY SERVICE.

FORAGE, IRELAND (CHECKERS).

Major **NEWMAN** asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether he will give the number of civilians of military age who are at present acting as checkers in connection with hay pressing and the purchase of forage in Ireland; what is their weekly pay and allowances; and why these positions are not reserved for disabled soldiers and military pensioners?

Mr. **FORSTER**: The number is fifteen, of whom five are discharged soldiers and the remainder are nearly all unfit for military service. Their weekly pay and allowances vary from £1 16s. to £2 9s. Disabled soldiers and military pensioners are employed wherever suitable men are available.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

Sir **MONTAGUE BARLOW** asked the Minister of National Service whether he has set up special advisory committees to consider the cases of exemption from military service of certain classes of co-operative employes; whether he accepts the principle that, allowing for the service to the State rendered by the co-operative societies, the private traders are entitled to be treated on principles of equality with the co-operative societies; whether he can state what these classes

are; and whether he will see that similar opportunities are afforded to private traders who are working on the same lines and in similar trades?

Sir A. GEDDES: My hon. Friend will find all the information he requires in the answers which I gave to the hon. Members for Merthyr Tydvil and Tower Hamlets on the 24th July, and to the hon. Members for Devizes and Great Grimsby on the 29th July. I may add that the List of Certified Occupations is being revised with a view to including certain classes of men engaged in the distribution of food.

MAIDA VALE BAKER.

Sir R. COOPER asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that Harold Watkin Wynn Lloyd, of 14, Formosa Street, Maida Vale, has been refused exemption from military service by the local tribunal and that the London Appeal Tribunal has refused to rehear the case; that this man's two brothers are serving in the Army; and that the last brother was taken on the understanding that H. W. W. Lloyd would remain to carry on the business; and, seeing that this business is now being closed and that there are three German bakers in the immediate vicinity carrying on trade—Bechman (trading as Wright), Sasse, and Schneider—can he take steps to save this British business from falling into the hands of neighbouring traders of enemy origin?

Mr. HAYES FISHER: I have been asked to answer this question. This case has been before the Appeal Tribunal on a number of occasions. As the hon. Baronet will appreciate, exemptions have to be reviewed in the light of increased military requirements, and the Appeal Tribunal, notwithstanding the facts as to the brothers who are serving and the other businesses in the neighbourhood, felt that they could not any longer grant exemption. The man is thirty-two years of age and single. I may mention that the case was once reheard, in November last, and temporary exemption was then granted. I propose to communicate with the local tribunal to ascertain whether something can be done for maintaining the business.

ROYAL ENGINEERS (RIVETERS).

Mr. DUNCAN asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he

can state the rate of wages to be paid or at present being paid to men in the Royal Engineers who are to be, or who are now, employed there and who are qualified riveters?

Mr. FORSTER: On joining as recruits such soldiers receive regimental pay at 1s. 2d. and engineer pay at 6d. a day. On completing the recruits' course they receive the regimental pay of their rank, 1s. 2d. a day as sapper, 2s. 6d. as corporal, and 3s. 3d. as sergeant, with engineer pay varying from 1s. to 2s. a day according to their qualifications.

NAVAL AND MILITARY PENSIONS AND GRANTS.

Mr. JOWETT asked the Pensions Minister if he will state the present position in regard to the pension of parents who have lost one or more sons in the War and whose claim for a pension has been denied on the ground that there had been no pre-war dependence, the sons in question having been apprentices, secondary school scholars, or in receipt of progressive wages when they enlisted, now that it has been decided that separation allowance ought to be paid to the parents in such cases, can the parents referred to claim a pension; and, if not, why this claim cannot be entertained?

Sir A. GRIFFITH-BOSCAWEN: Under the existing Regulations the parents of any soldier, sailor, or airman who has lost his life as a result of service in the present War may, if at any time either or both of the parents is or are wholly or partly incapable of self-support from age or infirmity and in pecuniary need, be granted a pension of not less than 3s. 6d. and not exceeding 15s. a week. The recent concession as regards separation allowance carries with it a 5s. pension to a parent or parents who had been drawing the allowance under the conditions laid down, if their son has lost his life as a result of service in the present War.

Mr. MORRELL asked the Secretary to the Admiralty whether there is still an inequality, amounting in some cases to 3s. a week, as between the separation allowance granted to a sailor's wife and that granted to a soldier's wife; whether there is any reason for such inequality; and whether it is proposed to take any steps to remove it?

Dr. MACNAMARA: In May last provision was made, by a scheme of supplementary Navy separation allowances—subject to an increase in allotment which would still leave the sailor or marine with 10s. 6d. a week for his personal use—to ensure that the wives and dependants of the lower ratings and ranks in the Royal Navy and Marines should receive as much in the form of separation allowance, allotment, and allotment concession, as the family of a private in the Army. As my hon. Friend is no doubt aware, rates of pay in the Navy are, except in the lower ratings, higher than in the Army.

Major NEWMAN asked the Under-Secretary of State for War whether he will inquire if Mrs. K. Bone, of 9, Chesterfield Road, Enfield Lock, received on 20th June Effects Form 161 acquainting her that her son, Private E. W. Bone, No. 131686, Infantry branch, Machine Gun Corps, killed in action, had executed no valid will in her favour, and that, consequently, though he had been his mother's support and she had brought him up entirely, her husband having deserted her many years previously, the amount due to him from Army funds must be paid to the father; and, if nothing else can be done, in view of these circumstances, will a compassionate allowance be granted to this woman from Army funds?

Mr. FORSTER: The late soldier left no will disposing of his estate, and the War Office has no power to act contrary to the law in the matter. Under the law of intestacy the estate is the sole property of the father and could not be paid to any other person without his consent. I understand from the Ministry of Pensions that a pension of 11s. weekly is being awarded to the mother, Mrs. Keziah Bone, with effect from 6th August, 1918.

MERCANTILE MARINE (UNIFORM).

Mr. PETO asked the President of the Board of Trade what steps it is proposed to take to give effect to the finding of the committee appointed by the Board of Trade to report on the subject of a national uniform for the mercantile marine?

Mr. WARDLE: I hope to be able to make a statement about this matter very shortly.

GERMAN PRISONERS, HORSHAM.

Sir R. COOPER asked the Home Secretary if his attention has been drawn to the behaviour of German prisoners working without a guard on farms in the neighbourhood of Horsham and Steyning, to the behaviour of these men towards women and girls, and to their freedom to visit the beach; has he received any official report on this state of affairs; and what action has he taken?

Mr. MACPHERSON: My right hon. Friend has asked me to answer this question. I am making inquiry, and will write to my hon. Friend.

DISTRICT WAGES COMMITTEE, SUSSEX.

Mr. C. DUNCAN asked the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is aware that Mr. W. P. G. Boxall, K.C., one of the appointed members of the Sussex District Wages Committee, is a farmer employing agricultural labourers, and is therefore directly and immediately interested in decisions affecting wages and working conditions of agricultural workers; whether he is aware that the workpeople concerned take exception to this gentleman being an appointed member, because of his partiality to the employers' side on wages questions; and whether he will inquire into this matter, with a view to appointing in the place of Mr. Boxall some other less partial gentleman?

Mr. PROTHERO: I understand that Mr. Boxall has a country house in Sussex to which about 60 acres of grass and some woodland are attached. None of the land had been under arable cultivation for forty years until a field was ploughed up by contract work this year. He at present employs three workers for dairy, farm, and garden work. Mr. Boxall is a distinguished lawyer, a King's Counsel, Recorder of Brighton, chairman of Quarter Sessions, and chairman of the Appeal Tribunal for West Sussex. His interest in farming does not appear to be sufficient to affect his impartiality, while it gives him the advantage of practical knowledge in dealing with such questions as come before the district wages committee. I see no reason for making any change at present in the constitution of the committee.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS
(RENTS).

Major LANE-FOX asked the President of the Board of Agriculture if he will state on what basis agricultural workers, who are now paying less than an economic rent for the cottages that they occupy, are to be charged for rent in reckoning the wages to be paid them under the awards of the Wages Board; and whether it is intended that in future the full economic rent should be allowed for in reckoning the total wages paid?

Mr. PROTHERO: The Agricultural Wages Board have just given notice of a proposal to make an Order defining the value at which the occupation of a cottage held by a worker from his employer may be reckoned as part payment of wages. I should be glad therefore if my hon. and gallant Friend would await the issue of the Order for an answer to the first part of his question. I may add that the Wages Board do not in the proposed Order take the economic rent as the value for this purpose

WOOL PRICES (ISLAND OF
HARRIS).

Sir R. COOPER asked the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is aware that the crofters in the island of Harris are compelled by Government to send all their wool, except 50 lbs., to Oban and sell it to the Government at 24s. a stone, and that the consequence is that they have to buy back their own wool from the merchants and pay about 44s. a stone for it; whether he is aware that some of the women in Harris are to a great extent dependent on spinning wool for their living; and whether, in view of these facts, he will take steps to put an end to this treatment of the people of the island?

Mr. FORSTER: The limitation of the amount of wool which any crofter can keep for manufacture to 50 lbs. applies only to cases where the crofter makes up the wool for domestic use. Where crofters are

engaged in the manufacture of cloth for sale no limit is placed on the amount of wool to be retained. Crofters desiring further supplies of wool are able to purchase them at the Government issue rate of from 36s. to 37s. per stone of 24 lbs. The price of 44s. per stone quoted by the hon. Member, it is concluded, must refer to cases of illegal sale, and if he will give me particulars of any such cases I will cause full inquiries to be made into them.

INTERNED GERMANS, SANTANDER
(ALLEGED SIGNALLING).

Major Sir H. HAVELOCK-ALLAN asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, of the crew of the German submarine U56, who were interned at Santander on 21st May, 1918, six individuals have been permitted by the Spanish authorities to signal seawards; and if two illicit wireless transmitters have been detected sending signals in cipher?

Lord R. CECIL: His Majesty's Ambassador at Madrid, who is of course aware of the rumours which have been in circulation, reported on 28th July that the matter was receiving the close attention of the British Vice-Consul at Santander, with whom His Excellency was keeping in constant touch, but that at that date it had not been possible to substantiate the allegations that had been made.

Opium.

Mr. THEODORE TAYLOR asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, with regard to the remaining stock of opium in Chinese ports, of which the Chinese Government has by purchase recently relieved the importers, he has any information to the effect that it is the declared purpose of the Chinese Government strictly to confine its use to medicinal purposes?

Lord R. CECIL: No, Sir; I am afraid that I have no information on this subject which I can usefully give to the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. DILLON: I wish to ask the Leader of the House what business he proposes to take to-day?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Bonar Law): If the hon. Member will look at the Paper, he will see that most of the Orders down are subjects which will not occupy much time. We hope to take as far as we can to-day.

Mr. GULLAND: Does the right hon. Gentleman intend to ask the House to sit at twelve on Thursday?

Mr. BONAR LAW: I had not considered that. Perhaps my right hon. Friend will put the question to-morrow.

Mr. DENMAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman going to leave the Lotteries Bill to the decision of the House?

Mr. BONAR LAW: I propose to take the course of leaving the Second Reading of the Bill entirely to a free vote of the House.

Ordered, "That Government Business be not interrupted this night under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House), and may be entered upon at any hour although opposed."—[Mr. Bonar Law.]

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 3) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time To-morrow.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

INDIAN CONSTITUTIONAL REFORMS.

MR. MONTAGU'S STATEMENT.

Order read for Committee.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I beg to move, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

We are within a few hours of the end of this part of the Session, and we are getting on in the month of August, and therefore it is in accordance with Parliamentary

tradition that a tired House of Commons should spare a few hours at this season of the year, if it spares them at all, for an Indian Debate. I say if it spares them at all, for I regret that it is five years since we had a debate upon the Indian Budget, and I am only too painfully aware that it was I, as Under-Secretary of State for India, who delivered the last four Budget statements. On this fifth occasion, when I ask leave to move that you should now leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to review the financial and other situation in India in the ordinary way, for I gather that this Debate has been set down on this occasion, just as a similar occasion is being offered in another place, for the discussion of a particular set of problems. The financial statement has, as usual, been furnished to the House. I would only like to remind hon. Members of the one outstanding feature of the last year's finance, namely, the contribution of £100,000,000 towards the cost of the War. The intention was to raise as much as possible of this by loan in India and to liquidate the balance by the Government of India taking over the required amount of British War Debt, meeting the interest thereupon and gradually discharging the principal. The response to the loan raised in India far exceeded any anticipation. I think the sort of estimate of a loan under previous circumstances was something like £4,000,000. The loan last year realised £35,000,000, which was in due course transferred to the Imperial Government, and at a later date in the same year the Government of India succeeded in raising for its own needs £30,000,000 in the form of Treasury Bills for the purpose of financing war expenditure in India. The applications for War Loan from all classes were most satisfactory, and large subscriptions were obtained not only in British India, but in the native States. I realise to the full that figures of this kind are not comparable with the enormous results of War Loans in this country, but it is hardly necessary for me to remind the House of the poverty of the people of India, of the undeveloped condition of its natural resources, and that contributions to loans of this kind can only be made, not by denying luxuries, but by severely restricting expenditure on such vital necessities as education, sanitation, and the development of industries.

This year a new War Loan has been issued, the proceeds of which will also be

[Mr. Montagu.]

paid to the Imperial Government. The estimated yield of it was to be £20,000,000. Already £16,500,000 has been realised, and therefore it is obvious that of the £100,000,000 promised well over £50,000,000 has already been raised in India itself. That, I think, everybody will agree is a very remarkable result. Particularly in view of the Motion which stands in the name of my hon. Friend the Member for Lincoln (Mr. C. Roberts), I should like to say a word or two about Indian war effort. First of all, as regards supplies, in 1917 1,383,000 tons of wheat were exported by the Government of India for the relief of Great Britain and her Allies. Special measures were taken last autumn to increase the wheat area, and 34,688,000 acres of wheat were planted, but I am afraid that the estimated exportable surplus will not be reached, because the monsoon, for the first time for many years, is not progressing altogether favourably. Two hundred million pounds of tea were exported last year, and arrangements have been made to export 250,000,000 this season. Thirty one million pounds' worth of jute and jute goods were exported last year for war purposes, and £2,250,000 worth of wool. Large quantities of Army blankets are also made in India, and 60 per cent. of the boots manufactured in this country are provided—with the tanned hides necessary for their uppers—from India. I will not go into details of saltpetre, manganese and wolfram, but I will turn to the men.

It is well known that Indian troops have played their part, and are playing by far the larger part in Mesopotamia and Palestine, and, at the beginning of the War, played a very large part in France. This has solely been possible by the increase in the number of recruits. Before 1914 the annual intake of recruits for combatant purposes was about 15,000. Last year the figure exceeded 285,000, and, reckoning non-combatants, 440,000. This year it is proposed to raise 500,000 combatants, besides a large number of non-combatants, and I am informed that those responsible for recruiting have no doubt that India will obtain the men necessary to complete the new establishments which have been sanctioned by the War Office. The recruiting figures for June reached the record of 50,000, and the remarkable fact is that provinces from which recruits seldom came before

—races which have never yet shown martial instincts, or only to a small degree—are providing their contribution to these numbers. I will instance in particular Burmah. Then, too, these new recruits are not being asked to come to the War only as privates. They are to have the opportunity comparable to the opportunity which is given, I think, to every other soldier raised for combatant purposes for the British Empire, of acquiring His Majesty's commission. It was stated in the House the other day that the military members of the Army Council differed from the policy of the Government of India and of the Cabinet on the subject of commissions in the Army. I will respectfully say, without entering into controversy, that if you ask a man to fight in this War—in this War above all other wars—then surely he should be given every opportunity of winning by gallantry any position in the Army, whatever his race. It is said sometimes that it is an intolerable thing to risk British soldiers being commanded by Indian officers. Those racial considerations are, I hope, wholly out of date. When different principles have long since been established for the civilian population, when Indians are eligible for the highest positions in their own country in civilian life, when Indian officers command large hospitals in Mesopotamia at this moment, it is idle to say that racial considerations should continue to debar Indians from obtaining His Majesty's commission and becoming officers in His Majesty's Army. That controversy—a long controversy, a controversy extending through many years—is now, I hope, at last settled with the approval of the overwhelming majority of people of this country.

But I should like to say one word more of Indian effort in Mesopotamia. The railways which convey our troops both in Mesopotamia and in Palestine have been largely constructed from materials supplied by the Indian railways, and in Mesopotamia they are worked mainly by Indian labour. Seventeen hundred miles of track, 200 engines, and nearly 6,000 vehicles have been provided by India for the various theatres of war. The river flotilla on the Tigris and the Euphrates is mainly composed of vessels drawn from Indian rivers. The plant which now lights Basra and Baghdad was nearly all drawn from India, and is worked by Indians. With the help of expert advice, by modern irrigation, and up-to-date agricultural

machinery, a very large proportion of which comes from India, we are gradually reviving the former fertility of Mesopotamia. These resources are provided by India, and are gradually changing the appearance of the country and eradicating the blight of Turkish misrule. It is rather interesting to compare the results of British occupation in Mesopotamia with German occupation in Belgium. I have nothing to say about frontier affairs, which have been quiet, or about those grave occurrences in the Middle East which necessitate taking every precaution for the security of Indian frontiers, as those would be more fittingly dealt with by some other representative of the Government. They are not wholly Indian concerns; they are mainly military and Foreign Office concerns, but vitally, it is true, affecting India. I do not think any useful purpose would result from discussing them now.

I would occupy the rest of the short draft I propose to make upon the patience of the House with a short discussion of this book. It has been published as a Parliamentary Paper. It is called a "Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms." I cannot pretend in the short time I propose to occupy the attention of the House or in any length of time short of reading the Report out and out—which I hasten to assure hon. Members that I have no intention of doing—that I can hope to provide a substitute for reading it, and, though I have no intention of advertising the goods of which I am part author, I cannot attempt to provide a substitute for the necessary task sooner or later of reading this document. I say that with very great respect, for no speaker, no summary, no newspaper article, no newspaper letters, can provide real, genuine students with a fair view of the case unless such students are good enough, and I know how appallingly long it is, sooner or later to read the volume itself. I am going to assume this morning that nearly everybody has read it. If it has been read it will be seen that we claim to prove in this document, and I claim it with confidence, that the principles of reform which we have recommended throughout are not principles which arise now, but are the logical, inevitable outcome of over 100 years' of Indian rule. We have tried to show how we have steadily inculcated into some, at least, of the Indian people love of liberty and self-government, education on Western lines, ideas of local

government comparable to our own. The whole development of legislative example has stretched from the time when one or two Indians sought to help to register our laws, right through to the day of those reforms with which the names of Lord Morley and Lord Minto will be for ever associated. The developments have lead irretrievably, inevitably and infallibly to the conditions which have arisen to-day, when those people whom we taught and trained to this extent come to us and say, "You have taught us the value of self-government; set us on the road to obtain it." I do not say that that demand was not quickened by the War, but the statements of our own ideals from our own Ministers and from Allied Ministers, the hatred of the Prussian ideal, the share of India in this War of liberty, the natural searchings of men's hopes and aspirations for something better, have added their impulse to this development and made an irresistible appeal to the Government of India for some further steps in the development of self-government. It started with the determination of the Government of India to do something more. In the time of Lord Hardinge it was pursued while he collected the opinions of local Governments, and at the end of his Viceroyalty it was taken up immediately by Lord Chelmsford, who concentrated upon getting an authoritative declaration from the Home Government as to what we sought to do with the India which we had created. His demand and the demand of his Government for a statement of the aims of British policy were under consideration by the Home Government and by the War Cabinet when I assumed office. The announcement was almost ready. I inherited the situation from my right hon. Friend beside me (Mr. Chamberlain). I was proud to be the spokesman of the Government, and I wish to give the history of that declaration as it started in India, and as it was pursued by my right hon. Friend, because it has been stated publicly that this whole movement is a conspiracy which I hatched, and along the tortuous paths of which I have led an unwilling and unfortunate Viceroy. Of course, this is a travesty of the facts, but when I pointed this out a fortnight ago to its authors in public I was then accused of sheltering myself behind my predecessor and the Viceroy. Nothing will satisfy them. It is either my

[Mr. Montagu.]

work alone, in which case it is to be damned because it is mine, or it is my work with somebody else, in which case I ought to have the courage to say that it is wholly mine. As a matter of fact, for six months Lord Chelmsford and I worked together in close association as colleagues, working this thing out together, listening together to all kinds of representations, and I should not be doing my duty to a friend and colleague if I did not on this, the first occasion on which I have had an opportunity in this House, pay a tribute to his earnestness, to the sincerity of his judgment, and to the steadfastness of the purpose which he displayed in pursuing what he thought to be right, as well as to the complete lack of prejudice which accompanied his almost unexampled public patience. We are together responsible for our proposal. I could not drag him along if I tried; we both walked together, side by side, and we were neither of us unwillingly harnessed to the other. May I read again to the House the announcement which I made on behalf of His Majesty's Government on the 20th of August last year:

"The policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. They have decided that substantial steps in this direction should be taken as soon as possible."

Then follows the statement that I was to go to India, and it concludes with these words:

"I would add that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages. The British Government and the Government of India, on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples, must be the judges of the time and measure of each advance and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service will thus be conferred, and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility. Ample opportunity will be afforded for public discussion of the proposals which will be submitted in due course to Parliament."

Those were our terms of reference. That is the principle to which the Government of this country stands committed; that is the principle which has remained unchallenged by Parliament now for nearly a year, and I say with great respect and

with all the emphasis I can command that you can, if you will, tear up the specific proposals contained in this Report, in order to find better; you cannot, without perpetrating the grossest breach of faith in the history of the world, depart from that announcement of the 20th August last.

Mr. DILLON: You can follow the Irish precedent.

Mr. SWIFT McNEILL: Take the correspondence to Dublin Castle.

Mr. DEVLIN: Call in Shortt.

Mr. MONTAGU: If hon. Members are going to remove the discussion from India to Ireland, perhaps it would be better for the Chief Secretary to be here, but I would respectfully suggest that India is big enough for a few hours' discussion without that. Therefore, I would ask first and foremost everybody who is going to take part in this Debate, and everybody outside this House who is good enough to read the account of our Debate here—do you or do you not accept the principle embodied in the announcement on the 20th August last? If you do, we are all working for the same end. We are all desirous of carrying out the same thing. But there are two parts of that announcement, one is the statement that what we want is the realisation of responsible Government, and the other is the declaration and admission that it cannot be done yet, that it has got to be done by stages, and that this House and the other House, on the recommendations of the Governments which are responsible to it be the judges when the steps are to be taken. There are, therefore, I say, two parts to it. If you criticise this scheme because you are not willing to give responsible Government to India, then you are denying the principle embodied in the announcement of August last. If you criticise it because you want to do it at once, or because you want a stereotyped time-table taking it out of the hands of the Government responsible for the welfare and well-being of India to decide the time when steps are to be taken, then, again, you are denying the principle of this announcement. Therefore, I say to both sides, to those whom I may be allowed to call extremists on both sides, we cannot pursue this object or discuss the Report which resulted from the announcement of the 20th of August,

unless you come within the four corners of that announcement. I want to say just this about it. I think it was inevitable, I cannot conceive that there could have been any other answer consistent with the history of the day. The moment you were asked: "What are you going to do in future," the moment you decided to announce your policy, it must have been, it could only have been, a policy of determination to give complete self-government. To do otherwise would be to depart from your traditional belief in free institutions. Could you say that in every other part of the British Empire self-government was right, but that in India you were going to deny opportunities for or access to self-government. What was the use of the existence of those very legislative councils? How could you train men and educate men as educated Indians had been trained and educated if you were to say to them that the political life, the opportunity of moulding and creating the destinies of their own country, is to be withheld from them for ever, and that our purpose in India differs from our purpose in every other country. There is something peculiar in the Indian Ocean which makes it possible to glory in freedom in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

Mr. DEVLIN: What about Ireland?

Mr. MONTAGU: And to hope for freedom in Ireland.

Mr. DEVLIN: Hope springs eternal in the human breast.

Mr. MONTAGU: Could you then deny it to India? I would submit most respectfully that if the idea of Indian Government was persistently to be subordination and subjection, then Lord Morley's reforms, the reforms which preceded those and the grant of high office to Indians, and the actual inclusion of Indians in the Imperial War Cabinet itself, are and were all out of harmony, and the Indian Empire would be a curiously truncated affair. This could have been only the substitute for the announcement of 20th August! We cannot devote more than a century to the tilling of the soil and then refuse to plant the seed. If you are going to institute responsible government in India, the first thing to do is to give the people the vote and to exercise them in the use of the vote. I would suggest that you cannot

instil the customs, habits, restraints, and conventions upon which representative institutions depend until you give people the vote, and they use it. It does not seem to me that you can keep people voteless until you think that the chances are that they will vote wisely and well. You can only teach the people to vote by giving them the vote to use. You cannot, I would submit, teach people to use the vote wisely if the vote is to achieve nothing. You must give to the person voted for something to do, so that he can be trained in administration, and so that the person who exercises the vote thinks it worth while to give it. Therefore, since you want responsible institutions in India, I submit you ought to give the vote to the people on as broad a franchise as possible, and at the same time you must give the representative elected by these votes real and responsible work to do.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will they be allowed to address their constituents without a permit?

Mr. DENNISS: You go and play football.

Mr. MONTAGU: Let me just—if the House will bear with me—and if Irish envy of the good things in India is not too acute to listen to me—suggest for a few minutes a rough outline of the scheme which we suggest to carry out these things. Let us begin here at home. We have suggested that the salary of the Secretary of State should be borne on the Estimates of the House of Commons. There is nothing very novel in that, as members older than myself will allow, and nothing very revolutionary! It is proposed simply for the reason that we desire that the control over Indian affairs exercised by the Secretary of State, which can only be exercised in the name of this House, should be brought into proper relation to the House itself. I am not now talking of the financial unfairness which saddles the cost of my salary on the Indian taxpayer, while every other Minister's salary, with the sole exception of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, is borne upon the Votes of this House and paid by the British taxpayer. I cannot help thinking—I hope I shall not be considered lacking in respect to the House when I say it—that Indian Debates in this House suffer from their unreality. We are now discussing things of the

[Mr. Montagu.]

greatest possible importance to India on a Motion that you, Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair. I hesitate to think what constitutionally would happen if that Motion was lost. If we are successful in our desire that you do leave the Chair, then another Motion will be moved in Committee which will say that "it does appear from the accounts presented to Parliament that there is a certain balance due to the Government of India," or words to that effect, as we shall hear them read from the Chair. Can you impart a reality to an Indian Debate on a Motion so meaningless? Can you convince the Indians that we are, as a House, really discharging our responsibility to them if we do not have before us some Motion on which something really hangs? Therefore, I would suggest that there is nothing very revolutionary about that change.

It is coupled with another—that there should be appointed at the beginning of every Session a Select Committee of the House of Commons which shall report to the House of Commons on Indian affairs for the past year, and before the Debate takes place on the salary of the Secretary of State for India. I cannot help pleading for the acceptance of that reform. The experience, always available in great quantity, of those who have lived in India in the past is invaluable, particularly when they remember that it is possible that conditions may have changed since they lived in the country. There is something equally valuable to experience in the past; that is experience in the present. If we had here, in this House, a body of Members who were willing to devote themselves from session to session to the affairs of India, thus becoming acquainted with the broad outlines of its administration and its problems. I cannot help thinking that India would gain by that real, sustained, and up-to-date Parliamentary interest, and Parliament would be able with less effort to devote itself to its great Indian responsibilities. It has been said in answer to this suggestion that it would bring India into party affairs. I cannot in the least understand that argument. It seems to me that nothing is more likely to keep India out of party affairs than to have a Select Committee drawn from all parties in the House considering Indian matters.

I go from the House of Commons to the relations between the Secretary of State in Council, the Government of India, and

local governments. It has often been complained that the Secretary of State interferes too much in Indian affairs. On the other hand, it has often been complained that he does not interfere enough. I would again submit that the Secretary of State interferes in the name of Parliament, that Parliament and he are trustees for the Indian people, and that as responsible government in India grows it follows that the control from here must be relaxed. I have been criticised for saying that, but is there any reason to fear it? Has not the history of our Empire throughout shown that when control from Home has gradually—or even suddenly in some cases—been replaced by control on the spot, by the people of the country themselves, it has ever weakened the British connection? Has it not been a source of its strength? Is not that the way in which our Empire has been builded? You cannot leave the Government in India squeezed, as it were, between two forces. As I think I said on the last Indian Budget, the totality of control of India and here should be constant. When you increase control in India you should decrease it here. Therefore our next suggestion is that the amount of control which should be relaxed should be considered by the Committee sitting in this House.

Then as to the Government of India itself. We have suggested that the Government of India is not a suitable sphere in which to start the first step towards responsible government, and that, for the present, until we see how responsible institutions are growing in India, it is desirable to keep the Government of India responsible to Parliament, and to Parliament alone. So we propose to maintain the powers of the Government of India to obtain its will through the legislature in India. But you cannot, I venture to submit, leave things as they are in the Government of India. You cannot call a legislative council which contains only twenty-seven elected members a sufficiently representative body to constitute a legislative council for India suitable to the present day. Twenty-seven Members is not enough. You must enlarge it in order to make it more representative. Since you have suggested that the council shall be enlarged, and since you have suggested that the Government is to be able to enforce its will when it wishes, it seems to me that you are inevitably led to the consideration of a Second Chamber.

That is the proposal contained in our Report. We propose that there should be a legislative council of 100 members, with a large elective majority, and an Upper Chamber, half official and half non-official, working normally by means of joint Sessions, but that, where the Government of India desires to enforce its will it should certify that the legislation is, in its opinion, essential, and that then the Upper Chamber should have the last, or the only word. The advantage of this machinery seems to me to be that it does make your legislative council far more representative than at the present time, and it does insure representative criticism in Delhi and Simla. It can easily from time to time, and when we are ready, be developed into the ordinary bi-cameral legislative machinery, as soon as you are ready to part with your control of the Indian legislature. It has another advantage. If you proceed in the devolution which we have suggested from the Government of India to the provinces, the functions left to the Government of India will be largely things which do not only concern British-India, such as Customs, defence, foreign policy, etc. Now we have proposed as one of our suggestions that there should be another body, composed of the princes who rule the native states. It seems to me that if you have this germ of a second chamber you also indicate the road along which, in due course, and when they wish to share in these great Imperial purposes, the princes, now rather isolated in the constitution, may join for joint deliberation of common affairs, and only for common affairs, with the upper House.

I now leave the Government of India, and come to the provinces. This is the part of the reform which it is most difficult to explain. It is in the provinces that we have suggested that the first steps towards responsible government should be taken. This will enable us to differentiate between province and province according to their conditions and according to their readiness for responsibility. When you are dealing with a province it seems to me that you have only three choices. Firstly, you can go on as you are with an executive government, wholly irresponsible to the electorate, and that is not a step towards responsibility or towards the progressive realisation of responsible government; secondly, you can have complete responsible government

in the provinces. I believe you will not find a single instance of a province which is ready for complete responsible government to-day. Thirdly, there is only one other alternative left, and that is responsibility in some subjects and reservation in others, and that is the system which we have ventured to submit to public opinion for criticism. If you can transfer more subjects in one province than you can in another, you can as time goes on increase the number of transferred subjects—and I have little doubt it will go faster than many people suppose—until you get to the time when there are no subjects to transfer, and all have been transferred. Then you get full responsible government in the provinces. That is the principle of our provincial proposals. I need not bother the House to-day by going into detail as to the form of government.

There are to be Ministers responsible and in charge of the transferred departments, and executive councillors responsible to Parliament here in charge of the reserved departments. We had to decide as to whether we should have two Governments in this transitional stage or keep to one, and we came to the conclusion that we would recommend one Government, because we did not see how the Civil servant could possibly be placed in a position to take orders from two rival authorities, and you have, therefore, the system under which the Ministers and the executive councillors will sit together, each in charge of their respective departments. The legislative council in the province will have a very large elected majority, but since it is our principle to reserve certain subjects, you must give those responsible for them power to obtain the necessary legislation, and therefore we have the system of a grand committee elected *ad hoc* which can take certificated reserve subjects and legislate upon them without reference to the whole legislature. I need not dwell upon local self-government, which we suggest should be made completely independent of official control, but I do want to draw the attention of the House to a provision to which Lord Chelmsford and I attach great importance, and which I would respectfully commend to the attention of this House, and that is the periodical review of the working of the whole scheme by a tribunal appointed by this House every ten or twelve years.

Mr. SWIFT MacNEILL: That is the old system, and it is a very good system.

Mr. MONTAGU: It will be the authority working in the name of Parliament which will decide upon the increase in the number of transferred subjects and the moment at which you can begin responsibility in the Government of India, and the knowledge that this review is destined to come at stated intervals will make for the smooth working of the machine. Each side will know—the official side and the unofficial side, Englishmen and Indians in co-operation—and all will realise that they can take their grievances for remedy to the High Court of Parliament itself at stated intervals, and I believe this necessarily transitional machinery can only work if you have this periodical review. That, in very rough outline, is the scheme. It was arrived at in this way: We devoted the whole of the winter to it, subordinating it only to the necessary and paramount consideration of improving India's contribution to the War. It will be remembered that I went to India, accompanied by my hon. Friend the Member for Lincoln (Mr. Charles Roberts), the Earl of Donoughmore, Sir William Duke (a member of the Council of India), and there was associated with me when I got to India a new member of the Council, Mr. Bhupendranath Basu, whom I asked to await my arrival in India. My colleagues have signed and published a letter expressing approval of our recommendations, but I hope I shall not be unfair to them, to whom both Lord Chelmsford and I owe so much, when I say to this House that at every stage of the whole proceedings we had almost daily discussions together on all the recommendations that were made to us by public bodies and private individuals. Not only that, but at each stage we, who came from England, sat in informal discussion with the whole Government of India, and there were constant Sub-committees of the two sets of people to consider the details of our proposals. Besides that, we saw innumerable deputations and we had innumerable and long interviews, from early morn till late at night, with anyone who had anything to contribute.

I labour this because there has been a suggestion that this work should be done all over again by another Committee, but I do not think that that is possible. I do not believe you would ever be able

to convince the Indian that you were in earnest if you adopted such a proposal as that, but I do say that both Lord Chelmsford and I are absolutely sincere when we asked that the Government should publish this Report for criticism. It is not here as a finished document which we seek to translate unaltered into an Act of Parliament. It must be sifted and tested. Does it carry out the principles which it professes? Let me take an example. We have stated our objections to communal representation, and I do not go back one single hair's-breadth from what has been said on that point. If you want to build up community of interests, if you want to get over racial antagonism and antipathies, surely the worst way to begin is to send the voters to different polling booths, making them into different constituencies for returning their representatives! We have also been accused of trying to divide the people of India in order to rule them. If we established communal representation on a large scale there would be some justice in that remark, but there is a paramount necessity and something which overrides all that, because the whole success of our scheme depends upon the getting of an electorate thoroughly representative of all the peoples of India. That is what we must have. The Report itself says that it is not our aim, and it ought not to be our aim, to hand over the government of India, or any part of the government of India, to the representatives of any particular section. We want an electorate as representative as we can possibly get, and, for that reason, although we have recognised right through that it is upon the development of a successful electorate that the whole thing depends, the scheme will not be complete until that electorate has been devised.

We recommend that two Committees should be appointed at once to consider the electorate and the differentiation between the reserved and transferred subjects, and also what shall be the Government of India's concern and what shall be provincial. Until those Committees have reported the scheme is not complete, and therefore, in order to complete the scheme, His Majesty's Government has assented to the immediate appointment of those Committees, as the Report recommends, with a chairman from England, two Indian officials, and two English officials, to recommend to

us what electorate is possible. Those who think that communal representation is the only way to obtain a representation of all the peoples of India will have an opportunity of arguing that as an open question before the Committee which will sit in India. I shall regret very much if it is proved that that is the only way. I feel convinced that the way to beat your enemy at the poll is to fight him and not to ask for special representation of this sort.

I will take another point 2.0 P.M. upon which criticism may be made. It seems to me that if you transfer responsibility for certain subjects to Indian Ministers you must ensure that you have given them the machinery which will enable them to discharge their responsibility. Similarly, if you reserve responsibility for other subjects to the existing Executive Council, you must ensure that you have given them the necessary machinery to discharge their responsibility. I think that the Report does this by the machinery of Council of States and Grand Committees, but, if it does not, that is a matter to which criticism ought to be directed. In fact, it is in no sense a mere expression; it is a real invitation that I make now for the assistance of everyone who will accept the announcement of 20th August, and who will give us not destructive but constructive criticism. I am perfectly certain that it is not necessary for me in this House to ask that the criticism should also avoid, if possible, stigmatising the defects of any section of the Indian people. It is not necessary to argue that the Indians who are anxious to embark upon this experiment are imbued with a patriotism and a love of their country which I do not think has ever been equalled in the history of the world, a patriotism which is almost, if not entirely, a religion, and a patriotism which is becoming slowly a national patriotism. India, the defence of India, the working for India, pride in India—these are all emotions which animate those who accept the announcement of the 20th August. There are some who do not accept it, not because they do not believe in eventual responsible government, but because they do not like the progressive stages proposed. You cannot expect people who want everything at once to be very enthusiastic when you plant them on the road which they have to travel, but do not plant them where they want to get, somewhat impatiently. I would say to

them that all the limitations which are to be found in this scheme are limitations not of distrust or fear, but of fact and of time.

It is useless to expect that Parliament, equally proud of India, equally proud of the India that Englishmen have done so much to make, is going to give up the control of Indian affairs to an Indian electorate which does not exist. It is impossible to pretend that all the disabilities and obstacles to democratic progress which are presented by illiteracy, by caste distinction, by communal antagonism, do not exist. They do. They are only pointed out by the true friends of India because we hope and believe that with the development of free institutions they will tend to disappear. I do not mean for one moment that caste will disappear, but the features of caste which make it impossible to regard India as a democratic nation may, with the flow of time, disappear, and, as these antagonisms between communities disappear, and as education spreads, the reasons for the limitations will disappear with them, and India will have a right to claim from this House, through these periodical reviews, that the limitations imposed by these conditions shall be swept away. You must create your electorate and train your electorate and exercise your electorate before these things can happen. Therefore, it seems to me that you have no right to reject this proposal because it does not give you to-day what you want to-day and things which you can only get to-morrow. You have no right to reject this proposal because it does not give you in the first, second, third, or fourth legislative councils what you would like to get in the first. What you are entitled to ask is that you should be placed upon the road, and that you should have access to Parliament at stated intervals for the hearing of your case. It seems to me that there is no other course. Agitation can produce chaos and revolution, and that is one way of proceeding. The history of many countries shows the path which revolution, chaos, and rebellion can play in their development. It seems to me that it is just worth while pausing to reflect that they have always imperilled liberty and retarded progress, and that they have always caused misery untold and hardship unfathomed to those who have lived through epochs of this kind. They have also often, if not always, been caused by obstinacy, short-sightedness,

[Mr. Montagu.]
arrogance, and unwillingness to yield to the legitimate demands of a growing and living people.

Mr. S. MacNEILL: And the bad faith of Governments!

Mr. MONTAGU: If we do not depart from our traditional faith in the power of free institutions to call forth and develop national character, if we are to set out to build a free, self-governing, responsible India under the ægis of the British flag and as an integral part of the British Empire with fixity of purpose and determination, it seems to me that we shall do well to start now. There are many people who suggest that we should start after the War. "For heaven's sake do not let us have this complication during the War." I have often noticed that the people who say that are the people who do not want it done at all. But if you really mean it, if you mean that you want to do it after the War, is it not just worth while to reflect for one moment what work we are reserving for ourselves and piling up for ourselves after the War, work to be crowded into one Parliament that in normal times would be quite enough for the lifetime of many a parliamentarian. Ought not you to do what you can to-day rather than add another liability that will not wait for ever until after the War? Is there a better time for doing it than now, when we are face to face with this record of India's share in the War, when we are able to profit on the one hand by looking at those ideals or lack of ideals that have made Germany the enemy of mankind, and when, on the other hand, we can look on those unhappy events which have made Russia the object of all men's compassion.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to move to leave out from the word "that" to the end of the question, and to insert instead thereof the words "This House welcomes the Report on Indian constitutional reform and asks for further opportunities for discussion at the earliest possible moment."

I do not know how many hon. Members can honestly say that they have justified the flattering imagination of my right hon. Friend and read his Report. I can claim to be one of those. I have read every word of the Report, and it is because I have read it that I am profoundly impressed with the inadequacy of

this Debate. We started the discussion at one o'clock, and we have been informed that it must be finished by seven o'clock. That gives us six hours to discuss a Report which, if epoch-making is justified as applied to any Report, certainly calls for that adjective. Whilst it is very tempting to go into some of the detailed proposals which one finds in this Report, it is far better to-day to have a preliminary survey of the field. The right hon. Gentleman has told us both in the Report itself and to-day that he is not finally committed to details. For myself, I think that they are too complicated. I think he can devise a much simpler, or at any rate a considerably simpler, scheme. The important thing for him and for the Indian Government and for this House now is to make sure that we understand the general intention of the Report, and that we have clearly defined in our own minds the goal to which the Report invites us to reach out. The Report lays down something as its goal, and it was immediately met by a series of critics in the newspapers and elsewhere who assumed that something had been manufactured by my right hon. Friend as a sort of war measure. As a matter of fact, this is a natural growth in our administration of India. It is a very bad complaint to this Empire that those who profess to be specially Imperialists should assume that a population such as we have in India, with such a rich civilisation of a social, of an intellectual, and of a political character behind it, should remain inside the Empire for centuries and never conceive as a legitimate ideal to put before themselves this goal of national self-government. At any rate, I am a better Imperialist in that respect than they are. The British Empire has a very providential method of suggesting to all its component parts that sooner or later they should find self-government within the Empire to develop themselves and to strengthen the Empire by the exercise of their own national individuality.

My hon. Friend the Member for South Donegal (Mr. Swift MacNeill) reminds me of Ireland. I hope that the Debate to-day will be of such a nature as to strengthen the Irish case. Some of those sentiments to which my right hon. Friend gave expression earlier on are mere verbiage if they are applied to India alone. They must also be applied to Ireland. Consequently, I hope that one of the fruits of the Debate will be not

merely to cheer the heart of Calcutta, but also to cheer the heart of Dublin. There is not only that. The whole of our Indian education has been tending to this goal. Who can go out to India without meeting the students there, with Burke in their hands as a text-book, with Macaulay in their hands, with Morley, with every book that expresses classical liberal political philosophy appearing at some stage or other in the college curriculum of India, and, in these circumstances, how can any reasonable man, whatever his political party or political principles may be, assume that sooner or later this country is not to be up against the problem of the self-government of India, demanded by the Indian people themselves. It is natural; it is inevitable; it is good. It is the fruit of our own rule. If we cannot stretch out our hands to pluck the fruit and enjoy it, if we should imagine that the fruit is poisoned or is something to which we should give an unwelcome greeting, then it is the bankruptcy of our statesmanship and not its pride. Personal administration in India is bound to be temporary. It may last for generations, but it is bound to go. The law of its own being is that it should be superseded by something totally different from itself, and my right hon. Friend has announced to the world and more particularly to the Empire and India that the time has come for making a beginning of change.

I went out some years ago on a Commission to inquire into the position of the Administration of India. One of the main objects of the Commission was to open the door wider for the admission of Indian candidates. That Commission had a very curious history. We left this country when the question of simultaneous examinations was the great question interesting the educated Indian. He did not think of legislatures, but of administration, of executives and of the Civil Service. Lord Morley, writing in 1906, put the position very well. He said

"I half suspect that what they—"

that is the Indians—

"really want a million times beyond political reform is access to the higher administrative posts of all sorts, though they are alive to the connection between the two."

That was quite true of 1906. That was quite true when the Commission of which I was a member went out to India. The truth to-day is exactly the reverse, and it might be stated in this way—

"I half suspect that what they really want a million times beyond access to the higher administrative posts of all sorts is political reform, though they are alive to the connection between the two."

That is the position, that is the change that has taken place within the life of this Parliament itself, and this Parliament has got to face it. The War has not made the demand for self-government. The War has hastened the effectiveness of the demand that has been made. The Morley reforms were rather the last chapter in an old order. This Report is the first chapter in a new order. The Morley reforms were based on the old traditions of British Government in India, and they were meant to apply those old traditions to a somewhat widening liberalising of the Indian mind. They have done their work, they have proved that we cannot go any further on that way, they have brought us to a *cul de sac*. That chapter is done. In fact it is not a chapter, it is a whole volume. We have to close it, put it on our bookshelves, and open a new one, and the Report we are discussing this afternoon is the first chapter in that new volume. When we take all these things into consideration and treat this not as a superficial yielding to some necessity, but as really the ripening of the life of a nation, and consider this demand, this new advance as the fulfilment of the past administration and Government of this country in India, then it is all the more necessary that we should go ahead generously and boldly. I hope that the right hon. Gentleman is going to enter the transition stage quite boldly. I daresay he will have to accommodate opposition, but I hope he will not accommodate it too much.

I am bound, therefore, at this point to express my profound disappointment at what seems to me to be the most stupid judgment of the Indian Government in withdrawing the passports granted to Mr. Tilak and his friends. We want them here. This is the place for them. They are the representatives of the other side. If the problems in this Report are to be hammered out, this is the place where that is to be done. If we have to speak to India thousands of miles away from Indian representatives—they may be the representatives of what you may call the Left Wing, but we have to try to get the Left Wing to work it as well as the Right Wing—if the only communications with these people are the telegraphs and cables that stretch from this

[Mr. R. Macdonald.]

country to India, if there is to be no personal contact and no immediate and personal exchange of views, if Mr. Tilak and his friends are to be left away over in India to do their work there, to preach their gospel there, to understand or misunderstand us, and also for us to understand or misunderstand them, then one of the greatest opportunities which would otherwise present itself for the proper acceptance and settlement of this reform has been thrown away by the folly of the Indian Government.

Mr. MONTAGU: May I remind my hon. Friend that it was not the Government of India that was responsible for that?

Mr. MACDONALD: I am very much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for correcting me; I knew that quite well. It was the home Government who withdrew the passports. The Indian Government granted the passports, but the home Government withdrew them after the mission has started upon its way; therefore, it is exclusively the home Government's responsibility. It is also worth remembering that telegrams are now going over from certain sections criticising the Report. I had one handed to me this morning. I do not think they quite understand this. If I may say so, they approach it with an unreasonable amount of hostility, but there they are. They are in Bombay and in Calcutta, and we are here. There is to be a special session of the Congress summoned. I understand that the Indian National Congress is meeting either this month or next month and that the exclusive purpose of the meeting is to discuss this Report, and undoubtedly to pass resolutions upon it. Again, I am perfectly appalled at the decision of the home Government against the far better judgment of the Indian Government—the Government on the spot—in saying that the leaders of this Indian National Congress, upon which so much depends at the present moment, both for us and for India, are to be excluded from Great Britain, and are to be confined in India to understand or misunderstand the Report, and that, above all, at a time when a wise statesman would take these people into his counsel, when, instead of inviting them, first of all, to discuss this as hostile persons who are not allowed to come to this country, they have an opportunity of

taking them here, of explaining to them all their intentions, hearing what they have to say, modifying their proposals in so far as the suggestions made by these people are reasonable, and persuading them, as undoubtedly they would, that the suggestions could not be accepted at the moment, but might be accepted later on. I must say that the way the home Government has behaved to this deputation, and the way they have cut off Indians from ourselves in this consultation which ought to take place, is perfectly amazing to me, and I am afraid it will give my right hon. Friend difficulties which he should not have had presented to him, and which he would never have had presented to him if greater wisdom and more liberality had been shown about the matter with which I am now dealing. So much for that. What is to be the position? India wants no more declarations. India is surfeited with declarations.

Mr. S. MacNEILL: So is Ireland!

Mr. MACDONALD: India has had declarations for generations, and India has not been satisfied that the declarations were fulfilled. Therefore, I thoroughly welcome the definite statement made in this Report, first of all, that self-government is to be the goal; secondly, that there is to be a real beginning made, a beginning which is meant to be real—we can discuss details later on, but I think I am doing my right hon. Friend no injustice when I say that his intention is that it shall not merely be a beginning, but shall be a really substantial beginning; and, thirdly, that an organisation and a machinery will be created which will go by its own momentum from stage to stage, and at each stage it reaches will carry to a fuller extent the complete ideal of self-government for India within the Empire. If my right hon. Friend can only persuade India that that is in the Report, he will have no difficulty so far as India is concerned. His difficulty is to persuade India that that is so, and any assistance that anyone can give to him in order to do that I am sure will be gladly given in view of the tremendous issues which the Report raises and the difficulties with which he will be faced. I want to make one suggestion to him on this point. It is necessary, if this momentum is to go from stage to stage, each stage being wider than the

preceding one, that the Government of India, either at home or in India, should not have an absolute voice in deciding those stages. I rather gather from the Report that he is giving it that power, but it is necessary that as the end of each stage is reached the experienced men of India, the Indian Legislature, should have something to say upon the amount of progress the next stage is going to bring. He must take India into consultation straight away, and he will discover that the problem of responsible representative government in India, whilst periodically presenting all the problems of similar government here, will at the same time just solve itself in the same way as it does here.

I should, therefore, begin with a series of propositions which ought to be the foundation of everything. I think they are all in this Report, and I will not take up the time of the House in discussing them. First, I think that local government, as we use the expression here, should no longer be sufficient; secondly, that he should build up his system of self-government from the provinces; thirdly, that his conception of Imperial India should be the conception of a federated provincial system; fourthly, that the power of the provincial legislators should be delegated to them from the Central Government. That scheme of federation, I think, is the only scheme that can possibly work in India, and upon that I have nothing to say, except to pass it by with approval as it is expressed in his Report. I should like to say a word with reference to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State here, and, in fact, the whole of the Indian Government, still retains the features of the East India Company. It has been modified from time to time, but the parentage of our system is the East India Company. I would suggest to my right hon. Friend that he should inquire as to whether the Secretary of State and the Council here ought to be maintained. It is a pure anachronism, a survival of the trading company with the court of directors and so on, and not at all suited to a Government Department. If my right hon. Friend has any intention of making him a responsible Parliamentary Minister, then I hope this House will not tolerate the existence of a council of non-representative and largely personally interested people. I do not mean financially interested. I mean that I myself and my hon. Friend of mine here would grind our

own axes on a matter on which we had special views, and our only justification for being in a Government or an Executive Committee is that we represent something or somebody, and not merely our own personal merits. That is what I mean by being personally interested. The idea that distinguished servants coming over from India should sit here to advise and instruct and control is absolutely contrary to the whole theory of Parliamentary control, which is not a control of experts, not the control of men who have been working the machine, and, having been superannuated as workers of the machine, come over here to assist in the control. It is not at all the theory of Parliamentary control, and if it is advanced as a sound theory, then a great many of us here will violently oppose it.

The Secretary of State for India should be in the same position as the Secretary of State for the Colonies. He is responsible to this House, he is advised by the responsible authorities on the spot, and however curious it may appear on paper, as a matter of fact it provides a most admirable practical working political machine. Moreover, if the Committee which my right hon. Friend, I think very wisely, proposes to set up representing this House is set up, then the anomaly will be still greater. It is absolutely impossible to conceive a Secretary of State in touch with India with a Secretary's council of ex-officials and officials, and at the same time this House, again functioning through a Committee, elected according to the present suggestion, at the beginning of each Session. You are introducing into Indian government and administration a confusion of power by bodies which are bound sooner or later to come into very considerable and serious conflict the one with the other. Therefore, the suggestion I make on this point is that he will seriously consider whether part of his reform scheme must not be the abolition of the Secretary and the Secretary's council. Passing from that we come to lay down another proposition. You must discover some means of representation for India which is Indian. I think that is essential. The problem of the Indian constituency is not the problem of the English constituency—the problem of Indian grouping is not the problem of Lancashire, it is the problem of the province of Bengal. And therefore he ought not to be afraid at all of producing to us, when it is produced to him by this Com-

[Mr. R. Macdonald.]
 mittee, a scheme of Indian representation which is not on all fours with the schemes of representation which we have accepted on account of our own historical and political conditions. I think he will have to turn his attention to education first of all. That, of course, is a slow process, but no one can look forward to an efficient system of representation in India under the present system of education that we find there.

Sir J. REES: That is one of the transferred subjects.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes; but I mention it because nine-tenths of my right hon. Friend's difficulties and of the difficulties of any Indian administrator like my hon. Friend is that, in order to suit our old parties, we started education at the top instead of beginning at the bottom and building up to the top. It has enabled us to take a short cut, but I am afraid we will have to go back and go over it all again, beginning with the elementary school and building your college and university system on the foundations laid in elementary education. However, that is all in the nature of an aside, but the first thing that we have to consider about representation is the possibility of the diversity of representation in India. We have been listening to an argument which has been thundered at us for many years, that there is no such thing as India, that you have got a tremendous complexity of races, creeds, castes, communities, all historical products, and these all mix up in this Peninsula mechanically and not organically. It is perfectly true that the diversities in India are tremendous, but we have governed India—there is no doubt about that—we have got an Indian Government, we have unified that Peninsula, and I would demur a little to an expression which my right hon. Friend used when he said that the sense of Indian nationalism was beginning. No; the sense of Indian nationalism is very, very ancient. It may have been ineffective, it may have been broken up by accidents and force of circumstances, but it is there, and always has been there; in fact, it is so fundamental that it might almost be regarded as a mythical thing. There is this idea in the mind of the educated and religious Indian—not educated in our sense, but the religious Indian—that India is his mother; this political and national entity enters so intimately and

closely into his personality as for him to conceive India as his mother. That is not only a political but a religious conception, and does not belong to current phrasing and arguments.

While we admit diversity, we must keep our mind upon unity. I do not know whether my right hon. Friend has considered how far he can adapt and adopt proportional representation for getting him out of that difficulty. Proportional representation, to my mind, is a somewhat primitive way of solving problems of representation, but undoubtedly where you get differences of race, differences of creed that are very difficult to mix together, difficulties of getting any national unity, proportional representation does give opportunities that no other form of election possibly could. Moreover, if he is compelled to recognise political difficulties between Mahomedanism and Hinduism, I hope he will rigidly confine himself to those and not extend community representation beyond that. I know he does make an exception of the Sikhs—that is done in the Report. Community representation is a bad thing, but there may be certain circumstances for the moment which will compel him to accept it in India. But I would only do it if the circumstances were so great as to make it clear without a shadow of doubt that the only way to get representation established is in this way. I venture to say that if he will start in that way and stick to it there is not so much to be made in favour of the argument of community representation. Certainly in our own experience the distinction between Mahomedan and Hindu has enormously diminished. When I went to India, first of all, one heard of nothing else. The Mahomedans were sending deputations to the Viceroy and the Hindus were sending deputations saying that the Mahomedans were only to be used for illegitimate political purposes, and the quarrel between them was very great. There was a Moslem union on the one side and the National Congress on the other, and one required to be something of a prophet to have the courage to say that sooner or later these two bodies would come together. That was only a few years ago, but to-day the two bodies are very largely together; they have agreed upon common suggestions for reform, they are constantly in co-operation, and on all the legislative councils the Mahomedan representative co-operates with the Hindu repre-

sentative, while you find common representatives of a common party working for a common end and carrying out common ideals. The Sikhs present certain difficulties, but let us decide on the principle, and if any exception is to be made to it it should be made on the clearest and most unmistakable evidence.

Then we must not pass over lightly the problem of the villager. No system of representation will be satisfactory unless the agricultural population has, at any rate, some part and share in it. There are various ways in which it could be done, some of them indirect—local organisations of various kinds. I am perfectly certain that a Committee such as the right hon. Gentleman has been referring to to-day must face this village problem, and if it goes there and explores the possibilities of getting representative village opinion, it will discover several ways of carrying that instruction of ours into effect. Another class of the community which ought to be, and must be, represented is that of the workmen. Anyone who goes to Bombay and Calcutta and sees that extraordinary weltering mass of abandoned men living in insanitary filth, swarming upstairs and along corridors just like bees in a hive, must wonder how on earth they can live at all. No system of self-government can be satisfactory unless people in those conditions find somehow or other an access into the various governing assemblies and provincial and Imperial legislatures. I believe it is possible. I believe, for instance, that organisations like the Servants of India can make suggestions as to how that population is to be represented. In any event, hand them over to the lawyer, to the landowner, and to the big capitalists of Calcutta and Bombay and the condition of those people will be worsened rather than improved. We must, in weakening the sort of fatherly control that has been exercised up to now, put some weapons in the hands of the wage-earning masses of the industrial centres in India which will mean that they will be represented on the legislative councils, both local and Imperial.

I think we ought to make our minds perfectly clear that the elected sections of both provincial and Imperial legislatures will be in the majority. To that extent we support the Report. But I think there is much that we shall have to

discuss in the suggestions made in the Report in consequence of this. For instance, this is a very simple dilemma into which such legislatures can get. You get a majority of the legislatures elected. You get the executive official and nominated. That means that at once you invite conflict. You cannot run a legislature, the majority of which is elected, with an executive consisting of nominated or official members. Therefore, we ought candidly to admit that the elected majorities in the legislature must have, at any rate, a substantial representation of the legislature on the executive. There can be no half-way house in that, and the Government should openly accept it. It is a risk. You may get into difficulties. It is possible, though not likely, that you may have to modify your Budget. We will take the case presented in the Report. It may mean that some piece of legislation which either a local or an Imperial Government is very anxious to get may be defeated. If the alternative is that the elected body decides one thing and the Government decides another thing upon a matter of legislation, it is far better that the elected body should have the full responsibility placed upon its shoulders, and the Government do its best under the circumstances, than that the Government should say, "No; we are going to do what we want because we think it necessary, and we are able to pass this legislation over your head." The right hon. Gentleman's proposal is to give the Governments in some way or other the power to pass legislation over the heads of the councils. I think he would be well advised if he would reconsider that. Take the risks. Show the Indians straight away that we are trusting them, and do not put them in the position of being free and irresponsible critics. If the Government is to take that attitude its executive must be the representative of the legislatures, and the representatives of the legislatures must have the same responsibilities placed upon them as members of the Cabinet or a Ministry have in this country, and by putting the responsibility upon them in this way I feel perfectly certain there will be no special problem presented by the free decision of legislatures, a majority of whose members are elected directly by the people.

The Indian Civil servant at present is getting an absolutely impossible task assigned to him. The service comes from

[Mr. R. Macdonald.]

an old historical tradition, which is bad. You ask a man here to go to India and face him with a public opinion in India which we ourselves have created—the acute lawyer, the newspaper writer and proprietor, the politician, the landlord—and expect him to govern as his great grandfathers did at the same distance. You are asking an absolute impossibility of the best and most devoted servants of the State. The Indian Civil Service has broken down because the political conditions of India has completely changed during the last generation.

Captain LLOYD: I do not think there is any evidence that it has broken down.

Mr. MACDONALD: I will explain what I mean by that. At present you get your young men going out with dreams of authority, dreams of power, and dreams of that paternal rule which has been associated with the Indian Civil Service. Follow him in his history and you see this poor man worried by a thousand and one petty details. You see him, as I have seen him and lived with him in his tent, coming in morning after morning with enormous piles of papers. He gives you the privilege of looking at them. The details are maddening in their intricacy, giving no large scope for the man's mind, taking the whole of the morning, and he comes to you in the afternoon or evening jaded and tired. The overwhelming mass of detail, very often clerical detail, the reports which are required, the things he has to initial—all that is crushing the spirit out of your men, and you are not taking advantage of the fine intellectual capacity which they are only too anxious to put at your disposal. That is what I mean when I say the Indian Civil Service has broken down. I would call these men to a wider state. Instead of turning them out, I would give them something to do which was commensurate with their tremendous capacity for big things. Let the pettifogging detail, the checking of this, and the checking of that, the writing of this file, and the writing of that file, be dealt with by people whose minds are in accordance with that kind of thing. Let us put these men who have much wider views, great political capacities, and large grasp of national problems, who have India in their minds, and who understand the great, vital, palpitating problems of India, to their proper task, and I am certain

that when we do put them to it they will do it with pleasure to themselves and with credit to us. I think some further consideration, from that point of view, should be given to the position of the Indian Civil Service, and the part we have to play in the reconstruction of the Indian Government.

I have trespassed on the patience of the House, but the subject is so great, the field is so tremendous, and at every point there are so many interesting items to be picked up and examined and dealt with, that one can only end with an apology that a very rapid survey has taken such an unconscionably long period of time. I hope those who propose to oppose this Report and the spirit of it will think twice about it, whether they belong to the right wing or to the left. I hope they will consider the tremendous difficulties which are facing us now, and which will become ripe for settlement immediately after the War, and that those who lightly say, "Let us postpone it till after the War" will consider whether this line that they are always drawing after the War has any existence at all. If we do not prepare for it now it will be too late after the War. As it is, there must be delay. The months which go by will not be wasted. They will be required for building up this scheme, for thinking out its details, for rejecting that which will not stand further examination and accepting that which will stand further examination. I hope the publication of this Report and the Debate to-day will mark the closing up of all ranks, will be a call to all men of good will to come together to help India to a better and freer state of self-existence, and to add to the honour and the dignity of the race to which we belong.

Sir J. D. REES: Being the only representative of the service which has broken down—I am sure it was said in no un-

kindly spirit, but in the very

3.0 P.M. kindest spirit—I may say that

I agree in the main with

the views which the hon. Member has placed before the House. It is commonly said that the British Empire and its Allies are just now fighting to make the world safe for democracy. Whether that really is the case or not I have no idea, but I take it as being so from my superiors who announce the policy of the Government. However that may be, I do feel sure that it is quite impossible for the leaders of our nation to be laying it down that this

country is fighting to make the world safe for democracy and at the same time for this House to be acting in respect of the Indian Empire as if its object was to make it safe from democracy. These are two totally incompatible positions. I do not want to go over any ground that has been far better covered than I can cover it, but it is perfectly obvious, as the Secretary of State has said, that the present position, whether the individual Member welcomes it or not, is an absolutely inevitable position. It arises from the method of education we have given in India since the days of Lord Macaulay, and existing conditions were anticipated by men like Sir Thomas Munro, at whose feet Madras Civil servants, like myself, were proud to sit.

The present position dates from the 20th August last year, when the announcement was made by the Secretary of State for India, to which not only he and the Viceroy are parties, but also the whole of the British Government. It is the policy of the Prime Minister, of Lord Milner, Lord Curzon, and everybody else in the Cabinet, whether Imperialistic or not in character. It is as much their policy as it is the policy of the Secretary of State for India, to whom for some extraordinary reasons, and with the utmost injustice—well, there is really no injustice, because anybody might be proud to be connected with it—the whole Report has been ascribed. The only position for any Member of this House to take up is not to act in accordance with his own personal predilections, whatever they may be, but as a member of a businesslike legislative assembly, to deal with the position which arises from 20th August, 1917. We have created this Indian Intelligencia and it is impossible for us to say to the Indians, "Democracy is the only form of government, and we worship at its shrine, but directly you want a little yourselves we tell you it is not for you. Our principles are camouflage. You must not take us seriously." That is an impossible position, quite apart from what must be the feelings of any particular Member. I have not spent my life in promoting popular causes either on the platform, in the Press, or in the public service, but it is perfectly clear to me that one course only is open to any sensible, responsible man now, and that is to help the Government to carry out pledges which it has given with the consent of this House. There was no

opposition raised when the policy was announced. That policy was commenced by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Chamberlain), continued to the present Secretary of State (Mr. Montagu), who succeeded him, and time is lost in going behind that position. Of those who criticise this Report—I refer chiefly to those outside the House—very few have, I think, read it carefully. There are 300 pages packed with material. It is a Report which to be read with any care requires a week, and to master it is more than anybody can hope without prolonged study.

One criticism that is made very constantly is that to carry out the recommendations of the Report will be to transfer the Government of India from a bureaucracy to an oligarchy. I think that is one of the untenable criticisms made. No doubt our Government is a bureaucracy that needs no proving. An oligarchy meant originally government by a few, and it connotes government by a few rich at the expense of the many poor. There is no doubt that that is the meaning which this word has acquired, and to such an extent that its original signification has almost been lost. What is likely to happen after transferring the Government of India to an oligarchy? The oligarchy they have in mind are the Brahmins; but they are not a rich class. They are an aristocracy. They are an aristocracy of intellect and birth combined. Are those bad credentials—an aristocracy equally of birth and intellect? I should have thought they were tremendous qualifications for power. The Brahmins have ruled to a great extent in India ever since we have known anything about its government. The ministers of the great Moguls were Brahmins. The revenue minister who planned the system that we are practically carrying out in India now was a Brahmin. Our chief agents have been Brahmins. Whoever really governs India for a long time to come will inevitably be a Government immensely influenced by this and by the like castes. I do not know that that is particularly a matter for regret, but if it be wrong it will no doubt in time correct itself. In England, government by oligarchy succeeded that of aristocracy. I do not know that the latter was a bad government, that of the Whig oligarchy.

If the march of events leads to a period of oligarchical government by Brahmins, it would be a natural development, and I do not think it would be one that we need

[Sir J. D. Rees.]

greatly deplore. The evil will correct itself in time if there is anything wrong. I am told that already all over India, and particularly in the province to which I originally belonged, there is a strong revolt against it by rich non-Brahmin classes, not by poor, but by rich non-Brahmin classes. The rich who are not Brahmins are acting on their own behalf, and I dare say quite sincerely on behalf of the poor of the lower castes, and they are preparing to contest the Brahmin supremacy, which they think will be the result of the acceptance of this Report. We need not be greatly concerned about that. It is quite impossible to take more than fair and necessary steps which are dictated by the policy which has been deliberately adopted by Parliament and the Government. We cannot at the same time provide against certain developments which naturally flow from that policy, and which, although I do not particularly object to them, are very strongly objected to in many quarters. The natural leaders of the people in India are Brahmins. They are the aristocracy of birth and intellect, and I do not believe that any steps you can take will prevent those who are fittest for rule by universal consent and experience in exercising the greatest rule by universal consent and experience from exercising the greatest share of Indian government, in so far as you transfer it to the natives of India. If these reforms result in 5 per cent. ruling over 95 per cent. how would that be different from what happened here up to recent times, when a very small body of governing families, a fraction of 1 per cent. practically governed this country? We do not expect India to become in civilisation and development like these Western islands for a long time to come.

Whether these reforms will secure better government I do not know. I think the autocratic Government of India has been exceedingly efficient. The authors of the Report freely admit the fact. It has been an admirable Government, but it is not the same thing as self-government when you are dealing with the feeling that now pervades the *Intelligencia*. As Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman declared, good government is no substitute for self-government. I do not think we can cavil at that. If the carrying out of this policy leads to some lack of efficiency I believe the Indians are prepared to accept that decline. I do not think they make a

fetish of efficiency. We must let them have the reforms and let them profit by such mistakes as they make. If they want a great increase in education, if they want large sums of money spent on social reforms and education it may be that when they come to make the collection and levy taxes for that purpose those measures of social reform and education will cease to be the very popular projects which they appear to be at the present time in India. These are developments which we must face without fear. The fact that these reforms are not likely in themselves to give away British power in India will be very evident when we see the reception they have met with in India. The extremists renounce them all. Mr. Tilak and that storm petrel in petticoats (Mrs. Besant) with whom he is associated and who is absurdly enough President of the Congress, will have nothing to do with them. This gentleman and this lady, with their associates, denounce these proposals because they are too moderate. Similarly there is a class in this country who denounce them because they are too advanced. I am sorry to see the leader of that class describes the Brahmins as the most intolerant and oppressive of sacerdotalists. That is an absurd statement. They are only sacerdotalists by caste and not by profession and practice. I do not believe they are any more religious than the rest of us. I do not mean for the moment that religion is to be regarded as a fault in any one of us.

The extremists in India object that the Government of India's power is maintained. I regard that as one of the best features in the whole report and one, among others, that induces me to give it most hearty support. They object that it remains wholly responsible to Parliament. Surely Parliament will rejoice that the Government of India is wholly responsible to it. They also complain about the new Second Chamber. When the Second Chamber was more or less abolished in this country, or, at any rate, its wings were clipped, many of us thought that it was rather an unfortunate thing, and I do not think that we should object to the present proposals to provide a Second Chamber in the Government of India on the conditions stated. I was a member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council for four years, and, for what that is worth, my opinion is that the Second Chamber is a very good proposal.

It will ensure to the Government of India power of enforcing its own decisions in everything connected with the defences of the country, foreign relations, commerce, and other great subjects. I have observed that many of the leaders of the people in India, men whose names are household words, have strongly expressed the approval of these proposals regarding the Legislative Council, and when we are told that the Public Service of India is prepared to accept them and do its best to carry them out, that is no more than the Public Service of India always does, even when it disapproves of instructions which it has received. In Bengal, where they are hot reformers, a fair welcome has been given to these proposals, and it has been generally conceded that the Indian moderates are highly pleased and the Indian extremists equally displeased. I think that the bringing of the salary of the Secretary of State on the Estimate was absolutely inevitable. It has been pressed for the last twelve years, ever since I have been in Parliament, and I think that everybody will regard it as a matter of course. The Select Committee on Indian Affairs will have an excellent effect, more particularly if it is not made a lair in which men will lurk in search of subjects to take up in Parliament. The whole theory is that the Government of India should retain complete authority, as it does at present. I think in some respects the Report is almost stricter in regard to all matters which touch our supremacy in India.

When once an Indian gentleman was admitted to the Council of India, as was done by Lord Morley and Lord Minto, it was absolutely inevitable that more than one would soon be admitted. Is it likely, once the principle is conceded, that the inhabitants of the country would be content with this very partial application? Nobody is likely to disapprove of the increase in the numbers of the Legislative Council of the Governor-General. One hundred members is not a great increase, seeing that they represent some 295,000,000, and I rejoice that that special representation is provided for Chambers of Commerce. My hon. Friend who last spoke disagrees with the principle of communal representation. The Mahomedans, however, will stick to that which they have, and I think that the European Christians in India, commerce, mining and planting interests, and all such must have special representation, and

whether you call it communal or what not, I am content so long as the principle is conceded. One small point in regard to the changes made in the Legislative Council of the Governor-General, and on the position of the nominated official members. It is a very honest statement, but is rather bald, and I think might be the subject of some little criticism, as stated. It is provided that the nominated official members shall have freedom of speech and vote except when the Government otherwise directs. This shows the honesty of the Report in the matter, but I really would recommend that the matter should be a little more wrapped up. Although we all know what nominated members are—I was one myself, and know something about it—I do not think anyone ever went so far as to state it in those extremely bald terms, when I had the honour of a seat on the Council.

Mr. DILLON: Ask Shortt!

Sir J. D. REES: As the Secretary of State has gone right through the headings of reform, it is unnecessary for anybody else to go over the same ground, but he did not mention, I think, that power is retained to the Governor-General to dissolve his legislative council and to the provincial governors. Another important reservation this, in reference to the maintenance of the British power in India, for the present, at any rate—I must confess I hope for all time. Now that the Government of India is making over to the local governments the land revenue, which is the chief part of the Government of India's resources, each provisional government is to contribute 87 per cent. of the difference between its gross expenditure and its gross revenue to the Central Government. This will work out very hardly for certain governments. Some, particularly Madras, will pay very much more relatively than others. I hope that when the periodical Commission comes to report it will take that into consideration. As to the provincial legislative councils, after what the Secretary of State said, it is quite unnecessary to say more, except this, that a right of re-entry and a right of putting through their own measures is reserved to the Executive Government in respect of the defence of the country, foreign relations, tariffs, inter-provincial matters, law and order, race and religion, and the interests of the public service. The system, moreover, by

[Sir J. D. Rees.]

which the Government both on the Viceroy's council and the provincial councils can, by certifying Bills, either pass them through the legislative councils, or put them through otherwise I think provides as fully as any, what shall I say, old Indian Tory would require for the preservation of that which I, though like all of us here I am a democrat, think well worthy to be preserved. The periodical Commissions, too, can move backwards as well as forwards. Practically if a subject which is transferred to the new branch of the Government is not properly administered the periodical Commissions can recommend, and Parliament can arrange, that the particular subject which is mal-administered by the new Indian administrators can be retransferred to the Governor and the Executive Council.

I say nothing of local self-government except this, that it could not be regarded as serious so long as it was in such official leading strings as it has been up to the present moment, and it cannot be denied that the time was overdue when what Lord Ripon's Government intended should be carried out. In any event, the proposals have my approval for what it is worth. Coming to the native states, I wish to congratulate the authors of this Report for recommending that all the chief native states which are independent in their internal administration shall come into direct relations with the Government of India. I was myself a President in two native states. The relations of those states were with the provincial government of Madras instead of with the Government of India. I felt very much, and I do to this day, that the Presidents representing the Government of Madras, who were accredited to these prosperous and well-governed principalities of Travancore and Cochin, generally tried to introduce into those native states the official customs and class of administration to which during a long life they had been accustomed in British India. That is exactly the wrong thing to do. The individuality of these native states, and the susceptibilities of their rulers, should be regarded as the last thing to be interfered with. We do not want to place all India on one uniform plane, and the transfer of these states, these highly important states, the third political change in India in revenue and population, to direct relationship with the Gov-

ernment of India will give them a wider outlook, with less interference on the part of the Residents, and will altogether very much improve their position, and be very acceptable to the rulers. How it will be possible to provide machinery in the event of disputes between the native states, or anticipated misconduct by any of their rulers, I confess I do not know, and I would leave this matter to be dealt with when the occasion requires.

As regards simultaneous recruitment in India and England for the public service, it was absolutely inevitable that a change should be made, and it has surprised me that the Resolution of this House in favour of such an arrangement has remained a dead letter so long. Few will be found to object to its now, at the eleventh hour, being carried into effect. As regards the Indian Civil Service, to which full credit is given in the Report and was also given by my right hon. Friend, it is provided that 33 per cent. of its superior posts, and an extra percentage every year, shall be reserved for natives of India. Recruitment will be better regulated, and the pay of the European officers will be restored to something like the standard at which it was twenty years before the rupee fell off in value. These are extremely satisfactory provisions, and they show that Lord Chelmsford and the Secretary of State had the interests of the European servants at heart. I do not know whether it was meant to bring in the Indian Civil servants under the same pensions rule as other Indian services, but if, as I read the proposals, the total of money which they will draw in one way or another remains unaffected, I do not know that it is necessary to make any further remark about what is proposed. The greatest objection raised in this country—and I have read most of what has been said about these proposals, and have studied them with great care—is that they give away a good deal of the power of our Government in India. I find exactly the contrary at every stage. In the changes which have been made in the provincial councils ample power is safeguarded to the Governor to carry through any legislation that he wishes. In the Viceroy's legislative equipment complete power is given to carry out what he and his colleagues think necessary for the good of the country. So far from the Report having the opposite tendency, I think it confirms and consolidates our position. I find towards the end the

Report says that so far ahead as the authors can foresee a substantial English element will be necessary in the administration, and the continued presence of the English Civil servants is vital to making India a self-governing entity. The authors of the Report, in their almost last words, write that the presence of the British Civil servants will be as necessary as ever for the public service in India. As an old Civil servant, and as one who has been actively concerned with the affairs of India all my life, as actively since I left as when I was there, I can deliberately say I think the assurances which have been given are of the most satisfactory kind. I congratulate the authors of the Report. I believe that the criticisms to which I have referred will prove to be ill-founded, and that this project, when it goes forward, will be fraught in the end with great advantage to our Indian Empire, and to the British Empire, in which it is by no means the least important factor.

Mr. COTTON: I cannot claim the same weight of authority as the hon. Member who has just sat down. I have never been a member of the Civil Service, I have never been Resident at a native court, and I have never been a member of any legislative council, and I would ask the House to extend to me its usual indulgence this afternoon. For a considerable period of my life I resided in India, in a partly official and professional capacity, which brought me into close contact with Indian opinion. Since my return to this country I have endeavoured to keep myself in the closest association with that opinion, and I must offer this as my justification for intervening this afternoon in the Debate. I can promise the House that my speech shall not weary by being very long. I am bound to make the confession that in the past I have been a pretty strong, and perhaps at times an acid critic of the existing system of governing India. I am bound also to say that I never thought I should live to see the day when the Secretary of State for India would rise in his place and make a speech, on an occasion of this kind, with which I was able both wholeheartedly and thoroughly to agree from beginning to end. I do not want to enlarge unduly upon that, but it must be evident to all those who try to put themselves into the position of the educated Indian, that an attitude, I had almost said of hostility, is inevitable when one

comes to discuss the existing system of administration in India. Happily all that promises to come to an end. We are on the eve of most momentous changes, and it behoves all of us, whether in this House or out of it, to support the right hon. Gentleman in the proposals that he has embodied in his Report. Critics of that Report may be conveniently divided into three classes—first of all, those who do not want anything to be done at all; secondly, those who want everything to be done at once; and thirdly, those who think they have much better schemes than the scheme embodied in the Report. I have heard it seriously proposed—and the right hon. Gentleman referred to it this afternoon—that the whole of the work that was done in India during the past year should be set aside, that a Committee should be set up of Members of both Houses, who could discuss all the schemes that were offered to the Secretary of State for consideration when he was in India, amounting, I think, to some 300, and that in every case the proposer should come forward and be publicly cross-examined on the merits of his scheme. If we once embark upon a suggestion of that kind we shall never get to the real substantial question which is at issue, namely, that the time has come—I venture to think the time is overdue—when the legitimate aspirations of the people of India should be gratified.

With regard to those who claim that the whole of their demands should be conceded at once, I would suggest consideration of the course of English constitutional history. We have not won our liberties in the twinkling of an eye. They have not, so to say, been handed to us over the counter, but we have had to win them by degrees, to proceed from one development to another, and that is precisely what we are now inviting the people of India to do. To those who regard these proposals as a plunge into unknown depths I would suggest that in this case, as so often in the past, they should apply the principle of trusting men on the spot. In previous Debates in this House on the Indian Budget a great deal has been heard about trusting the men on the spot. Now we have got a situation in which the Viceroy, as the signatory of this Report on Indian Constitutional reform, with all the members of the Viceroy's Executive Council, with every one of those who are members of the Civil Service, and all the members of the State Council, and all the

[Mr. Cotton.]

members of the Civil Service who are members of that body, have signified their approval of the Report. So that we start at once with a large body of approval from the men on the spot—the men on the spot who have always been invoked in the past as being the only people who knew anything whatever with regard to the affairs of India. There are just one or two observations that I would like to make with regard to the question of communal representation. I am very glad that this question has been left an open question to be considered by the Committee which is to be appointed almost immediately, and which is to go out to India, there to go into the question of a franchise and of possible constituencies. I am firmly convinced that the more the question is discussed the more impossible it will be found to put it into operation in India, because it is so hard to know where you are going to stop.

What do you mean by communal representation? The whole principle is based upon the way everybody in India who belongs to the higher caste tries to tyrannise those who belong to the lower caste. That is the basis of the whole thing. You cannot trust the members of the higher caste to look after the interests of the lower caste, and you are obliged, therefore, to put them into cast-iron compartments, and suggest that they should form electorates of their own for the purpose of appointing their own representatives. The hon. Member for East Nottingham (Sir J. D. Rees) very properly pointed out that the Brahmins are the aristocracy of intellect and birth, and it stands to reason that, being possessed of special opportunities they have availed themselves of those opportunities and secured certain advantages. But I suggest, with all respect, that the anti-Brahmin agitation is being very much overdone. Let us look at the facts. If you take up any book of reference and examine the names of those Indians who have attained to positions of influence and authority under the existing conditions you will find that Sir Sankaran Nair, education member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, is no Brahmin; you will find that Sir S. P. Sinha, Indian member of the Imperial War Cabinet, is no Brahmin; and that Mr. Bhupendranath Basu, lately appointed a member of the Secretary of State's Council, and his predecessor on that body, Sir Krishna Gupta, are not

Brahmins. You might go on to any extent and indefinitely, and the only conclusion to which you can carry that question is that *la carrière est ouverte aux talents*. I am confident that the non-Brahmin caste is in a large majority everywhere, and if they use the opportunities open to them under the proposals embodied in the Report they will find an end of the evils of which they complain. But how are you going to secure your communal or non-Brahmin representation? In order to be consistent you must have a special electorate for everyone of the thousands of castes in India, or, on the principle that one caste cannot be allowed to legislate or look after the interests of another, you will have, in the end, the perplexities in which you find yourselves, and self-government must fail if in any way it encourages or attempts to develop discordant elements in the community.

The only chance of success is by teaching the people that they belong to one great community, and that the sole interest to have at heart is the common well-being. You cannot attain to that, however, by simply establishing cast-iron compartments for this, that, or the other caste. I have heard it said that there is no popular demand for these changes. Surely that is an argument which is rather outworn. When the question of votes for women was being discussed by this House it was granted as a matter of right and of justice, and in response to an overwhelming public demand. So in the same way the claim of the Indians for responsible government is based on considerations of right and of justice; based, also, on the innumerable pledges that we had given to them, and it is our duty—whether it is 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. who make the demand is immaterial—to see that we do that which is right in regard to this demand.

It does appear to me that this House should regard it as a matter of the utmost importance to present a united front with regard to the changes which are suggested in this Report. It is important, because there is in India a large, influential, substantial body of opinion, known commonly as moderate opinion, which is the very backbone of British rule in India and which needs every possible support and encouragement at the present moment. It would be a calamity if that great body of opinion were to feel that there were discordant voices in the House of Commons, or in another place, and it would be

calamitous if they were to feel that as a result of that want of accord this golden opportunity were to slip from their grasp, or, in the alternative, if the proposals that are embodied in that Report were to be whittled down and deprived of their value and their substance. I agree that the proposals are susceptible of modification in detail. I do not propose to go into any of those details this afternoon, but I do say to those hon. Members who are hesitating to take the plunge, remember that this House is committed by the declaration of 20th August last, remember that on the fulfilment of that pledge is waiting this great body of opinion in India, that they have been disappointed in the past, that reforms given to them in the past have not proved to have been possessed of that substance which they ought to have possessed, that here at last there is an honest and well thought out endeavour to carry into effect the principles for which we are fighting in this present War, and that India has every right and every claim to be considered. To suggest that these proposals should be postponed till after the War is equivalent to suggesting that nothing shall be done at all. What has to be done should be done now. Let it be done with a good grace, let it be done with unanimity, and let those who are inclined to take up an attitude of hostile criticism remember how deep is the responsibility that will rest upon them.

Captain C. LLOYD: I do not intend to follow the hon. Member who has just made such an eloquent and able speech into the details of criticism of this Report, but I am in agreement with a very great amount of what he says, and in any case I am perfectly certain that the attitude of those of us in this House who urged the Government not to let the Recess pass without having some discussion on this Report of the Secretary of State for India has been amply justified. We have had a speech from the right hon. Gentleman which has done a great deal to explain the general drift of the Report, which is extremely interesting in itself, but takes a lot of understanding and a very great deal of study. Furthermore, there was the great risk that if we let too long a period pass before we came and gave any consideration to this subject to the House of Commons it would give some colour, perhaps, to the statements which have been made by mischief-makers—a few only, perhaps—in India, who are trying

to pretend that the proposals for wider self-government have only got to be mentioned in England for them to be trampled upon and disowned. I believe it is already to be seen from the attitude of hon. Members in this House, although there are not too many of them here to-day, that this is exactly opposite to the truth and that there is a genuine desire in England to afford India a wider measure of self-government and that that desire will only be qualified by a prudence and caution which must be exercised in the interests of the people of India themselves. He would be a bold man indeed who went into the details of this Report very closely to-day. The main thing we desire to be clear about in our own minds is how far we honestly desire self-government in India. There are a large number of people in this House who have been prepared, reluctantly, to go so far as the Morley-Minto reforms. There have been others who have thought there was nothing to be improved in the general scheme of Britannic Government in India, and so surely as there can be no turning back once we decide in the next few weeks whether we are going to accept the main principles and outlines of the Secretary of State's and the Viceroy's Report, we had better be very clear to-day in our minds whether we mean the full thing some day or whether we mean only to modify to a certain extent the existing system of government in India. We should have had to decide this, I believe, if there had been no war, but the huge effervescence of thought and action which the War has produced throughout the whole world has made it certain that we have got to decide that now, and not at the time when we should perhaps have chosen.

I, like almost every hon. Member who has spoken, am unhesitatingly of the opinion that our decision must be in favour of self-government. I do not think there can be any two questions about it, with all its difficulties for us, and with all its dangers, dangers even more for India than for ourselves, and however much there is to be said—and there is a great deal to be said—for a benevolent autocracy in the East, it is no longer any use, once the leaders of opinion have turned from it and once the continuance of that system makes the peoples of India feel something less than the peoples in the rest of the Empire. Both these have happened to-day, and therefore the time for it must be over, and that chapter must be

[Captain Lloyd.]

closed. I am not much impressed by the very constant objections which one meets with in some quarters that there are only a handful of people to-day who speak in the name of India, while the millions are content to remain as they are. Of course, that is true, but, whilst it is true, it will always be true so long as we continue with our present system, and the responsibility is all the greater for us, it seems to me, to choose out a part, ahead of the big demand, so that when they come to greater intellectual maturity the people of India will be able to look back and to see what we did was in order to guide them to greater freedom and liberty. But in deciding whether we are going to give self-government to India in due course, we have to remember that the moment we begin to discuss this Report there will be plenty of tests of our good faith. There will be pretty severe economic tests, and there will be other tests, and therefore I think, at the risk of wearisomeness, we must be very clear in our own minds whether we are going down that road, because we may have to abandon a great many things we have grown up to think essential, both in economics and in political ideas, and that caution will not be enough. We have got definitely to put aside one phase of thought and adopt another if we are really going to pursue the goal of self-government in India, as I believe we shall do in future.

I think the most valuable portion almost of the Report, from the reader's point of view, is the expository portion in Part I., which constitutes the first authoritative review, that I know of, of the whole situation in India since the Mutiny. The chapters on the growth of the administrative system, the clear examination of the existing structure of government in India, and the analysis of the conditions of the people, more especially those paragraphs with regard to small landholders and ryots and the labouring agricultural classes in India, are of the most intense interest and need reading and rereading over and over again before they can be understood or criticised properly; and I believe further that those early passages, which describe the growth of political aspirations and which culminate in the simple declaration, on the part of the authors of the Report, that India's position in the Empire is clearly becoming a matter of increasing concern to the leaders of Indian opinion, is the exact truth and no less than the

truth. You cannot discount India's loyalty to us in the War by the simple expedient of saying it is merely a faithful and an old obedience on the part of the people of India. Any officer commanding any Indian battalion will tell you a very different story. Anyone who has been alongside Indian troops in Mesopotamia or in Gallipoli will tell you a very different story, and will tell you that when they saw the admixture and the cheerful service of Indian troops alongside Australian troops, as they were seen in Gallipoli and elsewhere, that the Indian soldier served cheerfully and happily alongside British troops, that a very large number of them took up arms, not only against our foe, but against a nation with whom they had considerable political sympathy and the closest religious affinities, and that they took up arms unhesitatingly and have carried on war against Turkey for the past four years. To anybody who has a spark of understanding or a gleam of imagination that is an immensely remarkable fact, and it should reveal that there are qualities and ideals in the Indian people which are not based only upon obedience, but are based upon some sympathy with the ideals for which we are fighting and which it remains for us to discover and put to better use. That is not a dreamy sympathy or idealism. It is statesmanship and political instinct to discover that, and, when discovered, to put it into force at the supreme moment is political success, and that is what I believe, on the whole, the Report of the Secretary of State for India and of the Viceroy has achieved at this moment.

But we have got to proceed, as the Secretary for State said just now, with very great care and very slowly, and that is most easily to be seen in looking at the proposals affecting the provincial government. As far as I understand these proposals, the principles that underlie them and the general line of advance seem entirely good and to be commended. The question a little bit in my mind is whether the proposals may really safeguard some of the principles that are laid down, namely, the ultimate power and responsibility of the Provincial Government and Council and the Government of India, but no final judgment can be passed, as has just been admitted, until the questions of the constitution of the electorates and of the separation of the reserved and the transferred powers are decided, and I

was very glad indeed to hear from the Secretary of State to-day that he was going immediately to set up Committees to deal with the matter. It is to put the cart before the horse, obviously, to ask us to decide upon any of these proposals until we know what the electorates are going to be. To provide popular assemblies and to map out their powers before we know who are going to make those powers is obviously absurd, and I think it is impossible even to criticise, with any intelligence, any of the proposals regarding provincial government, although we may have an interesting conversation on them. We cannot give intelligent criticism until we have the Report of these Committees before us, and know how they are going to solve the difficulties of the electorates. A great deal was said in the Report against the communal system of representation. I do not think anybody so far in this House has said a word in their favour, but at least let us observe the difficulty.

I quite agree with what the 4.0 P.M. right hon. Gentleman said as to the unwisdom of keeping alive that sectionalism which a system of communal representation obviously tends to do. It is pretty hard to conceive any general franchise that would secure a fair representation to non-Brahmins in Madras or for the general agricultural communities elsewhere, but in the Report of the Viceroy and Secretary of State they make it clear, and hon. Members recognise, that it is of the deepest importance that if we are to have representative institutions in India on a proper basis they should not be run entirely by the Western educated members of urban councils. Until I had read the Report I myself was very doubtful how to devise a general franchise for India which would meet all these difficulties. Therefore, I do suggest that, however repugnant the idea of communal representation may be to a great many hon. Members, the difficulty has to be faced, and we cannot put it aside until we have heard a great deal more on the subject.

I would ask the Secretary of State, in conclusion, how he is going to deal with this Report in the future as regards the Parliament of this country. It is obvious we must not give any ground for Indian opinion to suspect our intentions. It is essential the whole subject should be thrashed out in public. We want to induce the nation to take an interest in

Indian affairs. It is difficult to do so, especially when our attentions are absorbed in the War. I suggest you can get no real sanction to your Bill, and that your reforms will eventually be delayed still more if you do not take means to interest the public, through the House of Commons, in the huge change you are going to make. You will be able to introduce your Bill in the House of Commons, and all will go well for a time, but you will suddenly find, when the glamour has passed away, after you have got a sympathetic Second Reading, that the sympathy will stop short, because it will occur to the people of this country that, without understanding it in the least, they are parting with a system of government in which they have had a great, just, and legitimate pride, and are giving complete sanction and authority to an entirely new form of government which they have been taught to believe is dangerous in the East, and which is also recognised as dangerous in any country in which the people have not learned to govern themselves. Unless the people understand more than they do now, I believe you will find, before much time elapses, that your Bill will not progress very rapidly. You have to provide for this difficulty. In my opinion the weakness of the Report is that it presents the case, but withholds the evidence on which that case is based. I understand that that was inevitable, and that volume after volume might have had to be presented to Parliament in order to avoid that difficulty. The fact remains that even those consultations which took place between the Viceroy and the Secretary of State, and the scores of different bodies, communities, and authorities in India can hardly, from our point of view, be held as sufficient evidence. They are evidence which we can appreciate, but something more is necessary to explain to us the evidence on which this Report—written so that the people of the country may have some basis to go upon. What we want to see is that these views are brought forward publicly, and in such a way that they can be tested by examination and cross-examination—to see whether they be the views of the European community, or of Mrs. Annie Besant, or of non-Brahminism. We want to be able to test the views, to examine them thoroughly, and give them full consideration. That is the only manner in which the right hon. Gentleman can fulfil the

[Captain Lloyd.]

pledges he made when he said there would be ample opportunity for discussion in Parliament. I take him to mean that in its fullest sense, not merely that there should be discussions across the floor of the House, but that the country shall also have an opportunity of judging. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not think I say this with any wish to burke or delay the reforms to which in their general principles I give a very unqualified assent, but I think unless we can get the proper amount of examination of the question, in the end your path will be more thorny and more difficult.

I would ask, as the right hon. Gentleman is setting up a Committee on the excellent system which prevailed in the time when the East India Company's Charter used to be discussed every twenty years, would it not be possible for him to set up a special Committee to examine the subject, a Committee which will have all its time free, and which will be able to create a greater body of public opinion in this House, and will be able to explain in Debate and in the country the proposals which are put forward in this report. Would it not be possible for him to set up such a body to examine all the points raised, and to get a full understanding of them? Otherwise what will be the position? The Secretary of State comes down to this House. We may not have an opportunity of discussing this matter again although I hope we shall. There are very few of us here who are in the least bit competent to form a really sane judgment on these very difficult questions, whereas if the right hon. Gentleman gave an opportunity to a Committee that would be willing to give a good deal of time to the matter, a Committee composed of Members of both Houses, I think he would find it of immense value to himself and to the reforms which we all desire to see carried through.

This Committee might possibly become a permanent Committee. I am perfectly certain great advantage would accrue from such a Committee, and if one such had existed after 1850, I doubt very much if any of that educational muddle which has done so much damage in India would have been allowed to go on unexamined and neglected for so many years. I throw out that suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman merely because I am anxious there should not be unnecessary delay. If

we have delay we shall get Indian opinion chilled, exacerbated, exasperated, and suspicious, and that is not an atmosphere in which you can carry through a reform scheme like this. When it was suggested just now by an hon. Member that we must take up this question at once, I felt strongly in agreement with him. This is the one moment—much better than after the War—when we can discuss this question. The whole attitude in India, so far as I can learn, the whole attitude of the people of India, is turned sympathetically towards us during this War. There have been obviously sectional differences and possibly acts of lawlessness in India, but you will never get a more favourable opportunity when the people of India press more and more to be associated with you before the world. Therefore, if we are going to inaugurate this reform now, I think it would be well for Parliament to set up a special Committee to deal with the matter and to carry this through before the good feeling now existing in India is worsened in any degree. If the right hon. Gentleman can give us some information as to how he proposes to proceed, it would be very much welcomed in this House. There are great difficulties obviously in proceeding by way of a Government Bill at once. But if there was such a Select Committee appointed as I have suggested it might be possible for the Secretary of State to put before that Committee an unofficial Bill in draft form, so that they could see the kind of proposal he was making to the Legislature. If that is done, and in any case on general lines I think the right hon. Gentleman will be able to count on the support of a vast majority of the Members of this House, at any rate, in moving towards this goal of self-government, and also for a large number of the provisions outlined in this volume.

Mr. CHARLES ROBERTS: I think the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State has no reason to complain of the course which the discussion has taken today. I feel we ought to be grateful to the Government for having given us this opportunity of a preliminary discussion. I am sure it was necessary to have it in order to clear away the misstatements and misconceptions which there have been in this country, and any postponement of the Debate would, I feel convinced, have led to misconceptions and misunderstand-

ings in India. The Debate has revealed so far a singular unanimity. There may be reservations, and there may be slight criticisms, but one has the satisfaction of seeing that the hon. Member for East Nottingham (Sir J. D. Rees) agrees with my hon. Friend the Member for East Finsbury (Mr. Cotton), who in a very interesting maiden speech has shown that he has not merely a personal but an hereditary right to speak on this question. And yet the amount of unanimity which has prevailed might, perhaps, give a wrong impression, for I cannot but remember that my right hon. Friend has not at the present time his Government behind his proposal. He has set us a very distinct holiday task to read his Report. I have read it. I hope he extends that invitation to his colleagues in the Government. Today he made a very welcome announcement. He said he was prepared to take a very notable step in setting up two Committees. I do not want to press that unduly, but it clearly does commit not only himself, but the Government of which he is a member to further steps along this road. I do not suppose it would be fair to assume that they have done more than accept the Report in its general principle. I hope that may be so. At all events, they have not rejected it as being inconsistent with their declaration in August last, and the fact that they wish to see it worked out and proceeded with is, I think, an omen of their intentions of which we should take note.

I do not wish at this present stage to put inconvenient questions. We were told by the Leader of the House that the pressure of business had been too great for them yet to make up their minds. One understands their preoccupation, but at the present moment they remain, of course, bound by their declaration of August last year, and after the holidays I think it will be our duty to press them a little further about that declaration, for, as my right hon. Friend made it clear, that declaration did commit them to taking substantial steps as soon as possible, and if those substantial steps are not an improvement on my right hon. Friend's Report, then we shall have to ask what are the substantial steps which they are going to take? The words "as soon as possible" are also words we cannot forget. They certainly do not mean the latest possible date, and, although they give a reasonable time, yet this is one of those matters to which the

story of the Books of Sibyl is applicable. I think this scheme is difficult to grasp as a whole. It is not merely that the details are somewhat complicated. They are novel expedients in the art of government perhaps, but it is a balanced scheme and different speakers have already laid stress upon different parts of it. The hon. Member for East Nottingham is satisfied with the safeguards. He finds that there are satisfactory assurances for the maintenance of British power, and I think there are safeguards in the scheme. But the existence of those safeguards does not prevent this measure being in reality, and marking, a great transition from a bureaucratic and autocratic system of government to the popular government on which, I believe, the Government of India will have to rest in the future.

It begins the first stages of the responsibility of Indian Ministers to an enlarged Indian electorate, and it provides statutory machinery for extending that measure of responsibility at recurring intervals. It does give to the Indians a place consistent with their own self-respect in an ultimately self-governing India which will form an integral part of the Empire. They will be in the future no longer mere passive subjects of Imperial rule, but conscious partners in an Empire which, in spite of differences of race, creed and language, exists for ideals of freedom and civilisation which appeal to Englishmen just as much as to Indians. I think my right hon. Friend was fully entitled to lay stress upon the backing with which the scheme comes to this House. Request has been made that **the evidence on which it was built up should be produced.** I think the Report says that that evidence really cannot be produced, so much of it rests on private opinions and on personal communications. It did not proceed by formal dispatch and official document. My right hon. Friend, I think, of all those who have previously held this high office, is **certainly in the best position to have formed his own individual judgment.** I think there were 109 formal deputations, and there must have been hundreds of interviews with officials and non-officials from all the different provinces of India. I think it only fair to my right hon. Friend to bear my testimony to his tenacity of purpose, the grasp of subject, the flexibility of mind, and his very

[Mr. C. Roberts.]

genuine belief in the principles of popular government, which, I think, expressed itself in his Report.

There has been a great deal of agreement as to principles expressed in the discussion up to date. And yet the reluctance of the Government to commit itself to the principles of the Report at the present time, joined with hostile voices that have not found expression in this House, but have found expression in the Press are, I think, a real danger signal to impatient idealists who, whether in this country or in India, are not content with the rate of progress which is being proposed. I think it is always a mistake, in judging of reforms, to measure them by a standard of theoretic but unattainable perfection. It is rather wiser to consider whether in practice they do represent substantial improvements on the existing state of things, and I defy anyone of honest purpose, who will take the trouble to grasp the scheme in its general principles and in its details, to fail to see that, in spite of the safeguards which are provided, it does give a very substantial and marked advance in self-government in India. I say this because I noticed a letter in a leading journal within the last few days which, on behalf of unofficial Indians in this country, complained that, though they did not wish the Report rejected, yet it gave little or nothing of real value to them. It is very difficult to summarise. I admit it does provide—and rightly provides—during a great transition, during the evolution of popular government, power to maintain law and order. It leaves the Government free with full powers to discharge its Imperial responsibilities. But if you take—I will not say changes in relation to the Secretary of State, to Parliament, or to the Indian Parliament—but, taking the actual changes in India, it is impossible to say that these are not substantial improvements from the standpoint of anyone who wishes to see self-government carried into effect or to see India marching upon the road to self-government.

Let me summarise the stages in the scheme towards self-government in India. There are: popular control over local government (in districts and towns); the extension, or rather creation of, electorates, mainly on a direct territorial basis; a largely increased measure of autonomy

for the provinces, as distinct from the Government of India; the institution of Executive Councils in four additional provinces, the placing of an Indian member on those Councils in all the eight provinces concerned; the enlargement of provincial councils, the increase of the elective majority, and their control of certain departments to be transferred to them; the establishment of Indian Ministers, who could, together with the Executive Council, form part of the provincial government, and will have to administer the transferred departments; the accountability of these Indian Ministers primarily for the first five years to their constituents, and thereafter their full responsibility to the provincial councils; the separation of all Indian and provincial finance, and a much freer hand to the Indian Ministers and to the Provincial Council to propose and carry new taxation and to raise loans; in the sphere of the Government of India the addition of a second Indian member of the Viceroy's Executive Council of six, and the enlargement of the Viceroy's Legislative Council, with a view to making it more representative of Indian opinion; and the institution of a statutory machinery for the enlargement of this measure of self-government at recurring intervals. I cannot understand anyone, who wishes to take an honest view of this subject, not realising that it does mark a very substantial advance. But my right hon. Friend says that he is prepared to vary details. I am not quite clear whether that may not open a somewhat dangerous prospect. Certainly none of these details is regarded as having any special sacrosanctity. The hon. Member for Leicester, for instance, thought there was too great complexity. I do not think he would find it, if he gave his mind to it, that it would be very easy to frame a single expedient to carry out the declaration of August last. Full responsible government, we know, is not a very simple form of government if you try to set out on paper all the unwritten conventions and understandings on which it rests. Democratic government we know, but the hybrid between the two—a transitional form of government, which is to be neither the one nor the other, but to lead from one to the other—cannot, I think, be very simple, and I think my hon. Friend tried to solve his riddle by arguing it would be very much more simple to have the system of Cabinet with

which we are familiar in this country. That, of course, is going far beyond the limits that were laid down for us, and far beyond the limits, I think, to which this House is prepared to proceed.

I am one of those who have a very honest and sincere desire to see this great adventure of instituting self-government in India succeed. I believe it is possible. I do not see any reason why the Indians should not succeed in this task, on one condition—that they will give themselves the necessary training time to master what is involved in learning the practical art of self-government. Given that, I see no reason why they should not succeed, just as our Allies the Japanese, who also had no historical basis for the Western institutions, which they have been able to blend with their own traditional principles of government in a way which has produced marked success and led to the greatness of their country. I should like those who may be impatient, who may wish to see a greater rate of progress than my right hon. Friend is prepared to admit, to be warned that there may be dangers which they would have to face in carrying their point, and that unanimity in this House to-day, at the present stage, does not get them over their difficulties. I think they will find that this scheme—or something like it—my right hon. Friend is really the limit under present conditions, here and now of what is possible. I do not myself see conditions in the immediate future which will enable them to obtain a great quantity. I am, of course, not forgetting the recurring intervals by which the present proposals for reform may be increased by means of the Statutory Commission. I do, however, think it would be wise for those who have the difficult task of judging how much it is well for them to ask to remember that if they want reforms they can only get those reforms by prudent and energetic concentration upon them, and that those who have not the statesmanship to accept a good offer when it is made generally pay the penalty by many weary years of waiting in an arid and possibly storm-swept wilderness.

I think there is only one preliminary point at this stage, when we are not dealing with details but general considerations, upon which I should like to say a few more words. The hon. Member for East Nottingham has spoken of Brahmin ascendancy as something which must immediately and necessarily follow

throughout India from the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman, and he said that he did not contemplate that result with much love. In the Press that supposed result of this scheme is being set before us as a formidable obstacle and as one of the results of these proposals. Our mentors in the Press emphasise the fact, as they say, that a visit to India disqualifies you from forming an opinion upon Indian subjects. I do not think a visit goes quite so far as that. It does give something of real value: not to put it too high, it perhaps illumines the depths of one's ignorance. These critics are always saying that India is a country very diversified, with not a single nation among its congeries of nations, sects, and so on, and they tell us that Brahmin ascendancy is going to be the result of these proposals. When they do so, they forget the result of their own reasoning. So far as the representations made can furnish materials for judgment. I do not think that that point is dwelt upon practically throughout the whole of the North. I think the existence of the caste feeling, or at least the worst abuses of the caste spirit, do not so much exist in the North of India as in the South. It may be that in the North it has been checked, or kept under control, by Mahomedanism—for, of course, amongst 70,000,000 of Mahomedans there is in theory—though I am afraid theory does not always work out in practice—no possibility of caste in the brotherhood of that religion. It is then, really, more prominent in the south, and the acute stage of feeling between Brahmin and non-Brahmin is really a local feeling of Madras. I do not say that has got to be ignored. I think the existence of these 60,000,000 of the depressed classes, the "untouchables," the "unapproachables," and the inheritors of unknown sins is a fact which cannot be lost sight of, nor is improperly to be borne in mind by this House in considering the problems which we have to meet. I think it is worth while, however, knowing that the representatives of all these depressed classes, when they came before my right hon. Friend did not by any means decline the idea of going forward towards representative institutions.

I have here a handbook, which is to be found on the various bookstalls, which is entitled, "Indian Opposition to Home Rule: What the British Public Ought to Know." This consists very largely of extracts from the addresses made by my right hon. Friend. May I give two illus-

[Mr. C. Roberts.]
 trations? The extracts are, I think, quite relevant to the point that there is a considerable amount of feeling against complete Colonial Home Rule in India; there is a fear amongst some representatives or spokesmen of these depressed classes that if complete power is given to the higher castes they will suffer. Take the first extract, given as an illustration, of the Deccan Ryots. That does lay great stress upon the dangers of the caste spirit. This particular portion of the address welcomes the declaration of His Majesty's Government towards the prospect of responsible government as the right goal. They say they welcome the ideal. It then proceeds to ask in a passage, which is also here, for provincial councils with a substantial election majority, complete control of the purse, with power to pass any laws and to make resolutions binding upon the executive, subject certainly to the veto of the Governor. That is to say, these representatives of the depressed classes ask for more, in fact, than my right hon. Friend is prepared to give. Take the same thing in Madras. There was a South Indian Liberal Federation, recently organised by an Indian gentleman, to plead the cause of the depressed classes in Madras—who have a real hardship and a real grievance. Here, again, the practical proposals which that Federation wishes to lay before my right hon. Friend are embodied, and if you look at the practical proposals both in the changes they wish to make in the Executive, and in the transfer of particular Departments to the control of the provincial councils, and my right hon. Friend's financial proposals, you will find—I believe it is here in this book, but I will not trouble the House with it—that they are really almost on the lines of the proposals that my right hon. Friend is now making in his Report. I do not merely call attention to this. I think it is that which the British public ought to know. They ought to know that the spokesmen of these depressed classes came to ask for representative institutions either on the same lines as is proposed by my right hon. Friend, or even in advance of those proposals—on condition that they had special protection by means of communal representatives—

Sir J. D. REES: The vast majority!

Mr. ROBERTS: You may regret the condition of some of these things, but it all comes back to the question of safe-

guards. When we are told, as we are told in the Press, that it is quite impossible to devise a system of popular government without creating Brahmin ascendancy which may act unfairly towards the others, then I think one may figure out the census and the statistics which I think have already been quoted; they somewhat calm one's apprehension. The Brahmin caste, men, women, and children throughout India is $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the population. In Madras, where the question is acute, the Brahmins are divided amongst themselves through economic interests which touch them and the other classes. They are landowners and cultivators, and some are in trade, and so on, as well as in the learned professions. This caste in Madras is only 3 per cent.. We are asked to believe that it is impossible to devise a scheme under which all power will not be put into the hands of 3 per cent., and that 3 per cent. will be able to ride rough-shod over the other 97 per cent.! If you went perversely about it, I think it might be difficult to succeed, but if these are the conditions which are going to be set up, and instructed as those concerned will be to devise a franchise on as broad a basis as the conditions admit, if they make a scheme and devise representation, an honest scheme, I cannot think it will pass the wit of man to arrange that you will get fair representation. The suggestion that you must put all power into the hands of this single limited class appears to me to be rather imaginary. Questions have been put to my right hon. Friend as to how he means to proceed; what further progress is he going to make?

I know quite well that the hon. and gallant Gentleman for Staffordshire who preceded me suggested that a Parliamentary Committee, to his mind, was a mere expedient of delay. He wishes frequent consideration and information. I think before any question of that kind arises there is one prior question: When are we going to get the Government proposals? That is the first essential. I would submit that the first thing we have to do is to ask the Government to prepare their measure, to settle on their measure, to make up their minds on the subject. I hope in the breathing space of the holidays that consummation can be effected. I cannot myself think that it would be anything but inexpedient and a cause of delay if the Parliamentary Committee which has been referred to should

be c
the
last
Gov
plac
be c
well
opp
defi
whi
also
this
imp
recl
star
pre
fut
the
can
cou
and
the
unc
and
pri
con
wo
the
cha
the
str

N
My
gir
of
no
wh
Th
inc
ne
me
int
ut
wh
dis
pr
an
wi
ma
pr
an
the
sta
by
wa
M.
Ro
ha
ne
bu

be charged with the duty of going all over the ground again which was gone over last winter. What we want is a definite Government proposal, and it should be placed before this House. Before that can be done I presume opinion in India, as well as in this country, will have had opportunities for expressing itself more definitely. I hope that the unanimity which has prevailed in this House will also prevail in the country at large on this question. I think we may ask the impatient extremists not to throw away recklessly the chance of the great substantial good which is offered at the present moment and the large vista of future prospects which are contained in these immediate proposals. I think we can ask all moderate minded men in this country or in India to accept this scheme, and I must again repeat my request to the Government that they should without undue haste make up their collective mind, and be prepared to march forward on the principles of this Report, which I am convinced, as far as my own opinion is worth anything, will be of benefit both to the material welfare of India and the character of Indian manhood, and will at the same time, I honestly believe, strengthen and consolidate the Empire.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (*War Cabinet*): My hon. Friend opposite said at the beginning of his speech that the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy had no reason to complain of the reception which has been given to their Report. That is so conclusive that I am almost inclined to ask myself whether there is any need for another member of the Government to intervene, and whether, when intervening, there are any criticisms uttered in the course of the discussion which I ought to answer. The House has discussed this question, as these great problems ought to be discussed, without any party spirit or party feeling, and with an obvious recognition of the magnitude and the difficulty of the problems with which we are confronted, and with a determination to confront them in a spirit of confident understanding and sympathy in the hope that by so doing we may march steadily forward in the path of progress and liberty. My hon. Friend opposite (Mr. C. Roberts), I think, of all the speakers who have intervened in this Debate, came nearest to a criticism of the Government, but he did not formulate his criticism

definitely, although he seemed to suggest that in his mind the Government had been too slow about making up their mind. It is very natural for my hon. Friend to hold that view, because his interest in India is of long standing, and it is profound. He was good enough to give me his assistance when I was Secretary of State for India, and I know how closely he follows all Indian questions. He also accompanied my right hon. Friend to India, and for six months he had nothing else to do but devote his whole mind to these great problems.

As a result of those deliberations, this Report was framed by the Viceroy and the Secretary of State, and it was laid before their colleagues at home. Under present conditions the Cabinet has not been able to give six months, six weeks, or even one week's uninterrupted attention to this question, and it is evident that if hon. Members will recall what has been the history of the War during the past month or two, it will be evident to them that the time at the disposal of the Cabinet for the consideration of this Report has been wholly insufficient for them to arrive at the conclusion which my hon. Friend desires to see, or to arrive at anything like detailed conclusions upon the Report itself. I do not think, however, that any time has been lost. One thing is quite obvious, that carefully as this Report has been framed, manifold as is the evidence within it that those who wrote it had given sustained and detailed attention to the problems with which they were dealing, it is not on the face of it a complete solution of the problems with which we have to deal. My right hon. Friend felt that there were many parts of this question which it was impossible to solve with the Viceroy within the space of the cold weather during the seasonal visit which he could pay to India, and it was left for Committees to take up in detail that part of the field which he had been unable to cover, and His Majesty's Government have decided, in pursuance of the recommendation of my right hon. Friend and the Viceroy, that these Committees should be appointed as early as possible, and proceed to India as early as possible, and that they should deal with these questions for which they are specially appointed, such as the franchise, the division between transfers and reserved subjects, and the division of authority between the Government of India and the provincial governments,

[Mr. Chamberlain.]

which are essential to the presentation, or even to the drafting, of any Bill on the general lines of this Report or in pursuance of the declaration of the Government in August.

My hon. Friend need have no apprehension in his mind that the Government mean to go back in the letter or even in the spirit on that declaration. As my right hon. Friend has said, it was not a hasty declaration, for no responsible Government would offer a hasty declaration on a subject of such importance. It was a matter which had been discussed between the Government of India and myself as Secretary of State and between myself and my colleagues before my right hon. Friend became responsible. He took up the story where I was obliged to leave it. He found the declaration in existence in substance if not in the exact words in which he subsequently read it to this House. He found the visit of the Secretary of State for India already arranged for by the Viceroy, and practically approved by the Government, and he thus entered upon an inheritance which I think he was not reluctant to take up, because he was wholly in sympathy with the movement. At any rate, he took up a movement which was already in progress, and he did not start the revolution which some hasty or careless observers have been inclined to suggest.

Do not let us underrate the difficulties of the path which we are pursuing. I am as profoundly convinced as anybody can be that the declaration of 20th August was right, and that the time has come for something more than a move forward towards a new orientation of our policy. I agree with my right hon. Friend that from the moment you seek to find the goal of British policy in India there is but one advance you can make, and that is the gradual development of free institutions with a view to the ultimate realisation of responsible government. Nothing else is compatible with our traditions, feelings or practice. Many people might have preferred, and I admit when I first considered the problem I should have preferred not to have defined the goal which must necessarily be far distant, but set to work on the immediate steps which could be taken at once in the direction of reform. There was a necessity for a declaration of policy which was desired and demanded by reformers, and it was urgently pressed for by those responsible

for the government of India who desired to have from His Majesty's Government a clear definition of the objects to which they were to direct their efforts, and a clear indication of the path which the Government wished them to pursue. That being so, it was right to make a declaration, and if any declaration was to be made it could be put in none other than the spirit in which it was made on the 20th August last.

The Government of that day did not make that declaration lightly, and did not conceal from themselves the large appeal to confidence on the one hand and patience on the other which it would be necessary to make to public opinion in order to realise the profundity of the change which was involved or the perils of the paths upon which they were entering. I think it is an encouraging matter that amidst so many difficulties we should see signs of so great a community of opinion, and above all that we should find in the great Service to whom India owes, above all other things, its advancement to its present position and its fitness to a further advance, such a spirit of readiness to enter on this new policy and to lend aid to make it a success. I am glad to think that in the course of the Debate, so far as I have heard it, there has not been one word of criticism of that great Service. A certain section of Indian reformers, in pressing forward claims which I think are extravagant and harmful to India, as well as injurious to the Empire as a whole, seek to promote their object by attacks upon some of the members of the British Government and the men responsible for it, but I think in so doing they injure their own cause and do a great wrong to the public service, which is one of the glories of our Empire, and without which neither India nor the House of Commons would ever have seen such a scheme of reform as we have before us to-day. Yet those who view these suggestions of reform with apprehension remember that we—I do not mean the Government of the day, but the British Governments of the past—have been the creators of the aspirations which have given rise to the demand for these reforms.

We have created feelings which but for the existence of British rule in India and for the ideas and the education which we have introduced might have

5.0 P.M. remained alien to India for centuries to come as they have been alien to her past. But having

created and implanted those ideas and having spread those ideas, not merely within the corners of our Kingdom, but throughout the world wherever our flag flies, we must have faith in the institutions that we have created and encourage the realisation of the ideals which we have held before them. It is not possible in a Debate like that of to-day—and I think every speaker has felt it—to deal in elaboration or in detail with such a vast mass of material as is contained within this volume; but I would venture to commend one or two general features of it for the consideration of hon. Members. I take, for instance, the chapter call “The conditions of the problem,” and I invite hon. Members to study them, whether they belong to the conservative view of the situation or whether they belong to the more advanced reformers. I attach importance to it, because it shows that the framers of this Report were fully conscious what they were doing and that they were not moving among circumstances and conditions of which they were unaware with eyes blind to the truth, but, seeing their difficulties and recognising them, they yet thought that they could offer a sure and certain method of progress through them. If hon. Members will turn to the early pages of Part 2 they will find that the authors of the Report lay down four propositions for their guidance. I submit those propositions with confidence for the acceptance of the House. In pursuance of the declaration of the 20th August they state, in the first place, that

“There should be, as far as possible, complete popular control in local bodies and the largest possible independence for them of outside control.”

I do not believe that is anywhere disputed. If there be a criticism of our Indian reform in the past it is that we have built from the top instead of from the bottom. It presents us with difficulties from which we cannot now get away. The answer of our predecessors might be that the same difficulties confronted them that the material with which you could build was found at the top and not at the bottom, and that was the reason for this anomalous style of building. I am sure that all who know anything of India will agree that it is of the utmost importance that forthwith you should proceed to widen and extend your popular Government and to give real control and responsibility to the popular bodies which you create, because it is there in the things of

narrow localities that you find the best means of educating the elector in his rights and in his duties and of providing him with power and influence in matters in regard to which he is well informed and can express a really practical judgment. The second proposition which the authors of the Report lay down is:

“The provinces are the domain in which the earlier steps towards the progressive realisation of responsible government should be taken. Some measure of responsibility should be given at once, and our aim is to give complete responsibility as soon as conditions permit.”

There, again, I think the Report will carry general concurrence. It is clearly in the provinces that the first and largest advances can be made, and it follows, as the authors of the Report point out, that, in order to do that, you must devolve authority upon the provinces and you must decentralise some of the functions of government and leave to the new provincial authorities which you create, or to the provincial authorities in their new form, a larger measure of independence than anything that has been accorded to them hitherto. That, in my opinion, is necessary for another purpose. India is a country of immense geographical area and immensely varying local conditions. If you try to make all India move entire, some parts will move too fast and some parts will move too slow. You must allow for elasticity of government in proportion to the diversity of local conditions and local capacity. I venture to call attention to the fact that the reforms proposed by the authors of the Report do not apply to the whole of India, but, for reasons which will be readily understood, certain provinces—the frontier provinces and Burma—are especially marked out for treatment different from others on account of the peculiarity of the problems or of the conditions existing in them. The third of these propositions is that

“The Government of India must remain wholly responsible to Parliament, and, saving such responsibility, its authority in essential matters must remain indisputable, pending experience of the effect of the changes now to be introduced into the provinces.”

I venture again to hope that is a proposition which will meet with general acceptance, and I would add that not scarcely less important is the provision that in those matters which are reserved subjects in the provinces the authority of the provincial governor and government should be clear, easily enforceable, and able to be sustained. Nobody will want to

[Mr. Chamberlain.]

reserve more questions than are necessary, but where questions have to be reserved and where the safety of India as a whole or the good government and peace and order of the community are concerned, the Government cannot divest itself of its responsibility at this time, and, having the responsibility, it must have the authority necessary to give effect to its decisions. I am not reading quite the whole of these propositions printed in italics in the Report and therefore easy to find. One more proposition is laid down, namely, that

"In proportion as the foregoing changes take effect, the control of Parliament and the Secretary of State over the Government of India and the Provincial Governments must be relaxed."

That led to an observation made by the hon. and gallant Member for West Staffordshire (Captain Lloyd) which is very just and which demands our attention and our acceptance. My hon. and gallant Friend said that we were taking a momentous step to which he himself was ready and anxious to be a party, but he thought it behoved us to realise what we were doing. I observed in the short time that I was Secretary of State that it was just those sections of opinion in this House and out of it who were most inclined towards the development of self-government in India who were also most inclined to call upon the Secretary of State to interfere with and override the Government of India. The House of Commons, if it desires to pursue the path indicated by the decision of the Government of 20th August, must be quite clear that, for the future, it is going to part with some portion of the power which it has hitherto exercised in India. We shall have to abandon, to use the words of my hon. and gallant Friend, some of the claims, economic and other, which we have hitherto asserted in dealing with India. Just as we invite the officials of India to surrender powers which they have hitherto exercised under the guidance of the Secretary of State, and just as we call upon them to employ methods of persuasion where hitherto they have been able to employ methods of command, so we ourselves shall have to be prepared to give up something of our authority, to see things done which we do not like done, and to see mistakes made which under the present form of government could and would be prevented, for the sake of

enabling Indians to gain by their own experience and in time to realise the self-government which is our goal. I do not pretend, and I think it would be a great mistake to pretend, that the immediate result of such changes as are contemplated will be an increase of efficiency in government. I suppose there has been no Government which for the purpose for which it existed was more efficient or more free from corruption than the Government of India as we have known it. It will not improve in either respect in the first stages of this popularisation. If we think it will we shall be doomed to disappointment. If we expect more we may regret the step we are taking, but, if we realise that just as we ourselves have had to learn and have learned through the centuries and have only in very recent times come to the measure of efficiency, of incorruption, and of democracy which we enjoy to-day, so the progress in India must be through mistakes and must be gradual and spread, I will not say over as long, but still over a long period of years, then we shall go on with confidence, without disappointment through ignorance of the conditions, and we may rest assured that in time we shall reach our goal.

I have ventured to utter these words of caution, but I hope that it will not be supposed that in so doing I am throwing cold water upon the scheme of reform or upon reform in general. I say again, as I said at the beginning, that I am profoundly convinced that on such lines of progress and on them alone lie safety for us. It is true that only a small proportion of the vast population of India take any active interest at the present time in political reform, but the numbers who do so, though small in proportion to the whole, are considerable. We have planted those ideas in their minds, and their whole association with us encourages them. Though small to-day, they are still a rapidly growing number, and though underneath that surface current, for perhaps it is little more than that, there lie great depths hitherto undisturbed by any of these political aspirations, yet the influence and the effect of the moving current on the top penetrate more deeply every year, and some of those who left India twenty or thirty years ago or even less would be surprised if they went back to find what new ideas are discussed in village circles, what thoughts are penetrating into places where comparatively a few years ago no political idea ever

entered. You cannot neglect that. It does not make the problem easier that there is so great a disparity between this active and alert but small political section of the population and the great masses outside it. It makes the problem infinitely more difficult. But if we do not seek to deal with it as we go along, and to move as it moves, we shall be confronted sooner or later with a situation in which hope deferred, aspirations disappointed, pledges or expectations unfulfilled, have created a bitterness and a discontent which we may find it difficult to undo.

After all, in setting our minds seriously to the problem of internal Indian development we are at this moment only following the path which India has already trodden in regard to its position in the Empire. I am not sure that Indians themselves always realise how profound has been the change in the position of India in and towards the Empire in the course of the last few years. Last year, for the first time in history, India was admitted formally, and by Indian representatives as well as by the Secretary of State, to the Imperial War Conference. Her delegates were welcomed there by the representatives of the self-governing Dominions, and, with the consent of those Governments—with their consent alone could it be done—India was made a member of the Imperial Conference henceforth. Last year India was represented in the Imperial War Cabinet by the Secretary of State. It is true—that in itself was a great advance—that the Secretary of State was accompanied by a representative of the Indian princes, an Indian representative of the Indian Government, and another gentleman, but they came there as advisers and to assist the Secretary of State, who, alone of the four, was technically a member of the Cabinet, although these gentlemen were present at every discussion, heard every secret, and saw every paper that was submitted to the Imperial War Cabinet. This year, apart from the Secretary of State, who sits in the Imperial War Cabinet as one of the British Ministers dealing with Imperial affairs, India sits there in her own right, represented by an Indian prince and an Indian gentleman whose distinguished career is familiar to this House. More than that, in the light of the discussions which took place last year and this year in the Imperial War Conference, a new recognition has been given to the

equality of status of India and to a right of reciprocal treatment as between the Dominions and India, or Great Britain and India, of their respective citizens. In these matters, within the last few years, India has leaped suddenly into a place of equality with the other great portions of His Majesty's Dominions, and her representatives sit with them in great Imperial Councils, just as and, perhaps, partly because, as my right hon. Friend has said, in every theatre of this War her troops have fought beside our own and those of the rest of the Empire in defence of our common cause.

Is it not right that that great progress in Imperial status and position, that admission to partnership in the Empire for India, should be accompanied or followed, as soon as may be, by a revision of the share which Indians take in their own government and by an effort to set them upon a road which will lead them steadily forward in the paths of progress and reform? I believe the time has come when that can be done. I believe it would be equally foolish to refuse to do it or to move too fast. I venture to say to those who would stand still, that that way lies destruction. I venture also to say to those who make extravagant claims, that that way also lies destruction. It is more important that each step that is made should be firmly planted on sure ground than that you should take two steps at once. It is more important that each new sphere of activity and responsibility which Indians acquire for themselves should be firmly held, and that such new powers should be wisely wielded, that vital mistakes should be avoided which would compromise all future progress, than that the progress should be a little more rapid or a little slower at first. I was profoundly impressed in the short time I was Secretary of State for India by the fact that no Englishman could hope to serve India without a real sympathy, bred of understanding, for her peoples and their aspirations. I venture also to say that the same is true of our Indian fellow subjects, and that, as they have a right to demand that sympathy and understanding of us, as they have a right to call for our good will and our assistance in the progress which they desire to make, so they should extend sympathy and understanding to us, with our great inherited responsibility to millions of people who are not yet fit to protect themselves, and to the interests which India, as a whole, cannot yet defend

[Mr. Chamberlain.]

without our assistance, and that they should examine the proposals of my right hon. Friend and the Viceroy, or the proposals of the Government when those proposals come to be laid before Parliament, and the acts of this Parliament, with a generous appreciation of the spirit in which they are framed and not with impatient, hasty, or ignorant criticism of the British Government either of the past or of the present.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: It is exactly 100 years ago that a predecessor of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down was elected as representative of the City of Birmingham. Sir Charles Wolseley, at the time of the passage of the Reform Bill, made this remark:

"Thank God the Reform Bill is in the hands of the people. Now they can save or ruin themselves."

That is the true spirit of Liberalism, and though I do realise the very genuine Liberalism of the right hon. Gentleman, I could wish there was a little more of that spirit and a little less of the cautious statesman. No doubt caution is essential, but at the same time what I value this Report for is that we have combined in it not only the caution of a statesman, but also the fine ideals of Liberalism throughout the ages. The Report which we have had put in our hands recently, and which some of us have read, is an historical document of the first importance. It is Lord Durham's Report upon the Government of Canada combined with the constitution of the Abbé Sieyès. It has embodied in its pages, particularly in that section to which the right hon. Gentleman has just referred, the true doctrine of historic Liberalism. If this Debate does nothing else but bring to the notice of the people of this country this document and induce them to study and read it, it will have served a very useful purpose. I am exceptionally grateful to the Secretary of State for India for having produced this historical document. It is a great credit to this country. I have a telegram to-day from a desperate, dangerous, Indian agitator—Lajpat Rai. His telegram begins:

"The general spirit of the Montagu Report is admirable."

That is the unbiassed opinion of the everybody who reads this Report. The tone of it is so excellent. Hitherto, English people have been rightly suspected of hypocrisy in dealing with India. Too

often they have made professions with their tongues in their cheeks, and have used those professions purely for platform purposes, while executive action has been very different. Take the case of education. There has been, very rightly, a suspicion on the part of Indian people that we have deliberately prevented them from getting education in order that they might not claim self-government. Another very well-founded suspicion of our rule is that we have deliberately divided the people in order that they might be better controlled, and that we have used the excuse of Mahomedan and Hindu in order to prevent self-government. When I point to the tone of this Report, I should like to refer specifically to those passages dealing with the question of the electorate and the question of the representation of minorities. It would have been so easy for the old stereotyped official to have produced a Report calculated to persuade all save the ignorant reader that the British Government, in the true interest of the minorities in India, and not at all considering the advantages of British control, felt it to be essential to provide separate representation for all the different castes and communities of that country. I suspected that would be done, that we should have class representation in order that the British Government, playing the Macchiavellian game, might play off one caste and one religion against the other, one interest against the other. The genuineness and the honesty of this Report is shown by the very fact that the whole arguments of the Report are directed against separate representations, and that the Report is based on the genuine desire to see India become a nation where all classes would pull together, and where the natural distinctions in politics would be between Liberals and Conservatives, and not between two religions or two castes. That to my mind is proof positive that this Report is in earnest. I am glad I have lived to see the day when a fellow countryman of mine in an official position, not only puts these views forward, but has been able to get them received unanimously by the House of Commons as the right thing to do. I regret, if it is a regret, that he is a Jew and not an Englishman. In doing the right thing by the world the Englishman has been left behind, and the Jew has come first. It is an additional satisfaction to the Indians to see that we who welcome the assistance and the co-

operation of all races, provided they are Liberals, now give an earnest of the fact that we shall welcome their assistance in the years to come, and that the traditions Britain has made will be carried on as well when India has Home Rule by the Indians, who will be as Liberal as ourselves.

The struggle for this Report has yet to come. We have seen a certain amount of opposition in India—I do not attach very much importance to that. After all, as an agitator myself, I know what the business and duty of an agitator are. You never dare accept what any Government offers you, because you know they will be pressed from the other side, and unless you are more extreme than the Government, the other people will manage to get the proposal whittled away and destroyed in the process of passing it into law. It is the duty of an agitator to say that this Report does not go far enough, because they have seen the opposition of Lord Sydenham in another place and of other important Anglo-Indians to certain portions of this Report. It is of the utmost importance we should have no whittling away of this Report. This should be the Magna Charta of the Indian people. The attack which will be made upon it by the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy will be on the representation question, and now, whilst there is a chance, before these forces come into play, I want to give the House the real advantage of having a uniform electorate. We have in the British Empire already two different systems. In South Africa we have the system of the black man having a vote for the ordinary election. In nearly every constituency in Cape Colony the black men have votes, and, consequently, the white members elected for those constituencies have to look after the native interest. They dare not oppress the blacks, because the blacks have votes for them, and you get fair treatment of the blacks in Cape Colony in consequence. The black minority, because it is only a small minority, has voting power, gets its rights and receives decent treatment. But if you go to New Zealand you see exactly the opposite arrangement. The Maoris are represented by Maoris; they do not vote for the white members of Parliament; they have three or four Maori representatives to look after their interests. They are easily corrupted; they are bought over; they are helpless in a white system, with the result that the position of the Maoris

where they have separate representation is infinitely worse than the blacks in South Africa where they vote for white men.

The moral of that is that if you give your minority, a Sikh or a Mahomedan, a vote in the ordinary run of affairs for representation on these representative councils—one in a hundred, or it may be one in a thousand—the elected man has to attend to these because they are his electorate. Directly you take them away and give them separate representation they may influence their own separate representatives, but they cannot influence the large body of the members of the legislative council. Therefore, I hope that if separate representation is provided for the Mahomedans and for the Sikhs, that still the Mahomedans and the Sikhs would be left on the general electorate lists so that they may have an equal power with any Hindoo in voting for the ordinary Members of Parliament. In that way we shall ensure that the separate representation is only temporary, and that both religions will finally coalesce in ordinary political relations. I think it necessary to point that out now, because it is in favour of more and more of this sectional representation that the Conservative efforts will be made in dealing with this Report. The proper Liberal attitude towards this reform Bill is, first of all, to secure the widest possible franchise in India for the legislative council. If you have a wide franchise everything else will follow in due course. What one is afraid of is the narrowing down of the franchise before everything else. Once you have got your elected majority on the legislative council everything else must follow as naturally as night follows day or day follows night.

With regard to the scheme put forward here for referred and transferred powers, it is obvious that all these are merely temporary. It is impossible to carry on permanently with an irremovable Executive and a legislative assembly elected by a popular electorate to which they are not responsible; you can only manage it temporarily on such a basis. Still, it is an extraordinarily clever way of dealing with the matter by means of transferred subjects and the gradual reduction in the amount of the reserved subjects. The Government was not prepared, as I should have been, to do away with the irremovable Executive at once, and to say that they would have Cabinet responsibility

[Colonel Wedgwood.]

and that the legislative council should choose the Ministry who should be the executive authority. Rather they said they would have a certain number of Ministers who should come from the legislative council and be responsible for the transferred subjects. That may do for a time. Gradually, as the transferred subjects increase and the reserved subjects are reduced, you will get an executive which will be responsible to the elective legislative council. That will be self-government. The steps towards it will be taken partly by your Committee in this House, partly by the ten-yearly revision of the Constitution, but the important thing is that, first of all, you should get your electorate on a broad and uniform basis. Unfortunately, the Report does not go into details about that; it is to be settled by the Committee. I only hope that there will be the same liberal element on that Committee as has been engaged in drawing up this Report. There are many obstacles in the way of the right hon. Gentleman if he puts on the Committee those elements which, we fear, will take care to ramp the electoral part of the Constitution in such a way as to nullify the liberal defects of the scheme as a whole.

Another point I would like to deal with is the transfer of the power of taxation from the Central Government of India to these provincial councils. At first sight, it seemed to me that the Committee had decided admirably. The transfer of the Land Revenue to the provincial councils is not only natural, but gives them a large source of revenue which can be dealt with in future as the Land Revenue increases. The retention by the Central Government of Income Tax also seems to me to be obvious, but I do rather criticise the way in which they have made up the revenue of the Government of India. By this transfer of Land Revenue to the provincial councils, a large hole has been made in the revenue of the Government of India, and they have proposed that each presidency or governorship should hand back to the Government a certain sum of money. They admit this system has been difficult to decide, but the system they have adopted seems most unfair. One-third of the whole amount to be handed back by the local government to the Central Government comes from Madras, because in the Madras Presidency—I am not certain about this, but the right hon. Gentleman will correct me—a far larger proportion

of the revenue for Land Tax is collected, because the land in Madras is owned by the State, and the accounts are paid to the State Government. But if you go to Bengal, that only contributes one-fourth of what Madras contributes, although Bengal is far richer. The reason is that there you have the land held under the settlement by which a landlord takes the benefit and the State gets next to nothing. The Madras Government has to hand over to the Government of India three or four times as much as is handed over by the great province of Bengal. That does not seem fair in the long run. Some adjustment will have to be made there so that Madras and the Central Provinces will come off rather better and not suffer for the benefit of others because they have a more intelligent system of land tenure in that part of the country. The other question connected with finance is that of loans. I am not quite satisfied that my right hon. Friend is right in preventing the provincial governments from applying for loans upon the markets like other provincial governments. Why should I not be entitled to invest my money in the Saskatchewan and not in the United Provinces Loan or the Madras Loan?

The reasons given are that there would be competition in borrowing and the market would be dislocated. Those reasons are very poor, and they apply to all other provinces and towns in the British Empire just as much as to India, and I cannot help thinking, with my suspicious mind, this has been done in order to leave a certain amount of administrative control in the hands of the Central Government. The Central Government has no right to say what money provincial governments shall borrow, whether for irrigation, sanitation, or public works of any kind, and if you think the Central Government ought to have power to interfere in these things, provide it openly in your charter; and do not do it surreptitiously by leaving it to the Central Government to say what moneys the provincial governments shall be allowed to borrow. It is just these little things, showing lack of confidence, which are likely to do harm to the working of this scheme. I hope the House and my right hon. Friend will not be disappointed if the scheme does not work admirably. Human nature being what it is, it is inconceivable that when this scheme is in operation in India you should not have agitation in all the legislative councils

to extend it till they get really responsible government. Do not let us start by making the mistake of thinking that anyone who agitates for an extension of the scheme is thereby an enemy of the State, a fit subject for deportation, hostile to British rule, and all the rest of it. If once we allow legitimate agitation for the extension of self-government to be made a ground for charges of disloyalty, we shall set up, in the happy relations which there ought to be between England and India, all the bitterness which we have in Ireland and which we would do anything to avoid now that we are all struggling together in the common cause of liberty. I hope the people of India will realise that this charter is the foundation upon which their liberties can be based. I hope also that they will not imagine that I am actuated by the desire to be kind to India or to give them anything. I support this scheme, not in the interests of India in the least—it is immaterial to me how they govern themselves—but in the interests of England, in the interests of her good name and her good traditions.

Sir EDWARD PARROTT: I do not propose to indulge myself in the language of criticism, but in that of sincere congratulation. We are here ostensibly welcoming a very wonderful visitant, and surely it is early days in which to "hesitate faults and hit dislikes" against his personal appearance! That, no doubt, will come later on. I most heartily concur in the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Chamberlain), who is perfectly right when he says that these proposals are entirely consonant with the time, spirit, and, at the same time, are absolutely essential, if we are to keep faith with India. Eighteen years ago, in the Proclamation of Edward VII., we promised India, by the mouth of our King, "prudently to extend the principle of representative institutions in India." We are bound in honour to implement that promise. We shall be shamed and disgraced before the bar of history if we draw back now and if we dash to the ground those aspirations towards self-government which we ourselves have so largely engendered and fostered. I know the problems are of unexampled complexity, and I know what very powerful forces are arrayed against any advance towards constitutionalism in India. It says much for the clarity of vision and

the fixity of purpose of the Secretary of State that he has managed to return from the Peninsula with his reforming zeal unimpaired and his Liberalism unabated. He has been sojourning in a land where the tree of liberty has never put forward more than sickly and frail blooms. Most of the Britons whom he met in India are impregnated with an intense Conservatism and a most violent aversion from any courses which may invade their status of racial and administrative supremacy.

I well remember in 1911, at the time when the Morley-Minto reforms were coming into play. I was in India, and I was fiercely assailed because I approved those reforms and assumed that they were the first tentative steps in progressive legislation which would ultimately lead to Home Rule. Padgett, M.P., and Globe Trotter were some of the mildest epithets which were hurled at me, and I was assured it was sheer impertinence for any person who had not spent the greater part of his life in India to have any views about Indian concerns at all. I misquoted their own poet and said, "What do they know of India who only India know?" But all in vain. I pointed out that they were too near the mountain to appreciate its full proportions and its full relation to the surrounding landscape, but I might have kept my breath to cool my porridge. I was assured again and again in the most emphatic manner possible that the Morley-Minto reforms, small and hesitating as we now know them to be, were the first steps on that downward path which led to an irrevocable and bottomless abyss. My right hon. Friend, I have no doubt, has met many Cassandras of this type during his journey, and has been subjected to the very same deterrent influences; but he has emerged, because I think he has apparently had the very good fortune to meet some of those rare fine intelligences in the Peninsula who do not believe that the last word has been said in Indian government, who look back on what has been achieved in the past with very great pride, but nevertheless regard that progress as a stepping-stone to higher things. After this War many of us hope that the nations will have to justify their dealings with subject races before the tribunal of the world's civilisation. In regard to India, I could well go before any tribunal with this Report in my hand. I could rely upon the world's approval if I were

[Sir E. Parrott.]

assured that there would be a genuine and vigorous attempt to transmit those principles into practice.

To many Indians and to many ardent reformers in this country the reforms will seem timid and niggardly. To those who stand upon the old ways and who hate and fear reform of any character they will be anathema. But to those of us who know and realise how slow is constitutional development and who understand how recently a full measure of enfranchisement has been given to the people of this country, they will seem to be based upon the profoundest wisdom. We must never forget that the bulk of the working classes in this country have only possessed the vote for thirty-four years, and they only received it then after fourteen years of compulsory education. But one thing we must have inviolable and inviolate from the very beginning, and that is the Parliamentary pronouncement of 20th August, 1917. I wish I could see that pronouncement set up in letters of gold on the gates of every town and village in British-India as the solemn undertaking of a great and honourable nation which did not shrink from its obligation to maintain its plighted word. I do not expect for a single moment that progress will be by leaps and bounds. It think it would rather resemble the slow and steady but irresistible progress of one of those great rivers of the Northern plain, or, if I may change my figure, we do not aim at a jerry-built system, but we want one which is put together, stone by stone, like the massive walls of Akbar around the Fort of Agra. The War has revolutionised our views with regard to India just as it has revolutionised our views with regard to the enfranchisement of women in this country. The War has made us a grateful debtor to India, and it has given birth to aims and objects which we can only disregard at the risk of eventual chaos. We must begin our building at once—prudence and gratitude alike demand it—and we must never pause in that building until we have a structure complete and established for all time.

I propose to confine the remainder of my remarks to what I regard as the very key-note of this Report—education. There are critics, I know, who ascribe all demand for reform to that system of Western education which Macaulay gave to India. I have heard Anglo-Indians again and again assure me that it was the

fountain and origin of all unrest. Whether Macaulay was the culprit or not does not much matter to-day. We cannot go back on the past, and there are many of us who would not if we could. Had we denied India a measure of that culture which we then possessed we should have sunk lower than the level of the Empire builders of ancient Rome. Macaulay gave to India what he had to give—that literary education which alone obtained in the universities of his time. It is not the least use to complain that it was too literary. Macaulay lived in pre-scientific days, in the days when the don of a university could declare without shame, "We know nothing about science here; we do not even teach it." Probably most people agree that Indian aspirations towards self-government are very largely due to the study by Indians of English literature. How could it be otherwise? On almost every page of our great writers you have the doctrine set forward that men cannot rise to their highest destiny unless they are lords of themselves. Reading English history has always been most popular in the Indian schools. I remember well in 1911 I was walking through a little town in the united provinces and a small boy in an exigent shoti came up to me carrying in his hand a well-known school manual of English history, and asked me to explain the meaning of a particular word. I did so, and I took the opportunity of glancing through the book. There were all the landmarks of English liberty set forward in the clearest and most unmistakable language—the great rebellion, the execution of Charles I., the Commonwealth, and Revolution, and the Reform Bill. As I handed the book back I said to myself, how can this boy escape being dissatisfied with the despotic Government under which he lives?

How is it possible for him, if
6.0 P.M. he thinks clearly and feels strongly, to be anything but an agitator. Indian unrest has always appeared to me to be more a sign of grace than an evidence of original sin. The educated classes in India amount to about 6 per cent. of the people, a deplorable figure, and it is from that 6 per cent. that the demand for a larger share of self-government proceeds. I understand that the most formidable argument which my right hon. Friend has had to meet is based upon the fact that only 6 per cent. of the Indian people may be by any stretch of the imagination called educated.

Those who oppose his reforms have expressed either a real of a simulated fear that the great unlettered masses, the Indian peasantry, would be subjected to the tyranny of an educated oligarchy. I should have a great deal more respect for that argument if it did not emanate from those who all along have shown themselves opposed at all times and in all countries and in all circumstances to self-government in any form. They express a very great solicitude for the ryots, the untutored peasantry of India, but I am afraid that to these critics any time would be too soon for establishing the first steps towards self-government. They resemble the mother who refused to allow her boy to go into the water until he had learned to swim. We must have beginnings, and everybody knows that the beginnings of all things are shapeless, but they are essential if we are to have progress.

The right hon. Gentleman will agree that the enfranchisement of the ryots is the greatest difficulty of all. He will also agree that the essential accompaniment of political reform is educational reform. While he is making a beginning in this representative system, he must fling wide the gates of the school to every child throughout India. I remember that that great Indian, Mr. Gokhale, whom I had the pleasure and privilege of meeting in India, and whose death is a great blow to my right hon. Friend, for he would have been a tower of strength to him in times like these, constantly and eloquently pleaded for compulsory elementary education from one end of the land to the other. I am sure that elementary education is an absolutely necessary concomitant to every social or political reform. I remember being asked to attend a meeting of certain directors of education who were charged with the duty of producing a scheme to bring about a wider extension of elementary education throughout India, and I was privileged to see some of the reports which were presented to that body by commissioners and deputy-commissioners. They resembled precisely in their language the kind of thing we used to have from Tory squires and half-pay colonels in regard to education in this country before 1870. Precisely the same arguments were used. We were told that the ryot did not want education, that it would unsettle him and drive him off the land to seek soft-handed employment in the towns. Thanks to a certain very enlightened official, I was able to

make a small test with regard to these very over-confident statements. On tour we were able to summon the villagers in certain places and to put to them this question, "Do you want a school here; and, if so, what are you prepared to do to get it?" I remember the evening before I made the first test I strolled through the village and that at the door of the Zemendar's house I saw his son receiving instruction in the open air. The lad was working on his wooden slate with a reed pen, and around him were gathered some of the villagers watching the mystery with eager curiosity. I was, therefore, not surprised at the result next day. The Zemendar freely offered to give the land for the site of the school. The craftsmen volunteered to erect it, and the rest of the men of all castes, from the Brahmin right down to the shoemaker agreed that they would pay a small annual tax for the upkeep of the school. I commend to my right hon. Friend that experiment. I believe that if he had a meeting, carried out by sympathetic people in every schoolless village in India, he would be amazed to find the large number who would declare for a school.

I know that very great strides have been made in elementary education since I was in India in 1911, but I know that a very great deal has to be done before there is a school within the reach of every child. Perhaps I might detain the House in order to say something about the kind of education which is proposed in these village schools. It should be conducted entirely in the vernacular and should be confined to the three R's, wood working, or some other form of hand training, and a little nature knowledge. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will agree that it is essential to political progress that this modicum of instruction should be given to every Indian child, and while he is doing that there is another task that awaits him. It is a deplorable fact that many Indian children who have learned to read before they grow up find that they have no opportunity of utilising the art which they have acquired. In very many of the vernaculars there is no literature worth reading, and so it becomes to them very much of a wasted art. I suggest to my right hon. Friend that while extending the education system as widely as possible, he should make some provision for reading matter in the various vernaculars. It is of cardinal importance, and I am not ashamed to

[Sir E. Parrott.]

press it again and again, that along with the first steps in representative government there should go the widest extension of elementary education and the provision of reading matter in the various vernaculars. If he thinks that compulsory elementary education throughout India is a distant dream, may I assure him that he can use the schools and adopt them for political purposes in order to explain to the proletariat the value of the vote and the meaning of representative institutions? I agree cordially with Sir Valentin Chirol that "the surest and quickest way to bring home to the elector the meaning of the vote is through his pocket," and "even an illiterate electorate, so long as it has some stake in the land, will probably learn, sooner than many people expect, to hold its representatives responsible for the effects of legislation and administration." The right hon. Gentleman can fortify and enlighten that economic tendency—and this is a practical point which I hope my right hon. Friend will think of some value—by authorising the issue to the schools of simply written pamphlets in the various vernaculars, expressing quite clearly and in an elementary fashion the elements of representative government. The children would receive them and understand them in the schools and they would take them home and discuss them with their fathers at night. In that way you would get a good deal of elementary political information disseminated throughout the land.

I am sure that no supporters of the reforms outlined in the Report minimise the magnitude and the intensity both of the inertia and the active opposition which has to be met. We have to take sides in a conflict which goes down to the very fundamental conceptions of the State. We shall have to take sides either with those who believe that the be-all and the end-all of national effort is good government or those who hold that the highest and best boon of civilisation is self-government. We shall have to take sides with those who idealise the material or those who aim at the spiritual—in a word, between those who oppose the German system and those who stand for that which, at least in theory, obtains in these Islands. We have given good government to India, we have given her roads and railways, we have irrigated her deserts, bridged her rivers, increased the yield of

her fields, opened up her mines, explored her resources, and, above all, we have endowed her with a peace such as she never knew before our advent. These are great things, but they are not the greatest thing. There still remains for us to call from the deep philosophic souls of Indians those higher and nobler virtues which can only come from individual participation and responsibility in the work of national government. To me these proposals are the harbinger of India's true greatness, and I earnestly hope that we who are here to-day will live to see India a shining orb in that planetary system of self-governing States which distinguishes the British Empire from every other Empire known to the history of mankind.

Mr. DENMAN: As one who pressed the Government to give facilities for this Debate, I think it is only courteous to thank them very much for the interesting discussion which we have listened to this afternoon, and I am sure the Government will not regret the result. The Debate has not been filled with high excitement, but, on the other hand, I have seldom listened to a Debate which is likely to have more profound importance throughout the world. We have had from the Government, from a member of the War Cabinet responsible for this subject, a definite reaffirmation of the statement of the 20th of August last. We have had from him a definite acceptance of the principles laid down in the Secretary of State's Report as the basis of his scheme. That will constitute a message to India which will not be forgotten. It may be considered unfair and unreasonable to look a gift-horse too closely in the mouth, but I would like to ask a question as to the procedure the Government propose to adopt. We recognise that they cannot act in a hurry and that everybody will understand that the consideration they have given to this subject must have been strictly limited. I confess to some disappointment with the idea that no progress is possible until we have the Report of the Committees to be set up to examine certain details. I had hoped that it would be possible to introduce legislation setting up the main structure of the Government's scheme, leaving the small details to be filled in by means of Orders in Council. I would ask the Government to consider carefully whether they can adopt some procedure of the kind rather than postpone any beginning of the legislative fabric until some time next year.

I believe that almost every one of the speakers in this Debate has had either close personal connection with India or else the opportunity of residence in it. I feel that a few remarks ought to be made by one of the many millions in this country who have not approached that Empire nearer than Asia Minor and who are, therefore, numbered among the impartial onlookers who will ultimately have to decide the problems that are raised. The ordinary critic, on reading the Report, would come at once to the simple conclusion that either of two arguments is easily tenable. You can either hold the view that the whole scheme is a delusion and a sham, and the powers given are so circumscribed and limited as to be valueless, or you can hold the other view that this scheme is the beginning of the downfall of British rule in India and is a prelude to the loss of that portion of the Empire. This view has been expressed outside these walls. I confess to considerable astonishment that no one has ventured to advance that point of view in this House in this Debate. I hope that the British public will notice that those who take that view, that is working with considerable wealth behind it in the country, have not had the courage to have it put forward in the open in the House of Commons Debates. Those two views are equally tenable, and so long as we regard these proposals from the point of view mainly of the technique of constitution-making, so long shall we get no reconciliation of those opposite points of view.

Any amateur on this subject can riddle the proposals of this Report with destructive criticism, if not with ridicule. I think you could prove, with very little of that diseased imagination that constitution-making so often calls forth, that disaster must follow from the pursuit of many of the courses proposed in that Report. But I want to suggest another avenue of approach to this subject—that we ought not really to regard it from the point of view of the technique of constitution-making. The Report enunciates not a constitution so much as a system of education. The end is not a method of good government succeeding bad government. That has been emphasised in more than one speech this afternoon, more especially by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. Any German could beat that Report hollow if it were simply a matter of devising good machinery

of government. That is not the object. Its object is to provide a way by which, while the government is conducted with safety, and security of person and property, there should also be a steady education in self-government. If one might compare great with small things, this is, of course, the principle on which we specially pride ourselves in the conduct of our great public schools. Quite deliberately, and with the express purpose of the formation of character, we give to immature youths a degree of control over the affairs of their own community. Transfer that principle to the vast plane of rational development, and you find in this Report that we are inviting our Indian fellow-subjects, while still politically adolescent, to assist in the formation of their own political destiny, and the method we use is that of our public schools, the method of drawing on our experience and the growth which we know to be the richest form of political education.

There is something immensely fascinating in the almost Quixotic courage of this proposal. If we look at it with the eye of history we shall realise that this is the first attempt in the world at an enterprise of that character. It is a wonderful political adventure, and on its success or failure depends the future of the leading races on the globe. And I suspect that this adventure will be one of the most notable enterprises that the British people have ever undertaken. Just for this reason. The right hon. Gentleman, I think, has not regarded the problem from any narrow consideration of the balance of constitutional forces, the poise of institutions, and the problem of the mutual checks. We are putting new wine into a new bottle, and I am very much more interested in the wine than in the bottle. Of course, the shape of the bottle is important, but it is the spirit that is put into it, the spirit which we put into the form with which this Report deals, that will fundamentally matter. The scheme will work if you bring to its operation men of wide sympathy, instinctive minds, and a deep sense of our trusteeship to India. It will certainly fail if the selected instruments are domineering, or narrow in sympathy and action, and uninspired by the glories of this Empire. We know from the history of the Indian Civil Service, and of all those organisations that have drawn men from this country to India, that the people are to be found,

[Mr. Denman.]

and I have no doubt that, because it will be worked in that spirit of sympathy and enterprise which is so characteristic of the men in India, that it will succeed rather than fail. But anyone who attempts to secure this success by slight alterations or fussings about small points of constitutions being set up will be deeply disappointed if he thinks that he is doing much good.

There is one point of criticism. This Report contains the suggestion that there should be a more effective control of Indian affairs. It is true that the ultimate idea is that this House should lose more and more of its authority while India gains more and more into its own hands, but there is the appointment of this Committee and compelling of it to exercise some of the powers that this House nominally wields. While the representative of the War Cabinet was speaking there were in this House between thirty and forty Members, and that, I suppose, represents the degree of interest in Indian affairs that the House of Commons feels. When you have a Select Committee actively intervening and advising as to the government of India, I am afraid that you will make the Rule of the House of Commons a little more of a reality, and I confess that there there is considerable danger. Of all forms of government that I detest, I think that an absentee democracy is just the very worst. Democracy is too big a subject to argue about at this moment, but I think that an autocracy or an aristocracy that is absentee has probably more intimate sympathies with the people it governs than a democracy can have, because the feature of democracy which has been growing year by year under our very eyes is the increased intensity of its interest in its own affairs, and it is quite clear that we shall have cases in which the economic interests of India and this country are not quite identical. It will be ever so. The organised forces of capital and labour may so present the economic issues that may arise in relation to India as to lead democracy to a decision which will neglect the true interests of that country.

Of all the parts of the reform that which I should most like to see carried out rapidly—though one knows in this connection that rapidity must be a matter of many years—is the transference of authority from this House to India and the giving to India of a dominion status.

That seems to me a reform that might come earlier than the democratic form of government within India itself. I conclude by one more plea—that this matter should be dealt with with what speed is possible. If we allow the hopes that have been raised to grow weary, or perhaps, what is even more dangerous, if we allow the fears to become organised, the difficulties of our task are immeasurably increased. A pledge such as has been given becomes a seaboard of political weeds unless it is quickly planted with a good crop. The foundation of our success in India has lain in the fact that India has confidence in our national honour. We do not want to suffer errors that may arise, though I venture to suggest that any errors that might so arise would bring greater benefit in their train than would the growing conviction in India that we are dilatory or half-hearted in carrying out our word. I trust the Secretary of State will press on with this Bill as quickly as he can, and I am sure he will have the backing of a large portion of this House.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Perhaps my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for India will not demur if I venture to suggest, in regard to the concluding remarks of my hon. Friend who has just sat down, that there may be some lack of faith in the Government's absolute determination to proceed with this measure, but my right hon. Friend will know that I have no such lack of faith in him, and that I have not the slightest doubt of his desire to get on with this great experiment or of his most sincere purpose, as a member of the administration, to carry out his object. But his sincerity may be to some extent thwarted by the difficulties inherent in the situation. I could not but be struck, in listening to the many interesting and able speeches we have heard, by the very remarkable transformation that has taken place in the tone and feeling of a large part of this House in regard to India. I can carry my mind back to the Debates of 1906, and the years following that time, when the interest in Indian reform found no such unanimity as the House has shown to-day, even with regard to proposals very moderate compared with the important or revolutionary proposals to which my right hon. Friend has put his name. In those days a large part of the House represented a body of solid resistance to any reform in Indian administration, and it was then

common in the Press for Indian reformers to be branded as seditious. What has brought about the change? We have been told that we in this country do not like advertising ourselves and proclaiming our own merits and achievements. I do not know that there has been any deficiency on that score to-day. My hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham, in his very able and interesting speech, said that it is we who have aroused in the Indian people the very aspirations that they press upon us. That seems to suggest that our Government in India had stirred in the minds of the Indian population a desire for self-government for which we are now beginning to make real and substantial concessions. I think his claim is not justified. It is English literature that has developed that spirit in India. John Stuart Mill has done more than the whole Indian Civil Service to evoke those aspirations. It was Mill who did the work of stimulating the mind of the Indian people, a work which the Indian Government cannot lay claim to have done. However, I only wish to suggest that there is an element of illusion in our attitude towards ourselves in this matter when we compliment ourselves on having as a nation raised aspirations in India, through our Government and Civil Service, to which we are, in a cautious and duly accredited manner, now seeking to give some effect.

I have a lively recollection of the tone and feeling in this House towards Indian aspirations in the past seven years. What has brought about this transformation of feeling in this House and in the Press, and the British public? I suppose I shall have general assent if I say that the War has a great deal to do with it. Undoubtedly the recognition of the loyal and generous part played by India in her co-operation with us in carrying on the War has had an effect. It has softened many hearts that were formerly hard. It may have had something to do with the transformation of the sentiments of the hon. Member for Nottingham. But the War has had this effect, it has roused the national conscience. All the discussions which take place with regard to the inalienable right of self-determination among nations have had their effect in altering the temper of the British public and a section, a large section, of this House. My hon. Friend (Mr. Swift MacNeill) is, of course, rather satirical, and he thinks our conscience is not duly

active towards his own unhappy country, but a good number of us should still be given credit for having an active conscience on that subject, which touches in some of its aspects the Indian problem. It is now proposed to give to India a measure of self-government that this House would not have dreamt of giving ten years ago, and this is attributable, to a great extent, to the state of mind caused by the War, and, conceivably, there is a risk after the War that a change in the present resolve of the Government may take place in regard to carrying out this measure, but I am sure my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State does desire to carry it out. My right hon. Friend has done all that a man can, having regard to the sacred and binding character of the pledge given in August of last year.

I want to concentrate the attention of the House on the situation. My hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle has made some very weighty remarks upon the subject, though I cannot pretend to support his suggestion that the Indian measure should be taken by some process of backing the measure and leaving the details to be carried out by something like Orders in Council. I think such a method would be unsuited to the situation in India. It is for my right hon. Friend to see how it can be carried forward. The unanimity of the House to-day depends a good deal on certain special circumstances, and it is in a very high and serious degree the duty of every one of us to see that this feeling does not weaken and that nothing will be allowed to thwart the purpose of my right hon. Friend in going on with his measure, and events in Ireland should strengthen us in that regard. My right hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle said we should at once call upon this House to attempt more control in Indian affairs, but the House as at present constituted is not able to attend to Indian affairs. The fact is that it is overburdened by its own affairs, and until the House is radically reconstructed Members would not be able to give careful and competent attention to Indian affairs. Therefore, that point does not greatly concern us; what does concern us is the frame of mind in which the House has received my right hon. Friend's proposal. That frame of mind should be very fully realised indeed, and there should be no retardation of the plans and purposes propounded in regard to India—no such retardation as has taken place in

[Mr. Robertson.]

the case of Ireland, where it has already been disastrous. In the case of India a similar retardation would be disastrous to an overwhelming degree, but I hope that my right hon. Friend will be able to carry his measure to a successful issue.

Mr. SWIFT MacNEILL: I have no intention of dragging the Irish question into Indian matters simply in the interests of Ireland. If I introduce the Irish question, it will be in the interest of India herself. The Secretary of State for India and I have always been on the best Parliamentary and personal terms. The right hon. Gentleman made use of some admirable phrases in the course of his speech, to which I listened with the utmost attention, and any observations that may have been thrown out by way of criticism were not made with the slightest idea of making any imputation of his zeal for reform or on his determination to carry out that reform. What I and other members of my party were thinking about was not the good faith of the right hon. Gentleman, as to which there is no doubt, but the good faith of the English Government, which has repeatedly broken its pledges, given in somewhat similar circumstances. When I first went to Oxford, Professor Sidney Owen, a very distinguished man, asked me to specialise on the subject of Irish and Indian history, but I regret that I did not follow that advice. It was not, perhaps, germane to the constitutional reforms which the right hon. Gentleman adumbrated, but at the very beginning he made a very remarkable statement in reference to the Indian Army and in reference to giving commissions in the Army to Indian natives. He said he was perfectly willing to do so, and that he was determined that he could carry it out, but that the military authorities were against him. May I ask him, in the interest of India, not to allow what the Prime Minister has called the malignities and the stupidities of the War Office, which destroyed recruiting in Ireland, to prevail in India in the same way? I saw how difficult that position was for the right hon. Gentleman, and I will ask him to stick to his guns and, according to the new watchword which we have been given, to hold fast. My right hon. Friend who preceded me referred very mildly and gently to the fact that the present Government were not completely the Messiahs

of Indian reform. He spoke almost apologetically of the work in that way of John Stuart Mill. He could also have spoken of the work of James Mill. Now let hon. Gentlemen laugh in the right place at what I am going to say. I expect a guffaw, but I wish to say this with the utmost seriousness, and I do not care for the guffaw. It is the Irish representation in this House, and the Irish representation alone, which has compelled the reforms for India. I am sorry to see there is not the laugh that I expected. Now let us see how that is true.

When India was sunk in the lowest abyss, when she was the victim of Clive and of Warren Hastings and their crew, when men came over to this House of Commons laden with the spoils of India, and known as nabobs, and tried to imitate in this House the principles of slavery which they had practised in India, who stood up against it and who prevailed in the end? It was my illustrious countryman, Edmund Burke, with whom there was Sheridan. Burke and Sheridan opened the eyes of England to what was going on abroad and stimulated her conscience, and from that day to this, whenever there was a sorrow in which the Indians were affected, there was always an Irish Member to plead for them. O'Connell never hesitated to speak in favour of the freedom of India. Neither did Parnell, and neither did Butt. Of course, we ought not to mention ancient history, and I must curtail my remarks because a more important Bill is coming on than this question which affects some 300,000,000 of British subjects in India. I refer to Lord Lansdowne's Charity Lotteries Bill. But let me remind the House that so far back as the year 1889 the Indian National Congress, which was not then so favoured as it is now, asked to preside over them as their President an Irish Nationalist Member, Mr. Alfred Webb, who went over to India and made the opening speech of the Congress and presided over it with dignity and with *éclat*. Mr. Alfred Webb was a gentleman of whom Mr. Gladstone once said that his presence in the House of Commons was calculated to elevate and to purify it. Again may I refer to Irish history and to Anglo-Indian history? What the right hon. Gentleman, with a flourish of trumpets, is promising and what he has pledged the good faith of England to do, we Irish Members asked the House of Commons to do twenty-one

years and one day ago. On 5th August, 1897, I got, through the fortunes of the ballot—that makes me rather approve of lottery systems—the opportunity of moving a Resolution to the ordinary Motion that Mr. Speaker should leave the Chair. This is the Resolution that I moved, and I can declare to the House conscientiously that that Resolution represented beyond all question the state of India as it was at that time, as far as I could get it from first hand authority. It is interesting in this way. As the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said, most properly, a man going back, after twenty years' absence, to India would scarcely recognise its condition to-day. Every word of that Resolution, I can assure the House, I was perfectly well able to substantiate at the time, and the Resolution which I moved was as follows:

“That this House views with grave disapproval the fact that famine, plague, and pestilence in India have been seized by the Indian Government for an attack on the freedom of the Press in India, and for the revival of the system of arrest of British subjects in India under the law of *lettre de cachet*, and the indefinite imprisonment without trial of persons thus arrested; and desires to place on record its conviction that the only safe foundation for Government in India is to be sought in the extension to British subjects in India of the full privileges of the British Constitution.”

My right hon. Friend and I are not now so much in disagreement, though I was twenty-one years and one day before him. During that Debate it was stated that we had given India her form of government and her ideas and our education. All these things are true, and the reasons for them were all given in anticipation by my poor self twenty-one years and one day ago. This is what I said:

“England had destroyed in India every form of government but her own. She had cast the thrones and government of native princes down to the ground. She was bound at least to extend justice and mercy to the millions thus brought under her sway.”

Every speaker with a knowledge of India, either official or personal, referred to the terrible mistake, as was supposed, of beginning education from above. It is now coming from below. The reason for that is that they could not do otherwise, when we recollect what the average income of an Indian per diem was—about 1½d., I believe—and that they were suffering such poverty that it was utterly impossible to bring down education to the humblest orders of the community. That, I believe, has been done now, and I really feel great appreciation of it. May I now

come to something about the pledge of the 20th August, 1917, a day which we must remember, is as great a day as St. Patrick's Day, or St. George's Day, or Commemoration Day. There have been other great days in India. There was the great day on which was celebrated the accession of Queen Victoria, when India was promised that equal rights should be given to everybody, regardless of black and white, in India. That promise has not been fulfilled. There was another great day after the Indian Mutiny, when similar promises were made but not fulfilled. There was a promise made by the House of Commons in reference to India which has not been fulfilled. In 1893 Mr. Herbert Paul brought forward a Resolution in the House of Commons, which was carried, to the effect that the Indian competitive examinations should be held equally and simultaneously in India, so as to give the natives a chance, as well as in England. That resolution was carried by the House of Commons. Twenty-five years have elapsed, and it has not been touched on since. Now let me say what an Indian Viceroy said about the pledges we have made to India. Lord Lytton said, in 1888, that we had our choice of either bullying or cheating India, and that we had preferred the less honourable alternative. Of course, those were days when public opinion was not thoroughly formed, when a gentleman in the position of the late Lord Salisbury, as Prime Minister and as an ex-Secretary of State for India, was able to refer to the first Indian Gentleman who had come to this Parliament, Mr. Naoroji, as “that black man.”

The Irish Members have always remained in the same position, and it is due to them, and to them only, that we were interested in India when nobody else took the trouble of touching it. I will say one word more, which is an absolute precursor of what my right hon. Friend has said. I said in that same Debate in August, 1897:

“He wished hon. Members to have no misconception of his meaning; he wished those privileges to be gradually extended, and first, that personal liberty should be secured. He wished, in the words of Edmund Burke, that freedom should be as much the privilege of the poorest British subject in India as the British subject in London.”

How can we believe that these sentences will be translated into action? Whoever got more solemn promises than we that self-government should be granted to us? The promises given to India are merely

[Mr. MacNeill.]

tentative good wishes in comparison. How can you go to India, and how can these people but draw a parallel or a precedent from your action towards us? That is the reason that I wish the right hon. Gentleman, at least in this case, to make the English Government keep to their promises. Of all subjects in India, the land subject is the most pressing. Everyone knows that. The audience here to-day is small, but everyone who speaks here to-day will be heard by millions in India, and I am speaking with a knowledge of that responsibility. Mr. Davitt, the apostle of the liberation of the people and of the freedom of land in Ireland, extended his comprehensive sympathies to India too,

and Mr. Davitt made a speech

7.0 P.M. in this House on that very day in seconding my Motion. This

is what he said—I wish it could be written in letters of gold in India:

“He felt very strongly in sympathy with the Indian people. He felt the deepest sympathy with every people who were subject to another nation. He was one of those who believed that England had no right whatever to rule in any country outside her own borders,”

He was a member, before the time, of the League of Nations—

“and he sincerely hoped and trusted that, unless the British Government would extend to British subjects in India the full right of protection of the British constitution, the Indian people would undertake by means fair and honourable to win their own independence.”

He drew a comparison between his own people and the Indian people. He said:

“Let the House picture the difficulties which would confront them if, instead of having to deal with 250,000,000 of Indians, they had to deal with 250,000,000 of Irishmen.”

I hope 250,000,000 Indians will not have the same sad fate as has befallen us. I will read one passage more, and that is from my hon. Friend the Leader of the Irish party, who spoke likewise on that occasion:

“It was right for Irish Members—if no one else would do it—to rise in the House of Commons and speak on behalf of these principles, and protest against these high-handed acts. In this particular matter he believed that Irishmen expressed the views of a large section of the people of both countries. If the British Government in India could not win the assent and approval of the people it had no right to exist. The Motion of his hon. Friend meant that the future stability of the British Government in India was to be sought in the extension to the people of India, not the whole machinery of the House of Commons, but those principles of even-handed justice, individual liberty, fair play to the poor, and responsible government in

some shape, which were recognised as the principles of constitutional government in this country.”

I felt it was incumbent upon me to say this, and that the warning my right hon. Friend gave should be endorsed by one who has had personal sufferings from that cause. I give to the right hon. Gentleman all credit for straightmindedness and perseverance, and I hope he or his successor will not appear at that Table and try to edge out of honourable promises given by an honourable man and received by an honourable people in good faith.

Let me say one word more. The Indians know that in all administration in India—and I speak rather sympathetically on account of the close relationship of myself—Irishmen have been pre-eminently successful. The best Irish administrators, both as governors and lieutenant-governors, have been Irishmen, and the next best administrators have been Scotsmen. The Debate has been remarkable, of course, by its dullness, which is characteristic of Indian Debates, but it has likewise been remarkable for a more pleasing reason, and that is the appearance, for the first time, in a speech on an Indian subject, in which he and his family before him have taken a great interest, of my hon. Friend the Member for East Finsbury. Again, I thank the House for the kindness and attention with which they have listened to me, and hope I have not, except by way of close analogy, dragged the Irish question into the Indian question, and, if so, I have only tried to maintain the honour of Parliament, and tried to keep recalcitrant statesmen in good faith. And now I am longing for the Lotteries Bill.

Mr. MONTAGU: I have only two or three sentences to offer. One is that I think the speeches that have been delivered this afternoon will have a most valuable result in India. The whole-hearted acceptance by everybody who has spoken of the principles of self-government for India is a very remarkable fact in the history of this House and of India. I am not going now to answer any of the helpful suggestions that have been made from all quarters, but I should like to mention two things brought to notice by my right hon. Friend opposite. I do not see any inconsistency in asking the House at one and the same time to relax its control of certain aspects of Indian administration, and secondly to improve

its method of obtaining information about those branches of Indian administration over which it does not relax its control. I do not suggest that a Select Committee of the House of Commons should actually administer or take part in the administration of the government of India, but that it should inform itself and report to the House. A much better analogy, but which, like that between Ireland and India may be imperfect, is that of the Public Accounts Committee, which reports to the House of Commons.

The second point to which I wish to allude was the solemn grave warning as to the dangers of not acting on the announcements of the 20th August and this Report. No one can appreciate that more than I can. No pronouncements have any value to the people of India until they are translated into Acts of Parliament, and those Acts of Parliament are set working. But it is not an easy thing to translate. If my right hon. Friend will turn his attention to the Report he will see it requires the preparation of a very complicated Statute, which will have to be settled in consultation with the Government at home and the Government in India. The very pledge of the 20th August promises ample time for discussion before proposals are put through the House of Commons. The Report has only been published six weeks, and I do not see how it would be possible to produce legislation this year—I mean practical legislation—either in pursuance of that pledge, or because of the difficulty of drafting a Bill and benefiting by all criticism. I think we are taking the right course in appointing the two Committees that are necessary to complete the scheme. At the same time we hope to collect for the instruction and information of the House of Commons all available criticism and advice and the opinions of the heads of the local governments. I am going to put in the Library of the House of Commons a complete copy of the addresses sent to me. I am also going to publish a summary, carefully prepared, of those Reports which can be supplied to Members, what each deputation said and, then, what all the deputations said on each particular subject—a sort of cross reference. All this material will take time to collect. If we set these Committees going so that we can hopefully look forward to their Reports early next year, we shall have lost no time, because the Statute

will be no use without the Reports; and, speaking for myself, what I prophesy would be is that when the Bill was introduced into the House of Commons the House would naturally want to study it with great care, presumably with Select Committee procedure, so that evidence might be available at that stage.

I intervened just to say that, because I do not want the right hon. Gentleman to think that, although we cannot hurry, we are going to pause. Everything will go on with a view to carrying out the pronouncement of the 20th August, and founding Government legislation upon the recommendations that have been made. May I now move the Adjournment of this Debate, because it seems to me that by that course we can best ensure the further discussion which the Motion asks us? It is an Amendment to the Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair." It would be the best way in which to ensure that further discussion of the Report, on which we have only touched to-night, to adjourn the Debate until we resume in October, and I beg to move accordingly.

Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned," put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

LOTTERIES (WAR CHARITIES)

BILL.—[*Lords*.]

Order for Second Reading read.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir George Cave): I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The Government desire to take the opinion of the House upon this Bill, and I should like to say a few words on certain aspects of the matter. Let me refer first to the police and Home Office point of view. On that I should like to say that the present position of matters is really intolerable. Ever since the beginning of the War there have been many efforts to raise funds for war purposes by drawings, by raffles, by tombolas and expedients of that kind, and money has been raised for the care of the wounded, and the assistance of prisoners of war and other purposes. Those efforts have been supported everywhere by public authorities, by the lord mayors and the mayors of our cities and boroughs, by Members of Parliament, and by persons in every kind of position,

[Sir G. Cave.]

all of them perfectly unconscious, I am sure, that there was any kind of danger of their infringing the law. Still, that has happened in countless, I was going to say, in thousands of cases. The position of the police in all parts of the country, if they had sought to enforce the law in all those cases, would, I think, have been impossible. If they had attempted to follow that course they would have run counter to the feelings of the great mass of our population, and I think they would have created a very bitter feeling against the law. They have therefore been, not unnaturally, unwilling to interfere. When the attention of the police authority was called to efforts of this kind they felt themselves bound to remind the promoters that a breach of the law was being committed; they warned the organisers of the drawings accordingly, and I must say that, almost without exception, those people accepted the warning and abandoned the lotteries in question. In that way thousands of pounds have been lost to war charities. Matters cannot be left there, because the effect of that has been that these people who have abandoned the drawings have felt it a very great hardship to be deprived of the chance of raising money for purposes they have very much at heart, while they have seen other people to whose actions attention has not been called in the same way gain their ends by the very same method.

Either the law must be enforced or it must be altered. The very worst thing is to leave it as it stands on the Statute Book and not to enforce it. It is for that reason I am most anxious to see the House come to a decision on the point. Here is a Bill which deals with the question. The proposal is that lotteries shall be allowed for war charities only, and only during the War, and, in order that these facilities may not be used for the purpose of supporting movements not of this deserving character, it is proposed that the operation of the Bill shall be confined to war charities which have been in existence not less than six months, and in no case shall it be allowed without the sanction of the chief officer of police in the district, and only during the remainder of the period of war. Very large sums for our wounded soldiers and for our prisoners of war are at stake in this matter, and I have one particular instance which I will mention presently,

although it is by no means the only one. The societies which have the greatest interest in the matter are the Red Cross Society and the St. John's Ambulance Association. As the House knows, there has been a great pearl contribution for the benefit of these two societies. If these pearls are to be sold in the ordinary way by auction, it is quite obvious that the people who may bid for them will be very few in number. There are not many who would be willing to spend their money in that way in war-time. On the other hand, if Parliament permits them to be dealt with by something in the nature of a drawing or a lottery, then very large numbers of people would be willing to participate, and I am told that the difference in results would be very great indeed. I hesitate even to name a sum, but I am informed that if the pearls were sold by auction they might realise something between £100,000 and £200,000, while if they were able to deal with them in the manner authorised by this Bill they would produce from £1,000,000 to £2,000,000. That is the measure of the difference between one method of disposal and the other. Of course, to societies like this which have to find something like £4,000,000 a year for their operations, a sum of that amount is of very great importance. But this is by no means the only case that will be affected by this Bill. In Liverpool the Lord Mayor's Prisoners of War Fund has to raise a sum of something like £6,000 per month. It has been raising money in this way, and the promoters of the movement are very much distressed at the fact that owing to recent discussions they cannot go on unless a Bill of this kind is passed. At Cardiff, for the Prisoners of War Fund, over 150,000 tickets have been issued with the object of raising money, but the scheme has had to be suspended pending the decision on this Bill. The Young Men's Christian Association, the Church Army, St. Dunstan's Hostel, and other charities of that kind, with which we all have the greatest possible sympathy, look to this means for raising funds. I shall be told that people can give the money.

Commander BELLAIRS: Then why do they not give it?

Sir G. CAVE: Of course, that is not an answer. You want to get the money, and the best way of raising funds for these purposes during the War appears to be this system of drawings and lotteries

which the House is asked to allow. It is really a question of policy. I should like to call the attention of hon. Members to the fact that the Acts dealing with this custom were passed, not for the purpose of preventing lotteries, but for the purpose of establishing a State monopoly in lotteries, and after the Acts were passed it will be found that year after year Parliament agreed to other Acts allowing lotteries under certain conditions. For some years, however, no such Acts have been passed. There have been one or two exceptions, one of them being the drawings for the Art Union. In the Dominions also an Act has been passed very much on the lines of this Bill, allowing lotteries for war purposes and war charities. The question is whether this Parliament shall legislate in the same way. I know that a lot of objection is taken and genuinely felt. It is urged that this may encourage a spirit of gambling in this country. I do not share that fear. I venture to think it is founded rather upon memories of what happened under a quite different state of things—memories and the knowledge of what happened during the time of speculations such as the South Sea Bubble. But these have no relevance at all to the state of things which exists to-day. Let us think whether lotteries of the kind for war charities have an element of gambling at all. I dare say many Members of this House have taken tickets in lotteries of this kind. Is there one who has taken such a ticket for the sake of gain? I do not believe it. Their feeling has been that the object is a good one. We all like to give money for it. There may be an element of an adventure which imparts a spice of amusement, but as a matter of fact no one cares a farthing whether he wins or loses. The general feeling is that the money is given for a good purpose—let it go. Very often, indeed, the winning of a prize is a nuisance. I am sure that in any case it is not the real object of taking the ticket. I think it is not the gambler's spirit which operates in cases of the kind; it is the giving spirit.

An HON. MEMBER: Then why not give?

Sir G. CAVE: People like to give in this way, because it brings everybody together. I am not going to make a long speech; I have expressed my own view. I am sure that for these purposes money can be raised in large amounts perhaps

better than in any other way. We are leaving the House to give a free decision as to whether or not they wish this Bill to pass. If the House gives the Bill a Second Reading, then it is proposed to take it up and to ask hon. Members to carry it through all its stages. We shall then know where we are. For myself, I venture to express the hope that the House will give facilities for the passage of this Bill. By so doing they will be helping the War charities, and I hope, therefore, that the majority of this House will not stand in the way.

Mr. THEODORE TAYLOR: I beg to move to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the question to add the words, "upon this day three months."

I ask, on this occasion, the indulgence and sympathy of the House, which is not usually accorded to an old Member. Following, as I do, one of the most formidable speakers in the House. I once heard it said about the present Home Secretary that he could put a nasty thing in the nicest way. Anyone in the world having to follow a gentleman of that sort requires the sympathy of the House, and I am sure the House will accord it to me, more particularly because there is some appearance of ill-nature in opposing any measure, however pernicious its principles may be, if the money that is to be raised by those principles is going to be applied to such a magnificent object as that upon which we are every one of us agreed—I mean the splendid work of the Red Cross. There is a little more to be said on this subject than has been told us by the Home Secretary. For one thing, he gave, I think, a definite sum of thousands of pounds that have been lost to some of the charities. What from? From the fact that the people, by complying with the law, had not broken the law. I want to know how he or anybody else knows what would have been subscribed differently from what may be subscribed under a plan of simple common sense—that of giving the money. If it is, as the Home Secretary said, not so much a question of gambling as of giving—if that is the object of people, it is a very simple thing to give. Is it going to be said that the people will not give for these various reasons?

Surely the people of this country are generous towards the Red Cross if towards anything? If the people have generosity, and willingness, and money

[Mr. T. Taylor.]

to give, who is going to tell us that they will not give unless they are bribed by appealing to their cupidity? It is nothing else. Do not let us be told that a raffle for subscribers is not appealing to cupidity and that it is more giving than gambling. I am surprised the Home Secretary should make such a statement. One knows very well the position of the Home Secretary. Like my own position, it is a very difficult one. The Home Secretary and his subordinates the police have had to stand the fire of a whole lot of ill-informed people, with good hearts, who want to support a good cause, and do not see any harm in this way of doing it. I am going to try to prove, what I really honestly believe, that if we let in the principle of gambling into a great national issue like this, we shall very soon be faced with demands for it for other purposes. I desire to give a few solid facts, because the Home Secretary has omitted some of the most important facts relating to lotteries in the past. Such, however, is the case.

The South Sea Bubble was instanced by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. We have no need to go back as far as that to get together authentic evidence as to the effect upon the national character of national lotteries. There have been repeated Committees of this House, sitting century after century—because this has been going on more or less for 200 or 300 years. Coming to the gambling itself, to what does it appeal? Is it not to our selfishness, to our instinct of getting something for nothing? That is a sentiment which is the curse of business, the curse of Stock Exchange transactions. It is a vice, and not a virtue, in any one of us. The principle of getting something for nothing—that is to say, getting something without giving to other people an equivalent for it—is a wrong principle. There may be those who admire it. If there are, let them stand up for it now. That is the very essence of gambling. It is that spirit that I want to warn the House against, in one of the last speeches I shall make in this House, for I have been eighteen years, and I am going to leave it shortly. But I want to warn the House, just as we hear of the diamond necklace story before the French Revolution, this pearl and pig legislation embodies a revolutionary sentiment in this country. Do you think you are going to get ladies of high position more eagerly to put their pearls forward

for creditable causes by legalising lotteries, which have been a great curse in the past, as I shall show? Is there a man in this House who will vote for this Bill and then go down next week to his own place and send poor men to prison, or fine them, for pitch and toss, which is a petty crime compared to this great crime—if it is a crime at all! I should like the House to know one thing: this is not a small matter. It has been said it is a matter of millions. There are these estimates about £1,000,000, £2,000,000, and so on. Who made them? There is not a tittle of proof to show that there are at stake one or more millions, or that they are to be gained in this way. Is there any proof to show that causes such as the Red Cross would not lose as much as they will gain? Because there are a large number of people—thank God!—in this country who will not like the Red Cross any better for having had to appeal to the cupidity and gambling instinct of the people.

I shall try to prove from history that the principle of lotteries, which, I will not say the Government, but the Home Secretary, has put forward, because we are going to have a Vote—I am glad to think an open Vote—upon the matter, and some members of the Government will vote against the proposal of the Home Secretary. I cannot think he has made it *con amore*, I do not believe that he has made his proposal, as he told us, from necessity. What has been the history in the past? Nearly one hundred years ago, in 1808, one of the most important Committees that ever this House has had on the question of lotteries and chance of that sort—and we have had a good many—reported as follows:

“The foundation of the lottery system is so radically vicious that your Committee feel convinced that under no system of regulation which can be devised will it be possible for Parliament to adopt this as an efficacious source of revenue and at the same time divest it of the evils of which it has hitherto proved so baneful a source.”

It took a number of years, formally by Act, to stop gambling through lotteries. Here are a few more words that were the apology of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1823 in this House, in Committee of Ways and Means, when he proposed the last lottery. On 23rd June, 1823, the Lord Chancellor, in conformity with previous promises, submitted an Estimate for the last Lottery Loan of £60,000. In giving his excuse for it he said:

"One reason for having the last Lottery Loan is because the parties principally interested ought not to be taken by surprise."

That is to say, the people who are getting money by selling the lottery tickets, who had a pecuniary interest in this business, ought not to be taken by surprise. I cannot see how they could be surprised, because Committee after Committee had been sitting for years, and all the time had been more and more strongly against the system. The Chancellor of the Exchequer of that day was anxious that the supporters of a lottery should not be taken by surprise. The Home Secretary and the Government have acted unfairly in taking Members of this House by surprise, because many of them went away for their holidays without the slightest idea that such a measure as this was being brought forward. I appeal for fair play in this matter. Is it fair for those who knew that this Bill was coming on to take an advantage of this sort? This is a private Bill promoted by private parties, and the prospect of it being brought forward has been known to its supporters, but this has not been known to those who were opposed to it. I know myself personally many hon. Members who would have voted against this Bill who have gone away without any knowledge of it coming forward, and are now beyond recall. [AN HON. MEMBER: "They ought to have stayed here!"] Yes; I know that is a very easy retort, but it is absolutely unfair.

Sir G. CAVE: The hon. Member is quite wrong, because it was not known until a day or two ago that this Bill was coming before this House.

Mr. TAYLOR: If it was not known until a day or two ago, why is it coming on at all? Why is it being brought forward at this period of the Session, when it is common knowledge to all hon. Members that many of their colleagues have gone away, not knowing that this business was coming on? We have just been told by the Home Secretary that it was not known until a couple of days ago, although it is a fair assumption that those who are promoting this private Bill knew that it was coming on, and therefore I say it is not fair. Whatever may be the case in other countries, the verdict of this House and of Committees of this House a hundred years ago was emphatically against lotteries. In 1823, when the Chancellor of

the Exchequer introduced the last Bill for selling lottery tickets, a Mr. Lester, opposing the measure, said:

"Why was the country to be inflicted with this moral pestilence for another year seeing the misery and vice it had disseminated in every part of the Kingdom."

Those are not my words. It has been represented that in some countries lotteries are carried on with little evil results, but whatever may be the case in other countries, our experience in this country was that the principle of lotteries in 1823 was abolished in this House, everybody assenting. That was based upon our experience at the time, and our action to-day will not be based upon the experience of a Government lottery, although this proposal seems to be leading the way in that direction. We had recently a Committee sitting upon the question of premium and investment bonds, and the evidence given was valuable as indicating what the opinion of the people would be of the effect of setting up anything in the nature of a State lottery. It is true that a certain amount of money would be secured for the Government by that principle, and in that case only half the interest was to be raffled for. We took the evidence of some thirty-five witnesses from all classes of opinion, working class, religious and commercial, and although we began undoubtedly on that Committee with a majority in favour of premium bonds, we ended by recommending that because this question would undoubtedly divide opinion, it was thought that it was not a fit subject to bring on during the War. This is what the Committee reported:

"We are impressed by the evidence of the instances of opposition to any such action which might be held to introduce the element of chance in our national finance, and it would not be possible to treat premium bonds as a non-controversial war measure."

I think that was the unanimous decision of the Committee. That being so in the case of a measure which secured to those who subscribed to the premium the full amount of the principal and made a gamble only of half the interest, if that would divide national opinion, how much more would the measure we are now dealing with be repugnant to the opinion of this country. I think the argument is unanswerable. You may say in one case it was the nation and in the other case it was the individual, and only a very small amount. I have no hesitation in saying from my knowledge of the opinion of many

[Mr. T. Taylor.]

religious bodies in this country that there is a unanimous and a strong and indignant feeling at this period of the Session about bringing on legislation of this kind. Readers of history cannot help but be struck with the pathetic fact that every generation refuses to learn lessons from prior generations. Every generation, or every other generation, seems to make the same mistakes as others made before it. Those are the wisest individuals who learn from the faults of others, and surely those are the wisest nations that learn from the corrected and ascertained mistakes of their forefathers. Surely it would be only the part of wisdom for us to learn from them.

What is the essential principle of a lottery? It is the hope of a chance to get something that you have not fully paid for. I am not going to attempt in any pharisaical or hypocritical style to deal with the practice of one man playing for money with another. I am not taking that line. I want to take the national view and to be guided by national experience. I want to look at this matter from the larger point of view. I maintain that to set up what is so near to a national institution as a lottery on this enormous scale to get rid of the pearls that had been given no doubt for a good object, would not only be setting a bad example, but it would be giving legislative sanction to a principle which has worked badly in this country in the past. It is said that we know of no other way of disposing of these pearls, and although the thing may be bad we want Parliament to find us a way out of our difficulty. The House of Commons is not sitting for a purpose of that kind. Are we going to violate the whole tendency of legislation for the past 100 years? Are we simply for the convenience of a philanthropic institution to reverse the whole of our policy? It is a question of pigs or no pigs and pearls or no pearls.

Mr. SWIFT MacNEILL: Pearls before swine.

Mr. TAYLOR: Lord Lansdowne says,

"May I cite a case? We have 3,300 pearls and we have one pig. The history of the pig is romantic."

Then he goes on to recite it. Is it befitting the dignity of this House or of the other House to be sitting in solemn conclave to find a legislative way of

raffling a pig and some pearls? Whatever we may think about it, the people of this country will not appreciate our reversing the law on this particular occasion and for this particular purpose. If the principle be right, why should it be limited in the way that the Bill proposes to limit it? Why should not other bodies that are not registered war charities be permitted to engage in lotteries? Where is the moral sanction for a raffle for a war charity and for nothing else, and what on earth have the police to do with it? What on earth have they done to be brought into it? Why should they be consulted? Are they any better judges of right and wrong or of expediency or non-expediency than the rest of us? If some charities are to have the benefit of their good opinion, why not others? I have far more respect for the police officials of this country. I leave Ireland out of the question for the moment. I do not know the Irish police as well as I know the English police. [Laughter.] Yes, I am both known to the police and, having sat for many years on Police Committees, the police are known to me, and I have a much better opinion of them than some of my fellow-citizens. I am perfectly certain that they do not want this duty of sitting in judgment upon these war charities. People say, "Oh, it is done in business," and so on. I was talking the other day to one of the largest woollen manufacturers in this country. He happens to be a member of one of the three largest firms, and I am a member of another. I was asking him what he thought about this Bill. He said, "Well, we do a bit of speculation in business. It is a bit on that line, and I am half-inclined to support it." I said, "Look here, that element of speculation in your business, is it an advantage to the welfare of the business or not?" "No," he said, "it is a bad thing." That element of wanting to get something without giving an equivalent for it, which is at the bottom of this Bill is bad, whether on the Stock Exchange, or in business, or anywhere else. Surely the fact that some undesirable things exist is no reason for bringing other into existence. If the spirit of gambling has eaten into our affairs and into the different departments of our life, let us do what we can to keep it back and not push it forward.

I often heard the word "sport" used, or rather, very much abused. I believe that this Bill is defended in the name of

sport. I maintain that it is a great abuse of the word "sport" to make it include gambling at all. Surely the term "sport" includes a code of honour, and "to be sporting" means to be fair. It means to some extent to be unselfish, loyal to an unwritten code of honour. "To be sporting" surely does not mean wanting to get an advantage at somebody else's expense, but the very reverse. Hon. Members of this House may have heard the story that I heard two months ago about the heir to the German throne. It ran something like this. He happened to be on board a British ship when there was being carried on that game where you pull a rope over a line. The Crown Prince showed one of the players where to stick his foot against one of the stanchions, and told him that he was a fool for not doing it. For not doing what? An unfair trick. That is not sportsmanlike. I believe that "to be sporting" means that in a grouse shoot one does not try to shoot his neighbour's bird. Has that spirit anything to do with the gambling spirit? Surely the reverse is the case. We had some interesting evidence given before the Select Committee, to which I have alluded, by the Chiefs of Police. It was stated in the most unequivocal way that the putting of money on football matches was a very bad thing for football. It tended to destroy and not to encourage sport. This Bill, by legalising the gambling spirit, would not do anything to encourage sport.

I beg leave, for one, to doubt the amount of extra money that would be raised by this means, and that would not be got in some other way. There are other ways of raising money. Surely this House is not so lost to all sense of decency that an appeal for getting money is sufficient to make us vote for any measure. There are honest and there are wrong ways of getting money. If the House wants to know, I will tell it of a way of getting large sums of money. (Cheers.) Yes, but hon. Members who cheer would not adopt it. It is the establishment, the endowment, and State patronage of sexual vice. Is there any man here who would deny that such a thing would raise large sums of money? Is there any man in this House who would speak in favour of raising money in that way? No; it has been well said that the love of money is the root of all kinds of evil, and this argument used at this juncture seems to me a good illustration of it. Let us beware in this hour of our national

temptation, which corresponds to the hour of an individual's temptation, because it is when men are short of money that they are most tempted, that we do not reverse our legislation simply because we are short of money. There is one more question that I would like to put. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his address in the House of Lords the other day in opposing this Bill, spoke of the effect that it would have upon our relations with other countries. I will read the words from the OFFICIAL REPORT. The Archbishop said:

"I was approached from one quarter with regard to the very proposal that he speaks of. . . . That was to be done on a gigantic scale. As described to me by the promoter, it was to go all over the world. 'We hope to get it into every country and town in Europe. We hope to get the matter taken up right through the Colonies and in America. It is to be on a huge scale, and we believe that the financial results will be enormous.'"

When this Bill was introduced, there happened to be in the House of Lords a very distinguished American, and a Member of the House of Lords told me to-day that he asked this distinguished American what would be thought of that proposal if it were made in the United States Senate. He replied that such a proposal would be simply inconceivable. Lord Bryce spoke after the Archbishop of Canterbury. He knows American thought, and particularly American political thought, possibly better than any other living Briton, and he endorsed the opinion of the Archbishop, who said:

"We know what pains have been taken in America to prevent the growth of this spirit. We know what is felt there with regard to lotteries and the circulation of lottery appeals, and I believe that if America were flooded with lottery appeals on behalf of the Red Cross Society of this country we should find that such a step would be met at first with surprise and then with something like indignation."

There are other parts of the world where we should get money as well as from America. There are, for instance, our Crown Colonies in the East, and, knowing something about them, I know the great evil that gambling is among the Chinese there. It is the duty of the Crown Colony Governments to try and keep their Chinese subjects from this evil. It is a great evil with them, whatever it is with us. Would it help them if they knew that we at home had carried a Bill that went over a little way in this direction? I want to ask: Is it really intended to carry this legislation any further? I gathered

[Mr. T. Taylor.]

from the Home Secretary that he does not so intend it, that it is for the duration of the War and for the objects named, namely, those licensed under the War Charities Act. I feel sure that the Leader of the House will not be a party to any extension of this principle. I believe what the Home Secretary said. But we must be on our guard against opening the door, because, if money is going to be the deciding influence, and if this Bill causes large sums of money to be raised, an extension of the principle will certainly be demanded, not only for every other good object, but for what seems to be the best object of all, the necessity of raising money by our Government for carrying on the War.

Of course, if what the House really desires is that we should sooner or later reverse our legislation, then let the House vote in favour of it. I am as heartily in favour as the Home Secretary is of a thorough Debate to thrash out this issue. But let us be fair all round. If I thought gambling of one kind or another was a good thing, I would say let us open the door to the poor man as well as to the rich man. If it be a bad thing, and at all events you have a probable gamble, let us maintain the law. One thing is absolutely certain, whenever you get a law which any any direction is restrictive, it is easy to relax it but very difficult to reimpose it. I hope the House will believe that I am not exactly a kill-joy. I do not like to pose as a skinny and disagreeable Puritan. I disclaim entirely the appellation of the "Nonconformist conscience," and all that sort of rot. I do not like it. Why? Because I give all the other Members of this House the same credit for an honest conscience as I take to myself. Therefore, it is not in any pharisaic spirit, but with the greatest hesitation, I very much regret that I have risen to move that this Bill be read a second time this day three months. To those Members of the House who do not agree with some things I have said I would still appeal on this ground, that supposing we ought to debate this matter at full length, weigh the pros and cons and make up our minds upon it, we want a more extended occasion after we have had time to think about the matter. The Bill should not be rushed through at this period of the Session. I,

therefore, appeal to hon. Members present to vote against the Second Reading on the ground at least of fair play.

Sir J. SPEAR: I beg to second the Amendment.

I am content to rest my support of the Amendment upon the eloquent speech of my hon. Friend. I am thoroughly convinced that the Bill is unnecessary and undesirable, and that we should not resort to what has hitherto been an illegal practice in order to raise funds for war purposes. Until now the people of this country have regarded it as a privilege to contribute to the health and comfort of our brave sailors and soldiers through the Red Cross and similar agencies. The result has been such as we might well expect from a grateful people. The introduction of this Bill seems to infer that we can trust no longer to the freewill offerings of the people, and that in order to secure the funds required it is necessary to introduce this measure to establish a lottery. I claim that there is no sufficient evidence in the country that any such a step is necessary. It is a humiliating and unjust reflection on the people of this country to suggest that they cannot be trusted to continue to provide funds for the Red Cross and other societies unless they are stimulated to do so by the chance of winning a prize. No

one questions the motives of those who have brought in the Bill, but I would ask the Government, who do not seem to be very decided in favour of the Bill, to consider what the men themselves will feel, and what our Allies will feel, when they see this country obliged to resort to what is, after all, a mild form of gambling in order to raise money to minister to the comforts and needs of the brave men who have fought our battles. It will be a humiliating spectacle for this country, which has stood nobly in the breach for constitutional government and liberty at enormous sacrifice. Everybody must be proud of the way in which British people of all classes have submitted to inconveniences and gladly borne their part in this great struggle for liberty and civilisation. It cannot be said with justification that it is necessary to offer such people the inducement of a lottery in order to raise funds to meet the needs of our brave men.

I would ask the Government to consider the effect of passing this measure on the

efforts which are made to subdue gambling. My hon. Friend who moved the Amendment asked how it was possible for the Government, after passing this Bill, to prosecute boys for playing pitch and toss in the streets or villages. As a magistrate I would not like to sit and condemn a boy so caught. I could not do so. It would be at variance with the sense of consistency and fair play which generally characterises people to allow a thing to be done which we condemn so strongly, and for which we often imprison boys who gamble at the street corners. In recent years we have had laws against gambling saloons. What right have we, if we pass this Bill, which legalises a mild form of gambling, to enforce those laws and others when we ourselves break them in this House by passing this Bill? I would put that point to the Government before they close the door to meeting what I believe is the express wish of the country, namely, that we should go on raising money voluntarily for these great purposes. I can only speak for agriculturists. We have raised, gladly, nearly £1,000,000 for the Red Cross, and we are ready to go on doing our utmost, as are all other sections of the community. Why should such ill-favour be cast upon the people as to infer, by this action, that we are no longer able, out of a due sense of our responsibility, to minister to the comfort of our men and maintain these great societies? Then what effect will this have on the lads of the country? Gambling is a great evil, and many a boy, having taken up the gambling spirit, to recoup his losses takes his employer's money and is ruined thereby. Can we in this House condemn a boy who does that when we pass a Bill legalising gambling, in a milder form it may be, but the same in principle?

I venture to say that the Government have taken a wrong step in giving a certain amount of acquiescence to this Bill. I hope it is not too late for them, and that they will withdraw the Bill. The adoption of that course would be appreciated very much in the country, and I am satisfied that people will feel an increased responsibility for the raising of money by other and upright means and save the country from the ill-flavour—I was going to say the disgrace—of resorting to what hitherto have been regarded as illegal practices. A mistake has been made in introducing this Bill, and in the interests of the dignity of this House and of the

country I suggest it should be withdrawn. My hon. Friend spoke of some of the things that are going to be run under the powers of this Bill. Is it right that this country, which has done so nobly in this crisis, should now descend to the undignified position of having raffles in order to raise money for what, after all, is a privilege and a duty which has up to now been readily undertaken by the people? Notwithstanding what the Home Secretary said, I fail to see any diminution in the desire or intention of the people to carry on this good cause, and that is why I unhesitatingly second the rejection. If I thought for a moment my action would be the means of depriving those brave fellows whom we all so much admire of comforts and necessaries, I should support it, but I am satisfied that the money will be raised in the future as in the past, and that there is no need whatever for bringing in this Bill. It would be an evil day when this House sanctioned the spirit of gambling which, though it is only intended for the time of the War, must leave a bad influence on all sections of the community and lay the seed of evils in the future which the country will regret. I, therefore, second the rejection of the Bill.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL: I desire to support the Government in this matter. [HON. MEMBERS: "Oh!"] At any rate, I desire to support the Home Secretary. I take an interest in the matter because I happen to be secretary-general of the Order of St. John and a member of the Joint War Committee of the Order of St. John and the British Red Cross Society. It is estimated that the passing of this Bill will bring in £2,000,000 more money to these societies for their well recognised work than they would otherwise get, and that the other approved war charities will benefit more or less in like proportion according to their size. My hon. Friend the Member for the Radcliffe Division and the hon. Member who has seconded the rejection have spoken with great sincerity. I do not doubt their sincerity. My hon. Friend the Member for the Radcliffe Division always speaks with eloquence and earnestness on any subject he takes up, and I am sure, in recognising his sincerity to the full, he will equally be willing not to question mine.

Mr. TAYLOR: Hear, hear!

Mr. CECIL: I also regret to find myself in conflict with two or three friends among

[Mr. Cecil.]

the bishops. It is a quandary to which I am not altogether accustomed. I notice that the House receives that with a legitimate degree of amusement. I do think that the views of these episcopal peers are exaggerated in this matter, and I would very respectfully take leave to say that I doubt whether the spokesmen of the episcopal bench speak for all the occupants of it. My hon. Friend who moved the rejection has raised three or four objections. He talked of the unfairness of bringing the Bill suddenly before us now, and rather insinuated that those who are supporting it knew that it would come forward long before it did, and that the action of the Government—I suppose it is the Government on this occasion—was unfair in that respect. Let me say that, as far as I know, everybody was equally ignorant until a few days ago that this thing was going to be brought forward at all. It was, as far as I know, very suddenly launched in the other House, and I do not think my hon. Friend is justified in putting forward this plea of unfairness when everybody really has been equally ignorant in the matter. Then he suggests that this is very much on a par with Premium Bonds. He referred to the Committee on that subject, upon which, I believe, he has lately been sitting. I think there is an essential difference between the two. The suggestion of issuing Premium Bonds was that they should be issued under the *aegis* of the Government. There is nothing under the *aegis* of the Government in a matter done by private societies for war charity. Nor in Premium Bonds was there any question of charity. Here there is. If the Report of the Premium Bonds Committee is to be quoted, I cannot but say that my impression when I read it was that the evidence went one way and the conclusions appeared to go the other.

Mr. TAYLOR: Have you read the evidence?

Mr. CECIL: I do not say that I read every word of it, but certainly that was the general impression left on my mind, so that I do not think it very safe to quote that Committee or its Report. My hon. Friend really bases himself on the question of morality. He argues that this is mischievous legislation of gambling. What I should like to know is whether this is really the proper attitude. Nobody doubts that so far as gambling leads

to bad results, it is harmful; but what if gambling leads to good results as here? If you call it gambling, which I think is a matter of controversy—whether you call it so or not, it certainly leads to good results—no amount of sneering will be able to deny that fact. Does the hon. Member contend that gambling in itself is a moral sin or a crime?

Mr. TAYLOR: It is objectionable.

Mr. CECIL: He does not deny it. He cannot say it is a moral sin or a crime. The answer obviously is No.

Sir S. COLLINS: Experience teaches us what gambling is.

Mr. CECIL: It is not a sin or a crime. Does the hon. Gentleman say it is, and, if so, what commandment does it infringe? It is not the least use arguing on that line, because gambling is not a sin or a crime. What is objectionable is excessive gambling and the misery, the loss, the waste of energy and of time, the selfishness and the ruin which comes in its train. That is what we want to prevent. That has always been at the bottom of all legislation against lotteries and against gambling, and that is what I am perfectly willing at any time to prevent. Weak characters get drawn into its vortex and lose fortunes to the men whose simple prey they are. That does not really occur under this Bill. It is expressly limited to the duration of the War, and it is an emergency measure. Large sums of money do not go to some selfish idler and stimulate him to entice a weakling loser to play further. They go to approved war charities which need it. Our Joint War Committee spends now £4,000,000 a year, £10,000 a day, or putting it in another form, over £7 a minute. It is not an easy task to raise that money, and I think I am entitled to ask hon. Members who object to this particular form what other more effective form they can devise. It is not at all an easy matter, and I think for this special purpose this is the best method. Voluntary, though illegal, effort has been going on all along for some time. There have been county bazaars and raffles on behalf of the Red Cross. Estimable ladies have put their backs into it and done their utmost. I suppose they are all liable to be arrested and tried or imprisoned. I almost wonder the hon. Member does not set about bringing that into practice. You cannot altogether change human nature. People

will resort to these methods when they are very effective, and by this procedure numbers of persons are reached, and they salve their consciences by going in for a lottery of this kind, who cannot be reached in any other way. A lottery brings in infinitely more than the market price of a particular article. It is therefore desirable from the point of view of war charities. If a pearl necklace or a pig is raffled for, it is quite certain to bring in vastly larger sums of money than would ever be obtained by merely putting them up for auction. If objection is taken to raffles I cannot but ask those who criticise whether they have ever had their attention directed to church or chapel bazaars. The promoters of these entertainments, if they be entertainments, have often resorted to raffles. I do not know whether the hon. Member when he opens bazaars, and raffles occur, conveniently shuts his eyes to them, or whether he tolerates their existence.

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not take part in them.

Mr. CECIL: The hon. Member must know perfectly well that that goes on, and it is really a little hypocritical to object to the Red Cross going in for methods of that sort when in church and chapel bazaars the same thing has occurred for years past. It is rumoured that in Ireland this law has been disregarded for decades past. He said he had lots of experience of a kind. I could not quite follow him. He said this was opening the sluice-gates, and that all sorts of troubles might occur. But there is a precedent which is very useful at present. One of the most important of the long series of Gaming Acts was 8 and 9 Victoria, cap. 109, in 1845, which to some extent consolidated and enlarged the law. In the very next year it was found necessary to make an exception. Art Unions had been instituted. It was believed they came under the Lottery Law, and they were expressly exempted from being liable to them. The matter is so important that I think it worth while to read the preamble of the Art Union Act of 1846:

"Whereas certain voluntary associations have been and may hereafter be formed in various parts of the United Kingdom, under the name of art unions, for the purchase of paintings, drawings, or other works of art, to be afterwards allotted and distributed, by chance or otherwise, as prizes amongst the members, subscribers or contributors forming part of such associations, on the condition nevertheless that such sums of money so allotted and distributed be expended

solely and entirely in the purchase of paintings, drawings or other works of art; and whereas such allotment and distribution of paintings . . . or of sums of money for their purchase, and the proceedings taken to carry the same into effect, may be deemed . . . to come within the provisions of the several Acts of Parliament passed for the prevention of lotteries, littlegoes, and unlawful games, whereby the members, subscribers, or contributors of such associations as aforesaid . . . may be liable to certain pains and penalties imposed by law. . . . Be it enacted . . . that all such voluntary associations as aforesaid . . . shall be deemed to be lawful associations," etc.

That was an exceptional case, and it has been the law of the land for very many years. Does the hon. Member suggest that any harm has come of it? Of course he cannot. The thing has gone on perfectly legitimately, without doing any moral harm to anyone, without the smallest national offence, and we ask the same thing here. If it was right then to make an exception of Art Unions, surely I am not pleading too much to say that in war time an exception ought to be made of Red Cross work and war charities which are properly approved. I think there is no answer to that argument, and to tell us that national demoralisation has ensued is a suggestion which seems to me to be making a misuse of language. If the hon. Member feels so strongly, as he evidently does, why has he not got that Act repealed during the eighteen years he has been in the House? I urge upon the House that just as there was a special occasion then, which was approved by Parliament, so now there is an exceptional occasion, and this Bill ought to be passed for the benefit of the societies I have mentioned. Something of the kind, as the Home Secretary has told us, has been done in New Zealand, and I think we should do well to follow that example. We ask the House to approve a measure which is expressly limited to the period of the War, which is framed to meet the special emergency, which is designed for a most excellent purpose, and which has the advantage of experience from precedent. I hope, therefore, that the House will agree to the Second Reading of the Bill.

Sir A. SPICER: I desire to say a few words in support of my Friends who have moved the rejection of this Bill. I believe that my right hon. Friend (Mr. E. Cecil) has put the Red Cross first and some moral principle second. It is very difficult to oppose anything that the Red Cross Society proposes, after all the splendid

[Sir A. Spicer.]

work it has been doing during the War, but I cannot help thinking my right hon. Friend has been trying to prove too much. He raised the question as to whether gambling is a sin. It is not for me to say what is a sin and what is not, but I can say very respectfully, and without any cant, that I have judged through my life whether any action had the spirit of gambling in it by asking myself whether it was contrary to two Divine laws—the Divine law of work and the Divine law of love. I think, if my right hon. Friend will examine some of the arguments he has used, he will admit that the action which is proposed in this Bill comes up against those two principles. The very fact that he has stated that if this Bill is passed something like £2,000,000 will be raised proves that. I do not know what the market price is, but I presume, from that figure being stated, that it is far in advance of the market price, and, therefore, it is trying to get something at a much higher value than it is actually worth. It is also trying to get something for which you are not called upon to work. The occasion for this Bill is about the worst occasion that could be devised. There are hundreds of thousands of people in this country who are making larger wages every week than they have ever earned before, and without denying themselves the actual necessities of life they will be tempted and induced to put their money into lotteries established for such beautiful articles as pearls, when the State has put its imprimatur upon a principle of this kind. The workers throughout the country, I am sure, will be demoralised in a way I am sure my right hon. Friend would not attempt to justify.

The House of Lords has sent this Bill to us and I am sincerely grateful for the protests that were made by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Bryce, and also for the letter in the "Times" of last week from the Bishop of Winchester. He sees very clearly what this would mean. But we have a far greater responsibility in this House. We are the representatives of the people. I am quite sure that I can say with perfect truth that I should have had no majority in 1910 if the Constituents whom I asked to return me to this House had known that I was prepared to vote for a measure that contained the spirit of gambling. Therefore, I should not be true to the pledges which I gave to my Con-

stituents, and to the spirit of those pledges—although the question of gambling did not actually come into the discussion—if I were to support a measure like this. A large number of us are employers; and we are responsible for our example and for our influence upon those who help us to carry on our undertakings. If we pass this Bill we proclaim to the people of this country that we believe this Bill is right and justified, simply because of a difficulty in other ways of raising money. If this Bill passes it is going to be a tremendous blow at the work of war savings committees. Directly the people of this country begin to look at this question of lotteries—because it is not only for the Red Cross, but these lotteries would spring up all over the country—and they commence to put their money into lotteries, they certainly will not go on investing their money in the various war savings associations. Some of us are doing all we can to make it easy for those who are connected with us in our various undertakings to put money into National War Bonds, and other national war funds. Therefore, I do feel very strongly that if this Bill is passed it will be a great blow at the growth of war savings. If these pearls have been collected by the Red Cross, and they find it impossible to sell them at the present time, would it not be far better for the Treasury to take them over and pay a certain amount of money on them and sell them after the War? All the values that have been given to us are only estimates. It is perfectly clear that the Red Cross cannot get this huge amount for these pearls without at the same time striking a great moral blow in connection with gambling upon the whole country, and without, I believe, doing a great deal of harm to the question of war savings.

Sir STEPHEN COLLINS: I was rather surprised to hear the arguments of the Home Secretary. I think his heart was not in the work. He was very half-hearted in putting forward the proposal. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been here I should have liked to ask him, if this Bill is carried, what will be the effect upon the large masses of working people in this country? As the right hon. Gentleman has said, the people will be tempted to put their money into these lotteries, and the children, instead of putting their six-pences and their shillings and half-crowns into war savings, and filling up their

books, or taking up a £5 War Loan, or investing 15s. 6d. in a War Savings Certificate, to become £1 in five years, they will be putting their money into what I say is distinctly a gamble. They may put their money into this lottery and get £1 for their half-crown, or a diamond necklace worth £200,000. What is a workman's wife going to do with that? Put it round her neck? My hon. Friend who moved the rejection of the Bill referred to the Report of the Committee on gambling in 1808. I will give another sentence from the Report of that Committee:

"No mode of raising money was so burdensome, so pernicious, and so unproductive as lotteries, and the Committee questioned whether any pecuniary advantage, however large or convenient, would compensate for the vice and misery that they produce."

If that is true of one hundred and ten years ago it is equally true to-day. I would suggest that young persons who invest their money in this lottery, if they are successful, will be induced to go on and put their money on other things, perhaps on horses, or resort to other modes of obtaining money by not working. This is going to have a vast influence for good or evil on the rising generation of the country. I beg Members of this House who feel inclined to vote for this Bill to pause before going into the Lobby in support of it. The excuse is made that it is for the War. But it is a dangerous excuse. As I understand, if this scheme is passed, it is to be advertised throughout our Empire, our Dominions, and other countries. I was glad to hear my hon. Friend refer to the testimony of that great American who, I believe, is a representative man. Is England, which has been in the forefront of many of the moral reforms of the world, going to go back to the state of things of hundreds of years ago, and be scouted by our great Ally the American Republic, which is helping us in this glorious warfare? Are we going to be scorned by them, as I believe we shall be?

Let us pause before we carry this any further. Have the public in this country asked for this? Have you ever seen a single letter in a newspaper asking for this lottery to be started? The Home Secretary said that £2,000,000 is at stake. What is that? If I mistake not, there is one leading newspaper in this country which has already obtained £12,000,000 for the Red Cross or, at any rate, for charitable purposes in connection with the War,

and other newspapers have obtained millions of pounds. It is a slur on the nation and on the sacrifices of the nation to say that you cannot get this paltry £2,000,000 without resorting to this system of gambling. If this proposal had been known a fortnight or a week ago we should have had protests from nearly every Protestant church in this land of ours, and if this passes to-night there will be a storm raised to-morrow in the country by the churches and by all lovers of the true morality of this country. I give credit to my Friends for good intentions, but some good intentions lead to a certain place, and I do hope that they will pause before supporting this proposal. The appeal of the lottery is not made to any lofty or ennobling emotion or to any generous impulse, but only encourages the spirit of adventure. I trust that we shall throw out this Bill, though it has come from the other House and from the Noble Lord who brought it forward with good intentions. The harm that you do will be far greater than any good which it will accomplish. Reference has been made to the question of the pearls. If it had not been for the pearls we should have heard nothing of this lottery. If the good people who gave the pearls had only given money we should have heard nothing of this proposal. I heartily support my hon. Friend who moved the rejection of the Bill.

Mr. ROBINSON: I am very sorry that the Government have brought in this Bill at this period of the Session and at such a crisis. Whatever it may do it cannot tend to elevate the moral sense of the community at large. The Government, after all, must accept the whole responsibility for bringing in this Bill, whether it runs away from it or supports it in the Lobby, as they ran away from a Bill which they brought in a fortnight ago, leaving it to be dealt with by the House, which was not a very heroic course for the Government to pursue. There has been a certain amount of correspondence on this subject in the papers. I find that if anyone says a particularly futile thing, if he does not sign his own name he generally calls himself "Common Sense." Writing to the papers to-day, "Common Sense" says:

"Motive in these matters is everything. No one doubts that the motive of the purchasers of these tickets is to help on the Red Cross."

I only wish I thought that were true. But I believe that nine-tenths, or nineteen out of every twenty, who buy these tickets will buy them for the gamble and

[Mr. Robinson.]

for nothing else. What good will a pearl necklace of great value be to a miner or a munition worker? Their wives would be anxious not to get the pearl necklace as such, but to convert it into cash. It is pure gambling, and it is nothing else. I do not know how many necklaces there are to be, or whether the pearls are to be divided into ten necklaces, valued at £5,000 up to £50,000, according to the size of the pearls, but there is no doubt whatever that the people who are interested in this draw are really actuated by a spirit of greed, by a desire to see what they can get out of it in hard cash. Never was greater encouragement given to the gambling spirit, and I very much regret it. Goodness knows we have about enough at the present time. We have only to see evening papers sold in the streets when there is a race on to understand a little what a proposal of this kind means. I heard of a case of a small tipster business, the owner of which was asked whether he was pretty well doing nothing at the present time, and the reply given by him was that he was doing ten times what he was doing before the War. It is in that kind of thing that we are now engaging. I really wonder whether the donors of the pearls would approve of the way in which they are to be disposed of. I think a great many of them would have hesitated very much before they would have made such a gift to be dealt with in such a manner. I should like to appeal to a voice that was heard not so long ago, the voice of one who would have saved us if he had been listened to from many of the burdens we have now to bear—I mean the late Lord Roberts, who has turned out to be a true prophet. He was, on one occasion, asked to take tickets in a lottery. He wrote a polite reply, regretting that he was obliged to return the tickets, "as it was entirely against his rule to patronise lotteries of any kind." Coming from a man like Lord Roberts, whatever may be thought of this matter one way or the other, such words ought to receive the grave consideration of this House.

I cannot help recollecting that not so many years ago there were special postal restrictions in regard to lotteries for which tickets were sold in this country; they were largely German and Dutch lotteries. If lotteries were not considered good then, why should we take the

action which is now contemplated? If they are not good at one time and place, they are not good at another time and place. If this sort of gambling is right, why should it have been subjected to these restrictions? On the very day this Bill passed through the House of Lords, there were two cases of women who were taken up for keeping tipsters' shops, or places for betting purposes. They were both lightly fined. What was the difference in their case? Surely it is difficult to say that they were any more to blame than are those who concern themselves in carrying out lotteries on behalf of the Red Cross. Only to-day a gaming raid was made in the East End, and in that case also the keepers were fined. Yet you are now encouraging this lottery and encouraging gambling in a way which has not been known for a century or more. I submit that is a very regrettable thing. The Government, I am sorry to say, have altogether lacked courage in this matter. They let racing go on, but if they had stopped it they would have obtained the services of a number of men, who would have been taken from their racing occupations, and that would have done something to counteract the scandal, for it is nothing less than a scandal, of our utility horses being starved at the present time while extra rations are being given to race-horses, which are for people's amusements and for gambling. I am not one of those who would spoil sport, for I am afraid I have devoted too much time to it in my young days, but I do not see the necessity of horse-breeding for racing purposes and sports of that sort, which are carried on by a number of people for the sake of gambling. It is an extraordinary thing how many men who ought to be doing military service at the present time, and who were engaged in horse-breeding for racing purposes, have somehow or other managed to get off, or have disappeared to Ireland in some remarkable way. I say that the Government, in the matter of allowing horse-racing, have gone to the other extreme, and I regret that they encourage the gambling spirit in the way they are doing. The Prime Minister has spoken of this War as a holy War, and many of us think that it is. Only last Sunday we had a solemn procession to church, and the Archbishop of Canterbury spoke to us as engaging in a solemn

act of prayer, confession, thanksgiving, commemoration, and resolve. The country would do well at this time to ask that it should be borne in mind that it is not a case of charity which is contemplated by this Bill, but is really to encourage gambling.

Mr. CHANCELLOR: I will not go over the ground that has already been traversed, but I wish to point out that gambling is an offence against the moral and spiritual and statutory policy of the nation. It has been regarded as wrong for a very long time, and in spite of what the Home Secretary said as to the early gambling laws, that does not apply to the gambling laws of the last century, which were framed to discourage and put down gambling, because it was recognised that its practice was evil, a moral wrong, and that it undermined the character, while it was the cause of all kind of social evils which it was desirable to put down. Those laws were intended as a protection against the strong and inherent tendency in the minds of men, and an endeavour to eliminate it as far as possible. This Bill is for encouraging what we have been discouraging up to now. In regard to these gifts which have come into the possession of the war charities, you introduce for their disposal a game of chance, which appeals not to the giving spirit, as the Home Secretary said, but appeals to the spirit of greed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aston Manor said it was expected to get £2,000,000 of money as the result of this lottery. I understand that the particular collection of pearls is worth about £100,000, and it is hoped to realise by this method of disposing of them £1,000,000—that is to say, persons are expected to buy tickets realising £1,000,000 for what is only worth £100,000. The interest in this matter does not centre in the pearls; it is centred in the system introduced, and it will have a tendency to spread through every rank of society. There is talk about appealing to the sporting instincts, but what is really appealed to is the spirit of greed, by which alone you can reach the pockets of a large number of people who would not otherwise give to these charities at all.

Everybody is anxious to raise funds for the Red Cross, and we do not oppose any efforts in that direction, nor do we desire to diminish in any degree what goes to the Red Cross funds; but we do protest

against any means being adopted which are purely gambling. We do protest against what affects the morals of our people; we do believe that a moral evil will result from the adoption of this practice, or its sanction by the introduction of a special law to except this particular thing from the operation of laws that we already have on the Statute Book. We believe it would be a sanction which would cause its encouragement, and would cause many thousands of people to indulge in gambling who would not be otherwise touched by it at all. I can quite understand why, in another place, Lord Lansdowne, in explaining the purpose of the Bill which was introduced, stated that there are numbers of people who are charitable and who look for no reward, but that there are others whose interests in charity was of a very languid description, and who required more or less stimulus and excitement to provoke them into activity. That stimulus is not an appeal to the spirit of charity, but is a stimulus for the spirit of greed. The Noble Lord also said do not let Noble Lords be too squeamish about the ethical aspects of these institutions—that is to say, that for any good object never mind what are the means to achieve your purpose and whether the purpose be good or ill, adopt means to produce the result desired. It is the advice of Bassanio to Portia over again:

“Wrest once the law to your authority:
To do a great right do a little wrong.”

It is a doctrine which St. Paul denounced, that he had been accused of advocating. It is doing evil that good may come. And, after all, the moral good of the community is of greater importance than the mere temporary prosperity of certain charities, even though those who benefit by them are our soldiers and sailors. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aston Manor, asked if anybody could say that gambling was a sin or a crime. It is a crime, or we should not have laws against it, the infraction of which leads to punishment. That it is a sin I am absolutely convinced. The right hon. Gentleman asked which of the Commandments gambling breaks. There is one Commandment which says, “Thou shalt not covet,” and I think it is an infraction of that, but the Ten Commandments to which he referred do not cover the whole of the moral law, and in the view not only of myself, but of large numbers of people outside this House, and in the view of

[Mr. Chancellor.]

nearly all the religious leaders of the country and most of its moral teachers, the practice of gambling and of speculating for gain in this way is in itself a sin, which we are encouraging if we pass this Bill into law. The right hon. Gentleman also referred to Premium Bonds, and he said the difference between Premium Bonds—which were examined by a Committee of this House, which, after long and careful examination, came to the conclusion that they would produce little financial good and a great deal of moral wrong—is that in connection with the bonds there is nothing in the shape of charity. So for the purpose of charity we are entitled to do things which would be wrong for the purpose of business. I do not agree with that view at all, and I think that we as a House of Commons are responsible for passing laws which shall not be a breach of the moral law, which shall as far as possible coincide with the moral law, which shall not encourage our people to do things which in normal conditions we regard as wrong, and which we have tried to discourage by a long course of legislation in the past hundred years or so. To take the opportunity when the House is about to rise, without proper notice, to pass an Act which must inevitably create great division in this House in order that we may introduce into the systems for raising funds for our charities a principle which is popular in Germany is, I think, an outrage. This war has brought

9.0 P.M. us a good many unexpected things, and amongst other things we denounce Germany and imitate her. Yesterday the Leader of the House told us that the War Cabinet had decided to maintain an iniquitous, a wicked, and an outrageous Regulation by which they hoped to protect the health of our soldiers by a Regulation which reintroduces the principle of the Contagious Diseases Acts, which causes the forcible examination and degradation of the womanhood of this country. That is a German practice, and we have imitated Germany in it. This Bill invites us to imitate a German practice which we have excluded by our postal Regulations for years past, and to cause our people to come under the same kind of moral influence as those which we denounce in the enemy against whom we are fighting. If we are going to do this kind of thing, we deserve to lose the War, and I hope that the House of Commons,

which at least will have a free vote in this matter—although this Bill has been advocated by the Home Secretary, apparently on behalf of the Government, and although this private Bill has been turned into a Government Bill—will exercise its judgment and decide that in this case, at any rate, it will exercise its freedom for the moral advantage of the country rather than for the immediate temporary financial benefit of certain charities.

Mr. HEMMERDE: It amazes me to see the levity with which His Majesty's Government, at this hour of the Session, throws this apple of discord into the House and into the country. Really, I should have thought that with the present Prime Minister the Government might have learned that this is a thing which, if passed, will cause the greatest heart-burning throughout the length and breadth of this country. I do not pretend to be a person who is so opposed to gambling that I would never gamble, but I do know that the greater part of my constituents are persons like that. They hold very strong views, and they have a right to have those views respected, and not to have Bills brought in by a Government which then runs away and leaves a Whip or two in charge of the Government Bench, while this matter, which will exercise the minds of all the churches in this country, and of many people who never go into a church at all, is calmly left to its fate in the House here at the fag end of this very busy Session. It is not in any spirit of wanting to spoil sport that I oppose this preposterous measure. It is because I think it is an insult to this country, which has raised thousands of millions, that now we have to send the hat round amongst people who, to use the phrase of that great leader of public opinion, Lord Lansdowne, are "languid in their charity." Lord Lansdowne is not a politician whom I have ever followed, and I do not think I am ever likely to follow, and I really do not care whether it is with his authority or with the authority of any of his colleagues in the House of Lords that this Bill is brought in. I want to know why it is brought in.

We have got through the War up to the present time without having to do this sort of thing to spur on those who are charitable but languid. I do not think it is charity that is going to be excited by this Bill, and everybody, I believe, in this House knows it is not charity at all, but merely a question of greedy people who

want to get rich quick. This is a principle we are to bring into our body politic when thousands and millions of our people are making more money than they have ever made in their lives. Are we, who praise the magnificent ethical views of President Wilson one day, to grovel in the gutters the next? We are told it is sporting. I have never been opposed to sport, but I do know that betting—and it is from the spread of this sort of thing that betting arises—has spoilt every sport. I have never believed in the sportsman who watches sport and never plays but bets on it. I do not believe it does any good to the country or to the so-called sportsman. I think that this is a degrading Bill, and that it is an insult to the country to say it is necessary. I think it is a demoralising Bill, because it cuts across the very principles on which our law and morality are based. How is it possible to sentence people, as I have to do quarter after quarter, for keeping gaming houses, and with what spirit are the police at Liverpool to try, as they have been doing, to stamp out betting and gaming, when people, who will not take the trouble to listen to a word of this Debate, come in and vote us down, as no doubt some of them will do, at a later stage, without considering that they are really thwarting the whole development of the moral life of the country when they do things of this sort?

For what reason do people imagine that the police of our great towns are loyally supporting the authorities in trying to cut out the cancer of gaming and gambling? Because it fills the gaols. They know perfectly well that everything that leads to this spirit of getting rich quick has only one rival in filling the gaols, and that is drink. Anyone who has administered the law in this country for any time knows it perfectly well. Therefore, I say it is about time this House took this Government in hand, and took it in hand very vigorously, if we are going to have this sort of sloppy legislation, without a word of encouragement and without a word of discouragement. I hope the House will absolutely refuse to have anything to do with this measure. I believe that the Government in bringing in measures that divide public opinion in a time of party truce and in a great War, are doing a great wrong, and when men talk about doing it for the soldiers and sailors I make bold to say there are 1,000,000 men and more in the Army and

Navy who would deplore this Bill as much as anyone in this House. They would say that you have no right to find money in this way, and that it is the country's duty to find the money, and that if charity is languid let taxation provide the money. Let us have real charity that ennobles and real Government—the Government that ennobles—and let us have no more trifling with the public morals in the name of sport, or whatever you like to call it.

Sir ARTHUR STANLEY: I had no intention of intervening in this Debate, but the name of the Red Cross has been so frequently mentioned that I fear it might be thought curious if I, who have the honour to be the Chairman of the British Red Cross Society and the Order of St. John, refrained from saying a few words in favour of a Bill which so vitally affects our interests. I, like the hon. Member who moved the rejection of this Bill, have very little time left as a Member of this House, and as it is certain that this will be the last speech I shall make in it I should be ashamed of myself if I advocated, in the very last Debate in which I took part, anything that could possibly lead to the demoralisation of the nation, of which hon. Gentlemen opposite have spoken, and if I feel that as a Member of the House I should feel it even more as one who has had the honour during the past four years of being concerned in the Red Cross movement—in the movement which, above all others, has shown us the splendid generosity and the splendid spirit of our peoples. I speak, as I said, because the Red Cross has been mentioned, and I should like to make it clear that this Bill is not one which affects the Red Cross alone. It is one that affects all war charities. It is one that has been made possible because there is a War Charities Act which, for the first time, has put all charities connected with the War under some definite central control. That is a feature which has not been alluded to, but one which is very important and which ought to be borne in mind during this Debate.

That leads me to mention a remark made by one hon. Member opposite. He said that if it had not been for the pearl necklace, of which we have heard so much, this Bill would not have been brought in. I can assure him that is not the case. This Bill was necessitated, so far as any Bill can be necessitated, by the actual circumstances. What really led to this Bill was

[Sir A. Stanley.]

not the pearl necklace nor the Red Cross but it happened to be a very big lottery which was carried on a short time ago, which it was impossible to treat as a mere tombola or anything camouflaged under any name, and either needed the enforcement of the law or some change in it. I only mention that because I want to make it clear that the inception of this legislation was not due either to the Red Cross or to the pearl necklace. Hon. Members opposite—and I should like to take this opportunity of thanking them for the very kind manner in which throughout they have spoken of the Red Cross and the Order of St. John—have opposed this Bill because they say it introduces the spirit of gambling. I am not concerned to argue here whether the spirit of gambling is right or wrong. I come from a family which I suppose has always been connected in one way or another with sport—I do not say gambling, but I do thoroughly agree with what has been said by hon. Members that gambling is one of the things that go to spoil sport. Does this Bill, however, introduce a spirit of gambling? I think hon. Members opposite will agree with me that whether it encourages gambling or not it does not introduce it. Let us take our minds back to the days before the War. Most Members of Parliament have been exposed to bazaars, and it would be safe to say that before the War at every nine out of ten of these bazaars were in some way or other connected with the church. I go further. I take my own Constituency in Lancashire, and I say that at practically every one of these bazaars I have been asked to take part in at least a dozen raffles. Does not every hon. Member when he goes to bazaars provide himself with a pocket full of silver in order that he may take tickets or raffles when asked? I say this does not introduce the spirit of gambling. Is morality in any way harmed by this very harmless amusement of raffling, and if no harm has been caused when it has been practised in pre-war times, is harm going to be done because it happens to be on a rather bigger scale?

The hon. Gentleman who moved the rejection of this Bill spoke about the pearl necklace. He said, and I thoroughly agree with him, that this Debate has assumed a higher character than one of mere triviality, and it was not the time for anyone to get up and make jokes, even if he could do so, about pigs. So much,

however, has been said about the pearl necklace, that I think the House will forgive me if I very shortly mention it. There was one part of the hon. Member's speech which I confess a little bit jarred upon me. I have no doubt he did not mean it. But in one part his words amounted to almost a sneer at the noble ladies giving these pearls.

Mr. TAYLOR: I did not mean it as a sneer.

Sir A. STANLEY: I know that, but I would point out that many of these ladies are very far from rich. They gave that which to each of them was most precious, and they gave it in order to help what they felt was even more precious. They felt that they were giving these pearls for the relief of suffering, which they themselves would willingly have laid down their lives to avoid. Out of these pearls have been formed a necklace. Some Members have spoken of that necklace as though it had a price, but it has no price. It is a necklace formed of pearls given by women in this great War, and it is something which cannot be priced; it is something above all price. That is not all. When you have an object like that in your possession, an object which was placed in the possession of the Red Cross to be used for a most sacred purpose, how are you to dispose of it in the best way? Is it the best way to sell it to a jeweller or to sell it to a rich man? May it not possibly be the best way to sell it in such a manner that even a man who can only afford to give a shilling may have an opportunity of securing that necklace? I only ask the question. I do not expect hon. Members opposite to agree with me, but I do ask them to put to themselves the question which we have put to ourselves, what, when you have a great trust like this confided to your care, in order to help those who are suffering for their country, is the best way to realise it? I own myself I should think that that necklace had been more properly and more worthily bought by the poor man who managed to pay the shilling than by anyone who could afford to buy it.

I do not wish to labour the point that this is only a war-time measure. I would make one remark in passing, that measures are justified in war when they might be questionable in less strenuous times. One of the pillars of civilisation is built upon the sanctity of human life,

but even that has to be suspended during war. Is there any one of us who does not rejoice when we hear of some new instrument for taking the lives of our enemy? I say that war measures which would be questionable and not even justifiable in peace time certainly may be justifiable at a time like this, if, indeed, any justification were necessary. There is one point I would like to make with regard to this particular Bill, especially as it affects the Red Cross. I do not believe—and I do not suppose any hon. Member of this House believes—that the Gaming Acts which have been mentioned in this Debate ever contemplated a question such as this. I am not very well up in these matters, but I am told that those Acts were directed first of all against people being swindled, and, secondly, largely with the view of maintaining the right of lottery in the hands of the Government. I believe that is so.

Mr. CHANCELLOR: That only applies to the last century.

Sir A. STANLEY: At any rate, these Lottery Acts had their basis first in the desire of the Government to keep lotteries in their own hands, and, secondly, on the determination of Parliament to prevent people being swindled. This Act provides that it can only be applied in the case of certain specific charities which have to render their accounts to very strict audit by Commissioners every year, and it is further provided that the police shall satisfy themselves about the particular lottery; undoubtedly, they will take every necessary precaution in doing so. I say that the Acts to which reference has been made were never intended to apply to cases like this, where the prizes, such as they are, are given, and where every single penny that is paid for the tickets goes directly into the coffers of the charity for which the lottery is held. I would simply end as I began by saying that I should feel ashamed of myself if I were to advocate any measure which, in any possible degree, would tend to demoralise that splendid public which has shown what its generosity can do. I am surely the very best person for knowing how deep is the heart of the great British public! I have no doubt that those people who have determined that the soldiers shall lack for no comfort that money can buy will support us in the future as in the past; but is there any harm in adding to their pleasure in giving just the extra

spice, that inducement, that they, whatever you may do or say, will find in a perfectly harmless lottery—the inducement that leads men, as we have seen in these auction sales, to buy something far beyond its price and then immediately to give it back again for the mere sake of giving? I do not believe that great fundamental principles, about which hon. Members have spoken so eloquently and so well, are involved. I do ask this House to pass this Bill. I do not ask this simply on the ground of money. I do, however, ask hon. Members to let us have what I believe to be a perfectly innocent incentive to a generous public who have given us support in the past in our great undertakings.

Sir WILLIAM COLLINS: Whatever may be the opinion of hon. Members of this House in regard to the merits of this Bill, they can, I think, only be of one opinion as to the value—the enormous value—of the services to the British Red Cross of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. The hon. Gentleman has given his time, thought, and himself to the service of that great cause. No words of mine can adequately express the gratitude of this nation and of this House to the hon. Member. In a humbler capacity I have been a voluntary worker for the Red Cross from the earliest days of the War. I am still a hospital surgeon. I saw service with the Red Cross in the front in Flanders in the early days of the War and at the present time I am serving in one of the largest hospitals in London. I can thus speak with personal knowledge of the great services of the hon. Member. I understand one of the arguments in favour of this Bill is the expression that “war charities are languishing.” As a member of the King Edward Hospital staff, of the League of Mercy, and of many of the hospitals in London, I confess that that is news to me. There is one form of charity which never fails to impress itself either on the wealthiest or the humblest, and that is for the work of the hospitals of this country, especially those which are doing work for the wounded soldiers and sailors. They never fail to evoke a generous response whenever an appeal is made, whether to the humblest citizen or to the wealthiest subscriber.

I gather that the object of this Bill is to exempt war charities from the general law of the land in regard to lotteries. I have, I confess, yet to learn that a method

[Sir W. Collins.]

which is reprehensible in itself becomes less so when the object in view is a good one. If a method be reprehensible in itself that may be a good reason for repealing the whole of the lottery laws. If the method be not reprehensible in itself, then, of course, there is no more to be said. I cannot, certainly, support the argument which urges that the ground for making the war charities an exception to the ordinary law of the land against lotteries is because there is a difficulty in obtaining money for them at the present time. The hon. Member who spoke last, I think, indicated that there are other modes of helping, and I think we will agree. I confess that as a London magistrate who has to sit on the Bench to deal with certain persons, and perhaps send to prison those who have been engaged as gaming tipsters in this London of ours, I feel very great hesitation in making less difficult methods of gambling than they are at the present time, however worthy the object may be, for which we are asked to make this relaxation of the law. I, therefore, without further words beyond those of the strongest possible approbation—if I may use the term—of the magnificent services of the hon. Member who has just spoken, regret that I am unable to support the Second Reading of this Bill.

Mr. ARTHUR RICHARDSON: I have not very often found myself in this position. When I came to this House a few years ago I thought I would either have the opportunity of voting for a right or for a wrong thing; for a good thing or for a bad thing. I find to-night that a very large proportion of hon. Members of this House are in the position of having to vote for what they believe to be the better of two good things or the lesser of two evils. For my own part my course is clear. I entirely agree with the statement of the hon. Member for Norfolk that it is a case of proof in relation to the moral aspects of this Bill. It is not, however, from that standpoint that I want to make one or two observations, which, I am sure, will appeal to the Government. I do not suggest for a moment that other considerations do not, but I am quite certain this will appeal to them from a practical standpoint, and that is how best to win the War or how best to lose it! I had the honour, along with the Mover and the Seconder of the Amendment, of sitting on the Premium Bonds Committee.

I have waited and hoped that some Member of the Labour party would have something to say on this Bill.

An HON. MEMBER: That has been explained.

Mr. RICHARDSON: We had before us three hon. Members of the House who represented Labour. We had many representatives of the Churches. I only want to make a remark or two on the views held by the Members of the Labour party, and on some of the views held by some of the ministers representing the Free Churches of this country. Of the three Labour Members there was not a single one but what stated before that Committee that they were entirely and thoroughly opposed to any kind of gambling, not because they had any long-faced motives or prejudices in relation to gaming, but because the introduction and passage through this House of the gaming principle would lead to disastrous results among their own people, whom it would encourage in this direction. I remember very well the hon. Member for Derby stating that he addressed meetings of his own men every Sunday. Very often he was approached in matters of investment. He was quite certain that if any Bill were passed in this House having in it the element of gambling he would be crowded with questions asking where, in connection with these gambling projects, he thought the working classes of this country should invest their money. It was the ultimate results the Members of the Labour party were afraid of. It was a statement made by one of the representatives of one of the Methodist bodies that impressed me, and I think also the members of that Committee with the seriousness of the step we should have taken had we recommended the endorsement of Premium Bonds. The minister I refer to represented a denomination of Methodists numbering between 20,000 or 30,000, with schools for about 500,000. Questions were put to the representatives of this Methodist body in relation to what would be the attitude that denomination would take presuming the Bill for Premium Bonds was passed. One question put was, "Had you not some passive resistance movement in connection with your denomination in regard to the passing of the Education Bill?" and his answer was, "Yes." Then this question was put, "Presuming that Premium Bonds were passed, do you think in spite of the fact

that under the Defence of the Realm Act you would be running great risks, your minister would denounce Premium Bonds even after the Bill was passed and even presuming he might be sent to prison?" He replied, "I have not the slightest doubt that from every pulpit Premium Bonds would be denounced even though it meant imprisonment."

I put that to the Leader of the House in connection with this Bill. I see the Prime Minister sent round a message last night asking the country to "hold fast." I am certain as far as this Bill is concerned it will not assist this particular denomination to "hold fast" in connection with the War, but it will rather loosen the moral fibre of this denomination and the country as well. I appeal to the Leader of the House on the grounds advanced by many hon. Members, but more so on the practical ground that you are going to cause dissension and division of opinion and feeling in the country that will not help the Government, and if it were possible to lose the War—and I do not think it is whatever blunders the Government may make—the passing of this Bill is one of the things that would help in that direction.

Mr. BONAR LAW: The Government have already announced that it is proposed to leave this measure to the free judgment of the House, and I have only risen to justify, if I can, the action of the Government in taking the decision to leave it to the House. It will be a perfectly free vote, and I feel certain that some Members of the Government will vote one way and some the other. I want to say in reply to the suggestion made by the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Taylor) that there was nothing unfair to those opposed to this measure in the course which has been adopted, and he is entirely mistaken on that point. The very day on which the Government came to the decision that they would leave this matter to the House was the day upon which it was announced in the House, and it was not known before. I think it is probable that the smallness of the House tells rather in favour of those who are opposed to the Bill rather than in favour of those who support it. In any case of this kind those who support the measure do not do it with any strong or passionate feeling. Those opposed to this Bill have spoken with feeling, and I am informed that a great many of them have come back for the

purpose of voting against this Bill, and I do not think that is the case with any of those who are supporting it. Therefore, on that ground, there can be no complaint made against the Government.

Mr. TAYLOR: I only want to inform the right hon. Gentleman that I was not alluding to the decision which he announced last Friday, but to the fact of the Bill being brought in so late in the Session without any notice, and presumably the promoters alone knew it was coming on.

Mr. BONAR LAW: The promoters of the Bill could not have known that the Government were going to give time for this measure. My belief is that if we had a fuller House there would be a larger number in favour of this Bill. Therefore I think we can safely assume that the decision of the House, whatever it is, will be fairly representative of the views of the House of Commons as a whole. As regards proceeding with this measure, it is not as if it were an easy thing to leave it alone. The hon. Member who spoke last said that when he came into this House he thought he would always be able to give his vote with perfect confidence that it was being given for right against wrong. I would point out to the hon. Member that that is not easy in the House of Commons. Indeed, I think it was Carlyle who said that the real difficulty is not to distinguish clearly between right and wrong, but deciding between right and right, and very often that is the difficulty. When the Government had to decide whether we would give time for this discussion we were in this position: that the law, as it existed, has not been enforced, and is not being enforced, because public opinion is against it at this moment in the localities where this kind of thing is going on. [HON. MEMBERS: "No!"] That is true, and I can assure hon. Members that that is so, and that is the reason why this Bill was brought in. The Home Secretary has already explained that this kind of thing in one shape or another is going on all over the country for war charities.

Mr. CHANCELLOR: Is that not because there are no prosecutions?

Mr. BONAR LAW: No; it is quite the reverse. In some places they are not permitted because people in the locality have pointed out what the law is, and they have insisted upon prosecutions. It

[Mr. Bonar Law.]

is the fact that things of this kind which are entirely illegal have been going on under the auspices of some of the largest local authorities in the Kingdom and under the auspices of some of the religious denominations, and my right hon. Friend has found the position absolutely intolerable. He finds himself in this position, that either the law must for the time being be changed, and the position regularised, or he must raise prosecutions which would irritate public opinion in the localities where these things are going on, and he would run the risk of finding public opinion against such a course.

Mr. HEMMERDE: Was it not with the right hon. Gentleman's authority that Lord Lansdowne introduced this Bill?

Mr. BONAR LAW: My right hon. Friend (Lord Lansdowne) was bound to come to the Government, and that was the proper course in view of the fact that this Bill had to be introduced. The position has now been changed by the fact that it has been introduced and the House of Commons has to take a decision one way or the other. My hon. Friend opposite made a speech, which I felt strongly, against this proposal. He said that if a thing is wrong the object for which you are doing it does not justify you in committing that wrong. That is perfectly true, but can any hon. Member describe anything in connection with this proposal which in itself is wrong? [HON. MEMBERS: "Certainly!"] I venture to say that the great and overwhelming majority of the people will not take the view that this thing of itself is of necessity wrong, but it is the abuse of this thing which is wrong. Surely that is admitted! It is really not so simple a proposition as my hon. Friend who introduced the opposition (Mr. Taylor) seemed to imagine. He said that whenever anyone gets something for nothing it is wrong and ought to be put down. He is in business and I was in business, and there is hardly any business in which there is not an element, I will not say of gambling, but of chance where you may get something without working for it. Therefore, it is not the kind of action that the ordinary common-sense man would stigmatise as of necessity a vice, but it is a matter with regard to which, if it is not done in excess, there may be a considerable difference of opinion among different kinds of people.

What else could the Government have done? We were urged, on the one hand, to give the opportunity because of the effect on charity. The House would desire to encourage and increase charities for this reason, and I cannot help thinking that the idea that, by doing this, you are really opening the floodgates of gambling, is greatly exaggerated. I am inclined to think, if it is confined, as the Bill proposes to confine it, to the period of the War, to objects connected with the War, and to charities which have been in existence for six months, that the fear of the encouragement which it will give to indiscriminate gambling is greatly exaggerated. I am not very clear in my own mind about it—I say that quite frankly—but we have all got to vote one way or the other, and I am going to vote in favour of this measure. It was not to say that that I have risen, but it was to try to convince the House of Commons that the course which we have taken is, in the circumstances, not unreasonable, and that we propose to deal with the matter fairly. Surely it is a case, however strong the feelings of individual Members may be, in which the free judgment of the House of Commons ought to have play, and that is what we are proposing! If the majority of the House of Commons takes the view of those who think that this is all wrong, that is the end of it. I go further, and say that I do not think that a bare majority, especially at this stage of the Session, ought to settle it against those who are opposed to it, but I do think that we can take the decision to-night for the reasons I have given as not unfair to those who are opposed to the measure, and, if the Division shows in a clear and unmistakable way that the feeling of the House of Commons is in favour of removing these restrictions, then surely the Government were right to give the House an opportunity of expressing its opinion. I can understand the feeling of hostility to it, but I think it is fair that the House of Commons should have a chance of deciding the matter. The arrangement that I propose, admitting that we have a right to a difference of opinion at all, must seem fair to the House of Commons. If the House is given a fair opportunity of expressing its views, then, should we find that the feeling of the House is unmistakably in favour of this restriction being

withdrawn for the time being, and in this limited way, I would appeal to those who are opposed to it to accept the decision of the House and to allow the matter to go through now. I think that is not unreasonable, and I hope that I have justified the course which the Government have taken.

Mr. HOLT: I find the decision of the right hon. Gentleman to leave this measure to the decision of the House impossible to reconcile with the view which he expressed about the Bill for admitting women to the profession of a solicitor. When it was urged upon him that that Bill should be submitted to the decision of the House, he told us that he could not have anything to do with controversial measures, and that no controversial measures were to be brought before the House at this time of the Session unless introduced by the Government itself. Whatever the merits or demerits of this measure may be, it is certainly extremely controversial. It arouses controversy in one of the most unpleasant forms in which it can be aroused in matters connected with religion. Some of us believe that the whole system of gambling is absolutely wrong. I am sorry that the hon. Member for Ormskirk (Sir Arthur Stanley) thought it necessary to make a farewell speech. I am sorry that he is not staying with us. I agree with the hon. Member for Derby, who spoke in the warmest possible terms of our great appreciation of the service which that hon. Member has rendered to the Red Cross and other charitable societies. He told us that all Members of this House, in their relations with their constituencies have taken part in raffles. I certainly should not allow any raffling in connection with any charity in which I was interested, and I should not allow any religious body of which I was a member to hold a raffle. I am quite aware that a lot of religious bodies have bazaars in connection with their churches and hold these raffles, but it is absolutely wrong. With regard to what the right hon. Gentleman said about prosecutions, I submit that it is not for the Government to abstain from instituting prosecutions in matters where the law has been disobeyed because they think it would be unpopular locally. I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that the Home Secretary found that the law was being evaded by persons in very high positions and he had hesitated to institute a prosecution.

Mr. BONAR LAW: No, I did not say that. What I said was quite different. I said that prosecutions in some localities would be against public opinion and would make a very difficult situation.

Mr. HOLT: Certainly it is a very new idea that the law cannot be enforced because in certain districts popular opinion is against the institution of prosecutions. I should be very much surprised if we find later on that in other matters the Home Secretary takes the same view. The hon. Member for Ormskirk referred to the great sacrifices which many of these ladies have made in bringing their pearls, but I do not envy the man who pays a small sum for a ticket in a lottery and takes the pearls from the ladies who have made such sacrifices. I cannot imagine that there is any person who would not be ashamed to see his friends wearing a pearl necklace which he had bought for £1 while— [Interruption.] I object altogether to the doctrine that because a thing is desirable for the purposes of the War therefore you can justify something which is wrong in itself. That is the same old plea the Germans advanced for going into Belgium. A thing is either right or wrong. Gambling is either a vice or not a vice. If gambling is not a vice, there is not the slightest reason why there should be any prohibition of lotteries. If, on the other hand, as many of us believe, gambling is a very serious evil, there can be no reason why a lottery, which is gambling, should be admitted for war purposes. I hope that the House will refuse to allow a very serious innovation of what many of us believe to be an important principle of public life, namely, that there shall be no lotteries or public gambling sanctioned by law, therefore I hope the House will refuse to allow an evasion of the law to take place, even for such a good purpose as the Red Cross.

Sir J. HARMOOD-BANNER rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the House is ready to come to a decision upon the Question.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided: Ayes, 77; Noes, 81.

Division No. 80.]

Agg-Gardner, Sir James Tynte
Amery, L. C. M. S.
Baird, John Lawrence
Baker, Maj. Sir R. L. (Dorset, N.)
Baldwin, Stanley
Barlow, Sir Montague (Salford, S.)
Barnett, Capt. Richard W.
Barnston, Major Harry
Bathurst, Capt. Sir C. (Wilts)
Beck, Arthur Cecil
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Benn, Sir Arthur S. (Plymouth)
Boles, Lt.-Col. Fortescue
Boscawen, Sir Arthur Griffith-
Bridgeman, William Clive
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cator, John
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cave, Rt. Hon. Sir George
Coates, Major Sir Edward F.
Craig, Col. Sir James (Down, E.)
Craik, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Du Cros, Sir Arthur Philip
Falle, Sir Bertram Godfray
Fell, Sir Arthur
Fletcher, John S.

AYES.

Foster, Philip Staveley
Gibbs, Col. George Abraham
Gilmour, Lt.-Col. John
Greenwood, Sir G. G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Sir Hamar (Sunderland)
Hall, Lt.-Col. Sir Fred (Dulwich)
Hamilton, C. G. C. (Aittrincham)
Harmood-Banner, Sir J. S.
Henry, Denis S. (Londonderry, S.)
Hills, John Waller (Durham)
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hope, Lt.-Col. Sir J. (Midlothian)
Horne, Edgar
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hughes, Spencer Leigh
Jackson, Lt.-Col. Hon. F. S. (York)
Kinloch-Cooke, Sir Clement
Law, Rt. Hon. A. Bonar (Bootle)
Layland-Barratt, Sir F.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd, George Butler (Shrewsbury)
Locker-Lampson, G. (Salisbury)
McCalmont, Brig.-Gen. Robert C. A.
M'Kean, John
McNeill, Ronald (Kent, St. Augustine's)
Malcolm, Ian
Mount, William Arthur

[9.59 p.m.]

Neville, Reginald J. N.
Newman, Sir Robert (Exeter)
Nicholson, Sir Chas. N. (Doncaster)
Orde-Powlett, Hon. W. G. A.
Pennefather, De Fonblanque
Perkins, Walter Frank
Pullej, C. T.
Rees, Sir J. D.
Roberts, Rt. Hon. Geo. H. (Norwich)
Samuel, Samuel (Wandsworth)
Sanders, Col. Robert Arthur
Seely, Lt.-Col. Sir Charles (Mansfield)
Stanley, Capt. Sir Beville
Stanley, Hon. Sir A. (Ormskirk)
Staveley-Hill, Lt.-Col. Henry
Stewart, Gershom
Talbot, Rt. Hon. Lord Edmund
Troy, Capt. George Clement
Walker, Col. W. H.
Weston, John W.
Whiteley, Sir H. J. (Droitwich)
Wilson, Col. Leslie (Reading)
Wilson-Fox, Henry (Tamworth)
Yate, Col. Charles Edward

TELLERS FOR THE AYES:—Mr.
Evelyn Cecil and Mr. Roch.

NOES.

Alden, Percy
Anderson, William C.
Banbury, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick
Cecil, Rt. Hon. Lord H. (Oxford U.)
Chancellor, Henry George
Clynes, Rt. Hon. John R.
Collins, Sir Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir William (Derby)
Compton-Rickett, Rt. Hon. Sir J.
Cotton, H. E. A.
Denman, Hon. Richard Douglas
Dougherty, Rt. Hon. Sir James B.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Essex, Sir Richard Walter
Ferens, Rt. Hon. Thomas Robinson
Gelder, Sir William Alfred
Gilbert, James Daniel
Goddard, Rt. Hon. Sir Daniel Ford
Goldstone, Frank
Gulland, Rt. Hon. John William
Harris, Percy A. (Leicester, South)
Harvey, T. E. (Leeds, West)
Haslam, Lewis
Hill, Sir James (Bradford, C.)
Hobhouse, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles E. H.
Hogge, J. M.
Holmes, D. T.
Holt, Richard Durning

Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Rt. Hon. Albert H.
Jacobsen, Thomas Owen
Jones, Sir Edgar R. (Merthyr Tydvil)
Jones, J. Towyn (Carmarthen, E.)
Jones, Rt. Hon. Leif (Rushcliffe)
Jowett, Frederick William
Kellaway, Frederick George
Kenyon, Barnet
King, Joseph
Lambert, Richard (Cricklade)
Lewis, Rt. Hon. John Herbert
M'Callum, Sir John M.
Maden, Sir John Henry
Marshall, Arthur Harold
Martin, Joseph
Mason, David M. (Coventry)
Middlebrook, Sir William
Morgan, George Hay
Outhwaite, R. L.
Parkes, Sir Edward
Parrott, Sir Edward
Pease, Rt. Hon. Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Major Hon. G. (Spalding)
Pollock, Sir Ernest Murray
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Pryce-Jones, Col. Sir E.

Raffan, Peter Wilson
Richardson, Arthur (Rotherham)
Richardson, Thomas (Whitehaven)
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Rt. Hon. J. M.
Robinson, Sidney
Rowlands, James
Rowntree, Arnold
Samuel, Rt. Hon. H. L. (Cleveland)
Short, Edward
Smallwood, Edward
Somervell, William Henry
Spicer, Rt. Hon. Sir Albert
Sutton, John E.
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tootill, Robert
Walsh, Stephen (Lancashire, Ince)
White, James Dundas (Tradeston)
Whittaker, Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas P.
Whyte, Alexander F. (Perth)
Williams, Aneurin (Durham)
Wilson, Rt. Hon. J. W. (Worcs., N.)
Winfrey, Sir R.
Wing, Thomas Edward
Wood, Rt. Hon. T. McKinnon (Glasgow)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr.
Theodore Taylor and Sir J. Spear.

Words added.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Second Reading put off for three months.

BRITISH NATIONALITY AND STATUS OF ALIENS BILL.

Lords Amendments considered.

CLAUSE 1.—(*Substitution of Provisions for Section 7 of the Principal Act.*)

The following Sections shall be substituted for Section seven of the British Nationality and

Status of Aliens Act, 1914 (hereinafter referred to as "the principal Act"), which relates to the revocation of certificates of naturalisation:—

"7.—(*Revocation of Certificates of Naturalisation.*)

(1) Where it appears to the Secretary of State that a certificate of naturalisation granted by him has been obtained by false representations or fraud, or by concealment of material circumstances, the Secretary of State may by Order revoke the certificate, and may, if he thinks fit, before so doing refer the case for such inquiry as is hereinafter specified.

(2) Where a certificate of naturalisation has been granted during the present War to a person who at, or at any time before, the grant of the certificate was the subject of a country which at the date of the grant was at war with His

Majesty, the Secretary of State shall refer for such inquiry as is hereinafter specified the question whether it is desirable that the certificate should be revoked, and if such question shall be answered in the affirmative shall revoke the certificate, but this provision shall not apply to a person who at birth was a British subject.

(3) Without prejudice to the foregoing provisions the Secretary of State may by Order revoke a certificate of naturalisation granted by him in any case in which he is satisfied that the person to whom the certificate was granted either—

- (a) has shown himself by act or speech to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty; or
- (b) has during any war in which His Majesty is engaged unlawfully traded or communicated with the enemy or with the subject of an enemy State, or been engaged in or knowingly associated with any business carried on in such manner as to assist the enemy in such war; or
- (c) has within five years of the date of the grant of the certificate been sentenced by any Court in His Majesty's Dominions to imprisonment for a term of not less than twelve months or to a term of penal servitude; or
- (d) was not of good character at the date of the grant of the certificate; or
- (f) remains a subject of a State at war with His Majesty that does not regard naturalisation within the British Empire as extinguishing his original national status;

and that (in any case) the continuance of the certificate is not conducive to the public good, but the Secretary of State may, if he thinks fit, before making such Order refer the case for such inquiry as is hereinafter specified, and in any case to which Sub-section (1) or paragraph (a), (b), (d), or (f) of this Sub-section applies, the Secretary of State shall, by notice given to or sent to the last-known address of the holder of the certificate, give him an opportunity of claiming that the case be referred for such inquiry, and if the holder so claims in accordance with the notice the Secretary of State shall refer the case for inquiry accordingly.

(6) Where the Secretary of State revokes a certificate of naturalisation, the revocation shall have effect from such date as the Secretary of State may direct, and the Secretary of State may Order the certificate to be given up and cancelled, and any person refusing or neglecting to give up his certificate shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding one hundred pounds."

"7A.—(*Effect of Revocation of Certificates.*)

(1) Where a certificates of naturalisation is revoked the Secretary of State may by Order direct that the wife and minor children (or any of them) of the persons whose certificates is revoked shall cease to be British subjects, and any such person shall thereupon become an alien; but except where the Secretary of State directs as aforesaid, the nationality of the wife and minor children of the person whose certificate is revoked shall not be affected by the revocation, and they shall remain British subjects:

Provided also that the Secretary of State shall not make any such Order as aforesaid in the

case of a wife who is a natural-born British subject unless he is satisfied that if she had held a certificate of naturalisation in her own right the certificate could properly have been revoked under this Act, and the provisions of this Act as to referring cases for inquiry shall apply to the making of any such Order as they apply to the revocation of a certificate"

Lords Amendment:

Leave out Sub-sections (1) and (2), and insert the words,

"(1) Where the Secretary of State is satisfied that a certificate of naturalisation granted by him has been obtained by false representations or fraud, or by concealment of material circumstances or that a person to whom a certificate of naturalisation has been granted, has shown himself by act or speech to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty the Secretary of State shall by Order revoke the certificate, and."

Sir G. CAVE: I beg to move, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

I think it would be a convenience to the House if I refer briefly to the whole of the Amendments. All the Amendments on the Paper are drafting Amendments proposed by the Government in another place, with three exceptions. The three Amendments are these: There is, first, the Amendment which substitutes "shall" for "may." That, as I shall show in a moment, has really no effect. Secondly, there is the Amendment which provides that if a naturalised alien is fined £100 his case may be submitted to the Committee for denaturalisation—a very reasonable Amendment, which the Government accept at once. Thirdly, there is the Amendment which provides that no enemy alitn shall be naturalised for ten years after the War instead of five years. That shall be decided by the House. I hope I may make this observation: It is rather interesting to me that the Amendments adopted in another place should be so few and of so little importance. Upon the Debate on the Second Reading of the Bill in another place speeches were made which were not only vehement but violent, and threats were made that the Bill would be radically amended. It is obvious that when the Lords came to consider the matter in detail they found that, as I thought, the Bill was a good and a strong Bill, and did not require amendment in any substantial way. This Amendment raises, among other questions, the question of "shall" and "may."

May I just put that point to the House? I have heard the question of

[Sir G. Cave.]
 "shall" or "may" debated many times in this House. On every occasion that a Bill proposes that a Minister "may" take a certain course, the Opposition nearly always propose that he "shall" take the course, and on every occasion the Government has defended the word "may," and this House, at all events, has entertained that view. The view of our House, I think, is this: It is that when you put into the hands of the Minister power and authority you must trust him in a proper case to use it. If he does not use it in a proper case, this House will call him to account. It has never been our practice to say a Minister "shall" do a thing; it has been our rule, not only as a matter of drafting but of Parliamentary practice, to give him the power to do it, and hold him responsible if he does not use his power. Therefore, I think "may" is the proper word in this case. I think it is, in the case of this Bill, especially vital to put the word "may" instead of the word "shall," because see what this Clause provides: it provides that if a Secretary of State is satisfied that a certificate of naturalisation has been obtained by fraud or is satisfied that a naturalised alien is disloyal, or something of that kind, then he may revoke the certificate. Just consider the only case in which the difference between "shall" and "may" would be proper. You must assume that the Minister has charged a naturalised alien with fraud. He would probably have brought the matter before a Committee. He will make his case to it, and he will then have the finding of the Committee in favour of that view, and pronounce himself as satisfied that fraud has taken place or that the man is disloyal.

Then it is suggested that that same Minister would say, "I have gone through this process for nothing; having made good my contention that you are guilty of fraud, and having put you to the trouble of defending yourself and having defeated you, I now say I will take no action and will not revoke the certificate." It is only when a Minister says that that the difference between the word "shall" and the word "may" is at all important. As a matter of justice to myself, I ought to say that no one has said in this House that I would be such a fool as to take that course. It has been said that perhaps succeeding Ministers may take that view. Well, I have a better

opinion of my successor, and I think that any Minister in practice not "shall" but "must" revoke a certificate under these circumstances. I am certain that the Minister, having taken the steps I have described, would have no other course open to him except to revoke it, and it is for that reason that I defended the word "may" here, as I still do. Perhaps the House will see from what I have said that to change the phrase will have in practice no effect at all, as I feel certain that whether you put "shall" or "may," this process having been gone through, the Minister would do it. It would be beneath the dignity of this House to enter into a contest with the other House in a matter which, in practice, was irrelevant, and, therefore, I think the House may fairly accept the decision and agree with the Lords Amendment.

Mr. HEMMERDE: I want to ask the Home Secretary whether it is his view that "shall" in the next Clause is the same? I noticed that in another place, after "shall" had been put in the first Clause the Government accepted "shall" in the second as though the position was exactly the same. If that is the case, I should like to argue the matter of "shall" and "may" now, because if you are going to commit yourselves at all in the next Clause I should not like it to be altered now. The Home Secretary has stated that the ordinary practice of this House—it has been so for years—is in these cases to give Ministers a discretion. I do not understand why it is beneath our dignity to follow out the ordinary practice of the House. Apparently, the reason is that the Members of the other House made vehement and even violent speeches, attacked the Bill in every conceivable way, and then practically did nothing. If, after all, we find that the House of Lords did nothing in particular, and did it very well in this case, I do not see why we should not have "may" and in the next Clause it is very important to have "may" and to preserve that distinction. I urge upon the Home Secretary that we do not accept this Amendment, but insist on leaving it to the discretion of Ministers, as has been the invariable custom of this House.

Sir R. ADKINS: Without echoing the lively criticism of the other House which my hon. and learned Friend has made, I regret that the usual practice of putting

in the word "may," particularly in a Clause of this kind, should not be adhered to. I have absolute confidence in the Home Secretary, and I think the substitution of "shall," while of very little, if any, effective value, tends to weaken and not strengthen the responsibility of the Home Secretary, and I think that responsibility ought not to be weakened in time of war and ought not to be weakened in connection with a subject of this kind. I regret that the Government is not adhering to its original intention. I would not willingly be a party to anything that reflected on the right hon. Gentleman, or even on his successors, because I believe the more responsibility is placed on the Home Office under these conditions the better and I am very loth to weaken the responsibility of the executive in a matter of this kind.

Mr. H. SAMUEL: The Home Secretary, having shown quite conclusively that the House of Lords is wrong, advises us that it is right to accept it. I suppose, in the circumstances, that is so, but I hope this will not be drawn into a precedent in future.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendment:

In Sub-section (3), leave out the word "may," and insert instead thereof the word "shall."

Sir G. CAVE: I beg to move, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

What I said applies to this Amendment because in this case the Secretary of State must be satisfied, not only that the offence in question has been committed, but that it is conducive to public good that the certificate should be revoked. I cannot conceive that a Secretary of State so satisfied could fail to revoke the certificate. He would be stultifying himself if he did so. Therefore, in this case, it makes no difference whatever in practice, and I think perhaps the better course would be to accept the Amendment.

Mr. HEMMERDE: I only raised the point on this Clause because I wanted to get it quite clearly from the Home Secretary that in his opinion the Lords words really govern the case, because if it was not so, and they did not really give him discretion, it is quite clear that

the matters which were discussed in the House of Lords and rejected by them, for instance, taking away the Privy Councillorship of Sir Ernest Cassel and people like that, is clearly covered under (e). I only wanted it to be clear that these Amendments really give him a discretion in the matter.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendments:

Leave out the words "(a) has shown himself by act or speech to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty, or."—Agreed to.

In paragraph (b), leave out the word "knowingly" ["knowingly associated"] and after the word "business" ["with any business"], insert the words "with his knowledge."—Agreed to.

In paragraph (c), after the word "servitude" ["penal servitude"], insert the words "or to a fine of not less than £100."—Agreed to.

In paragraph (f), leave out the words "a subject of a State at war with His Majesty that does not regard naturalisation within the British Empire as extinguishing his original national status," and insert instead thereof the words "according to the law of a State at war with His Majesty, a subject of that State."—Agreed to.

Leave out the words "but the" ["but the Secretary of State"], and insert instead thereof the word "the."—Agreed to.

Leave out the words "such order" ["making such order"], and insert instead thereof the words "an order under this Section."—Agreed to.

Leave out the words "this Sub-section" ["of this Sub-section"], and insert instead thereof the words "Sub-section (2) of this Section."—Agreed to.

In Sub-section (6) leave out the words "the Secretary of State may order the certificate to," and insert instead thereof the words "thereupon the certificate shall."—Agreed to.

In substituted Clause 7 (a), Sub-section (1), leave out the words "is a natural-born," and insert instead thereof the words "was at birth a."—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 2.—(*Minor Amendments to the Principal Act.*)

The following Amendments shall be made in the principal Act:

(1) In paragraph (b) of Sub-section (1) of Section one (which defines natural-born British subjects) after the words "had been granted" there shall be inserted the words "or had become a British subject by reason of any annexation of territory, or was at the time of that person's birth in the service of the Crown"; and at the end of that Section the following Sub-section shall be inserted:

"(4) The certificate of a Secretary of State that a person was at any date in the service of the Crown shall, for the purposes of this Section, be conclusive."

(4) In Section ten (which relates to the national status of married women) at the end of the Section there shall be added the words "and provided that where an alien is a subject of an enemy State it shall be lawful for his wife if she was at birth a British subject to make a declaration that she desires to resume British nationality, and thereupon the Secretary of State, if he is satisfied that it is advisable that she be permitted to do so, may grant her a certificate of naturalisation."

Lords Amendments:

After Sub-section (2), insert as a new Sub-section:

(3) In Sub-section (2) of Section five "whether or not" shall be substituted for "although" and "not" shall be omitted, and in Sub-section (3) of Section five "Act" shall be substituted for "Section."

—Agreed to.

In Sub-section (4), leave out the words "an enemy state," and insert instead thereof the words "a State at war with His Majesty."—Agreed to.

Leave out the word "advisable," and insert instead thereof the word "desirable."—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 3.—(Provisions as to Naturalisation Certificates.)

No certificate of naturalisation shall, for a period of five years after the termination of the present War, be granted to any subject of a country which at the time of the passing of this Act was at war with His Majesty, but this provision shall not apply to a person who—

- (a) has served in His Majesty's Forces or in the forces of any of His Majesty's Allies; or
- (b) is a member of a race or community known to be opposed to the enemy governments; or
- (c) was at birth a British subject.

Lords Amendment:

Leave out the word "for" ["shall, for a period"], and insert instead thereof the words "before the expiration of."—Agreed to.

Leave out the word "five" ["period of five years"], and insert instead thereof the word "ten."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—[*Sir G. Cave.*]

Sir H. DALZIEL: I understand that it is the intention to appoint a committee to operate under the powers of this Bill. That will be separate from the Advisory Committee, and also apart from the committee appointed to deal with aliens in Government Departments. I do not know whether it would be convenient for the right hon. Gentleman to tell us how soon he hopes to be able to announce this committee, and, if possible, the character of the committee.

Sir G. CAVE: I hope to be able to do so within a few days. I am now considering it. I cannot say more than that.

Sir H. DALZIEL: Will they proceed to business at once?

Sir G. CAVE: Yes.

Mr. HEMMERDE: I want to know something about this Clause which has been transplanted from the first Clause. In the third Sub-section there is a provision which says that

"The Secretary of State may, if he thinks fit, before making such Order, refer the case for such inquiry as is hereinafter specified, and in any case to which Sub-section (1) or paragraphs (a), (b), (d) or (f) of this Sub-section applies, the Secretary of State shall, by notice given to or sent to the last known address of the holder of the certificate give him an opportunity of claiming that the case be referred for such inquiry."

Now that we have transplanted this Clause, how are you going to deal with the case of a naturalised alien coming under Clause 3? How is he or she going to be made aware that his or her case is going to be considered? The Clause does not make any provision for that at all. The case which I have in mind is that of a person who has been made a British citizen, and who is abroad at the present time. I raised the question on the Second Reading of the Bill, because I did not think that it is provided for. Now that it is transplanted to another place in the Bill it is even less provided for. I want some assurance that nobody's case will be considered until he is affected by the notice. It is not sufficient to leave notice at the last known address of a person who has been abroad a couple of years, perhaps nursing at the front.

Sir G. CAVE: I am quite sure that no Committee of the character in question here will inquire into a case without such notice as can be given being given. Of course, if the person is out of reach it cannot be helped.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendments: Leave out the word "for" ("for a period"), and insert instead thereof the words "before the expiration of."—Agreed to.

Leave out the word "five" ("five years"), and insert instead thereof the word "ten."

Sir G. CAVE: I beg to move, "That the House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

Sir G. CAVE: This is a matter of substance. The House will remember that the Home Office adopted the practice, before this Bill was introduced, that no enemy alien should be naturalised for five years after the War. When the Bill was in Committee in this House an Amendment was made making that statutory. The period proposed was five years. I accepted the Amendment. In another place the proposal was made that the period should be fifteen years. After some discussion a period of ten years was agreed to. No logical argument can be brought forward either for five or ten years. I thought myself that five years was a reasonable time. When the matter was discussed the other day at the Imperial Conference there was considerable difference of opinion. Canada and South Africa expressed unwillingness to limit their powers to any period whatever, while the other Dominions, Australia and New Zealand, took the other view. So I am afraid that in this matter there must sometimes be divergence of practice between the Mother Country and some of the Dominions. As between five and ten years there is very little to be said. Each part of the Empire can judge for itself. I move that we agree with the Lords Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendments: After the word "granted" insert the words "in the United Kingdom."—Agreed to.

After the word "Allies" insert the words "or of any country acting in naval or military co-operation with His Majesty."—Agreed to.

EDUCATION BILL.

Order read for consideration of Lords Amendments.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Herbert Fisher): I beg to move, "That the Lords Amendments be now considered."

I think probably it will be for the convenience of the House that I should make a brief statement at the outset of the course which the Government propose to pursue with respect to the Lords Amendments. We propose to recommend that the House do agree with the Amendments which have come down from another place. These Amendments fall into three classes. By far the greater number of the Amendments on the Paper are purely Amendments of drafting, or improvements in the form of the Bill, which do not affect the substance. Then there are other Amendments which do contain points of substance but points so small that I trust the House will accept those Amendments without much demur. In any case we are satisfied that no one of the Amendments belonging to this category is at variance with the general principle on which the Bill has been framed, or even at variance with the spirit and temper of the House on the problems affected. There are other matters which are not only Amendments of substance, but Amendments of some little importance. As the Bill left the Commons it contained no restriction on Sunday labour. In its present form it provides that no child under twelve shall be employed on Sundays, and that the child of twelve or upwards may not be employed on Sundays for more than two hours. Again, as the Bill left the House of Commons the employment of children before school hours was absolutely prohibited, except in the case of employment of the children by their parents, in which case one hour of employment before nine in the morning could be permitted by by-law, provided that the employment after school hours was limited to one hour. In the House of Lords an Amendment has been inserted providing that children over twelve may under by-law be employed for not more than one hour on school days before nine a.m., provided that they are not employed for more than one hour after school hours. It will be observed that these Amendments substantially restrict

[Mr. Fisher.]
 the total amount of employment which is possible in cases where the child is employed before school hours. If the Amendments which have come from another place had had the effect of enlarging or increasing the period of industrial employment for any children, the Government would have looked into them very carefully indeed, but the Lords Amendments have the opposite effect; they have the effect of amending the restriction upon the industrial employment of children. In these circumstances the Government believe that it will be the general wish of the House that these Amendments should be accepted as being in conformity with the general principle of the Bill. Accordingly I feel that we should accept all the Amendments which have come down from another place.

Mr. E. HARVEY: The right hon. Gentleman will perhaps be good enough to explain at this stage the new Clause proposed by the Lords with regard to medical treatment in schools, which was proposed and passed without debate in the other Chamber. I think it is regrettable that the powers of the local authorities should be absolutely used in the way the new Clause suggests. It appears to have been the result of some agreement with some representatives of the medical profession, about which apparently there was no statement in the other House. I think it would be useful to have the reasons given.

Mr. KING: I think everybody ought to congratulate the President of the Board of Education that he has a Bill brought down from the other place raising so many points, on some of which some of us, at any rate, had great fears that they might be interfered with in the other place, and that the Bill should come back so substantially the same as it was when we sent it there. I think we can heartily congratulate the President on what is really a very great triumph, not only for himself, but also for the House of Commons. I also think it is unsatisfactory that the right hon. Gentleman has not referred to this very serious alteration, which has been made in what might be called the doctors' safeguard in Clause 18. To my mind, it is the one bad alteration which the Lords have made, and I am quite surprised that the President did not just now allude to it. Perhaps he has been so carried away by his success generally

that he has ignored the fact that here, at any rate, he has had a palpable hit made against him. I hope he will be able to say that in this matter, at any rate, he does not propose to agree with the Lords.

Sir RYLAND ADKINS: I entirely agree with the congratulations which have been offered to my right hon. Friend, but I think the House of Lords ought to be included in the congratulations, because they have taken a great and complicated Bill and have certainly improved it in certain matters and have not impaired its efficiency in any way. In regard to the Amendment to Clause 6, which most happily explicates the truly voluntary character of the Clause, I want to ask my right hon. Friend to say if I am right in concluding that the voluntary character of the Clause includes all details of the scheme, so that the problems which arise with regard to members of these federations who are not existing members of local education authorities, and who are to be appointed by the members of the local education authorities after the nomination of those representing particular interests or otherwise would be a matter for voluntary arrangement under each particular scheme. I feel sure that that is so, but it would be valuable if it were put on record and if my right hon. Friend endorsed that view, as the matter is of some consequence in working out these schemes. I think the alterations in regard to the employment of children are all to the good. They extend the restriction to Sundays; they give greater flexibility without increase of time on other days, and I think they go further to preserve the proper balance between unharmed industrial occupation and the conservation of energy for doing school work.

Mr. T. WILSON: I would like to endorse the last remarks of the hon. Member who has just sat down. I think the Lords have made Amendments to the Bill which will make it work more smoothly. So far as I am concerned—and I think so far as the party with which I am connected is concerned—we welcome the Education Bill. We wish to see the children of this country made as intelligent and as useful as they can possibly be made by education, and I can only hope that the Bill, which will now, I take it, receive its blessing from this House, will be of immense benefit to the people of this country.

Question put and agreed to.

CLAUSE 2.—(*Development of Education in Public Elementary Schools.*)

(1) It shall be the duty of a local education authority for the purposes of Part III. of the Education Act, 1902, to make adequate and suitable provision in order that full benefit may be derived from the system of public elementary schools, and for that purpose, amongst other matters—

- (a) to make adequate and suitable provision by means of central schools, central or special classes, or otherwise—
- (b) to make adequate and suitable arrangements under the provisions of paragraph (b) of Sub-section (1) of Section thirteen of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act, 1907, for attending to the health and physical condition of children educated in public elementary schools; and
- (c) to make adequate and suitable arrangements for co-operating with local education authorities for the purposes of Part II. of the Education Act, 1902, in matters of common interest,

and any such authority from time to time may, and shall when required by the Board of Education, submit to the Board schemes for the purposes aforesaid.

Lords Amendments:

In Sub-section (1), leave out the words "for the purposes of," and insert instead thereof the words "so to exercise their powers under."—Agreed to.

Leave out the words "1902, to make adequate and suitable provision in order that full benefit may be derived from the system of public elementary schools, and for that purpose, amongst other matters," and insert instead thereof the words "as."—Agreed to.

In paragraph (a), after the word "make" ["to make adequate and suitable provision"], insert the words "or otherwise to secure."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—[*Mr. Fisher.*]

Mr. KING: These Amendments have taken away a great deal of the rhetoric which was in this Clause. I commented on this, and even tried to improve the rhetoric when we were in Committee. On that occasion the President of the Board of Education was so proud of his rhetoric that he would not listen to my Amendment, but I suppose he has learnt, as we all do, that rhetoric is not, after all, the whole of life. There is a great deal of attention effected by this Amendment, but what I object to is the omission of the

words "amongst other matters." I think that is rather unfortunate, because it restricts the wide scope of the Amendment. It is very difficult really to understand how far these Amendments will restrict the power in making schemes. I want to know whether the President has really considered that point, and whether he can assure us that the effect of this Amendment, taken together, is not unduly to interfere with the scope of the scheme.

Mr. FISHER: I would like to give my hon. Friend that assurance. It was never intended that the local education authorities under Part III. of the Act of 1902 should be compelled to exercise the functions which were not within their powers under that Act, and this is made explicit in the amended Clause.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords Amendments:

In paragraph (b), after the word "make" ["to make adequate and suitable arrangements"], insert the words "or otherwise to secure."—Agreed to.

In paragraph (c), after the word "make" ["to make adequate and suitable arrangements for"], insert the words "or otherwise to secure."—Agreed to.

Leave out the words "purposes aforesaid" ["schemes for the purposes aforesaid"] and insert instead thereof the words "exercise of their powers as an authority for the purposes of Part III. of the Education Act, 1902."—Agreed to.

Lords Amendments:

Leave out the words "(1) With a view to continuing the education of young persons and helping them to prepare for the freedom and responsibilities of adult life."—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 3.—(*Establishment of Continuation Schools.*)

(1) With a view to continuing the education of young persons and helping them to prepare for the freedom and responsibilities of adult life, it shall be the duty of the local education authority for the purposes of Part II. of the Education Act, 1902, either separately or in co-operation with other local education authorities, to establish and maintain or secure the establishment and maintenance under their control and direction of a sufficient supply of continuation schools in which suitable courses of study, instruction, and physical training are provided without payment of fees for all young persons resident in their area who are, under this Act, under an obligation to attend such schools.

(2) For the purposes aforesaid the local education authority from time to time may, and shall when required by the Board of Education, submit

to the Board schemes for the progressive organisation of a system of continuation schools and for the purpose of securing general and regular attendance thereat, and in preparing schemes under this Section the local education authority shall have regard to the desirability of including therein arrangements for co-operation with universities in the provision of lectures and classes for scholars for whom instruction by such means is suitable.

Lords Amendments:

Leave out the words,

"(1) With a view to continuing the education of young persons and helping them to prepare for the freedom and responsibilities of adult life."

—Agreed to.

In Sub-section (2), leave out the words "the purpose of" ["for the purpose of securing"].—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 4.—(*Preparation and Submission of Schemes.*)

(3) A council in preparing schemes under this Act shall have regard to any existing supply of efficient and suitable schools or colleges not provided by local education authorities, and to any proposals to provide such schools or colleges.

Lords Amendment:

Leave out the word "council" ["A council in preparing"], and insert instead thereof the words "local education authority."—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 5.—(*Approval of Schemes by Board of Education.*)

(3) If thereafter the Board of Education disapprove a scheme, they shall notify the authority, and, if within one month thereafter an agreement is not reached, they shall lay before Parliament the report of the public inquiry (if any) together with a report stating their reasons for such disapproval and any action which they intend to take in consequence thereof by way of withholding or reducing any Grants payable to the authority.

Lords Amendment:

Leave out the word "thereafter" ["If thereafter the Board of Education"], and insert instead thereof the words "after such modifications."—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 6.—(*Provisions as to Co-operation and Combination.*)

(1) For the purpose of performing any duty or exercising any power under the Education Acts, a council having powers under those Acts may enter into such arrangements as they think proper for co-operation or combination with any other council or councils having those powers, and any such arrangements may provide for the appointment of a joint committee or a joint body of managers, for the delegation to that committee or body of managers of any powers or duties of

the councils (other than the power of raising a rate or borrowing money), for the proportion of contributions to be paid by each council, and for any other matters which appear necessary for carrying out the arrangement.

(2) The Board of Education may, on the application of two or more councils having powers under the Education Acts, by scheme provide for the establishment and (if thought fit) the incorporation of a federation for such purposes or any such arrangements as aforesaid as may be specified in the scheme as being purposes relating to matters of common interest concerning education which it is necessary or convenient to consider in relation to areas larger than those of individual education authorities, and the powers conferred on councils by this Section shall include power to arrange for the performance of any educational or administrative functions by such a federation as if it were a joint committee or a joint body of managers.

Lords Amendment:

In Sub-section (1), leave out the word "those" ["having those powers"], and insert instead thereof the word "such."—Agreed to.

At the end of Sub-section (2), insert the words

"Provided that no council shall without its consent be included in a scheme establishing a federation; and no council shall be obliged to continue in a federation except in accordance with the provisions of a scheme to which it has consented."

Mr. FISHER: My hon. Friend asks me a question in connection with this Amendment, and I am very glad to be able to satisfy him. He asked me whether it would be competent for a council entering into a federation under the operation of this Clause to nominate a third of its members from persons suggested.

Sir R. ADKINS: To appoint?

Mr. FISHER: Yes; to appoint one-third of its members to be persons nominated by other bodies. I conceive that will be possible under the operation of this Clause.

Lords Amendment agreed to.

CLAUSE 8.—(*Provisions as to Compulsory Attendance at Elementary Schools.*)

(5) Notwithstanding anything in the Education Acts the Board of Education may, on the application of the local education authority, authorise the instruction of children in public elementary schools till the end of the school term in which they reach the age of sixteen or (in special circumstances) such later age as appears to the Board desirable:

Provided that, in considering such application, the Board shall have regard to the adequacy

and suitability of the arrangements made by the authority under Section two of this Act and to the effective development and organisation of all forms of education in the area.

Lords Amendments:

In Sub-section (5), after the word "under" ["by the authority under"], insert the words "paragraphs (a) and (c) of Sub-section (1) of."—Agreed to.

At end of Sub-section, insert the words "and to any representations made by the managers of schools."—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 9.—(*Provisions for Avoidance of Broken School Terms.*)

(3) For the purposes of this Section, a school term shall be deemed to be the term as fixed by the local education authority.

Lords Amendment:

Leave out Sub-section (3).—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 10.—(*Compulsory Attendance at Continuation Schools.*)

Lords drafting Amendment agreed to.

CLAUSE 11.—(*Enforcement of Attendance at Continuation Schools.*)

Lords drafting Amendment agreed to.

CLAUSE 13.—(*Amendment of 3 Edw. 7. c. 45. & 4 Edw. 7, c. 15.*)

(1) The Employment of Children Act, 1903, so far as it relates to England and Wales, shall be amended as follows:—

(i) For Sub-section (1) of Section three the following Sub-section shall be substituted:

A child under the age of twelve shall not be employed and a child of the age of twelve or upwards shall not be employed on any day on which he is required to attend school before the close of school hours on that day, nor on any day before six o'clock in the morning or after eight o'clock in the evening:

Provided that a local authority may make a by-law permitting, with respect to such occupations as may be specified, and subject to such conditions as may be necessary to safeguard the interests of the children, the employment of children by their parents, but so that any such employment on a school day before nine in the morning shall be limited to one hour, and that if a child is so employed before nine in the morning he shall not be employed for more than one hour in the afternoon.

Lords Amendments:

In Sub-section (1), paragraph (i), after the word "employed" ["shall not be employed"], insert the words, "on any Sunday for more than two hours or."—Agreed to.

After the word "children" ["the employment of children"], insert the words "of the age of twelve or upwards before school hours and the employment of children."—Agreed to.

Leave out the word "such" ["so that any such employment"].—Agreed to.

After the word "employment" ["any such employment"], insert the words "permitted by by-law."—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 15.—(*Further Restrictions on Employment of Children.*)

Lords drafting Amendment agreed to.

CLAUSE 18.—(*Medical Inspection of Schools and Educational Institutions.*)

Lords drafting Amendment agreed to.

Lords Amendment: Leave out the words

"Provided that the local education authority shall not establish a general domiciliary service of treatment by medical practitioners for children and young persons to whom this Section applies, and in making arrangements for their treatment the local education authority shall consider how far they can avail themselves of the services of private medical practitioners."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. KING: Here the privileges of the doctors as private practitioners are more exercised than we here intended. The two hon. Members who were specially interested in this question are not able to be here at this late hour, but they both feel that this Amendment is a serious inroad upon what was intended. Perhaps the President of the Board has some explanation to give?

Mr. FISHER: I think I can easily satisfy the House on this point. Originally there was a Clause in the Bill which provided for a school medical service, and one section provided for the treatment of young persons attending continuation classes. In deference to the view of the medical profession, words were inserted in the Clause providing that a domiciliary service should be established. After that Clause was passed in Committee, an Amendment was accepted on the Report stage which imposes upon Part III. authorities the obligation to provide medical treatment in public elementary schools. It was felt desirable that the same provision should apply to the medical treatment of children in elementary schools as applied, by common

[Mr. Fisher.]
consent of this House, to the medical treatment of any person attending continuation classes. The most convenient way to give effect to this purpose was to insert the new Clause.

Mr. ROWNTREE: Is the right hon. Gentleman quite satisfied about this? I gather from what he said that, at any rate, the last part of the Clause carries out the general custom of the Board at the present time. But supposing there was an actual shortage of medical assistance in a vicinity, and it was found that the children were actually suffering from lack of that medical assistance might prevent the Board really seeing that, even in the homes of the children, they were properly attended? Since this Amendment was accepted by the Government in the House of Lords correspondence has reached some of us from those interested, and I should like to be fully assured that my right hon. Friend is satisfied that the Government ought not to have gone further.

Mr. FISHER: The last words in the New Clause to follow should, I think, satisfy my hon. Friend. If he looks at them he will find that "a local education authority shall consider how far they can avail themselves of the services of private medical practitioners." It is for the local education authority to make the best arrangement it can.

Question put, and agreed to.

CLAUSE 20.—(*Education of Physically Defective and Epileptic Children.*)

The provisions of the Elementary Education (Defective and Epileptic Children) Act, 1914, relating to mentally defective children, shall be extended so as to apply to physically defective and epileptic children, and accordingly that Act shall have effect as if references therein to mentally defective children included references to physically defective and epileptic children.

Lords Amendments: At the beginning to insert the words:

"A local education authority shall make arrangements under the Elementary Education (Defective and Epileptic Children) Acts, 1899 to 1914, for ascertaining what children in their area are physically defective or epileptic within the meaning of those Acts, and."

—Agreed to.

Lords Amendment:

After Clause 24 insert new Clause A.:

NEW CLAUSE.—(*Provisions as to Medical Treatment.*)

A local education authority shall not in exercise of the powers conferred upon them by para-

graph (b) of Sub-section (1) of Section thirteen of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act, 1907, or by this Act, establish a general domiciliary service of treatment by medical practitioners for children or young persons, and in making arrangements for the treatment of children and young persons a local education authority shall consider how far they can avail themselves of the services of private medical practitioners.

—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 33.—(*Acquisition of Land by Local Education Authority.*)

(2) The powers given by this Section in relation to the compulsory purchase of land by the local education authority shall be in substitution for any other powers existing for that purpose.

Lords Amendment:

At the end of the Clause, insert the words,

"but without prejudice to any powers conferred by any Provisional Order confirmed by Parliament before the appointed day."

—Agreed to.

Lords drafting Amendment agreed to.

CLAUSE 35.—(*Amendment with Respect to the Allocation of Expenses to Particular Areas.*)

Lords Drafting Amendment agreed to.

CLAUSE 37.—(*Expenses of Education Meetings, Conferences, Etc.*)

Lords Drafting Amendment agreed to.

CLAUSE 39.—(*Public Inquiries by Board of Education.*)

(2) The following provisions shall (except as otherwise provided by the Education Acts) apply to any public inquiry held by the Board of Education:

(f) The Board may, where it appears to them reasonable that such an Order should be made, order the payment of the whole or any part of the costs of the inquiry either by the local education authority, if the inquiry appears to the Board to be incidental to the administration of that authority, or by the applicant for the inquiry, and may require the applicant for an inquiry to give security for the costs thereof.

Lords Amendments:

Leave out the word "the" ["the local education authority"], and insert instead thereof the word "any."—Agreed to.

Leave out the words "if inquiry appears to the Board to be incidental to the administration of that authority," and insert instead thereof the words "to whose administration the inquiry appears to the Board to be incidental."—Agreed to.

CLAUSE 41.—(Payments to the Central Welsh Board.)

Lords Drafting Amendment agreed to.

CLAUSE 47.—(Definitions.)

The expression "practical instruction" means instruction in cookery, laundrywork, housewifery, dairywork, handicrafts, and gardening, and such other subjects as the Board declare to be subjects of practical instruction.

Lords Amendment: After the word "instruction" ["of practical instruc-

tion"], insert the words ("The expression 'school term' means the term as fixed by the local education authority.")—Agreed to.

ASYLUMS OFFICERS (SUPER-ANNUATION).

Lords Amendments considered.

* * * * *

[For continuation of Proceedings, see Official Report, Wednesday, 7th August.]

Members wishing to have the daily Official Report forwarded to them should give notice to that effect at the Vote Office.

The Bound Volumes will—in addition—be sent to Members who similarly express their desire to have them.

No proofs of the Daily Reports are supplied. Any corrections which Members desire to suggest in the Report of their Speeches for the Bound Volume should be clearly marked in this Daily Report, and the Copy of the Report containing the corrections must be received by the Editor of the Official Report, at the Debates Room, House of Commons, not later than Saturday, 10th August, 1918.

Members may obtain excerpts of their Speeches from the Official Report (within one month from the date of publication), on application to the Controller of H.M. Stationery Office, Westminster, S.W. 1, from whom the terms and conditions of reprinting may be ascertained.

The House of Commons Official Report may 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;

37, Peter Street, Manchester; 1, St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff;

23, Forth Street, Edinburgh;

or from E. PONSONBY, Limited, 116, Grafton Street, Dublin.

Printed under the Authority of His Majesty's Stationery Office by Jas. Truscott and Son, Ltd., Suffolk Lane, Cannon Street, E.C. 4.