

## HOUSE OF LORDS

*Tuesday, 16th March, 1965*

The House met at half past two of the clock, The LORD CHANCELLOR on the Woolsack.

*Prayers—Read by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln*

The Earl of Woolton—Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

The Earl of Verulam—Took the Oath.

### THE LATE SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL: TRIBUTE FROM SENATE OF TEXAS

2.35 p.m.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (LORD GARDINER): My Lords, I have to inform the House that I have received from the President of the Senate of Texas copies of a Resolution issued by the Senate on January 25, 1965, in tribute to the memory of the late Sir Winston Churchill. I am placing these copies in the Library, and I propose, with your Lordships' permission, to express on your behalf the thanks of the House for the generous terms of this Resolution.

### RAILWAY DIESEL ENGINE FAILURES

2.36 p.m.

VISCOUNT MASSEREENE AND FERRARD: My Lords, I beg leave to ask the first Question which stands in my name on the Order Paper.

[The Question was as follows:

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether their attention has been drawn to the increasing frequency of diesel engine failures on British Railways; whether they are aware of the resulting inconvenience caused to travellers, and whether they will ensure that there is a sufficient steam reserve standing by at strategic points to engage in rescue operations.]

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT (LORD LINDGREN): My Lords, the Ques-

tion refers to matters which are entirely the responsibility of the British Railways Board.

VISCOUNT MASSEREENE AND FERRARD: My Lords, I can hardly thank the noble Lord for that short Answer. Is he aware that during the Christmas period there were 32 diesel engine failures on the Eastern Region main line? Diesel engine failures must affect following traffic. Will the noble Lord bring this to the notice of the British Railways Board? Further, I should like him to bring this to their notice: if we are not going to have all lines electrified in the future, would it not be wise to have fresh research into the oil firing of steam engines—in other words, to have modern steam traction?

LORD LINDGREN: My Lords, the Government, the public, and of course the British Railways Board are fully aware of the failure in operation of many and varied types of diesel engines. But I can only repeat that the types of locomotive to be purchased and their operation are entirely matters for the Board themselves. Reference has been made to the Eastern Region. These engines were bought from private enterprise. When they came into operation it was found that there were boiler failures, sometimes to the extent of 50 per cent., and therefore modifications of the engines, the bogies and axles have been required; in some engines as many as 300 modifications have had to take place. These modifications are being made by the manufacturers and the Railways Board in consultation one with the other. Implementation of the latter part of the noble Lord's Question, in which he suggests standby steam engines, would entail shed staff and the availability of coal and water, and the cost of the standby insurance would not be justified.

LORD ROBERTSON OF OAKRIDGE: My Lords, I wonder whether the Minister could confirm my impression that although certainly there have been a number of failures among some of these diesel locomotives, yet the incidence of failure among steam locomotives is nearly double that among diesel locomotives. Secondly, would he agree that, as we are selling quite a number of

these locomotives as exports, it is important not to exaggerate the incidence of failure there has been among some of them?

LORD LINDGREN: My Lords, of course, there were failures with steam engines. But, as the noble Lord knows, and as the House will appreciate, when a diesel fails it stops; when a steam engine fails, with an expert driver it can generally glide on to the nearest station and is not isolated in the middle of the countryside. I am certain that co-operation between the Railways Board and the manufacturers will produce a locomotive which will be a valuable export commodity.

#### SALE OF CRIMINALS' REMINISCENCES

2.40 p.m.

VISCOUNT MASSEREENE AND FERRARD: My Lords, I beg leave to ask the second Question which stands in my name on the Order Paper.

[The Question was as follows:

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether they will consider introducing legislation to make it illegal for a criminal to sell the story of his misdeeds to the Press, Radio or Television.]

THE PARLIAMENTARY UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE, HOME OFFICE (LORD STONHAM): My Lords, the Government fully recognise the undesirability of exploiting crime by this means. I understand that the Press Council are reviewing the subject and that they have obtained a good deal of information which is being closely studied. I think that we should await the result of this review before considering the matter further.

VISCOUNT MASSEREENE AND FERRARD: My Lords, I thank the noble Lord.

BARONESS HORSBRUGH: My Lords, will the Minister take into account, in a case where large sums are obtained for selling such stories, that that fact should be considered when the amount of legal aid is being assessed?

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, I think that that question scarcely arises from the original Question. The position is that the Home Secretary cannot prevent released prisoners from communicating with the Press; but he takes all possible steps—and successful steps—to prevent persons in prison from communicating with, or giving stories to, the Press. But it often happens that newspapers get their information from other sources, and all they need is the signature of the criminal. That, of course, is something that we cannot really prevent.

VISCOUNT DILHORNE: My Lords, is it not the case that if a contract is made to sell reminiscences to the Press, if the contract is made before trial and that is known, that would be taken into account before any grant of legal aid was made?

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, quite obviously any grants of that kind might be included in the means of the applicant for legal aid; if the means were large enough, then he would not qualify for legal aid.

LORD WILLIS: My Lords, does not the Minister agree that most of these stories are highly fictionalised anyway, and that if you draw the line at criminals writing about their misdeeds, obviously you may reach the point where you forbid politicians to write about their misdeeds?

LORD STONHAM: I am quite sure my noble friend, with his considerable experience, can advise us on this point; but it is the case that responsible opinion has the view that activities of some newspapers in this field are to be deplored, and it is to be hoped that the Press Council will assist us in persuading these newspapers to put their house in order.

VISCOUNT MASSEREENE AND FERRARD: My Lords, does the noble Lord realise that the big fees presumably paid to these people for writing their stories do rather make young people think that crime pays? I cannot agree with the comparison drawn by the noble Lord, Lord Willis, regarding politicians.

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, any young people who think that crime pays would only have to experience the delights of a borstal or of one of Her Majesty's prisons to be sure that it does not.

PUBLISHERS' ADVERTISEMENT  
ON RECORD SLEEVE

2.44 p.m.

LORD CONESFORD: My Lords, I beg leave to ask the Question which stands in my name on the Order Paper.

[The Question was as follows:

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether the Director of Public Prosecutions has considered the following words printed on the cover of a record offered for sale under the title "Rolling Stones No. 2", and what action they intend to take:

"Cast deep into your pockets for loot to buy this disc of groovies and fancy words. If you don't have bread, see that blind man, knock him on the head, steal his wallet and lo and behold you have the loot. If you put in the boot, good. Another one sold."]

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, the attention of the Director of Public Prosecutions has been drawn to the noble Lord's Question. In his view, there is no evidence that these words have been published in circumstances constituting a criminal offence. He cannot, therefore, take any action about them.

LORD CONESFORD: My Lords, may I thank the Minister for his Answer? I would ask him if I have correctly understood that he is advised that inciting people to assault, rob and kick the blind is beyond the reach of the criminal law. If that is so, is there anything that Her Majesty's Government propose to do about it?

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, this particular matter is not one for my Department. As I am quite sure the noble Lord is aware, the Director of Public Prosecutions is by Statute and statutory regulations subject to the superintendence and direction of Her Majesty's Attorney General. He is not subject to the directions of the Government. I think, however, that we all agree that these words are offensive to a degree, but our advice is that they are not regarded as incitement to commit a criminal offence. If it is any consolation to the noble Lord, research which I made at the week-end supports the view that, even when they are intelligible, the words of a "pop" song are not considered important, and devotees pay even less regard to the "blurb" on the envelope.

LORD CONESFORD: My Lords, may I make it quite clear that I am not talking about the "pop" song at all? Is it not probable that, if a young man thinks this incitement to crime a good joke, he will consider committing the crime a better joke still? Has that aspect of the matter been considered by Her Majesty's Government, or is the provision of this sort of "blurb" part of the youth service?

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, incitements to crime are matters which have to be dealt with under the criminal law, but I trust that I have made it clear to your Lordships that in this particular matter the Home Office have no power; and also that the Director of Public Prosecutions, as I said in my original Answer, does not regard these words in the way in which they have been published as constituting a criminal offence. Therefore no action is called for on the part of Her Majesty's Government.

VISCOUNT DILHORNE: My Lords, the Government have recently announced that they propose to introduce a measure to deal with incitement to racial violence. Will not the Government also consider whether the ambit of that measure ought to include incitement to violence against the blind?

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, I will take note of what the noble aud learned Viscount says, but I cannot seriously regard these words as being likely to be taken by any mentally normal person as encouragement or incitement to commit a crime.

LORD CONESFORD: My Lords, has the Director of Public Prosecutions or any other legal adviser of Her Majesty's Government considered whether this is not an obscene publication?

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, I indicated in my original Answer that the attention of the Director of Public Prosecutions had been directed to the noble Lord's Question, and I am quite sure that in his review of the words complained of he would have considered any offence which might have been committed.

LORD CONESFORD: My Lords, may I ask one final question? What steps



have been taken by the Decca Company to withdraw this offensive publication, and to apologise for it?

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, that, of course, is not the responsibility of Her Majesty's Government, and I am not aware of any steps that have been taken. But I am very glad that the noble Lord has asked this Question, and I hope that Mr. Lewis, the chairman of the company (if he is still chairman), will take appropriate action in the matter, now and in the future.

LORD LEATHERLAND: My Lords, will my noble friend take care to see that the mere use of offensive words is not made a criminal offence, otherwise it would be extremely dangerous for any of us to refer to our fellow citizens as being "stark raving bonkers"?

#### COMMITTALS FOR DEBT

2.50 p.m.

VISCOUNT DILHORNE: My Lords, I beg leave to ask the Question which stands in my name on the Order Paper.

[The Question was as follows:

To ask Her Majesty's Government what is the average number of persons in prison at any one time as a result of non-compliance with court orders for the discharge of debts.]

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, it is estimated that during 1963, the latest year for which complete figures are available, an average of about 200 persons committed by county courts, and about 260 civil process prisoners committed by magistrates' courts, would have been in custody at any one time.

VISCOUNT DILHORNE: My Lords, while thanking the noble Lord for his Answer, may I ask whether he is aware that on March 3, when announcing the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the law and practice relating to the recovery of debts, the Minister without Portfolio stated that there were about 7,000 people in prison at any one time for non-payment of debts? Is the noble Lord further aware that this statement, which his Answer to-day shows was wholly incorrect, received the widest publicity and has not, so far as I am aware, been corrected until to-day? Does not the noble Lord regard it as regrettable

that the facts were not accurately stated, and does he not think that here again, perhaps, an apology might be indicated?

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, I was aware that on March 3, in another place, my honourable friend the Minister without Portfolio had made the statement to which the noble and learned Viscount referred. He did so in agreeing to a statement made by the honourable Member, Dame Joan Vickers. However, the noble and learned Viscount is quite wrong in thinking that the statement has not been corrected, because my right honourable friend the Home Secretary gave the correct figures the very next day in another place, in answering a question from the right honourable gentleman Mr. Henry Brooke. He further added the information that 7,047 persons committed by county courts and 3,669 civil process prisoners were committed to prison by magistrates' courts in 1963. It may well have been that the Minister without Portfolio had this in mind. The mistake has been corrected, but I am quite sure that he regrets—and certainly I do—that it was made.

VISCOUNT DILHORNE: My Lords, I am very glad to know that the mistake has been corrected, and I am grateful to the noble Lord for the information that he has given. Of course, the figure for the number of committal orders bears no relation to the numbers actually committed for contempt of court, for not complying with court orders.

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, I am most grateful to the noble and learned Viscount. I hope he will agree with me that there are still too many people in prison on these orders, and that it is always advisable for Ministers to have their Portfolios with them.

BARONESS SUMMERSKILL: My Lords, would the noble Lord break down these figures which he has given, and tell me what proportion are in relation to affiliation orders and maintenance orders?

LORD STONHAM: No, my Lords. I am afraid that I cannot give my noble friend that information, but I shall be glad to write to her on that point. I would say that the numbers relating to affiliation orders would be included in the total of 3,669 civil process prisoners committed by the magistrates' courts. It would be a number somewhat less than

[Lord Stonham.]  
that. But I will certainly let my noble friend know what the answer is.

VISCOUNT DILHORNE: My Lords, perhaps the noble Lord would give the information in *Hansard*, as an Answer to a Written Question, as I think it would be information most useful to have.

LORD STONHAM: Yes, my Lords. I will certainly do that.

#### SUPERANNUATION (INNER LONDON MAGISTRATES' COURTS) REGULATIONS, 1965

2.53 p.m.

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, I beg to move that the Superannuation (Inner London Magistrates' Courts) Regulations, 1965, a draft of which was laid before your Lordships' House on February 24, be approved. These Regulations are necessary because of the integration of the two systems of magistrates' courts in this County of London—the Metropolitan stipendiary magistrates' courts and the petty sessional courts of lay justices—which is effected by the Administration of Justice Act, 1964. The relevant part of the Act comes into operation on April 1, 1965. This change will naturally affect the staff of the two sets of courts, who are to be transferred, by an order made by my right honourable friend the Home Secretary, to the employment of the Committee of Magistrates for the Inner London Area. This Committee has been set up under Section 13 of the Administration of Justice Act, 1964, to administer the integrated courts, which are to be known as the Inner London magistrates' courts.

The Committee of Magistrates has been negotiating with representatives of the staff concerned about the conditions of service which should apply in future to the staff of the Inner London courts. All concerned have agreed that, subject to the protection of the interests of the existing staff of the petty sessional courts, who are at present subject to a scheme of local government contributory pensions, the superannuation scheme which should apply in future is the non-contributory scheme at present enjoyed by the staff of the Metropolitan magistrates' courts. The Regulations there-

fore have two purposes: first, to apply this Metropolitan scheme to the staff of the Inner London magistrates' courts; and second, to protect the interests of the lay staff.

Regulation 1 extends to the justices' clerks for the Inner London area, and other officers employed by the Committee of Magistrates for the Inner London Area, the non-contributory scheme of superannuation under the Metropolitan Police Staff (Superannuation) Acts, 1875 to 1931. Regulation 2 and the Schedule allow the existing staff of the County of London petty sessional courts, after their transfer to the employment of the Committee of Magistrates, to continue to enjoy their present scheme of local government contributory pensions if they so wish. However, since that scheme is operated by the London County Council it is necessary to make special provision in the Regulations to allow the scheme to be carried on. This will be achieved by making use of the Greater London Council superannuation fund and requiring the Committee of Magistrates, as employer, to take certain discretionary decisions which were previously taken by the County of London Magistrates' Courts Committee.

The Regulations have been drafted after consultation with the Greater London Council and the associations representing the staff concerned. Except for two points raised by the London Justices' Clerks Society (who represent the clerks of the lay justices, as distinct from the metropolitan, courts) to which we felt unable to agree, the Regulations are an agreed measure. I will elaborate on these somewhat technical points, if your Lordships so desire, but perhaps it is sufficient for me to say that one of the provisions proposed would, in our view, have been *ultra vires*, and the other would have introduced a novel and, as we think, undesirable, element into the "no detriment" provisions. In neither case does our refusal of the proposal imply a worsening of the position of the persons concerned in relation to their former position. The Regulations are designed to ensure that the position of all the staff concerned is not less favourable with regard to superannuation after transfer than it was before, and I can assure your Lordships that that has been achieved. My Lords, I beg to move.

Moved, That the Draft Superannuation (Inner London Magistrates' Courts) Regulations, 1965, laid before the House on 24th February, be approved.—(*Lord Stonham.*)

EARL JELLICOE: My Lords, I am very grateful to the noble Lord for this explanation of the Regulations. I think I can tell him straight away that they are quite satisfactory to this side of the House, more especially since, as he explained, they command a very broad measure of agreement by all the parties concerned.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

#### POLICE PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1965

2.59 p.m.

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, I beg to move that the Police Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1965, a draft of which was laid before your Lordships' House on February 24 last, be approved. These draft Regulations amend the Police Pensions Regulations, 1962, and they fall into three parts. Part 1 increases certain widows' and children's benefits payable under the Police Pensions Regulations by amounts corresponding to the increases in National Insurance benefits made by the National Insurance, Etc., Act, 1964. It is necessary to make this special provision because the police were excluded from the contributory old-age pensions scheme which existed before National Insurance Schemes were introduced in 1948 and, as a result, some police widows and children are not entitled to those benefits. Police authorities are, therefore, given discretion to pay corresponding benefits under the Police Pensions Regulations.

The effect of Part I of the Regulations is to give these special classes of police widows and children increases corresponding to the National Insurance increases. Your Lordships will not wish me to quote all the figures, because they are incorporated in the draft Regulations, but as examples it may be helpful to mention that a widow will get £5 12s. 6d. instead of £4 15s. a week over and above her basic pension for the first 13 weeks of widowhood, and thereafter £4 instead of £3 7s. 6d. a week above her ordinary police pension; and the allowance payable in respect of a child where both

parents are dead will be a maximum of 40s. instead of 37s. 6d. a week. These, your Lordships will agree, are desirable and acceptable amendments.

In Part II the amendments flow mainly from provisions of the Police Act, 1964. This Act provides that, with effect from April 1 next, a police authority, acting with the approval of the Secretary of State, may call upon a chief constable, deputy chief constable or assistant chief constable to retire in the interests of efficiency. The draft amending Regulations 8 and 9 ensure that an officer so required to retire will be entitled to an ordinary or short-service pension according to the length of his service. Regulation 10 ensures that he will be able to commute part of the pension for a lump sum. Regulation 13 excludes these officers from the existing provisions of the 1962 Regulations, which provide for the compulsory retirement in the interests of efficiency of police officers who have an entitlement to maximum pension. These provisions, of course, would otherwise overlap the provisions of the Police Act to which I have referred.

The Police Act also makes further provisions for schemes to be made amalgamating police areas. On or after April 1, amalgamation schemes will be coming into operation which may result in a chief constable losing his post, and orders may be made under the Local Government Act, 1958, making boundary changes affecting police areas and, of course, a chief constable's post. Regulation 14 inserts into the Police Pensions Regulations a new Regulation 74A to provide for chief constables who are affected by these schemes and orders. The new Regulation secures that a chief constable who loses office in this way shall be treated as having retired. If he joins another police force within a prescribed period, his service is to be treated as continuous for pension purposes. If he continues in the police service but suffers reduction in rank, the new Regulation provides that he shall be entitled to retain the age of compulsory retirement applicable to his former rank.

Special provision is made in the case of a chief constable losing office who was already a chief constable on July 1, 1964,



[Lord Stonham.]

when the provisions of the Police Act, 1964, relating to local government reorganisation and amalgamation schemes came into operation. The new Regulation 74A, read with the new sub-paragraph (e) added to Regulation 3(1) of the 1962 Regulations by Regulation 9, secures (believe it or not) that if he loses office as a member of a police force he shall, regardless of age, be entitled to an ordinary or short-service pension, according to the length of his service. Incidentally, the draft Regulations we are now considering make the sixth set of amendments to the 1962 regulations. I should explain that the rights of chief constables who are affected by local government reorganisation or a police amalgamation scheme will not be limited to those arising under the Police Pensions Regulations, as amended by these draft Regulations. It is intended that compensation regulations will be made under the Local Government Act, 1958, entitling them to claim compensation for loss of office or diminution of emoluments. Special provision will also be made in the compensation regulations for chief constables who held that rank on July 1, 1964.

In Part III your Lordships will notice that Regulation 17 provides that Part I of the Regulations—that for widows and children—shall come into force on March 29, when the increased National Insurance benefits become payable. Part II, however, comes into operation on April 1 because certain provisions of the Police Act, 1964, and police amalgamation schemes under that Act, on which Part II of the Regulations is mainly consequent, come into operation on that date. The Police Councils for England and Wales and for Scotland have been consulted and are in agreement with the proposal that these amendments should be made. My Lords, I beg to move.

Moved, That the Draft Police Pensions (Amendment) Regulations 1965, laid before the House on February 24, be approved.—(*Lord Stonham.*)

EARL JELICOE: My Lords, I should again like to thank the noble Lord for his careful and clear explanation of these draft Regulations. I can again assure him that, at least so far as I am concerned, they are perfectly satisfactory.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

## INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES BILL [H.L.]

3.7 p.m.

Order of the Day read for the House to be in Committee (on Re-commitment).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (LORD GARDINER): My Lords, I beg to move that the House do now resolve itself into Committee on the Bill.

Moved, That the House do now resolve itself into Committee.—(*Lord Gardiner.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee accordingly.

[The LORD MERTHYR in the Chair.]

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (LORD MERTHYR): This Bill has been amended by the Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills. If your Lordships permit it, I will put the Question, That Clauses I to 32 inclusive stand part of the Bill, unless any noble Lord wishes to speak on any of those clauses.

Clauses 1 to 32 agreed to.

Clause 33 [*Discharge of mortgages in England and Wales*]:

THE LORD CHANCELLOR moved, in subsection (1) to leave out the word "land", where it first occurs, and to insert "property". The noble and learned Lord said: With the leave of the Committee, it would probably be of convenience to the Committee to take the two new Amendments together. In their First Report, the Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills reported that they had considered the Bill, and that:

"No representation was received by the Committee with respect to the Memorandum setting forth the corrections and minor improvements of the law proposed in the Bill.

"The proposals were approved by the Committee, subject to an amendment to proposal 19.

"The Committee are of the opinion that the Bill consolidates the existing law with such corrections and improvements as can properly be authorised under the Consolidation of Enactments (Procedure) Act, 1949. They have made certain amendments which seem to them necessary to the improvement of the form of the Bill, and they considered that there is no point to which the attention of Parliament ought to be drawn."

In these circumstances, it is somewhat unusual, though not unknown, for the Committee of the Whole House to amend a Consolidation Bill in the form in which it has been reported by the Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills. In this case, however, there are special reasons for inviting the Committee to do so.

The Joint Committee reported on the Bill largely, of course, as a result of the draftsmen's evidence that the Bill consolidates the existing law with such corrections and improvements as can properly be authorised. It was only after the Joint Committee had reported that it was brought to the notice of the draftsmen that Clause 33 of the Bill contains an error in consolidation which would, in fact, make a change in the law which has not been authorised in pursuance of the 1949 Act. This clause deals with the discharge of a mortgage by endorsing it with a receipt for the moneys secured by it. The clause is intended to re-enact the effect of Section 43 of the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1893, as amended by Section 115(9) of the Law of Property Act, 1925, with corrections and improvements made under the 1949 Act. Clause 33, however, is in terms of a mortgage of land, whereas Sections 43 and 115 are in terms of mortgages of property. This would have the result of narrowing the scope of the provision, but excluding from the operation of Clause 33 certain mortgages—for instance, mortgages on life policies, which are covered by the existing provisions. This change was not intended and is not covered by the corrections and improvements authorised under the 1949 Act, and for that reason was not drawn to the attention of the Joint Committee. These two Amendments, therefore, are designed to correct the error in consolidation by making the Bill reproduce more accurately the effect of the existing law. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 20, line 35, leave out ("land") and insert ("property").—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

VISCOUNT DILHORNE: The noble and learned Lord has made out an overwhelming case for this Amendment and I want to add only a few words. It is, indeed, a very rare occurrence that any slip is made by the Parliamentary Counsel which leads to Amendments such as

are being proposed to-day being moved after one has had the Report of the Joint Committee. Indeed, thinking back, I cannot remember in the last 22 years a previous occasion on which this has happened. The fact that it has not happened or has happened very seldom, is due to the very great care and trouble that the Parliamentary Counsel take over these matters. I wish to emphasise the rarity of this because it underlines the skill which they exercise and which they have to possess in their securing that this procedure under the 1946 Act is fully carried out. Of course, the Joint Committee also spend a great deal of time, and one ought to be grateful to them also for going through the suggested alterations in detail; and there are sometimes a great many of them. Very little escapes their notice.

I think that what has happened to-day—the noble and learned Lord having to move these two Amendments—shows, as is generally recognised, not only the importance of consolidation but the fact that if you are going to consolidate it is an extremely difficult task and must be done very carefully indeed, as it always has been. I hope the Parliamentary Counsel will not feel, because this Amendment has to be moved at this late stage, that this means there is any reflection on the way in which they conduct their work. I do not know how this particular defect came to light, but I know myself how thorough they are and what steps they take to try to get a Consolidation Bill absolutely right.

LORD PEDDIE: I am sure the Committee will join in paying tribute to the excellence and skill of the Parliamentary draftsmen. It is pleasing to learn of the infrequency of errors of this description. I am sure the Committee will appreciate also the action taken in effecting this Amendment because inaction would have meant considerable confusion where industrial provident societies are concerned.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I am grateful to the noble and learned Viscount and to the noble Lord for their observations. I agree that the rarity of the occasion is an example of the high skill and industry of the Parliamentary draftsmen.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.



THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 20, line 3, leave out (“land”) and insert (“property”).—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 33, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses and Schedules agreed to.

House resumed: Bill reported, with Amendments.

#### REMUNERATION OF TEACHERS BILL

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

#### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY BILL

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

#### SUPERANNUATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Report of Amendments received (according to Order).

#### KENYA REPUBLIC BILL

Read 3<sup>a</sup> (according to Order), and passed.

#### SWEEPSTAKES ON HORSERACES (AUTHORISATION) BILL [H.L.]

3.18 p.m.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD JESSEL: My Lords, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill I should like at the outset to declare that I have no interest in racing either as owner, trainer or shareholder. I enjoy going to the races and it was in 1919 as a schoolboy that I had my first bet. It was 10s. each way on “Grand Parade”, which won the Derby that year at the very satisfactory odds of 33-1. For a short time, I was the richest boy in the school. But *facilis descensus Averno*, which can be translated as “a sucker is born every five minutes”—the motto, of course, of the Bookmakers’ Protection Association and the Victoria Club. I should have liked to call this Bill the Grand National Sweepstake Bill, but I was advised for technical reasons that that would make it a hybrid Bill, for which the procedure would be much more elaborate and expensive.

Before I deal with the clauses of the Bill, I should like to say a word or two about Aintree Racecourse and what I call the Topham story. Your Lordships may have read in the newspapers reports of Lord Sefton’s case against Tophams, Ltd. Briefly, the story of this is as follows. In 1949, Tophams acquired the freehold of the racecourse and of certain adjoining land. Under the terms of the conveyance, Tophams are restricted from using the racecourse for any purpose other than racing, and the other land for any purpose other than agriculture, during the life of Lord Sefton and of his wife.

Tophams recently entered into an agreement with Capital and Counties Property Company, Ltd., to sell the whole of the land for housing development. Lord Sefton went to court and was granted an injunction restraining Tophams from proceeding with the sale, as being a contravention of the terms of the conveyance. Tophams have appealed against this decision, and the appeal is pending. But whatever the result of the appeal, there will not be any more Grand Nationals after this year, unless something is done. If the

appeal succeeds, Capital and Counties will proceed with the transaction, but they will have to obtain planning permission for their proposed development; and if this were refused, the agreement would no doubt be terminated. Should the appeal fail, Tophams have stated that they will discontinue racing and allow the land to become derelict, no doubt in the hope of compelling some action by the local authority.

Mrs. Topham has stated that the racecourse is no longer a paying proposition. I have not been to Aintree for many years, but I am told, on good authority, that the stands are in a deplorable condition and that the whole place has a run-down look. In fact, a large sum is needed to put it in order. This situation would be altered by the passing of this Bill and the authorisation of a sweepstake on the Grand National. The profit to be made from the sweepstake would make ownership of the racecourse an attractive proposition.

In that event, Tophams would have two alternatives open to them. The first would be to sell the racecourse to the actual or potential promoters of the sweepstake, who would be prepared to pay a price calculated by reference to their profits on the sweepstake and the resulting prosperity of the racecourse. The second alternative would be for Tophams to retain ownership, and either bid for the right to conduct the sweepstake or merely reap the benefits which would flow from a sweepstake run by another. Your Lordships will see, when we come to Clause 2 of the Bill, that the sum paid for the right to conduct a sweepstake must be first applied in improving the racecourse. If, as it is reasonable to suppose, the racecourse improvement results in increased attendances, the racecourse will once again become a valuable asset, which Tophams could either continue to run or, if they thought fit, dispose of at a profit.

The Explanatory Memorandum to the Bill sets out the clauses very clearly, and I do not propose to go through them other than briefly. Clause 1 authorises the promotion of sweepstakes, lays down the conditions that are to apply and provides for the nomination of at least one race, and not more than two races, on which it will be legal to conduct a sweepstake. The clause also deals with the purposes to which the proceeds are to be devoted

and ensures that the right to conduct the sweepstake will be put out to public tender. This is very important, and I hope that your Lordships will take note of it.

Clause 2 provides that the sums paid by the successful tenderer for the right to promote the sweepstake shall be applied, in the first place, towards improving the racecourse concerned, as well as horseracing thereat, and that any balance shall be passed over to the improvement of horseracing in general. Clause 3 provides that the Secretary of State for Education and Science shall be the authority to decide how the appropriate proportion of the proceeds shall be spent. On what I call some good cause, I have suggested medical research, but here I am open to suggestions. All I want to do is to make sure that the proceeds go to some worthwhile cause, and I am not wedded to medical research, although it is probably as good as any. Clause 4 makes it the responsibility of the local authority concerned to evolve and provide the recreational facilities referred to in subsection (2)(d) of Clause 1.

Your Lordships will note that my proposals in the Bill are that 50 per cent. of the proceeds shall go as prizes to the purchasers of tickets, 25 per cent. to assisting medical research and 2½ per cent. to providing recreational facilities for the public. In tendering for the right to promote a sweepstake, the tenderer will have to estimate how much of the remaining 22½ per cent. he can afford to offer, while leaving sufficient to cover his expenses and provide a profit. I think the competition will be very keen and that any successful promoter will have to give back a large "chunk" of his 22½ per cent. The remaining clauses of the Bill deal with technical details, with which I need not trouble your Lordships to-day.

My Lords, that is the Bill. And we have to ask ourselves two questions. Is the Grand National worth trying to save, and, if so, is this a good way of doing it? The Grand National is part of the British tradition. It gives pleasure to a vast number of people in this country. Many who never bet at all have a few shillings on the Derby and the Grand National every year. I am confident that anyone who has seen the actual race, or watched it on television, will agree

[Lord Jessel.]  
that it is the kind of spectacle which helps to build up Britain's prestige, not only in connection with racing in particular, but also the general image of Britain as a sporting nation.

So we come to the question: is the legalisation of possibly two national sweepstakes a year desirable? The Report of the Royal Commission on Betting, Lotteries and Gaming, 1945 to 1951, came out, on balance, rather mildly against national sweepstakes. On re-reading their Report, I find their reasoning very out of date. They said that a national lottery would discourage thrift. This rings rather hollow to-day, when we have thousands of betting shops, and when bingo and premium bonds are all legal.

The Report gave some interesting figures in regard to a survey which was carried out at that time by Mass Observation. This showed that about 30 per cent. of those questioned did not know what a national lottery was, but of those who did, not less than 71 per cent. approved of the idea, 4 per cent. expressed no opinion and only 25 per cent. disagreed. I suggest that to-day many more than 30 per cent. would know what a national lottery was, and probably more than 71 per cent. would be in favour of it. My supposition is fortified by the *Daily Express* of March 11, in which they had the result of a Public Opinion Poll where people were asked two questions. The first was:

"Would you, in general, approve or disapprove of the idea that we have a State Lottery in Britain if the profits went, for instance, to hospitals, medical research *et cetera*?"

The answer was that 88 per cent. approved and 12 per cent. disapproved. The other question was:

"If there was such a lottery about once a month, with tickets at say 10s. each, do you think you would buy a ticket?"

The answers were:

"Every time, 19 per cent. Sometimes, 60 per cent. Never, 21 per cent."

We come now to what I call the "thin end of the wedge" argument; that if you allow one lottery, where are you going to stop? This is why we have in the Bill a limit of two national sweepstakes, confined, I hope, to the two great sporting events, the Grand National and the Derby. If one looks at the social

side, I think it is hypocritical to give facilities to people to spend hours in betting shops and yet not allow them to buy tickets for a national sweepstake once or twice a year.

To sum up, the Grand National is worthwhile, and it is worth saving. This is a sound method of doing it. The sweepstake will provide money for Aintree local amenities, for racing generally and for some worthwhile cause, such as medical research. We are not thinking in terms of small amounts. If Eire can sell £6 million worth of tickets a year on sweepstakes, I am sure that this country can sell at least £10 million worth of tickets a year. This means £2½ million for a worthwhile cause, and at least £1 million for racing. Nearly everyone I have spoken to about this Bill has been enthusiastically in favour of it. This attitude I take to be endorsed by Mr. Wigg, the Paymaster-General, who is reported to have said yesterday, apropos of the dispute about televising the Derby:

"It is a grim thought that if this dispute is not solved the end of T.V. racing may be in sight; the pleasure of millions may be threatened."

It would be an even grimmer thought if there were no Grand National to televise. The people of this country want this Bill and if Her Majesty's Government actively try to frustrate it, let them beware, because they will find that they have incurred the wrath of thousands of their supporters in the constituencies. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, that the Bill be now read 2<sup>a</sup>.—  
(*Lord Jessel.*)

3.35 p.m.

LORD AIREDALE: My Lords, I am sure the noble Lord, Lord Jessel, is to be congratulated upon his valiant and ingenious effort to save the Grand National in this way. I think I must be younger than the noble Lord. Certainly I was not sufficiently *compos mentis* to be on "Grand Parade" at 33 to 1 in the Derby of 1919. It was not until "Call Boy" won in 1928 that my first schoolboy winning bet took place, and the odds were only 4 to 1. So my *facilis descensus Averno* was not quite so steep. This surely is not a Party matter: at any rate, I, for my part, speak on my own behalf, and I do not



seek to bind other noble Lords who sit on these Benches by what I have to say.

I do not personally feel at all against lotteries, as such, and I do not feel against a lottery for this kind of purpose. But I do feel that perhaps we should examine the avowed purpose of this particular lottery, the Grand National steeplechase. May I straight away get rid of two matters which I am certainly not going to put forward. I am not going to suggest that the Grand National is cruel; and I am not going to suggest that it is Parliament's job to try to teach the racing authorities how horse racing should be conducted. Nevertheless, if Parliament is to be asked to approve a national lottery for a particular horse race, let us have a good look at the horse race and see whether we think it is worthy in its present form of being the subject of a national lottery.

I think the Grand National carries by far the richest prize in the whole of steeplechasing, being worth, I believe, some £20,000 to the winner. One might suppose, therefore, that the finest steeplechasers would take part in the Grand National, and that the horse that won it might have some claim to be regarded as the champion steeplechaser. The extraordinary thing is that this is not the case. Last year, the outstandingly champion steeplechaser in Ireland was "Arkle", and the outstandingly champion steeplechaser in this country was "Mill House". Neither of these horses ran in the Grand National last year. This year, both of these great horses have kept their places as the undisputed champions in their two countries; but neither of them will run in the Grand National. "Arkle" was not even entered for this year's Grand National. "Mill House" was entered, but he was withdrawn from the race a good many weeks ago.

The reason for this is not far to seek. The Grand National, as I am sure all your Lordships know, is a handicap race. The purpose of the handicapper is to try to secure that every horse has an equal chance of winning the race, and a brilliant horse like "Arkle" or "Mill House" is going to be weighed down with such an enormous burden that he will be slowed down to the pace of his much more moderate rivals in the race, and his chance of winning the £20,000 will be brought down to being no better than that

of any of his rivals. I should have thought that this was something of a defect. Admittedly, there is the Cheltenham Gold Cup for the champions. But the Cheltenham Gold Cup is worth 2½ times less than the Grand National: I think it is worth about £8,000, as against the £20,000 of the Grand National. This is not just my surmise, because, if I may quote from the racing correspondent of *The Times* on February 26, he wrote:

"It is the type of Grand National with no top horse in it this year for everyone to try their luck."

For all I know, the authorities who conduct the racing at Aintree may feel along these lines, as I do. They may wish, for all I know, that the Grand National should be a true championship race. But undoubtedly it is a very expensive event to stage, and it may well be that they have to draw in the crowds by making the race a wider open betting proposition, swelling the tote takings, encouraging bookmakers to come in in large numbers and pay large licence fees in order to bet, and so on. So only in this way can the Grand National, as things are at present, be made a financial proposition. If this Bill is passed, presumably the financial worries of the Aintree authorities are going to be swept away; there is going to be plenty of money to finance the Grand National. That being so, has not the time come for making the Grand National a true championship race so that we may say that the horse which wins it has some claim to being regarded as the champion steeplechaser?

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: My Lords, may I ask the noble Lord whether he is aware how many runners there are likely to be in this year's Grand National, and how many runners there were in this year's Cheltenham Gold Cup?

LORD AIREDALE: My Lords, I understand that there were four runners in this year's Cheltenham Gold Cup. I hope that, as I am under examination from the noble Duke, he will put me right if I am wrong—because I am sure he will be able to—but I understand that the number of runners in the Grand National this year is likely to be something over forty. I suppose there will be a cavalry charge to the first fence; I suppose there will be a number of fallers; I suppose that a great many of those

[Lord Airedale.]

fallers will become loose horses which will interfere with the jockeys still in the race trying to win, and I should not be surprised if some cynic, watching from the stands, said to his companion, "You seem to have something of a lottery here already. Do you mean to say you are trying to superimpose a lottery on it?" It seems, with due respect, that the Grand National would be on the whole an improved national event if it were a championship event.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: My Lords, I must cross swords once more with the noble Lord. If you turned the Grand National into a championship race, in which all horses carried the same weight, it would cease to be the Grand National. I have every respect for the Cheltenham Gold Cup—it is a magnificent race to win. But the Grand National is known throughout the world, and the Cheltenham Gold Cup is known throughout the British Isles, and that is the difference between the two.

LORD AIREDALE: The noble Duke has laid the ground for my peroration in this debate. What I was going to suggest was that the Aintree authorities, having been relieved of the financial burden of finding the prize money for the Grand National, will presumably be able to find, say, £5,000 for the prize money of a handicap race for the second-rate horses—or the second best horses perhaps is a fairer expression to use—to be run over the Grand National course, which would be for the future what the Grand National has been in the past. But let the race for which the lottery is to be conducted be a championship race, so that there is some reward for exercising skill in training your horse to be the best steeplechaser, which will then have the best chance of winning by far the greatest prize in steeplechasing.

3.45 p.m.

LORD GREENWAY: My Lords, this is not the first time that I have addressed your Lordships, because I have been guilty of interrupting on previous occasions and I crave your indulgence and forgiveness. This Bill is a simple and most interesting one. It concerns not only England, but the whole of the world, including, I can say, the whole of Rhodesia. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has just come back from Rhodesia. I used

to be there many times when federation was going on, and I am sure that even in Zambia or Malawi they still follow the Grand National and will be having their bets. The Grand National is part of our life, and no matter what colour a man may be he will always look forward to it.

My noble friend Lord Jessel quoted a report in *The Times*. In the *Evening News* on Friday night there was an even better report; and I think it said that 99 "guys" out of a hundred in London support it. I was talking to a "guy" from Manchester and he said, "If you don't get that Bill through we shall be after you". I will not take up any more of your Lordships' time, except to say that this Bill must be passed, otherwise we shall lose a national institution.

3.47 p.m.

THE DUKE OF ATHOLL: My Lords, first I must apologise to my noble friend Lord Jessel for the fact that I did not hear what he had to say in his speech, but I feel, knowing him as I do, that I would thoroughly support all that he said. Also, I would say that I thoroughly support the principles of this Bill. If I am allowed to assume that one of the selected races permitted under the Bill will be the Grand National, I think it would be a great pity if this Bill were not passed, and that thereby the Grand National as a race was allowed to die. To say that it could be moved to any other course is simply untrue. It is not the quality of the horses which attracts; it is not the distance over which it is run: it is simply the fact that it is the Grand National and that it will always be run at Aintree over the Aintree fences that makes it what it is, and makes it the world attraction that it is.

The amount of revenue which the Grand National brings into this country is already quite considerable. There are American owners and Irish owners. There have been in the past French owners and, I think, on one occasion an Italian owner. They all run their horses in this race. Indeed, there have been Russian owners. The argument is less good there, because on the whole the Russians do not come to support their horses, although I am sure that if they did we should much appreciate the roubles they would bring with them. But

the Americans, Irish and French certainly come in very large numbers purely to see this race, and this brings in quite large sums of foreign currency.

In addition, if the sweepstake was started, many of the tickets would be bought abroad. At the moment, I believe that something like 50 per cent. of the tickets taken on the Irish Hospital Sweepstake are taken by people normally resident in this country, and that this money, or the vast proportion of it, ends up in Ireland. Much of this money could be saved from going to Ireland and could be kept in this country if there were a sweepstake on the Grand National on which people could have their little "flutter". If we really put our minds behind this sweepstake, I am sure that many tickets could be sold all over the world. The Australians, I believe, are the biggest gamblers in the world, but many other countries would probably be prepared to take tickets in a sweepstake on a race as well known as the Grand National.

Therefore I very much hope that this Bill will get its Second Reading and will become law without any delay, because delay would be fatal. There are no fixtures scheduled for Aintree after this year, and if there were a year's gap in the continuity of the Grand National the whole point of the Bill, and the Grand National, would in my opinion be lost. I hope, therefore, that it will become law as soon as possible.

**LORD FRASER OF NORTH CAPE:** My Lords, the noble Duke does not seem to have mentioned Scotland at all in his speech.

**THE DUKE OF ATHOLL:** For the noble Lord's benefit, may I say that the favourite for the Grand National this year comes from Scotland, and we in Scotland are full of hope that for the first time ever the trophy will come North of the Border. We have had several near misses, including the gallant "Wyndburgh" who has run second three times in the last ten years, but we have never yet succeeded in getting a Scottish winner, although we hope that "Freddy" will put that right this year.

**LORD AIREDALE:** My Lords, is it not true, and also very much regretted, that the horse called "Scottish Memories" comes from Ireland?

**THE DUKE OF ATHOLL:** My Lords, it is owned by someone who lives in Scotland—who in fact lives in Perthshire, I am delighted to say.

3.52 p.m.

**LORD CRAWSHAW:** My Lords, this is the first time I have had the honour of speaking in your Lordships' House and I would beg that kindness which I gather noble Lords always show on such an occasion. It is, in fact, a few years since I took my seat in your Lordships' House, and all this time I have been fully aware that I should be well advised to keep silent unless there was a subject about which I felt fairly well informed. I know I am not as well informed on this subject as many in your Lordships' House, but it is a subject very close to my heart; therefore I felt that perhaps I might be allowed to speak. Had I realised before I came that I should speak under such close scrutiny from the noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury, I should have been even more awe-struck than I am already.

The object of the Bill is to help in the plight of Aintree, along with its great and unique race. I have been there fairly frequently in the past few years and have been sadly shocked by the increasing drabness that surrounds it. The place needs a great deal of money spent on it which the proposed sweepstake would help to provide. The proceeds from the sweepstake would also help to increase the stakes, which would assist all engaged in racing. As one who tries to train a couple of steeplechasers, without much success, I even hope that the place money may be extended to those who finish fourth, fifth, sixth and so on. The third object of the Bill is for the proceeds to be used for medical research or some other such cause, and I am sure that that is an object which we should all acclaim. I believe it is no crime to invest a small sum in a sweepstake, especially when there are three such praiseworthy objectives for the proceeds.

My Lords, I have come up this morning from a part of England, Leicestershire, where the horse and his rider are held in very high esteem. The hero of all



[Lord Crawshaw.]  
 heroes is the winner of the Grand National and his rider. I know the great support there is for this Bill in that part of England as, I believe, there is in all of England. Therefore I would ask your Lordships to give this Bill your solid support and help save the Grand National, as all people well-informed in racing believe that it will.

3.55 p.m.

VISCOUNT MASSEREENE AND FERRARD: My Lords, I heartily welcome this Bill, but before I speak about it it is my extremely pleasant duty—in fact one of the most pleasant duties I have ever had to perform—to congratulate the noble Lord, Lord Crawshaw, on his maiden speech in this House. Lord Crawshaw was a gallant rider over fences, and I can assure your Lordships that there is no one better qualified in this House to address your Lordships on this subject than the noble Lord himself. The noble Lord's spirit and gallantry is apparent for all your Lordships to see. I should also like to congratulate the noble Lord, Lord Greenway, on addressing your Lordships for the first time.

My Lords, we often hear the expression "perfidious Albion". It is very rarely true, but when it comes to our moral attitude to gambling I am afraid it really is rather true; for instance, on the question: when is gambling a sin? The Church of England, I presume, regards all gambling as a sin. What the opinion of the Roman Catholic Church is on this subject I do not really know, but from my experience when I was younger of the number of priests at Irish racecourses I rather imagine that the Roman Catholic Church do not object to gambling. But, surely, gambling is only a sin if people gamble above their means and, therefore, their families suffer. I must apologise to the right reverend Prelates on raising this question, but the attitude of the Church to gambling is a subject which interests me. After all, I presume that the Church to a certain extent does gamble, inasmuch as the Church Commissioners buy shares and, I presume, hope that the shares will increase in value.

The only gambling I do is on horse-racing, and here I have to declare a very small interest, in that I do have an odd horse in training sometimes.

LORD JESSEL: A very odd horse.

VISCOUNT MASSEREENE AND FERRARD: But I have a hopeful one this year. The noble Lord, Lord Jessel, told us that his addiction to betting came in 1919. My own came in 1924 at Punchestown. I was a boy at the time and I had 5s. on a horse. I cannot remember the odds, but they were quite long. Unfortunately I lost the book-maker's ticket and so was extremely perturbed and was kicking up a row about it. A very nice bookmaker heard me, took pity and paid me out. Of course, I was completely sunk after that, because for quite a few weeks I was inclined to think that all bookmakers were fairy godmothers. I soon realised otherwise.

My Lords, there is also a school of thought that says there is something immoral if you win a big sum of money by gambling. When people win, as they can, I think, £200,000 from the football pools, which is of course a complete fluke, the argument is that it is probably rather bad for their character. Well, of course that depends on the character of the recipient, but there is probably something in the argument. But not all gambling is chance. Some gambling requires skill and great experience and study.

I have never understood why the various Governments of this country have always been against State lotteries, because in this country we have far more pernicious forms of gambling. After all, in a betting shop a man can spend his whole pay packet in an afternoon. I remember reading about a survey by some Americans, who came over here and made a survey of betting shops in this country. The worrying part was, I understand, that when there is a slight rise in unemployment the betting shops do far better. I am not too happy about betting shops on the whole. But if a man takes a 10s. ticket in a State lottery, you cannot call that gambling, because he knows that half that money is going to a worthy cause, and he invests only what he is able to afford. He has no temptation, as he has in a betting shop, to double up. I do not personally call a State lottery gambling, but even if you call it gambling it is a far less harmful form than betting.

We have heard from my noble friend the object of this Bill. It is to be strictly

controlled by the Secretary of State. It is only in the first instance to be for one horse-race, presumably the Grand National, and if that experiment turns out successfully, probably two horse-races—the other horse-race, I presume, would be the Derby. Two or three speakers have told us of the great history of the Grand National. Racing generally is, of course, a very large industry. It employs tens of thousands of people. It helps the farmers through the sale of hay and oats. It is a great export industry through the bloodstock industry. It is, in fact, the only industry connected with gambling which helps the economy at all. One cannot say that casinos or football pools or any of those other things—I can think of all sorts of things—help the economy; but racing does. The Government must bear that in mind.

The Grand National is a part of the English scene. It has been going since quite early in the 19th century. We have heard that our tourist industry in this country is growing at a great rate; it is almost our largest dollar earner, I think. Last year we earned about 380 million dollars from the tourist industry, I think I am correct in saying, or something approaching that. If we allow great events like the National to drop out of our calendar, this country will not be so attractive for tourists. We have also heard that if we have a State lottery for the National we shall sell a great number of tickets abroad, which, again, will help to bring in foreign currency.

I ask the Government not to take up the attitude of a Mrs. Grundy on this matter. Logically they have not got a leg to stand on. After all, premium bonds are coming very near a lottery. I agree that one can get the money back, but it is coming very near a lottery. Look at some of the immoral taxation in which the State indulges. If you are going to speak of morals, I would say that it is far more moral to have a State lottery to help hospitals and public facilities for recreation. I agree it is not a Party matter, but I have often thought that the Party opposite are rather looked upon by the public as kill-joys. If the Party opposite would only allow this Bill to go through, I am quite convinced—though of course it is against the interests of my Party to say so—that they would gain tens of thousands of votes, because it

would be a very popular act. I heartily support this Bill, and I sincerely hope that the noble Lord opposite—I understand Lord Stonham is going to reply—will not appear in the clothes of a Mrs. Grundy.

LORD MOYNE: My Lords, it is perhaps not inappropriate that we should be discussing this measure on the eve of St. Patrick's Day. Though I am not much of a racing or sweepstake man myself, I do know of the immense benefits that flowed to the hospitals in Ireland from the establishment of the sweepstakes there a good many years ago. But if I understand it aright, it is still technically against the law for a British citizen to take a ticket in an Irish sweepstake. While we ourselves, rightly or wrongly, held the view here that it was against public policy to allow people to take part in a sweepstake at all, it was logical to forbid their doing so in sweepstakes overseas. But I suggest to the noble Lord, Lord Jessel, that in seeking by this measure to change the law to allow sweepstakes to be organised over here, he will make us look rather hypocrites if we are still to be left committing an offence every time we participate in a sweepstake across the water.

4.10 p.m.

LORD BLYTON: My Lords, I rise to address the House for the first time, although it is not the first time that I have made a speech in this Chamber. I made my first speech here in 1945, and I made many more up to 1950, when we were transferred to "another place". I oppose the Bill. I am not opposing it for any angelic reason, because I do not profess to be an angel. I worked too long in the mines to be an angel. I am no killjoy. I like a game of dominoes or of bingo. I back a horse. I go in for any sweeps that attract me, and I am not opposed to a lottery. But I think that under this Bill the proceeds would be going to an entirely wrong cause. If this Bill had been proposed to assist the hospitals I should have fully supported it. I think that the health of the people is an everyday matter and not, like the Grand National, a once-a-year effort. The sick and the infirm are with us every day, and if there is any money going about I think it ought to be theirs. I see no reason to support this Bill for the maintenance of race-horses or racecourses, or even the Grand

[LORD BLYTON.]  
National. Next year, if Mrs. Topham wins in court, will see the end of the Grand National.

I am not opposed to a lottery Bill, but I believe that the proceeds of a lottery Bill ought to go to something better than horseracing, or the Aintree course, or anything like that. If the proceeds of the Bill had been to help the sick, the aged or the infirm, it would have had my full support. But I could not vote for the proceeds of a lottery to go to maintain horseracing. I know that £866 million per annum is spent on various forms of gambling in this country—on bingo, horseracing, dogs, anything you can think of. Any Bill which would take from this sum up to £100 million a year for our hospitals, I would support. Ireland, Australia and France have their lotteries on horses. They run them to help their hospitals in their own country. I do not see why we should not do it here. I want to make my position quite clear. I do not oppose this Bill on principle, but because the proceeds are to be devoted to a cause which I think is a wrong one, and I hope that the Government will oppose the Bill.

4.14 p.m.

LORD LEATHERLAND: My Lords, at this moment the nation is wrestling with the huge problem of its balance of trade. At this moment the whole world is worried about Vietnam. But here we are, in one of the greatest Parliaments in the world, discussing the question of horseracing, and bandying betting tips about the Chamber. I hardly think that this is calculated to enhance the esteem in which we are held in the country.

I do not speak as a killjoy. I do not speak as one who dislikes horses. For many years, I regularly kept two or three hunters. I rode them every day. I took Tuesday off from work every week to ride with the local hounds in my part of the county. I really do like horses; I do like riding, and I have no particular dislike of horse-racing. But I do not want to view this subject from the standpoint of discussing the ethics of gambling. When all is said and done, we live in a world of bingo, of pools, of the Stock Exchange and of the Church Commissioners gambling in equities, of

premium bonds introduced by a former Conservative Prime Minister and so on.

There are many people in this country who, as the noble Lord has said, regularly send a pound over the seas for a ticket in the Irish Sweepstake. So I do not want to be any more of a hypocrite than any other noble Lord, or indeed anybody outside this House. But I think we can overestimate the importance of horse-racing as an industry in this country; and I agree with my noble friend Lord Blyton that if there is to be a sweepstake then it should be for a worthy cause. Do not let it in to subsidise what is really a vested private interest—the ownership of the land by a certain family at a certain place.

I was rather struck by an utterance of the noble Viscount, Lord Massereene and Ferrard, who said that racing helps the economy. Well, if you go some day to Newmarket Heath and see thousands of people there, thirsting to join in the drive for more productivity, surely that is—

VISCOUNT MASSEREENE AND FERRARD: My Lords, if the noble Lord will allow me to say so, I was referring to the bloodstock industry, which is a great exporting industry. You cannot have a bloodstock industry if you do not have racing to back it up.

LORD LEATHERLAND: My Lords, one of my own horses was exported. It was a very fine horse. I bought it from Sir Abe Bailey; so it was a pretty good horse, and it had come from the blood of a Derby winner. But there are even more important export industries than the bloodstock industry. There are steel, textiles, coal. Do not let us get things out of proportion. When we try to pretend on this delightful spring afternoon that the encouragement of the racing industry, and particularly the subsidisation of a particular property firm, is the main thing and the most important thing that this country has to consider—

VISCOUNT MASSEREENE AND FERRARD: My Lords, if I may again interrupt the noble Lord, ought we not then to do away with football pools? Football pools serve no useful purpose at all—absolutely none; whereas a State lottery to help racing, would.

LORD LEATHERLAND: My Lords, the noble Viscount is jumping up and



down like a tick-tack man. May I proceed? As I say, I should not be opposed to a State lottery for a worthy cause. But I do not think this is a worthy cause. Secondly, I should not rush with enthusiasm into a State lottery, even for a worthy cause. But it is not my object this afternoon (I have intervened only at the last moment) to preach a sermon on ethics or morality. I should like to deal only with one small technical point which has come to my notice while reading the Bill. I must confess that I am not too conversant with racing finance, but if your Lordships look at Clause 1(2) you will find that 25 per cent. of the proceeds are to go to research, and 50 per cent. in prizes, and then 2½ per cent., or £150,000, whichever is the greater, is to go to recreation for the public.

Here is the simple and narrow point on which I wish to address your Lordships. If we assume that the proceeds—what are called here “the whole proceeds”—are £500,000, let us proceed to work out the arithmetic of that situation. First of all, we deduct the 25 per cent., which is £125,000. That leaves us with £375,000. Then we deduct the 50 per cent., which is £250,000. That brings us down to £125,000. With £125,000 in our satchel, we march on to the next subsection of the clause, and find that we are committed under this Bill to give somebody £150,000. How do we do it?

LORD JESSEL: You have forgotten the 2½ per cent., first of all.

LORD LEATHERLAND: No. The Bill says,

“two and one-half per cent. . . . or £150,000 (whichever is the greater)”.

And as in the case I have taken the whole proceeds are only £500,000, then the £150,000 would be the greater. So at the end of the two parts of the transaction, we have £125,000 in our satchel. Then we proceed to the third part, and out of that we have to find £150,000. Without walking further down morality lane, I am going to suggest that a Bill which is drawn so carelessly and so irresponsibly as that, certainly ought not to be given a Second Reading by this House.

4.21 p.m.

LORD CITRINE: My Lords, I hope that, before the debate concludes, some of us whose names are not down on the list of speakers will be able to put our point of view. I do not know whether

or not this Bill had anything to do with Party politics. So far as I am concerned, I hope that it will be entirely free from that. When I was a workman I should have said that the most frequent topic of conversation among my workmates was what was going to win the big race. I saw no particular evidence of immorality about the occasional shilling they put on horse-racing. For myself, I have never been a punter—not because of any moral scruple, but because of the fact that whenever I do bet I generally lose.

My first experience of the Grand National—I forget the year—was the year in which “Poethlyn” was a strong favourite to win. It had won the race the previous year, and the night before the race took place the second year, when his horse was the favourite, the trainer—evidently a kindly soul—walked around the jumps, thought they were stiffer than ever, declared that his horse would have no trouble, but hoped that others would get across, much as he doubted it. On the strength of that very competent prediction, I put £3, which I could ill afford, on “Poethlyn.” The race had scarcely started before my acquisitive instincts took hold of me, and I went to a bookmaker and put on another £2. Immediately I had done so, almost as though I had given the signal, the odds against “Poethlyn” lengthened very considerably. I did not discover until later, when I saw the jockey coming in, a mass of bruises and cuts, his clothes in tears and tatters, that “Poethlyn” had fallen at the first jump. My money had really gone to the charitable organisation which maintains the bookmakers.

Nobody can deny that the Grand National is one of our great English spectacles, just as the Derby is. I well remember the dramatic race (I think it was in 1957) when I was able to accompany Mr. Malenkov, who in those days was a prominent personality in Soviet Russia, to see the race. It was a race in which “Devon Loch”, the Queen Mother’s horse, was approaching the winning post with a clear lead, but through some misfortune—cramp or something of the kind—the horse collapsed and lost the race. I told Mr. Malenkov that if he went to the Grand National every year subsequently he would never see a more dramatic event on that course than that one.

[Lord Citrine.]

The purpose of the Bill is a perfectly sensible one. Here we have a racecourse which quite clearly is falling into decay, partly because of lack of patronage and partly because of lack of resources on the part of the owner to meet any temporary misfortune of that kind. The purpose of this Bill, so far as I understood the very condensed, sensible and logical speech of the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading, is to restore that racecourse to a position whereby it can, to say the least, provide those who go there with comfort and make the course something of what it was in its heyday.

I agree with the noble Lord who said earlier that perhaps the references to the proportions of the money raised by the sweepstake should be revised. I assume that that kind of thing could be dealt with at the Committee stage of the Bill. This Bill, like other Bills, is subject to amendment. The mover has shown no bias, and I should think that he would be amenable to Amendments which would conduce to the general desire of the House. But the first call on the Bill, whatever we say, must be to restore the racecourse. I, for one, think that that is a worthy cause, and it is one that will have my support.

4.27 p.m.

THE LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN: My Lords, I apologise for not having heard the speech of the noble Lord, Lord Jessel, in introducing the Second Reading of this Bill. Perhaps I may be allowed to say certain things in view of statements which were made earlier; and also because I take my See title from a City which has just lost a racecourse. We shall see at the end of this month whether, in fact, it is possible to transfer the Lincolnshire Handicap to another course with any success. There are those who say that it will be a very much better race run under new conditions. Whether or not that would be so with the Grand National, I do not know, but we should not take too romantic a view about a racecourse, which, admittedly, has been in existence for some years, and think that a particular race can never be transferred without losing a part of our national heritage. That seems to me to be exaggerating the argument for this particular Bill.

I suggest that the real debate is not concerned with the morality of gambling. The noble Viscount, Lord Massereene and Ferrard, suggested, to my surprise, that the Church of England regarded this as a sin. I do not know on which of our formularies he bases this somewhat surprising statement. I would suggest that he himself expressed a view—which would be that not only of many members of the Church of England but of moral theologians—that matters such as gambling or drinking are matters for the Christian conscience, provided that it is guided by those admirable principles which the noble Lord himself expressed. It would be a mistake if in this debate we were to become involved with the morality or otherwise of gambling.

While it is proper that we should be reminded that the Grand National is a great race, and one that has played a great part in the social history of this country, I do not think that is the real issue here. I am bound to say that, having listened to the debates, I still cannot see any real justification for this particular proposal. Why, for example, is it not possible for this immensely important industry (as we have been told it is), which is responsible for so much of the transfer of wealth in this country, not to be able itself to put into good order a particular course which is required for the continuation of this particular race? In other words, the Betting Levy Board, surely, is a proper charge.

But ought we not to give serious consideration to the desirability of changing by legislation what, up to now, has been our custom of not having national sweepstakes? I cannot see any reason why, if it were thought fit, in the wisdom of your Lordships and Members of another place, to approve this Bill, we should not be inundated with many other infinitely better causes for sweepstakes. I cannot think that the grounds given are so grave that the only way of meeting them is to set up yet another form of gambling at a time when our affluent society has certainly considerable play in that field. And I should not particularly wish to see the existing opportunities extended.

4.30 p.m.

VISCOUNT DILHORNE: My Lords, I have listened with interest to everything

that has been said in this debate, and perhaps I had better start in the same way as my noble friend Lord Jessel, by declaring that I have no interest in racing. Of course, I say that using the word "interest" in the purely Parliamentary sense. Indeed, I have never had a horse in training and the last time I rode in a race over fences was in 1939. I will not disclose how much overweight I was.

However, a great deal of this debate to-day has been in relation to the Grand National, and not so very much has been said about the general scope of this Bill. May I say at the beginning that it may be possible for the right reverend Prelate—who no doubt will be watching with interest what happens about the Lincoln—to transfer the Lincoln to Doncaster. But I do not myself believe that one can transfer the Grand National to any other course in the country without a very signal change in its character. We have heard a lot about noble Lords' first speculations. I cannot remember when mine was. We have not had many tips about the race on Saturday week. But I was hoping to be there myself, unless of course the Government, following the bad example set by another place, instead of sitting on Wednesday mornings decide to sit on Saturday afternoons.

It would, I think, be greatly regretted—and I speak for myself personally; this is not a Party matter but one on which, if it comes to a vote, I hope we shall have a free vote—if the Grand National ceased to exist; yet we are told by my noble friend that this year's Grand National will be the last unless something is done. But when one reads the whole of this Bill, one does not see the words "Grand National!" in it at all. I make no complaint of that, because I think the case for this Bill can be put in a wider aspect—although I do not expect the right reverend Prelate entirely to agree with me—than the case for reconditioning or refurbishing Aintree.

If one looks at the Bill one sees that it extends to two racecourses; and, if I may say so, I think it is important to bear in mind (without doing any of those careful arithmetical sums of the noble Lord, Lord Leatherland, who intervened at short notice to raise what was really no more or less than a purely Commit-

tee point) that one sees from Clause 1(2) that the main objects of a sweepstake held under this Bill will be either charitable or benevolent. Under this Bill, as I read it, a total of 25 per cent. of the proceeds will go to research into illness or mental defectiveness. My noble friend has said that he would be perfectly ready to consider broadening or altering that provision, and presumably he would be prepared to alter the percentage if thought right.

I should like your Lordships to consider that percentage with what will accrue to others under this Bill, if it is carried in its present form. Fifty per cent. of the stake money will go in prizes—whether or not that is too big a percentage I would not know, but take the figure as 50 per cent.; 22½ per cent. will go to the promoters. In addition to paying all the expenses of running the sweepstake—I have no idea what they will amount to—they have to pay to this board, which is going to be set up under Clause 1(5), a sum, and a substantial sum, because the right to run the sweepstake at all will be out to auction. What in fact 22½ per cent. of the stake money will amount to one does not know, but presumably the promoters would have to pay, I would guess, something like 10 or 15 per cent. of what they are likely to get in stake money to have any right to run the sweepstake at all. Also, if I read the Bill correctly, it is only going to be out of this arbitrary figure of 10 to 15 per cent. that any provision is going to be made for Aintree, after deduction of the expenses of this nominated body.

So, my Lords, with the greatest respect to him, I did feel that the objections of the noble Lord, Lord Blyton, to whose speech I listened with interest, were rather misconceived, for this reason. He said, and said very firmly, that he did not oppose the Bill on principle, and that if it was for the support of hospitals he would support it. Bearing in mind that, as the Bill now stands, 25 per cent. will be for hospitals, 2½ per cent. for local authority recreation, and 22½ per cent. for the promoters, out of which they have to pay for the right to run the sweepstake—let us assume that that is 10 to 15 per cent.—it is only out of that 10 to 15 per cent. that anything will go to racing.



LORD BLYTON: My Lords, my position is quite clear. I want the whole of the proceeds apart from the expenses to go to hospitals.

VISCOUNT DILHORNE: My Lords, the noble Lord made his position quite clear, and I was hoping to prevail upon him slightly to move his position. He and I have known each other for a very long time. I was delighted to be present to hear his maiden speech in this House, although, as he said, it was not the first time he had spoken here because he spoke here when making his maiden speech in another assembly in 1945. I did it two years earlier in this House. I am afraid I do not remember the noble Lord's maiden speech on that occasion, but I am sure it was good, as indeed his speech was to-day, although I disagree with the conclusion to which he came. The noble Lord once tried to lead me down a pit, but then he had second thoughts, thought better of it, and withdrew the invitation.

We have had a really interesting debate with no fewer than three maiden speeches. There was the noble Lord, Lord Greenway, who was quite clear in his support for this measure, and the noble Lord, Lord Crawshaw, who made a very powerful plea for this Bill. I am sure we are all very pleased to see him here, and I hope he will come and join in our deliberations again because we enjoy his presence.

I rise to give my support to this Bill, because I think it is a measure of general importance. I really do not see why we should not have a measure of this sort—I think it is a well drafted measure—which fulfils so many objects. The main object, as I see it, is to provide funds for charitable and benevolent purposes, and why should we not have a sweepstake for that? The Irish Sweepstake has flourished for many years. My noble friend Lord Moyne said that, if we passed this Bill, we should make it legal to take tickets in the Irish Sweepstake. If my memory serves me aright, the whole of our lottery laws started by laws being passed to prevent competition with the Government. I think that is so, and I certainly do not think that this question of purchasing Irish Sweepstake tickets ought to bear one way or another in relation to this Bill.

There are two Amendments which I hope my noble friend will consider if this Bill is given a Second Reading. In the first place, although its intent seems fairly clear, I think that Clause 1(3) might be drafted a little more specifically. Secondly, Clause 1(5) provides that,

“The Secretary of State shall nominate a body being a body incorporated by statute”.

I think it would be desirable that this Bill in itself should provide for the creation of that body and we should not have to have another Bill to provide for its existence. I agree very much with the noble Lord, Lord Airedale, that this is not a Party matter, but I cannot join with him in expressing any view upon whether the Grand National race should be at all changed. I myself, as a mere spectator, would much prefer to see it remain as it is.

My Lords, I do not propose to speak any longer upon the Bill except to say this. I hope that if this Bill secures a Second Reading my noble friend will consult with those at Liverpool to see whether there are any changes which they may wish to have made to it—and, perhaps in passing, consult the Lord Bishop of Liverpool, to see whether or not he views with equanimity the loss of a famous race from his diocese, which Lincoln, apparently, can suffer without any severe hardship. If this matter is pressed to a Division I will myself certainly support my noble friend. This is a non-Party matter, and I hope that if the Bill does get a Second Reading we can join together in making it an even better Bill than it is now.

My Lords, I think this Bill is skilfully drawn. The noble Lord, Lord Leatherland, seemed to think it was wrong that we should be discussing this subject at all when there are other, more important, subjects to discuss—such as, he said, exports; and I was surprised that he viewed with comparative equanimity the loss of exports in this field, bearing in mind the loss of exports due to Government action which has been suffered in so many other fields. But we are not debating that today. The noble Lord made it quite clear that he intervened solely to raise, as I have said, a purely Committee point, but I do not agree with him that this Bill is carelessly and irresponsibly

drawn. I think it is extremely cleverly devised to achieve the object of securing that the greater part of the proceeds of the sweepstake will go to benevolent and charitable objects, and that at the same time provision is made for the carrying on, at Aintree, of the Grand National as it used to be and as many of us hope it will be for many, many years to come.

4.42 p.m.

LORD STRANGE: My Lords, I was afraid mine was going to make it a treble, but now I should like to make an accumulator of maiden speeches. This will be my first speech in the House, and I think I am making a forecast, because the point I wish to make is really a Committee point, or it verges on that. Most Members of this House will at some time or other have ridden a motor bicycle and most of them will have ridden a horse. It happens that, at this time, the Tourist Trophy Race in the Isle of Man also contemplates have a sweepstake. The point I wish to make, which I think is really a Committee point, is this. The organisers have decided not to announce the draw until after the race is over, because although in both the Grand National and the Tourist Trophy Race the riders are very sporting riders indeed, as we all know, it is felt that they might be influenced by some sort of bribery.

I think this is a point which should be borne in mind, because it is a new idea in sweepstakes to tell the names of the draw after the race is over. I do not think it has been done before. It has this advantage: that when the people who have bought tickets are watching the race on television they think that every horse is theirs—"This is my horse, and it is going to win". It is only afterwards that they find out it is not.

4.44 p.m.

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, the noble and learned Viscount, Lord Dilhorne, like the noble Lord, Lord Jessel, assured us that, in the Parliamentary sense, they had no interest in the subject-matter of this Bill. But I think that, if this debate has made one thing clear, it is that all of us have a keen interest in racing, and I think that is pretty representative of the British people.

This has been a quite remarkable debate. We have had no fewer than six late entries as speakers (six chalk jockeys, in racing parlance), and we have had the remarkable number of four maiden speeches—four novice steeplechasers, as it were; divisions one, two, three and four, which I think is more even than they had on Monday at Cheltenham. All the maiden speeches have been welcome. The noble Lord, Lord Greenway, gave us in point of time a sort of five furlong sprint—not delivered quite in that tempo, but nevertheless very welcome. He assured us of the great interest in the National in, among other places, Rhodesia. I can assure him that, in even darker places than that, there is a very keen interest—Her Majesty's prisons, for example, where they have bets in quite strange coinage but, nevertheless, bookmakers as well. We all welcomed very much indeed the first-class maiden speech by the noble Lord, Lord Crawshaw. I am sorry that he waited two years to make his maiden effort, because I am quite sure that all of us hope that it will certainly be less than two months before we hear from him again, and that we shall often have the favour of his contributions.

My noble friend Lord Blyton, twenty years in Parliament, scarcely qualifies for the apprentice allowance, so far as maiden speakers are concerned, but we certainly welcomed his version of the Blydon Races, and we look forward to his contributions on other subjects. The noble Lord, Lord Strange, made, as he put it, a Committee point. And, although I do not propose to comment on his suggestion (which would have disadvantages that for the moment I will not canvas) at least we are glad that he has broken the ice, and that it was not on the other side of a very tall fence that he broke it.

My Lords, it seemed to me, in listening to some of the contributions, that, when noble Lords described what they called their descent into Averno, their whole attitude towards racing was decided by their initial experience. The noble Lord, Lord Jessel, for example, who backed "Grand Parade" at 33 to 1, was all in favour of this Bill. The noble Viscount, Lord Massereene and Ferrard, had a successful bet at odds that he could not remember, and was paid out only by the kindness of the bookmaker. I hope it was the bookmaker with whom

[Lord Stonham.]

the noble Viscount had the bet, because otherwise it would have been unfair. The noble Lord, Lord Airedale, it seemed to me, was not quite so uncompromisingly supporting, and I rather thought that that was because his first winner was only 4 to 1, and therefore he was not quite so enthusiastic.

If I may deal first with one point which was referred to by the noble Viscount and was also raised by the noble Lord, Lord Moyne, I think, he said that in this country it was illegal to purchase a ticket in the Irish Sweep. I am able to say that, to be precise, neither the 1934 Act nor, indeed, the 1963 Act make it an offence to buy a ticket in the Irish Hospitals Sweepstake; but it is an offence to sell or distribute tickets, or to send out of the country money in respect of the sale of these tickets.

As I have said, this has been a very interesting debate, with a great deal of expertise, and in some ways I regret that I shall have to do my best, I hope not altogether without success, to demolish the arguments that have been put forward. The noble Lord, Lord Jessel, has put before us a highly coloured and alluring prospectus. He put his case, I thought, in a wholly admirable and restrained way, and sincerely believed in the points that he was putting forward. Those I can summarise, perhaps, in this way.

First, the prospectus promised that it would save Aintree for racing and save the National, which, I agree, is worth saving—and I think it was the noble Lord, Lord Airedale, who said that. Secondly, millions of people would get a little extra excitement at small cost, and a few people would win fortunes. Thirdly, medical research would receive large-scale financial help. Fourthly, at least £150,000 would be provided for recreational facilities in the racecourse area. Fifthly (though this was not mentioned in the debate), we should prevent another injustice to Ireland, and, in fact, everyone would be happy—especially, my Lords, the promoters.

So far as Aintree is concerned—and the debate has made it quite clear that, despite the words about the value of the money for medical research, this is the mainspring of the Bill—I give place to

none in wanting to see Aintree preserved as a racecourse and for the Grand National to continue to be run there. It engages the excited interest and admiration of virtually the whole nation and a good deal of interest also in other countries. The National, in my view, is the world's greatest contest for horse and rider. It would be regretted by almost everyone in this country if it were threatened. I agree with the noble Duke, the Duke of Atholl, and the noble and learned Viscount, that, whatever we called it, the National on a park course would be just another steeplechase. But I do not accept this Bill as the solution for Aintree. Aintree has been losing money for some years. Understandably, the owner wants to sell and has been prevented from selling only by the fortunate and public-spirited action of Lord Sefton.

But apart from the British people themselves, there are powerful public bodies interested in preserving the course. The Government have no direct knowledge of what they may intend, or whether any direct approach is likely to be made in the matter. There is, in our view, no reason to believe that if the threat to Aintree should become real, or imminent, means will not be found to preserve it. Indeed the present situation might well lead to improvement of the present facilities and fuller development of the course in the public interest so that it could become a paying proposition. To my mind that removes the mainspring and principal attraction of the Bill.

I will deal now with the "fortunes for a few". This is my second objection to the Bill, because this proposal is another addition to the major industry of gambling. I am not now arguing about the morality of gambling; I want to make the point (which has so far not been made in this debate) that it is surely fundamentally wrong to set the seal of State approval on a proposal for a private person to run this monopoly; to set the seal of State approval on this unhealthy octopus of gambling which is spreading its tentacles among all classes and ages of people throughout the length and breadth of the land. There are football pools, bingo, the dogs and thousands and thousands of betting shops. Of course, it may be argued that



it is only another £10 million or another £20 million. You can say, as did the noble Lord, Lord Jessel, that the *Daily Express* has made its inquiries which show that nearly nine out of ten people are in favour—in favour of something for nothing. The *Evening News* headline was “It’s a Winner!”.

But this is not an ordinary sweepstake ; it is something to which the Government are being asked to give State approval. Her Majesty’s Government feel that at this we should draw the line. According to the estimates by the Churches Council on Gambling, the nation is spending something like £860 million a year, not including what may be spent in gaming clubs. That means that the total may approach £1,000 million a year, or 25s. a week for each family. The other day my noble friend Lord Robens pointed out that this is giving the country a wrong sense of priorities. Some 50,000 people are employed full-time on just taking bets and administering the betting machine. This is as many as are employed in the vital engineering tools industry. Bookmakers alone employ almost as many people as the total of those actually engaged full-time in sport and recreation. Are the Government to make this unhappy situation worse? It is impossible to get people by law to refrain from gambling ; but it is possible, when the opportunity arises, to refuse to encourage gambling by Statute ; and that is what the Government are asking Parliament to do now.

This Bill is a very different proposition from the Betting, Gaming and Lotteries Act, 1963. That Act, while declaring all lotteries illegal, makes specified exceptions for private lotteries—for example, at dinners, dances, bazaars and similar entertainments. And it allows certain small public lotteries for charitable, sporting, cultural and other non-commercial purposes. All these lotteries are subject to conditions to ensure that they may be conducted only on a relatively small scale, with limited stakes and prizes, and that the proceeds, after permitted deductions for expenses, are devoted to purposes other than private gain. In those lotteries where tickets may be sold to the public, the conditions imposed by the Act limit the price to one shilling, the total value of tickets to £750, total prizes to 50 per cent. of the proceeds,

and the first prize to £100. No remuneration may be paid to the promoter, or to any person employed by the promoter, who is engaged in a betting business. The expenses must not exceed 10 per cent. of the whole proceeds. People give cheerfully to these small “swindles”, as they are commonly called, in the knowledge, first that they are supporting a cause in which they believe and, second, because no one is making a profit out of it.

This Bill is a totally different proposition. When the Press first noted it, it said that its sponsors quite frankly expected it to gross £10 million ; and in my view that is a conservative estimate. But even on that basis the promoters’ “cut” would be no less than £2½ million. It is true that out of this they would have to pay the tender price to the body nominated by Statute (it has been suggested it would be the Horserace Betting Levy Board), and they would have to pay promotional expenses. But at the end of the day its promoters—and it was suggested that Crockford’s, the gaming club, might be among those who would tender—would be the big winners, to the tune, probably, of £1 million. This is “nice work, if you can get it”.

If it were a wholly private business, no one could raise any objection, provided that it was legal. But this would not be a private venture ; it would be a privately-owned monopoly created by the State. Whenever in the recent past such a proposition has been put forward and responsibly considered, it has been rejected. The noble Lord, Lord Jessel, spoke of the Royal Commission who twice considered this matter within the last thirty years. He said that they only mildly condemned it, and that their reasoning was out of date. I am not, of course, actually quoting the noble Lord ; I am only paraphrasing his remarks.

LORD JESSEL: Quite correct.

LORD STONHAM: What did the Royal Commission say? First, the Royal Commission of 1932-33 considered the question of allowing large-scale lotteries, promoted either by or on behalf of the State or a public body, and recommended categorically against them. At the time when that Royal Commission was appointed the Irish Hospitals Trust Sweepstakes were very popular, although

[Lord Stonham.]

the sale of tickets was illegal. The Commission was concerned to find out whether this implied a public demand for such a sweepstake in this country and whether a change in the law to permit such a sweepstake was desirable. It heard evidence from many witnesses on the subject, and in its Report dealt very fully with the questions of principle and the practical considerations involved.

Three different schemes were suggested to the Commission—first, State lotteries for the direct benefit of the Exchequer; secondly, a board set up by Parliament to promote lotteries for charitable objects, and, thirdly, a system of permits to promote lotteries, the profits being devoted to public or charitable objects. As regards lotteries in general, the Commission decided that the main objections were that they represented gambling in its easiest form, calling for no skill or knowledge, and thus appealed to many who would not, for instance, risk their money in backing a horse. There was also the dazzling lure, to the ordinary man or woman, of large prizes. On the whole, the Royal Commission decided that lotteries were objectionable in principle and socially undesirable, as likely to lead to a spread of gambling. Their conclusions covered the alternative proposals and condemned them all. The 1949-51 Royal Commission also considered this question. I will not go into all they said in detail, but they supported the objections of the previous Commission, so these views are not out of date.

As regards large-scale lotteries not conducted by the State—that is, the type we are now asked to approve—the Royal Commission had no hesitation in agreeing that the basic difficulty was that there would be no logical or equitable grounds for restricting the right to promote such lotteries to a strictly limited number of organisations—or tenderers, as under this Bill. It was also their view that, if the number was not strictly limited, it was probable that lotteries would be promoted for spurious objects, and also that many of those promoted for genuine objects would fail. The argument that it would be undesirable for the State itself to participate or be concerned in any way in the promotion of a lottery, as contemplated by this Bill, still holds good to-day. There can be no question about this, and noble

Lords who want to support the Bill must face up to this point. Do they agree that the State should approve and authorise a lottery? Do they wish to set the seal of approval on a lottery which is going to be administered by a private person?

As has been said, though little has been made of it during the debate—except by the right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, who I hope gets the other half of his double—horseracing alone among sports already benefits from a substantial statutory levy on betting transactions, and is therefore already in a position of advantage. Since the Horse-race Betting Levy Board was established it has distributed, or will be distributing, in accordance with schemes already agreed, a sum of almost £8½ million, a considerable proportion of which consists of direct grants for the improvement of racecourses or of the facilities and services which are a necessary adjunct at racecourses. And, of course, assistance for the improvement or preservation of Aintree would be something that the Levy Board would be entitled to consider. This is important to all who want to preserve Aintree.

It was clearly far from the minds of both Royal Commissions that there could ever be justification for a proposal which would provide a large margin of profit for a commercial promoter enjoying a monopoly right to promote a public lottery, and surely there can never be justification for such an arrangement under Government sponsorship. I firmly believe that Aintree can be saved by other and more respectable means. Funds for medical research can be, are, and should be, provided by the taxpayer and by charitably disposed persons. Stripped of these lures, it means that we are being asked in this Bill to set up machinery empowering the Government to grant, to a private person or persons, what amounts to a licence to print money. I trust that we shall have no hesitation in refusing, and if it should come to a Division I hope that your Lordships will have no hesitation in refusing to give this Bill a Second Reading.

THE DUKE OF ATHOLL: My Lords, before the noble Lord finishes, I understood him to say that the Betting Levy Board have power to give money to all racecourses. I thought that they could

give money only to racecourses with security of tenure and that that was the difficulty over Aintree, where in fact no one had security of tenure.

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, the noble Duke will doubtless understand that the Levy Board is also aware of these things. I prefer not to make any comment on what he has just said.

5.6 p.m.

LORD JESSEL: My Lords, I thank all those who have taken part in this extremely interesting and, at times, amusing debate. I am really flattered because we have had four maiden speakers. I will not weary the House by trying to make a winding-up speech, but there are one or two speeches I would mention. There is, especially, the speech of the noble Lord, Lord Crawshaw, who spoke, I thought, with great sincerity and most effectively. There was also the extremely sensible and measured speech from the noble Lord, Lord Citrine. And I am very grateful to the noble and learned Viscount, Lord Dilhorne, for explaining the Bill and for really getting to the "guts" of the Bill, which, as a trained lawyer, he did far better than I could, and also for dealing with the 22½ per cent., which is going to be at the mercy of the voracious promoter, of whom the noble Lord, Lord Stonham, is so frightened. Only this 22½ per cent. will not fall into their pockets. There will be intense competition. The noble Lord, Lord Stonham, mentioned Crockford's as being interested. I know they are. And I am sure that other people such as Littlewoods and Mr. William Hill will be interested and that the competition will be extremely hot.

I would also thank the noble Lord, Lord Stonham, for his extremely amusing and genial winding-up speech. He has shown an extraordinarily intimate knowledge of racing phraseology. I did not quite follow his explanation of the legal situation in regard to the purchase of Irish Sweepstake tickets in this country. I think he made it a little obscure. Apparently it is not an offence to buy tickets, but it is to sell them and send the money for them.

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, I am sorry that I did not make the position perfectly clear. It is not an offence to purchase Irish Hospitals Sweepstake tickets. It is an offence to distribute them as an agent and to send abroad for that purpose.

LORD JESSEL: Is it an offence to remit the money?

LORD STONHAM: That means acting as an agent.

LORD JESSEL: In any event, in spite of the obscurity, I understand that a great deal of money from this country does find its way to Dublin. The crux of the objections of Her Majesty's Government to this Bill, so far as I can see, is that small smell of private profit. Are the Government against football pools on principle? Surely there is there a large private profit and I should have thought that it was very much on all fours with what is envisaged in this Bill.

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, may I make the Government's position clear? With regard to football pools, the Government have not created a private monopoly. Apparently, anyone can set up a football pool. The proposal here is that the Government should create a private monopoly. That is the objection.

LORD JESSEL: If the noble Lord's argument is right, then I think the Government should abolish football pools. I suggest that if some private promoter was allowed to handle this sweepstake it would be done much more efficiently; more tickets would be sold at less cost; there would be more money for worthwhile causes and for racing. If I am asked whether I approve that the State should authorise a lottery and give some private organisation authority to administer it and make a small profit, I say, unreservedly, Yes. My Lords, I have nothing more to say.

5.14 p.m.

On Question, Whether the Bill shall be now read 2<sup>a</sup>?

Their Lordships divided: Contents, 62; Not-Contents, 46.

#### CONTENTS

Aberdeen and Temair, M.  
Airedale, L.  
Amulree, L.

Arran, E.  
Atholl, D.  
Balerno, L.

Barrington, V.  
Boston, L.  
Braye, L.



Brocket, L.  
Brooke of Ystradfellte, Bs.  
Citrine, L.  
Colwyn, L.  
Conesford, L.  
Cowley, E.  
Crawshaw, L.  
Daventry, V.  
Denham, L.  
Devonshire, D.  
Dilhorne, V.  
Drumalbyn, L.  
Dudley, L.  
Elliot of Harwood, Bs.  
Falkland, V.  
Falmouth, V.  
Ferrers, E.  
Fleck, L.

Giendevon, L.  
Goschen, V.  
Gosford, E.  
Greenway, L.  
Grenfell, L.  
Grimston of Westbury, L.  
Hastings, L.  
Hereford, V.  
Horsbrugh, Bs.  
Howard of Glossop, L.  
Hurd, L.  
Ilford, L.  
Inglewood, L.  
Jessel, L. [*Teller.*]  
Long, V.  
MacAndrew, L.  
McCorquodale of Newton, L.  
Margadale, L.

Massereene and Ferrard, V.  
[*Teller.*]  
Mottistone, L.  
Mowbray and Stourton, L.  
Newall, L.  
Newton, L.  
St. Aldwyn, E.  
St. Helens, L.  
St. Just, L.  
Selkirk, E.  
Spens, L.  
Strange, L.  
Strange of Knokin, Bs.  
Terrington, L.  
Thurlow, L.  
Tweedsmuir, L.  
Wolverton, L.  
Wootton, E.

## NOT-CONTENTS

Addison, V.  
Alport, L.  
Archibald, L.  
Arwyn, L.  
Attlee, E.  
Blyton, L.  
Bourne, L.  
Bowles, L.  
Brown, L.  
Burden, L.  
Champion, L.  
Chorley, L.  
Chuter-Ede, L.  
Colgrain, L.  
Cork and Orrery, E.  
Fraser of North Cape, L.

Gardiner, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)  
Hawke, L.  
Hobson, L.  
Leatherland, L. [*Teller.*]  
Lincoln, L. Bp.  
Lindgren, L.  
Listowel, E.  
Longford, E. (*L. Privy Seal.*)  
Merthyr, L.  
Milner of Leeds, L.  
Milverton, L.  
Mitchison, L.  
Molson, L.  
Morrison, L.  
Norwich, L. Bp.

Peddie, L.  
Robertson of Oakridge, L.  
St. Davids, V.  
Segal, L. [*Teller.*]  
Shepherd, L.  
Silkin, L.  
Somers, L.  
Sorensen, L.  
Stonham, L.  
Summerskill, Bs.  
Taylor, L.  
Tenby, V.  
Wade, L.  
Williamson, L.  
Willis, L.

Resolved in the affirmative: Bill read 2a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

### MINISTERIAL SALARIES AND MEMBERS' PENSIONS BILL

5.23 p.m.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, That the House do now resolve itself into Committee.—(*Lord Champion.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.  
House in Committee accordingly.

[The LORD MERTHYR in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 to 6 agreed to.

Clause 7:

#### *Pensions of Members*

(3) The annual amount of the pension payable under this section shall be a sum calculated by reference to the number of complete years of reckonable service of the Member in question, as follows:—

(a) for each year up to fifteen, £60;

(b) for each such year exceeding fifteen but not exceeding forty-five, £24.

(4) A pension under this section shall continue for the life of the person to whom it is payable but shall not be payable in respect of any period during which he is again a Member of the House of Commons or is a candidate for election thereto; and for the purposes of this subsection a person who ceases to be a Member in consequence of the dissolution of Parliament shall be treated as a candidate for election unless and until he gives notice in writing to the Trustees that he is not seeking re-election.

(5) In this Part of this Act the expression "reckonable service" means, subject to the provisions of sections 11 and 13 of this Act relating to the refund of contributions and the transfer of pension rights,—

(a) service as a Member of the House of Commons after 16th October 1964, being service in respect of which contributions are paid under section 5 of this Act;

(b) service as a Member of that House before that date by a person who is a Member of that House at any time after that date;

but if in any case the service described in paragraph (b) above exceeds ten years, the excess shall be disregarded.

On Question, Whether Clause 7 shall stand part of the Bill?

LORD INGLEWOOD: I gave the noble Lord, Lord Champion, notice that I wanted to seek some information about this clause, particularly subsection (5)(b). Here we are concerned with the credits in a pension scheme for past services, over and above the future service financed by Members' contributions. I am sure the noble Lord will agree that it is right that we in Parliament should take an interest in credits or bonuses financed from public funds. I hope I may be excused if I am thought to be over purist—perhaps it is because I served as Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance and, therefore, have been concerned with these things—but I say that with the start of any scheme of this kind it is proper and reasonable that there should be some credit for past service, otherwise it is difficult, in the slang, to get the scheme off the ground.

I may be mistaken, but I should think that Clause 7 is open to the criticism of being too lavish on two grounds. First, there is the cost to the taxpayer. The Lawrence Report, Paragraph 79, estimated that the present capital value of this subsection is £2½ million, which is a great deal of money when we consider that the number of persons concerned is not so very large. It is tempting to suggest that more of us might share in this, but I am not doing that at all—rather the reverse. I am rather suggesting that ten years' credit for past services is too much. The noble Lord will correct me, I know, if I am wrong, but I understand that it could even work in this way. A Member with substantial past service has to serve only a very few days in this present Parliament, pay £150, and thus, under the terms of the scheme, compelling the Exchequer to pay another £150, after which, if he is 65 and his wife is the same age, he will be entitled to a pension the capital value of which in the market, I am advised, is about £6,200—which is not a bad golden handshake at all. Even the Sweepstakes on Horse-races (Authorisation) Bill, which we have just been considering, could hardly offer better prizes.

I suggest that four years' allowance for past services is really more appropriate. At one time I was tempted to table an Amendment, but I feel it better that I

should raise the point in discussion. That allowance, I think, would be more satisfactory all round, and not least to the taxpayer. It would not throw the scheme out of balance. It would provide that as from the beginning of the scheme a Member would have to serve in two Parliaments before he became entitled to a pension, and I do not think that is unreasonable. As I say, it would save the taxpayer a substantial sum.

I shall be interested to hear from the noble Lord the Government's reasoning behind this paragraph in the Bill. I hope he will not fall back on the answer that it is in the Lawrence Report and, therefore, has the character of Holy Writ—because I do not think we have any right to treat the Lawrence Report, no matter what respect we give to it, as Holy Writ. Secondly, I hope he will not say that it is hard to see where to draw the line in a matter like this (because we can all see that) and that in the end they seem to have chosen a line which is fair to everyone and have found the right balance, because that is a safe line of advice to Ministers frequently offered to them by their advisers. I do not think that is really sufficient in this instance. Therefore, as I have given the noble Lord a whole week's notice, I am looking forward to a full answer, because I do not want afterwards to consider putting down an Amendment at a later stage to give him another chance.

LORD CHAMPION: I am obliged to the noble Lord for the way in which he has posed his question, and for having advised me of the fact that he was going to ask it. I am not quite so happy about the way in which he has told me of his arguments and then dares me to use the argument that this is in the Lawrence Report. After all, when I embarked upon this subject I set out on a horse called Lawrence, and now in mid-stream the noble Lord shouts from the bank, "Change horses". I just cannot see a horse anywhere about that is half as good as Lawrence in this connection, because Lawrence, after all, was a Committee set up in order to consider the whole matter of Members' salaries and pensions and, of course, Ministerial salaries as well. So I think to a large extent I must stick to the horse that I happen to be on, namely, Lawrence.

[LORD CHAMPION.]

The Lawrence Committee recommended precisely the figure which is contained in the Bill so far as past service is concerned.

The Government have, of course, considered this matter. It is right that they should do so, and they have come to the point of view that in this matter Lawrence was intrinsically sound. Ten years' credit is just about the right figure for the purpose of getting this scheme off the ground. As the noble Lord will be aware from his past experience, it is the general practice of employers, both public and private, to allow a measure of back service credit when a scheme is established for the first time. This point was put, as I understand it, to the Government Actuary on occupational pension schemes, the report of which was published in 1958. That report said:

"Some degree of back service credit is granted in most pension schemes in public service or nationalised industries and for about one-half of the membership in private schemes. Where granted, a back service credit has been in respect of one-half of past service for most eligible members of insured schemes, but equal to the whole of past service for the great majority of eligible members of other schemes. An upper limit to the length of service allowed to count in full is fairly common, especially in the public service and nationalised industries."

The question is, just how much.

To turn perhaps from generalities to particular cases, in 1947 and 1948 large parts of the subordinate Civil Service staff—that is, industrial grades, messengerial and similar grades—who had previously been unestablished and un pensionable on principle, were established and made pensionable. The effect of the Superannuation Act 1946, which had just then been passed, was to allow these people, as soon as they were established, to count their previous un pensionable service back to 1919 as to the one-half of its actual length, which, as the noble Lord can see, would in many cases be very much more than the ten years which has been accepted for this Bill. Thus in some cases up to fourteen reckonable years of back service credit were granted. Similar provisions, partly contributory, were made for certain categories of staff when the pension schemes of the national coal and gas undertakings were set up. Similarly in local government, certain

non-contributory service was subsequently made reckonable at the sole expense of the employer when the groups of staff concerned became subject to the Local Government Superannuation Scheme for the first time.

We have adopted what seems to be a reasonable precedent that a good employer (although, of course, one is not an employer in quite the same sense here) has adopted in the past in this connection, and I think it is reasonable so to do, partly because it is based on Lawrence, partly because it is based on precedent. I rather think this is just about the right period of service, having regard to the type of scheme and the people for whom this pension is designed, and I rather hope that the noble Lord will feel that in my speech I have answered most of his points and that he will not feel it necessary at Report stage to put down an Amendment.

LORD INGLEWOOD: Before the noble Lord sits down, can he just refer to my calculations about achieving entitlement as a result of a few days' service?—because it is important.

LORD CHAMPION: Clearly the difficulty in all this is that when a date is set somebody who comes just on the right side of the date is going to get a tremendous advantage. Inevitably when a date, or, in some cases, a boundary line, is set, somebody is going to be just outside and somebody just inside. I remember that when I was chairman of an education committee, and there was a two-mile limit in respect of free travel for children to school, somebody on one side of the street could have free travel and somebody on the other side of the street could not.

As to the noble Lord's calculations, I must admit that I have not gone into the matter quite so deeply as all that, and therefore I am not in a position to reply on the actual sum. But it is a fact that some Members of the other place who remained in it for a very short time after the last Election would benefit under this Bill and would, of course, get benefits for which they have never in fact paid. But that is "in the nature of the beast."

LORD NEWTON: Would the noble Lord be good enough to clarify the exact meaning of subsection (4) of Clause 7? I



informed him that I was going to ask him these questions. Subsection (4) of Clause 7 says:

“A pension under this section shall continue for the life of the person to whom it is payable but shall not be payable in respect of any period during which he is again a member of the House of Commons or is a candidate for election thereto;”

It would appear to me that, if this clause is to have any meaning, the words “in respect of any period” must mean “during any period”. If that is so—and one hesitates, as a layman, to make any observations on drafting—perhaps the noble Lord would consider that an Amendment ought to be made; because it seems to me that, as at present drafted, the clause may suggest that further service as a Member, with a gap in between, will not be reckonable for the purpose of pensions, I am quite sure that that is not the intention of the clause.

May I also ask the noble Lord whether the words “candidate for election thereto” do mean a candidate, and not a prospective candidate? What I am thinking of is this. Supposing that a Member of another place is defeated at a General Election, and immediately after is readopted as prospective candidate for his division, it would be bad luck if in the lifetime of this Parliament he would not be able to get his pension. Again, I am certain that is not the intention.

LORD CHAMPION: I am also grateful to the noble Lord for having given me notice of these questions. This is a very courteous House and I like it. Certainly it is helpful to be advised of the possibility of these points being raised. The noble Lord has put quite fairly a point which raises some doubt in his mind. As I understand it, Clause 7 refers to the payment of pension, and not to the reckonable service and so on. As I understand it, the words “in respect of” mean precisely what he thinks they mean; namely, “during”. But whether “during” would be better than “in respect of” is something upon which I am not capable of pronouncing. However, I will put this point to the Parliamentary draftsman, and if he feels that the present wording is not perfectly clear I will, of course, produce an Amendment on Report. But the intention here is, I think, perfectly clear in this connection.

As to the period for which a person may be “a candidate for election thereto”, the candidate for election, as I understand it, is not a prospective candidate in the words that we normally use up to nomination day. From that moment onwards, as I understand it, a person becomes, legally speaking, a candidate; and from that moment onwards no candidate would be able to receive a House of Commons pension. I think this is perfectly clear. Certainly this is the intention of the Bill as it stands, and I think that it fairly clearly says so.

In the case of the period during which Parliament is dissolved and awaiting the next Election, this period between Dissolution and nomination day, the person will be automatically entitled to his pension on Dissolution, provided that he is not going to stand again. If he is going to stand again he will not be so entitled to a pension. If he is not going to stand again, he will be expected to notify the trustees that he is not seeking re-election and therefore will qualify. Subject to the promise I have made to the noble Lord, to look at this matter again between now and Report stage, I hope that I have reasonably satisfied the points he put to me.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 12 agreed to.

Clause 13 [*Transfer to and from other pension schemes*]:

5.41 p.m.

LORD CHAMPION moved, in subsection (4), after “person” to insert:

“any service of his as a Member of the House of Commons before the date on which the payment is made shall cease to be reckonable service and”.

The noble Lord said: This Amendment and the other one run together. The need for the Amendments arises from an error in drafting. The purpose of the Amendment I am now moving is to ensure that when a Member leaves the Commons, and his pension rights are transferred to another scheme, not only his contributory service but also any service before October 16, 1964, ceases to be reckonable service for pension under the Members' scheme. I have a lot of technical explanation here that I could give in respect of this Amendment.

[Lord Champion.]  
but I think it would be better if I confined my remarks to the effect of the Amendments.

The effect of the clause as it now stands would be to allow a man with a maximum of ten years' back service who has left the House with a transfer value which fully represents the value of his accrued rights for those ten years to receive in addition the pension for those ten years when he reaches age 65. In effect, under the clause as it is now drafted he could receive double pension. This is plainly wrong. The Amendment therefore cuts out double entitlement by providing that, when a transfer value is paid, any service before the date on which the payment is made—that is, both contributory and non-contributory service—shall cease to be reckonable. The second part of the Amendment removes the earlier provision, which applied to contributory service only and now becomes needless. With that explanation, although this is slightly more than a drafting Amendment, I hope the Committee will be prepared to accept this Amendment. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 11, line 2, after ("person") insert the said words.—(*Lord Champion.*)

LORD NEWTON: I should like to thank the noble Lord for his explanation.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD CHAMPION: I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 11, line 4, leave out from ("treated") to ("for") in line 5.—(*Lord Champion.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses and Schedules agreed to.

House resumed: Bill reported with Amendments.

DURHAM MARKETS COMPANY  
BILL [H.L.]

LIVERPOOL EXCHANGE  
BILL [H.L.]

Committed to the Committee on Unopposed Bills.

BRIGHTON SKYDECK BILL [H.L.]

GULF OIL REFINING BILL [H.L.]  
Committed to Select Committees.

PORT OF LONDON BILL [H.L.]  
Reported, with Amendments.

WRITTEN ANSWER

UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES OF  
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY:  
BUILDING GRANTS

LORD BROWN asked Her Majesty's Government:

How much money was allocated to individual universities and colleges of advanced technology for building starts in the period 1966-67 out of the £33½ million made available to the University Grants Committee by the Department of Education and Science and whether all that sum has now been allocated.

THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (LORD BOWDEN): It was announced on September 2, 1964, that building starts of £83 million would be allocated to the University Grants Committee for universities (including the colleges of advanced technology) for the period 1966-69. Of this amount £33 million will be released in 1966-67. The amounts allocated to individual institutions are the responsibility of the University Grants Committee and it has never been the practice to publish them.

House adjourned at a quarter before six o'clock.