

HOUSE OF LORDS

Wednesday, 17th 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

LABELLING OF DISPENSED MEDICINES

2.35 p.m.

LORD ST. JUST: 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 they would now consider allowing drugs prescribed by doctors to be named by pharmacists on the packet or bottle of medicine, unless otherwise stated on the prescription.]

THE PARLIAMENTARY UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS AND FOR THE COLONIES (LORD TAYLOR): My Lords, I ought first to correct the implication in the noble Lord's Question that in some way the permission of my right honourable friend the Minister of Health is required before pharmacists may put the name of the drug on a dispensed medicine. Neither the law nor the pharmacists' National Health Service Terms of Service prohibit it. The ruling convention at the present time between the pharmaceutical and medical professions is that the pharmacist should not name the medicine unless specifically directed to do so by the prescriber.

There are arguments for and against a change in the present practice, but it is clearly essential that any change should command general support in the two professions. Some years ago, following a request from the then Minister of Health, the Joint Formulary Committee, on which the British Medical Association and the Pharmaceutical Society are represented, examined the problem, and in 1960 issued a statement which upheld the present practice. The British Pharmacopœia Commission have

recently informed my right honourable friend that in their view there are strong and compelling reasons why the labelling of dispensed medicines should be made normal practice. I understand that they have also brought this view to the attention of a number of other interested bodies, particularly the Joint Formulary Committee.

LORD ST. JUST: My Lords, while thanking the noble Lord for his reply, may I ask whether he would not agree with the information that I have been able to obtain, that on the whole doctors are not against this idea so much as the pharmacists themselves?

LORD TAYLOR: My Lords, I think that what the noble Lord suggests is substantially correct, but it is only fair to the pharmacists to say that the automatic labelling of all prescriptions would involve them in a great deal of extra work, particularly where prescriptions were written out in full. There are pros and cons. It is encouraging that the British Pharmacopœia Commission have taken this strong view, and I hope that the Joint Formulary Committee will in fact consider their view sympathetically.

BARONESS SUMMERSKILL: My Lords, in view of what the noble Lord says, I hope that he will follow this up and will press for this small reform. Is he aware that the hospitals are already doing it, that the nurses and midwives are all asking for it, and that the only people who object to it are some conservative practitioners, elderly practitioners, and the retail pharmacists? Is my noble friend not aware that, although he has told the House that the reason why the retail pharmacists do not want to do this is that it will cause them a little more work, surely the most telling reason is that it would reduce their dispensing fees?

LORD TAYLOR: My Lords, I do not quite follow the last portion of my noble friend's argument. But on her former points, it is perfectly true that in many hospitals the pharmaceutical staff adopt this practice as a general rule; and the Royal College of Nursing has certainly spoken in favour of labelling dispensed medicines with the name, and probably the majority of the medical profession would favour this. It is, however, only fair to say that many retail pharmacists

[Lord Taylor.]
are heavily burdened with work, and it would involve them in substantially extra work.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, I do not know whether the noble Lord can say what his noble friend means by "conservative pharmacists".

BARONESS SUMMERSKILL: Doctors.

LORD NEWTON: I was going to ask the noble Lord this. Is it not really as simple as this: any doctor who wishes whatever he dispenses to be fully described on the label, can secure that that is done simply by what he writes on his prescription?

LORD TAYLOR: My Lords, yes, that is true; but it may mean that he has to repeat every prescription twice on the prescription form, because he writes a direction to the chemist stating how the drug should be labelled and the dose to be given, as well as the actual prescription.

LORD FRASER OF LONSDALE: My Lord, is the noble Lord aware that every medicine that is sold openly in a chemist's shop or elsewhere must be labelled with the prescription on the bottle, or indeed, where possible, on each unit; that this has been the law for 23 years, and now it is only the doctors who purvey secret remedies? And is he aware that this is positively dangerous, because one may have in one's cupboard, as I have to-day, half a dozen bottles, and one has forgotten what they contain and what they were for?

LORD TAYLOR: My Lords, that is indeed one of the compelling reasons why it would be desirable that all prescribed medicines should be labelled.

LORD AMULREE: My Lords, would it not be possible, I wonder, in view of the dangers which may come from the mixture of incompatible drugs which are not properly labelled now, for the Minister or someone at the Ministry, to encourage consultations once more between the medical profession and the pharmacists, to see whether they cannot come to some sensible way of settling this matter?

LORD TAYLOR: My Lords, I sincerely hope that as a result of the recommendation by the British Pharmacopœia Commission to the Joint Formulary Commit-

tee, on which both the pharmacists and the British Medical Association are represented, this matter will be considered again most seriously and swiftly.

BARONESS SUMMERSKILL: My Lords, may I clear up one point by way of a supplementary question? The noble Lord seemed rather surprised that I pointed out what was surely a most telling argument for the pharmacists, whether it is spoken or not, that they will lose dispensing fees. My noble friend wondered what I meant by that. If the people in the country used up all the half-filled boxes of tablets which were in their medicine cupboards, because they were not fearful of taking something which was labelled, then inevitably retail pharmacists must lose financially.

LORD TAYLOR: My Lords, with all due respect to my noble friend, the self-medication of patients with the residue of labelled products is not always desirable.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

LORD SHEPHERD: My Lords, at a suitable moment after 3.30 o'clock I shall be making a Statement about the Chairman of the National Board for Prices and Incomes; and my noble friend Lord Champion will be making a Statement on this year's Agricultural Price Review. May I also remind the House that dinners will be available this evening and on all subsequent Wednesdays, until further notice?

THE CRATHORNE REPORT ON SUNDAY OBSERVANCE

2.44 p.m.

LORD ST. OSWALD rose to call attention to the Crathorne Report [Cmnd. 2528]; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: My Lords, in view of the distinguished list of speakers who will be following me this afternoon, I cannot feel called upon for a very lengthy or comprehensive speech, and still less any pretence of a policy speech. Indeed, since it is almost unthinkable that Party Whips would ever be applied to such a theme, in whatever form it might be debated, I feel there is nothing incongruous in saying, even from this Dispatch Box, that I am speaking for

myself, and should not expect any of my noble friends to be tied or inhibited by any views I may put forward. I am, in fact, as so often has been the case before, providing an innocuous and uncomplaining target. It may be that the noble Lord, Lord Stonham, who will be winding up this debate with his usual ability, will take less advantage of this target than some others.

When this matter of Sunday observance was debated only nine months ago in another place, on the Motion for the Second Reading of a Private Member's Bill, my honourable friend, then speaking as Parliamentary Secretary to the Home Office, took a properly cautious line. He said that action on the Bill was a matter of conscience and private judgment in which it was for each Member to decide for himself, and that, in the view of the then Government, it would be both discourteous and improper for them, in advance of publication of the Crathorne Committee's Report, to take up a definitive attitude towards Sunday observance generally.

The Crathorne Committee's Report has now been published, and no doubt has been read by all those noble Lords who are taking part to-day, and is likely to be extensively quoted. I am in the happy position of being the first in this debate to pay verbal tribute to my noble friend Lord Crathorne, who with this Report has added yet another page to his long chronicle of public service. No doubt many compliments will be paid this afternoon to him and to the other members of his Committee. We know what a controversial subject this can be, provoking views ardently held and expressed, by thoughtful people, deeply concerned in one direction or another.

In this climate, the Committee were not content to produce a purely anodyne Report. Their recommendations are positive and even bold, yet tactfully and understandingly stated, and commanding respect even among those who may disagree. Plainly, anyone taking an interest in the social wellbeing and the dignity of his countrymen is bound to have views of some kind on this subject. These views are likely to be as varied and as well expressed within your Lordships' House as anywhere in the country. It therefore seems quite proper, and not surprising, that we are having a Lords' day

on The Lord's Day. This, of course, is only one form of title, in the terminology of the Christian Church, for describing a need of which all communities, including the most primitive, are conscious.

What has become very clear over the centuries is that to the individual, thinking Christian, the interpretation of the purpose of this day and what it requires of himself or herself has differed greatly, as it differs now. It is certainly not for me to be didactic, and in the presence of my own most reverend Primate in the North, and of so many right reverend Prelates, it would indeed become me iller than ever. It seems to me that if individual observance of the Lord's Day is to have true meaning, it must be compounded of instinct and common sense, as well as a personal sense of fitness, sincerely held.

None of these inner directives can be imposed from outside on the mind of the individual. Two of them can be put into his or her mind for consideration, but the willingness with which, in the event, certain things are done and others are left undone must be the consequence of personal judgments, not of rigid discipline. I have not submitted this point of view, as such, even to my own Bishop, for whom I have the greatest fondness and respect, and it may be that I shall be reproved by one or two of his brother Bishops during the course of this afternoon's debate. Polarising these three inducements through my unimportant self, I find that when I go to church on Sunday I feel the better for it. When I fail to go, without an adequate reason, I feel something is lacking, without being told so by somebody else. This, I concede, makes my attendance sound almost like a self-indulgence or self-protection, but I hope that it is not an especially wicked or corrupting form of self-indulgence.

Both teaching and temperament go into each personal attitude. I am fortunate that my temperament and teaching received are able to harmonise in my own attitude. I was warned long ago, for instance, not to confuse the Jewish Sabbath with the Christian Sunday. The Jewish Sabbath is consciously rooted in the Fourth Commandment:

"Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do

[Lord St. Oswald.]
any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates:”

This allows in practice very little latitude to a devout orthodox Jew. He cannot, for example, travel more than a Sabbath Day's journey; and a Sabbath Day's journey was the distance between the ark and the extreme end of the camp, amounting to 2,000 cubits, or a little short of an English mile.

The Christian Sunday, according to my instructors over the years, has a completely different and contrasting origin. Whereas the Jews, according to the Commandment, took the seventh day of the week for their purpose, rest and meditation, the Christian Churches have taken Sunday, the first day of the week, as the day of weekly remembrance of our Lord's Resurrection. This implies to most Christians, I believe, a day of gratitude and rejoicing rather than of discipline or repentance and abnegation. This interpretation I have always taken to be reflected in the present period of Lent. The period lasts not 40 days and 40 nights, but 46, because on the Sundays during Lent, the days of gratitude and rejoicing, fasting is not required.

Most of us, I believe, feel that throughout the year this gratitude should be expressed in some formal and intimate way, by going to Church, and to such of us this brings the satisfaction that I have tried to describe. Naturally, at this point I am watching the Bishops' Bench, with some apprehension, for any sign of clerical remonstrance. I certainly may appear to be taking a great deal on myself, and as a layman I am prepared to be told so. For that reason I should be grateful to hear later in the debate, if I am out of step regarding the purpose of the Christian Sunday as a day of recreation, in the sense of re-creation. On that day, we re-create our energies for the week ahead.

As we are a highly individualistic people, our methods of recreation are very varied, and to me it would appear logical that any attempt to limit this means to a kind of approved table of activities would be contradictory to the Christian purpose. There are clearly distasteful and even evil practices which cannot be classed, within this meaning, as recrea-

tion. The boldest thing I am going to say this afternoon is that to my mind if an activity is wrong on Sundays, it is wrong on other days as well; if it is right on a weekday then it is right on Sundays as well. In a sense at least, in the context of entertainment, this attitude appears in paragraph 38 of the Report which we are discussing. The thing that none of us would wish to encourage, by greater freedom of activity, is any abuse of the Lord's Day or any abuse of religious practice.

The noble Earl the Leader of the House has been the centre of recent controversy, stemming from certain words he uttered in your Lordships' House not long ago. My eye was caught by two letters in the *Daily Telegraph* last week, one from an Anglican Minister and the other from an Anglican layman, taking completely opposite attitudes to the complaint of the noble Earl concerning a B.B.C. sketch which gave him offence. The clergyman in this case among the letter writers supported the noble Earl in his indignation, while the other writer was, in his own words, “astounded by the outcry” of those who had supported the noble Earl. I do not know whether anything I can say could increase his astonishment, but I thought the noble Earl's words, which I did not hear but which I afterwards read, were pertinent and well deserved.

The counter-argument contained in the letter was that it was all right to “poke fun” at Christianity in general, or at certain Churches in particular, and that it was a sign of weakness for any Church or institution to mind being made fun of. My Lords, poking fun is one thing; crude and offensive misrepresentation is another. The further argument appeared to be that, because the Anglican Church and other denominations had been repeatedly lampooned in this programme and its predecessor, the Roman Catholic Church should not have remonstrated through the mouth of the noble Earl, or in any other way. The noble Earl was speaking personally at that moment. I am very ready to join him personally on this particular point to-day. I cannot recognise any obligation to silence under this form of abuse.

This spotlights the whole question of Sunday broadcasting, which was excluded from the Committee's terms of reference,

but which inevitably impinges upon most of the matters described in Chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9, creating anomalies which we, I think, in this debate cannot leave entirely out of account. Here, I also think, honesty demands that I should speak on a sharper note of criticism. There is no doubt that certain Sunday broadcast programmes give offence to a great number of people—I should think the great majority of people. One of the purposes of the B.B.C. monopoly was the maintenance of high standards, including high standards of taste. In preparation for a most rumbustious and satisfying debate on broadcasting some years ago, which some noble Lords present may remember, I had a long discussion with the noble Lord, Lord Reith, and there was no doubt in his mind that standards of taste had been among his most important responsibilities as the founder of the B.B.C.

It would be very hard to claim to-day that those standards applied, and, indeed, Sunday all too often seems to be made an opportunity for vulgarity in some instances. I therefore say, didactically as it may be, that whatever the freedom of activity or manifestation that may flow from this Report, there should be nothing "sick" about Sunday. "Sick" humour and "sick" so-called satire should have no place in this essentially different day. In fact, among the many misnomers of the day, the claim of the purveyors of modern satire seems to me to be about the furthest fetched. In the *Oxford Dictionary* satire is described as:

"a poem or prose composition in which prevailing vices or follies are held up to ridicule".

So defined, I should have thought it was the very contradiction of true satire to have to invent evils and follies which do not exist. I have not dragged in this contention simply for the sake of airing a one-sided point of view. In so far as it has force, it suggests to me that the best way of avoiding true satire is to offer no target in the form of evil or folly or anomaly. The Crathorne Report depicts the present legislation regarding Lord's Day observance as anomalous and anachronistic in several respects. I suggest that it will be to the advantage of Christianity as a force, and to the country as a whole, to correct this state of affairs.

In all that I have said so far, I have spoken consciously as if only the Christian attitude to the Lord's Day, and only my own interpretation of it, need prevail. My purpose is not so arrogant; if it were, it would provoke justified attack from a good many quarters. All the same, I find it quite beyond my own legislative imagination to visualise any form of law-making which could soothe the susceptibilities and satisfy the conscience of every religion without bringing the life of the country almost to a halt. To consider only some of the religions numerically most significant in this country to-day, Christians have been assigned Sunday as their day of rest and devotion; the Orthodox Jews have Friday night to Saturday night; and the Moslems have Friday. The religious obligations of both these latter religions are ignored by our present legislation, and I doubt very much whether any complete answer of their problem can be found.

What certain noble Lords will doubtless and properly emphasise is the physical and mental requirement, without reference to religious instruction, of a periodic break in the working effort. The Greek geographer Strabo, writing at about the time of Christ, declared:

"The Greeks and the Barbarians have this in common, that they accompany their sacred rites by a festal remission of labour."

In fact, as a much later writer has observed, in the advance of civilisation, "most festivals are celebrated as holidays, when men give up secular occupations and devote themselves to religious exercises and relaxation. Festivals, in consequence, assume with advancing culture a great significance from the economic and sociological standpoint. For the peasant and the artisan they provide welcome relief from physical exertion, and for all ranks of society their pageants and processions, their games, feasts and merry-makings give an outlet to the play instincts of mankind. We must not conclude, however, that the remission of labour accompanying a festival has always been dictated by practical and non-superstitious considerations. In some fairly rude communities abstinence from work is a part of the regular procedure for facing a crisis and the spiritual dangers supposed to characterise such an occasion. The rest is a measure of protection and propitiation, quite as much as the fasts, the sacrifices, and the prayers by which it may be attended. Where ideas of this nature prevail, all labour becomes tabu."

In the light of this ancient and continuing evidence, the concept of work or expense of energy being forbidden on

[Lord St. Oswald.] particular days may be seen as a throw-back to pagan and even primitive law and not of either Jewish or Christian invention. Indeed, much later, the Christian missionaries in various parts of the world discovered that the Lord's Day regulations they introduced among the converted presented no sharp contrast to the rigours of the old discipline. In Hawaii, for instance, the natives even called Sunday *la Tabu*, "the tabooed day". No food was cooked on that day, the meals being all prepared on the previous Saturday; no fires were kindled, and no canoes paddled. The people neither fished nor tilled the soil; and, if on a journey, they halted until the sacred day was over. In Tahiti, also, the Sunday rest was rigidly maintained. On that day no canoes were launched and no person was seen abroad except on the road to church or when returning from Divine Service. The success of the missionaries in introducing this strict observance of Sunday was, according to one of them, owed in great degree to its analogy to the taboo days of heathen times.

Other religions to-day try to co-ordinate this need with the natural, seasonal phenomena of their region. The rainy season has always been the traditional time for teaching and meditation in Buddhist lands. As it is not possible to work in the rice-fields then, many laymen, especially in Burma and Thailand, retire to the monasteries for a period, where they live abstemiously and meditate. Plays, in which the Burmese delight, are not allowed at this season. At the end of the rains, when gifts are brought to the monks, the pagodas are full of flowers and incense by day and of light by night.

Self-evidently, as humanity tends to work under greater pressure and against increasing competition, the requirement for physical rest, so long recognised, becomes of even greater importance. This importance has been recognised in a great deal of our recent legislation, and it is recognised throughout the Crathorne Report—in Part IV, in particular. In fact, paragraphs 57 to 60, read in conjunction with paragraphs 37 and 38, tie together the ancient and the up-to-date conceptions. The central message of the whole Report, as I read it, could be des-

cribed as the conviction that a day of change from normal working activities is essential for the normal citizen: it must be provided, but it cannot be forced upon him against his will; and above all its precise form cannot be dictated either by Church or Government.

I find myself, for what it is worth, in complete harmony with this view. But in saying this I think I ought to make it very plain that I should deeply regret and energetically oppose any future legislation which might obscure or restrict the value which religion can contribute to this day of rest, however the day may be named. My theme is, in fact: the more voluntary the more valuable. To anchor Christian religious observance rigidly to those tablets of stone delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai (as related in the Book of *Exodus*) is unproductive and misconceived. The origin can be found, separately and contrastingly, in verse 19 of the Twentieth Chapter of St. John's Gospel:

"The the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you."

This is the message of hope and uplift which echoes in every Christian Church on the first day of the week, from which those gathered together go out, replenished and full of joy, to their own pursuits and further re-creation, preparing themselves for the coming week.

My Lords, none of this is to decry or belittle the value which other religions obtain from their own respective, and respected, versions of what we call the Lord's Day. But they have the same problems as are discussed in the Crathorne Report. They are living in the same world in the same century. A lot is said about the decay of Christian faith in our day, and it is gloomily pointed out as either a cause or a symptom of our decline as a nation. Since I do not believe in that decline, I reject the cause and the symptom. It is an interesting reflection, for instance, that in 1825 those attending Communion at St. Paul's Cathedral on Easter Morning numbered no more than two or three dozen. I do not know what they will number in 32 days' time, on Easter Sunday, 1965, but the total will be more impressive than that.

My Lords, whatever problems the Christian Churches may have to-day, they are not in isolation. As part of my researches for this afternoon, I was interested to know how the Jewish Church in Israel coped, in the latter half of the twentieth century, in the matter, for instance, of entertainment on the Sabbath. I inquired of a close friend of mine, who is also a world-famous musician, whether he had any evidence that might assist me. He told me without hesitation that in Jerusalem it is not permitted to play a harmonica on Friday night, when the Sabbath begins; in Tel Aviv it is permitted to play a harmonica but not for a fee; in Haifa the performer may perform and receive a fee only for the entertainment of the armed forces; whereas in Beer Sheba he can play and receive a fee before any kind of audience. So it seems likely that any Israeli Crathorne Committee would have found at least as many anomalies as were found by the Committee of my noble friend in this country, and perhaps as might be found in Christendom as a whole.

It is notable that in the country where the Christian Church is politically most powerful—that is, in Spain—the bans on gaiety and entertainment of one kind and another are virtually indiscernible, though it is assumed that those enjoying themselves will have been to Church first. Perhaps I might at this late moment inject a little continental colour into what has been a fairly colourless speech, and tell your Lordships about *Los Seises*. The *Seises* are groups of six young choristers, in the magnificent Cathedral of Seville, who perform, I am told, the only dancing permitted anywhere before a Christian altar. Nobody is quite certain how far this tradition goes back, but they perform on four set days of the year—the only one I can remember being Corpus Christi—and their performance includes the playing of castanets and *flamenco* singing.

At some time at the end of the seventeenth century this performance was prohibited by the reigning Pope—a ban which so appalled the entire population of Seville that a huge delegation went to plead with the Pope in Rome, taking the *Seises* with them so that the Pontiff himself might appreciate the charm and importance of this tradition. The Pope was moved to the extent of seeking and

finding a compromise. He ordered that the tradition could continue until the existing costumes wore out. Since then, the costumes which he saw and approved have been patched and restored an unrecorded number of times but never completely replaced, so that the *Seises* still continue to play their picturesque part in the religious life of Seville.

My Lords, in drawing attention to the Crathorne Report I appear to have wandered pretty far and mentioned the Report itself relatively seldom; but so lucidly and confidently does it speak for itself, that a detailed commentary in opening might well have seemed impertinent. My noble friend Lord Derwent will deal with more of the detail. The Report's recommendations are, in my submission, bold and contemporary. I have seen it attacked in some ways which I consider out of date and misconceived. Yesterday I deleted from my speech the counter-attacks I might have made had I been somewhat lower down the speakers' list.

I am firmly persuaded that the findings have far more supporters than detractors. I have in the past week or two made a point of asking young people about their attitude to the problem reviewed. In fact, I discussed it during most of an aircraft journey last week with a young, attractive and, at 33,000 feet, helplessly captive neighbour, whose attitude, after some initial surprise, was considered and clear and responsible. My noble friend would have found her a useful, lively and like-minded member of his Committee, had she served upon it. I hope that he has himself found that his recommendations coincide closely with the feelings of the rising and thoughtful generation. As I have indicated, they do not conflict in any way with mine.

While sitting in church last Sunday I read this cheerful verse in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*:

“ Around the Throne of God a band
Of glorious Angels ever stand;
Bright things they see, sweet harps they hold,
And on their heads are crowns of gold ”.

This describes pleasingly to me a typical Sunday in Heaven. My own feeling is that, with such wits and materials as we possess here below, we should get as close to that as we can. I believe that the Report before us to-day will be a help. Those of us who reach there may

[Lord St. Oswald.]

then receive less of a blinding shock upon arrival. No doubt every noble Lord present has a better chance than I. None the less, I beg to move for Papers.

3.10 p.m.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: My Lords, I would add my tribute of gratitude to that which has already been paid by the noble Lord, Lord St. Oswald, who has spoken in introducing the debate, for the whole spirit which pervades this Report. I am sure that the right reverend Prelates who sit behind me would award the noble Lord an *alpha*-plus for his theological and classical insight, arguments and allusions. I welcome the case for the whole man which has obviously motivated the drawing up of this Report, and I welcome, as indeed the vast majority of Churchmen would, the desire to eliminate from the Statute Book anomalies and anachronisms in legislation which only bring the matter of Sunday observance into ridicule. It is clear to my mind that those who served on this Departmental Committee had in mind that we must work for such conditions as will allow men and women to have not a Sunday which is drab and boring but one which provides for recreation—and I note, in passing, Lord St. Oswald's correct hyphen in that word—of body, mind and spirit for refreshment and renewal of the whole person. Such a day once a week is a very important factor—I would say it is a vital factor—in the growth of men and women. Everyone has a right to avail himself of this and work must be so organised as to make this possible of achievement.

The terms of reference before the Departmental Committee were so framed as to exclude any allusions to those who do shift work in factories. That exclusion seems to me to be a great pity, for a vast number of our people are engaged in this kind of work, as I well know from visits to factories in my own diocese. In such centres as Hull and Middlesbrough there are factories, as noble Lords are well aware, which, by the very nature of the work they have to do, can never close, whose machines must never stop except for repair. This, with its burden of human labour, is part of the cost of our highly developed civilisation. But this means that the right of the worker

for a day of rest and, in particular, the right of the worker for the opportunity to worship if he wishes to do so, must be zealously guarded. If work is so planned that, say, once in four Sundays a factory worker is entirely free, and on the other three Sundays it is a matter of much difficulty for him to go to church, there is something wrong with the planning. The Committee have omitted to deal with this matter (it was outside their terms of reference), but I am pointing to a matter of some urgency which is closely allied to the matters with which this Report deals.

To preserve Sunday as a day of comparative quiet in an age becoming increasingly noisy, to make Sunday observance easier rather than more difficult, to cut down those organised entertainments or recreations or unnecessary forms of work which make heavy demands on the labour of others—these things, it seems to me, are not to impose on a society only partially Christian an unwanted burden of Christian legislation; they are, on the other hand, to preserve the right of all men to the enjoyment of a day meant for the well-being of all whether they call themselves Christian or no.

It is for this reason that I question the wisdom of the third recommendation of the Committee and agree with the limited dissent of one member. To retain a prohibition on public performances, stage plays, variety and dancing, where a charge of admission is made and where the performers are professionals, would be to relieve many from the pressures of work on Sunday. To remove that prohibition, as the recommendation suggests, would be to involve an unnecessarily large number in Sunday work and would, I think, be a retrograde step. The witnesses, so the Report tells us,

“regarded it as undesirable as a matter of social policy to make changes that would result in or encourage a substantial increase in the number of people who had to work on Sunday.”

And I underline, as the Report did not, “as a matter of social policy.” Here is enunciated a principle of great importance, and I suspect that Recommendation 3 would contravene that wise judgment and should therefore be resisted.

There is one other small point which may have a greater significance than would at first appear. The recommendation that places of entertainment should

open at 12.30 rather than at 2 p.m. or thereabouts on Sundays would do something to break up still further that strong family life which is at the heart of our national life. Sunday mid-day dinner is still for many tens of thousands a family bond of great sociological significance, and I should regret to see that bond in any way loosened. I believe that the putting forward of that hour of opening would go a certain way towards breaking down this sociologically significant meal and family gathering. I will not labour the point, but I would ask that another look might be given to the matter of opening hours in the middle of our English Sunday.

3.18 p.m.

LORD DERWENT: My Lords, I should like to thank my noble friend Lord St. Oswald for introducing this Motion, although there was what I thought to be a moment of pride in his speech which I should like to deflate. I thought he claimed—and was proud of the fact, naturally—that he was the one person here whose Bishop was the most reverend Primate. May I say that that is not the case. He is also my Bishop. I should like also to express my admiration to my noble friend Lord Crathorne and his Committee for their Report. It seems to me that, of all the various reports of committees that we read, it is the most pleasingly down to earth; there does not appear to be any humbug about it. There have been certain criticisms outside this House that it was perhaps a little unadventurous, that it does not go far enough; but in my view, if it were much more adventurous or went much further it would create considerable resistance; whereas in its present form it gives an outline of the sort of thing that I think we ought to do. I hope to hear from the noble Lord, Lord Stonham, when he comes to reply, that Her Majesty's Government are preparing, or perhaps have prepared, some appropriate legislation to bring some of these recommendations into force.

It seems to me that the Committee, before they wrote their Report—whatever they may have thought before they started to sit—came to four main conclusions about Sunday: first of all, that it was a day of religious worship, and that so far as possible nothing must be done to interfere with that religious

worship. In that connection, may I say that I personally agree with the most reverend Primate that it is probably rather early to allow these extraneous matters to start at 12.30. Not only would it interrupt the Sunday dinner, but it might well interfere with certain Church services. Speaking for myself, I should like to see the time laid down 1.30 or 2 p.m., instead of 12.30.

The second matter that the Committee appeared to have in mind is that Sunday is a day of rest. First of all, it is a day on which a minimum number of people should be employed, and, secondly, a day on which there should be adequate quiet for those resting. I think the Committee have met both these points very satisfactorily in their recommendations. The third matter they appeared to have had in mind is that Sunday is, by tradition and custom, a family day. It may well be the only day of the week on which the family can be together, and we should not do too much or go too far in making it difficult for families to be together on that day. It should be a day on which families should be able to take their recreation together. Lastly, the Committee clearly had in mind that Sunday is a day when people who like playing organised games of any kind should be able to do so, because it is not always possible, owing to work, to play organised games on other days of the week, even on Saturdays. I suggest that these are the four considerations the Committee had in mind when writing their Report.

I should like to deal with a number of details, rather as if this were a Committee stage. This is somewhat unusual in a debate of this sort, but as the Government, I hope, are preparing legislation I think that points of this kind should be brought forward now, even if they are small ones. The recommendations of the Committee, which your Lordships will find on pages 64 to 66 of the Report, are under three general headings. Recommendations 1 to 9 are under "Entertainments and Sports". With the exception of paragraph 3, with which I will deal later, I agree entirely with these recommendations and will not go further into them. And I am not going into Recommendations 27 to 29, which come under the heading of "Conditions of Sunday Employment", because other noble Lords will be dealing with that matter.

[Lord Derwent.]

But I should like to say a word or two about Sunday trading. I think that the Committee have taken a common-sense view of these matters, but I would mention one or two specifically. The first one is Recommendation No. 12, which deals with vending machines. In times past, we have had a good deal of discussion about vending machines. These machines, both in nature and number, are spreading very rapidly, and consideration will have to be given to this aspect in framing new regulations. I mention this point because it is something of which we must not lose sight.

In Recommendation No. 14 the Committee say, in my view rightly, that launderettes should remain open on Sunday. They serve a great social need and they do not involve much employment—indeed, I believe that they can be run without anyone present. But in this regard I would bring to the attention of the Government a recent legal case, that of *Ilford Corporation v. Betterclean (Seven Kings) Limited*. I am not a lawyer, but I am advised that the decision of the Court in this case raised much wider implications. The effect of the judgment was that launderettes could open on Sundays because they were a service. This raises the question of whether other services should be open on Sundays—for instance, theatre ticket agencies or travel agencies—and I would bring this matter to the attention of the Government as something which ought to be watched.

Recommendation No. 19 says:

“Any local authority should have power to make an order, in respect of the whole or part of its area, allowing shops to open on such number of Sundays as the authority specify for the sale of any or all of the following items . . .”

and it specifies, among other things, “souvenirs and fancy goods”. This is a matter about which the inspectors under the Shops Act have had considerable difficulty, because it is possible to wrap up almost anything in a cellophane cover on which is written “Souvenir from Scarborough”—I may as well have a local advertisement!—and I gather that there is considerable doubt as to whether this is within the law. So, as I say, this matter ought to be watched very carefully.

The final thing I want to mention is about Sunday opening. Recommendation No. 26 says:

“ . . . the hour of evening closing on Sunday should follow the same requirement as for weekdays other than the early closing or the late day ”.

With that recommendation I entirely agree, but I am a little concerned about one matter, again on behalf of the inspectors under the Shops Act. I hope that the noble Lord, Lord Stonham, will be able to give me an answer on this point. Paragraph 204 of the Report says:

“The evening closing hours fixed by the Shops Act do not apply to Sunday; most shops that can legally open on Sunday may keep open in the evening without limit of time . . .”

In my submission, that has never been the case, although the Committee state so.

After the 1936 Act (the later Act was a consolidation measure), a memorandum of guidance was issued by the Home Office to local authorities and shops, which said exactly the opposite. The memorandum says:

“A shop which is already exempt from the provisions of the Act as to closing on Sunday, by virtue either of the provisions of the Act itself or of an order or certificate of the local authority, will be subject as regards the evening closing hour to the provisions of the Shops (Hours of Closing) Act, 1928, and to the provision of any closing order made by the local authority which fixes the closing hour for Sunday.”

The memorandum added a footnote, as follows:

“Under the Shops (Hours of Closing) Act, 1928, the normal hour of closing on Sunday is 8 p.m.”

Doubtless any new Government legislation will not come into force for some months. Meanwhile, we have a Home Office circular which states the position to be one thing and the Report of a Committee which states exactly the opposite. I feel that it would be in everyone's interest if the noble Lord, Lord Stonham, could clear up this point when he replies at the end of the debate.

That is all I am going to say about the detail of the Act, except in relation to Recommendation 3 of the Report, which the most reverend Primate mentioned. In part, I am going to disagree with him. In Recommendation 3 the Committee say:

“We recommend, with limited dissent from one member, that theatres, variety entertainment, ballet, public dancing, circuses, fun-fairs

and similar entertainments which make a charge for admission should no longer be forbidden on Sunday."

I do not think the whole of that proposal is wrong. I believe that, when it comes to public dances and fun-fairs, it will be quite possible, without much difficulty, to have different people on Sunday; or, if I may put it in this way, not the same people on every Sunday. But I am concerned about the reference to theatres, variety entertainment and ballet. In the matter of sport, and so on, the Committee have pointed out, again quite rightly, in my view, that professionals should not have to work on Sunday. They may have religious objections to working on Sunday; and it may well be—it frequently is—the only day on which they can see their families.

My Lords, I have no moral objection to Sunday theatres and music halls. Quite frankly, I think that something in the nature of Sunday repertory might be a good thing. But I would ask your Lordships to consider the case of a theatre company, a play which is on a West End run, or on a summer run at Scarborough or Blackpool, and is running continuously. Virtually the same actors and actresses are employed throughout the run. And they also may well have religious objections to working on Sunday; or they may object on the ground that they cannot see their families on any other day.

With a play on a long run, if one is Sir Laurence Olivier and one does not want to play on Sunday one says so; and the theatre company will see that it is not put on on Sunday, because the play would probably be no good without the star. But supposing it is a fairly big musical show, running for a long time with a large chorus, or with a large number of subsidiary actors and actresses, some of whom object to playing on Sunday, the fact remains that, unless they are prepared to perform on Sunday (if Sunday performances are proposed) they will not get a job. There is nothing that Equity can do about it; such people will not be employed.

In the matter of music halls and theatres, I wonder whether there should not be a regulation stating that any theatre company (I use the term in the theatrical and not the financial sense)

playing during the week on either side of Sunday should not be allowed to play that piece in that theatre on the Sunday. As I have said, this might well lead to Sunday repertory: and there would be no objection to that, because if it is something like Sunday repertory, one need not act in the play, because it is not one's living. Far too many people want to be employed in the theatre for the number of places available, and I think this is one place where professionals should not be forced to work on Sunday. Voluntarily, yes; but if it was a long running play, they would be forced to perform on Sunday (if the play was performed on Sunday), and would be out of work if they would not do it. Those are the only points I want to raise. Apart from that, I think this is an excellent and common-sense Report.

3.35 p.m.

THE LORD BISHOP OF LEICESTER: My Lords, I am sure we are all grateful to the noble Lord, Lord St. Oswald, for giving us an opportunity to discuss this interesting and important Report, and also for the extremely edifying and uninhibited way in which he introduced it to us. We on these Benches have one motto that is passed on to us when we come on to these Benches: that the one thing we must never do in any circumstances is to preach. But the temporal Peers are not under this inhibition, and therefore we listen to them with great appreciation when they get on to such subjects. I was particularly glad to find that the noble Lord had derived such pleasure from reading through what some people nowadays would regard as a rather old-fashioned hymn. The only thought that crossed my mind of a critical nature was that I hoped it was not during one of the less interesting portions of the sermon that he found the hymnbook so entertaining. We Bishops seem to have taken rather a large slice of the time in this debate, but if we seem to have a kind of vested interest in the subject, that is what people always thought we had, so perhaps it is not very surprising.

On the whole, the Report comes down for preserving Sunday as what is called "a different day". It does not, in general—I think, not at all—use the phrase "the English Sunday", although that is clearly what is in mind. Scotland

[The Lord Bishop of Leicester.] is excluded; Wales is included, though with some degree of special consideration. The English Sunday is a peculiar product of our religious and social history. Many streams of influence have flowed into it in order to give it the peculiar flavour and colour that it now has. I do not think we can judge rightly about how to legislate for it without having, at the back of our minds at least, these historical considerations.

The Report provides a lot of interesting historical material, and as one reads it one can see different phases of civilisation and of national history reflected in the different stages in the development of Sunday. There was the Jewish tradition—and although I could not agree more with the noble Lord, Lord St. Oswald, that the motivation of the Christian Sunday is a different one from that of the Jewish Sabbath, I do not think we can shut our eyes to the fact that, to some extent, the two have been conflated in the minds of ordinary English people. They could not, for instance, hear that Fourth Commandment, which the noble Lord read out so well (I could have coveted him in my diocese as he did so), for generations without in some way thinking that these prohibitions or reservations had to be borne in mind in connection with the observance of the Christian Sunday, however illogical that may have been. It is to the Jewish tradition that we owe the very idea of a day marked out for rest and for the consideration of non-mundane matters. I think it is only fair to the Hebrew ancestors of our Christian religion that that should be mentioned.

There was the early Christian tradition, which has been described so well, of marking the first day of the week as specifically for Christian thanksgiving and fellowship; there was the mediæval tradition, the immediate ancestor of 16th and 17th century practice. And it is in the 17th century that most of our present divergent views are anticipated. That early 17th century records the Jacobean and Caroline authorisation of Sunday games, and also the almost contemporary prohibition of trading and unnecessary travelling. In that 17th century tension, I think one can see anticipated the whole future development of thought about Sunday. It has to some extent been polarised. The Puritanical tradition, the

Reformed tradition, which was on the whole sabbatarian, found perhaps its fullest expression in the Scottish Sunday. The non-Puritanical, perhaps the Catholic, interpretation, found its expression on the Continent; and it is interesting that on the Continent, even in Protestant countries and Protestant cantons in Switzerland, exactly the same general arrangements for Sunday obtain as in the Roman Catholic areas. England, as so often, has provided a mixture—something of the Puritanical restraint and reservation, something of a refusal to accept entirely that negative prohibiting side of Sunday legislation and life.

In the 18th century, Dr. Johnson laid down his dictum that “there may be relaxation but no levity.” I think that perhaps was a rather characteristic phrase of the high Anglicanism of the 18th century. Here we come on to legislation which we are now thinking of amending. It was then, in that 18th century, that the Act of 1780 was passed, which was especially directed against

“debating on the evening of the Lord’s Day by persons unlearned and incompetent to explain the Holy Scriptures, to the corruption of good morals”

and various other unfortunate effects. I could not help thinking that, if that Act had happened to apply to television, we might have been spared a few rather unseemly displays even by clergymen—not that they are unlearned, but perhaps they are not always competent to explain.

That 1780 Act was not really intended primarily to deal with theatres, but it took in theatres by accident, and ever since live performances have been forbidden by our laws. Your Lordships will be thankful to hear that I shall not take you through the whole of the Victorian story, but I think it is worth mentioning that the formation of the Lord’s Day Observance Society in 1831 was a very natural reaction against the first effects of the Industrial Revolution, bringing about change in society even before the days of the railways. But the survival of this Society, and its propaganda, in the 20th century is, I think we may be allowed to feel, an anachronism, and it is necessary, I am afraid, in all kindness, to detach the churches in their official and public life from the point of view usually put out by the Lord’s Day

Observance Society. I have been very surprised when I have been approached on the telephone by journalists about my attitude to these matters, immediately to be confronted with the views of the Lord's Day Observance Society as if it were something strange that a Bishop should be allowed to differ from that Society. It must be realised that this is a view to which those who hold it have a perfect right, but it must not be taken as the general view of either the Church of England or, I think, indeed, of any of the Churches in their official capacities.

It is interesting to note, coming into this century, the ambivalent attitude, as I see it, of the Liberal Government of 1906, because then they were under a number of influences. From the point of their philosophy, they wished to give the greatest possible freedom to all persons and communities, so long as those freedoms did not in any way interfere with the freedom of others. But they were also under strong influence from the Free Churches, from which they derived a good deal of support, and they were beginning to take note of the demands of the workers for protection from exploitation. These different influences did not combine easily, and I think that is the reason why, as we read in this Report, there were several efforts towards the reform of Sunday legislation, but very few that came to anything in practice.

So it is, at last, that we now have such a thing as the English Sunday. Its tradition has been much eroded by change, or, perhaps we should say, evolved, in order to make it compatible with modern needs. Shift work has all but obliterated it in certain parts of the country and certain realms of society. Motor travel to the sea has destroyed the peace, and even the safety, of the villages through which the traffic passes, although it has given pleasure and relaxation in measure to those who have travelled in the cars. But in spite of all this, Sunday is still a reality in our country. It has not yet been entirely changed. When I drive in my car, as many of us do early on Sunday morning, I notice an immediate difference as I go through the streets of Leicester. The first thing I notice is that it is a day when the dogs are all allowed out alone; when it is

safe for them to wander here and there. That is the first sign that it is Sunday. And there are many other signs as the day goes on.

I, too, had in my notes a reference to Sunday dinner. I noticed that the most reverend Primate estimated the numbers at tens of thousands. I was bolder than he—I should have said millions; and I think it is true that millions of our people look upon their Sunday dinner as the great family event of the week. I cannot say that I had thought of this point myself, but I think the most reverend Primate's point about the earlier opening of public entertainments is something that should be looked at in the light of this particular family festival.

Here we are with our English Sunday. Nobody could have invented it. It is something that has grown organically in the developing life of our nation. It somehow reminded me of the white cliffs of Dover—I expect because when this Motion was first announced we were thinking of those cliffs, in connection with the late Sir Winston Churchill. It occurred to me that if we had not had the white cliffs of Dover, we should not have thought we needed them, and we should not have constructed them. But as we have them, we treasure them. I think that the English Sunday has something of that character. It is something that has grown; we have it, and we have to think twice before we part with it.

I value this Report because I think it has struck a happy balance between change and continuity in this matter. If I venture on one point to diverge a little from the most reverend Primate, it is because I feel so strongly that the Churches must disabuse the people of this country of the idea that we are just watching to prevent their doing things they want to do. We must let them see that our contribution to this debate is a positive one, and I myself am very reluctant to ask for any restrictions at all, other than those that are absolutely necessary. So I feel that I have to accept the theatres—which perhaps is not very difficult; the circuses and the fun fairs take a little more "swallowing". However, as we see from reading the Report, fun fairs are for the most part now allowed, so it would be asking for new

[The Lord Bishop of Leicester.]
restrictive legislation if we asked for them to be forbidden.

We all have our illogical patches, and I am bound to say that I am very pleased to see in the Report that, so far, they do not wish to recommend professional sport, in the sense of great football and cricket matches. I know that the cricketers have sometimes looked with rather covetous eyes on the hours of Sunday, thinking that perhaps if they had Sundays at their disposal they might get the "gates" they do not always succeed in getting on Saturdays. I think that perhaps they are mistaken in that view. Whether they are or not, I just have to say that I cannot accept the idea of a great Test match or a Cup Tie on a Sunday. It may be illogical, but being what I am, made like everybody else by the traditions of the country in which I have been brought up, I just do not want it, and I hope that the country can manage without it.

With regard to trading, I do not claim to speak with any authority on the details and various lists of items that can or cannot be sold, such as mushrooms, prepared tripe and all the other things. But I am sorry to see one recommendation (and this is, I think, my only actual criticism of the Report), in connection with employees in shops, suggesting that it is too rigid to insist, as the present law does, that they should have free at least one Sunday in three. I think the Committee were perhaps being a little discreet in not mentioning in this Report precisely what the present law provides. But it does, I understand, provide that one free Sunday in three must be allowed to employees in shops. I think that is something we ought to stand by, because, as the Report rightly says, Sunday is not an interchangeable day. However willing you may be to give another day in the week—and there are good alternative provisions given—it is not the same thing, even apart from all religious considerations, to have a day free different from the day when most of the rest of your family or friends are free. At this point I do speak as a Bishop and as a Christian. I do not want to put any restrictions, or any but the absolute minimum restrictions, in the way of people doing what they want to do; but I do want to prevent those who wish to adhere to their

religious customs and practices from being stopped from doing so if it is in any way possible to allow them the freedom to carry on.

I was once in Switzerland, and in the village where I was staying a film was being made by a large company of some 200 people from England and America. I did what I could to persuade some of them to go to the little English church I was looking after on Sunday, but all my efforts were in vain. At last they managed to get one to come. She was the director's secretary, who happened to be an English parson's daughter, so was considered fair game and had to represent the company. Why I tell the story is this. It came out afterwards that they had abandoned Sunday and were working a ten-day week. If that is going to spread, we shall be making it very difficult for those, particularly the young, who may wish to explore the possibilities of religious worship. Therefore, I hope that we shall be able to stand firm and insist that employees in such establishments shall have at least one Sunday free in three. We all know that there are many branches of life that have to be carried on, but we have managed fairly well so far without this particular accession of Sunday freedom, and I hope that we shall be able to retain this very limited form of self-discipline.

THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PRICES AND INCOMES

3.55 p.m.

LORD SHEPHERD: My Lords, may I intervene into this very interesting debate to repeat a Statement that has just been made by my right honourable friend the Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in another place? The Statement reads as follows:

"I am authorised by the Prime Minister to inform the House that Her Majesty, the Queen, has been pleased to indicate Her approval of the appointment of the right honourable Gentleman, the Member for Hall Green (Mr. Aubrey Jones), as Chairman of the National Board for Prices and Incomes. The names of the members of the Board will be announced in the near future. The House will also be pleased to know that good progress is being

made in the discussions with the other parties concerned about the considerations which should govern the behaviour of prices and incomes and by which the Board will be largely guided. I hope to make an announcement about the outcome of these discussions soon."

THE EARL OF DUNDEE: My Lords, I thank the noble Lord for giving us this information which, either by clairvoyance or intelligent anticipation, has already been understood by newspapers for several days. I am also glad to hear that good progress is being made in considering the "guiding light", as we used to call it, which is going to govern the behaviour of prices, I hope not in a steeply upward direction. The noble Lord will no doubt acknowledge that the recent fall in the cost of living in Scotland by 7s. a bottle is entirely due to the action of the late Government in passing the Resale Prices Act.

THE EARL OF SWINTON: My Lords, we all welcome, I am sure, this appointment, but could the noble Lord say whether the Chairman of this body will be entirely independent and will be there to make reports and advise the Secretary of State and the Government, or will he be in the nature in any way of an official of the Secretary of State's Department and take instructions from the Secretary of State?

LORD SHEPHERD: My Lords, I am indeed grateful for the welcome which has been given to this Statement by the noble Earl, Lord Dundee, and the noble Earl, Lord Swinton. I am sure we are all very pleased that Mr. Aubrey Jones has been able to accept the appointment, and he is doing so, I may say, at considerable financial sacrifice. In regard to the point made by the noble Earl, Lord Swinton, concerning independence, I am quite sure that this is an appointment of independence and that there is no question of his being an official of a Ministry. Certainly there will be the guiding principles of Government policy, but the Board will have full independence within it.

THE AGRICULTURAL REVIEW

3.59 p.m.

THE MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO (LORD CHAMPION): My Lords, with your Lordships' permission, I should like to make a Statement similar to that which my right honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture has just made in another place on this year's Agricultural Review, the details of which are given in a White Paper available in the Printed Paper Office. If I may, I will use his own words, which are as follows:

"One of the Government's aims in this Review has been to promote developments in agricultural policy which we believe must be made if the industry is to go on increasing productivity, and so improve its income while reducing its need for Exchequer support. One of agriculture's main problems is the wide differences between farms. There are many farm businesses which already provide a satisfactory full-time livelihood. But there are far too many others which, because they need better management or are too small in size, cannot do so at reasonable prices. Our objective is to create conditions in which such farmers can raise their standards.

"In this Review we are making a start on these longer-term developments by introducing a number of new production grants and revising some of the existing ones. We shall help the smaller farmer to improve his farm business by making better farm management the essential object and condition of a Small Farmer grant. At the same time we shall extend the upper limits of the schemes so as to make them available to many more farmers, particularly the smaller dairy farmer and livestock rearer.

"We are also introducing wider agricultural credit facilities and providing grants for agricultural co-operative marketing. In addition, we are concentrating more help on the hill and upland areas. The hill sheep subsidy will be made an annual grant on a flat rate; the hill cow subsidy rate will be raised; and we are bringing in new winter keep arrangements. There will also be an urgent review of the more fundamental long-term problems in the hill and upland areas.

[Lord Champion.]

“ These measures will give help to those in special need who are willing and able to help themselves. But many of the smaller farm businesses, if they are to succeed, must also obtain the advantages which come from larger scale production or marketing. We are, therefore, planning measures to encourage an increase in the size of holdings on a voluntary basis and to extend further help to agricultural co-operation over a wider field.

“ Turning now to the present position of agriculture generally, actual farm income for this year is expected to be £472 million, a record figure, and £63 million more than last year. Adjusted for normal weather conditions the forecast for this year is £456½ million—about £30 million more than last year. Output is up substantially, and the growth in productivity has continued.

“ Coming to the commodities, let me deal first with milk. A number of producers are still giving up dairying, but the fall in the dairy herd now seems to have been checked, and production has risen slightly. Producers' prices have gone up appreciably. In view of the importance of the dairy herd, not only for milk but also for beef, the Government have decided to increase the guaranteed price by 1d. a gallon. This change, together with increased distributive costs, will require the retail price to be raised by one half-penny per pint with effect from August 1.

“ After a temporary decline, the beef herd is now recovering. But, in view of future world prospects, we are encouraging expansion of home production by an increase in the guaranteed price of 4s. per cwt. At the same time we are widening the calf subsidy to bring in more calves and increase the rate by 10s. We are also increasing the Hill Cow Subsidy by £1. The sheep breeding flock continues to grow and no change will be made in the guaranteed price for fat sheep or for wool. The new flat rate subsidy for hill sheep will be 18s. compared with an average of 9s. 6d. over the last five years.

“ Pig numbers have considerably increased, and a further substantial rise

is forecast. For much of the last year, however, the market for pigs has been reasonably strong, and, in view of this, the Government have decided to raise the middle band—in effect the standard quantity—by 900,000 pigs. We are also widening the middle band, and the steps on either side of it, so as to make changes in the guaranteed price less frequent. The decision first announced two years ago to abolish separate stabilising limits and to reduce the quality premiums will now be implemented. The combined effect of all these steps would considerably increase profitability and so run the danger of encouraging too high a level of pig production. As some offset, the basic guaranteed price will therefore be reduced by 1s. 7d. per score, but the immediate net effect will be that on average pig producers will be getting 11d. per score more than at present.

“ This year egg production has out-run demand. Although there are signs that production next year may be somewhat less, technical efficiency is still increasing. To try to avoid a return to surplus, the guaranteed price for eggs will be reduced by 1d. per dozen.

“ Cereals production has risen to a very high level this year. In consequence we are obliged under the cereals agreements on minimum import prices made by the previous Administration to take remedial action with the purpose of restoring a fair and reasonable balance between home grown and imported cereals. The standard quantities for wheat and barley will be increased to take account of the growth in consumption, but the guaranteed prices will be cut by 1s. 1d. and 1s. 4d. per cwt. respectively. The guaranteed price of potatoes and sugar beet will be increased by 5s. and 2s. 6d. per ton respectively. The fertiliser subsidy will be reduced by £2 million, and the lime subsidy by £750,000.

“ The net effect of the Review decisions will increase the total value of the guarantees by over £10 million. This will mean that in the present circumstances of the national economy, the agricultural industry will, like others, be expected to absorb this year through their increasing productivity a large part of their increased costs of

some £29 million. The present determinations will, however, give the industry the opportunity to improve its income, and a start has been made on policy developments of great importance to the industry in the longer term."

LORD ST. OSWALD: My Lords, I thank the noble Lord for giving us the repetition of this Statement. All the same, I have to suppose that in the light of my mild but protestingly-received strictures earlier in the Session the noble Lord, Lord Champion, must be very grateful at this moment that he is not an Agricultural Minister. The noble Earl the Leader of the House may well be grateful he has no Minister on his Front Bench at whom the finger can be directly pointed as being responsible for the utterly depressing review outlined in the Statement.

The Statement, after one or two long, pious and amorphous passages at the beginning, makes it clear that the contrast between Socialist promise and performance in agriculture is likely to be at least as stark as in other responsibilities of government. After all the conflated undertakings (there is nothing like using a new word as soon as possible after you hear it) of the gentlemen who are now Ministers of the Crown immediately before the Election, we have this poor, shivering town mouse creeping out through the protective portals of the Ministry of Agriculture and scuttling down Whitehall. How I pity it when it gets out into the open country! The only encouraging figure in the whole Statement is the record of income for the present agricultural year, £472 million, an increase of £63 million. If ever there was a success story written in black and white, here it is; but it is a success story of the previous Administration's agricultural policy, and I hope the Government will recognise that inheritance.

I do not wish to impose unendurable agony on the noble Lord, Lord Champion; indeed, who would? I wish only to ask two or three delicately probing questions. First of all—somewhat rhetorical in the circumstances—was this Review agreed? Secondly, why, hand in hand with the declared policy of encouraging beef, do the Government cut the Fertiliser Subsidy by £2 million?

Have they any reason to think that this may be matched, or even relieved, by a price reduction on the part of the producers? Thirdly, what has happened to the long-term policy for beef, so widely and exuberantly advertised before the Election? That is not identified in the Statement. The closing words may refer to it, but it is not identified. I should like to know whether in fact it appears in the White Paper.

Fourthly, my mathematics are not up to working out at short notice whether the 1s. 1d. cut in the wheat guarantee and the 1s. 4d. cut in the barley guarantee are in fact the maximum cuts permitted by the 1957 Act. My impression is that they are. My recollection is that the previous Administration never cut to that maximum. Fifthly, is the noble Lord's right honourable friend aware, or does he happen to know whether he is aware, of the pure irony of saying that in view of the importance of the dairy herd, not merely for milk but also for beef, he will increase the price by 1d. a gallon?

LORD CHAMPION: My Lords, the noble Lord has, as I expected him to do, tended to add to the excellent speech that he made just now on a totally different subject. He rather sympathised with me. I do not need his sympathy.

LORD ST. OSWALD: The noble Lord has not yet heard from the farmers.

LORD CHAMPION: My Lords, I should not worry about this Statement, even if I were deeply involved in this particular Ministry, because this is no mouse of a Review. It not only adds £10 million to the guarantees, but also holds out what I regard as immensely important in this consideration, a tremendous promise for the future. When the noble Lord tends to say: "You have not done too well considering your promises before the last Election", all I can say is that I never expected that we should find the mess we did find when we came into office. These are factors which have to be taken into consideration.

LORD ST. OSWALD: You certainly did not find a mess in agriculture.

LORD CHAMPION: Shall I tell the noble Lord why? I will. Last year we had an exceptionally good year for farming weather. Then there was also a good

[Lord Champion.]
Price Review. Why was that? It was because it came in an Election year. I remember speaking in agricultural constituencies during the last Election and saying, "If this Tory Government get back the best thing for the farmers to do is to try to ensure that they get an Election every year, and hope for the same sort of Price Review as farming had last year".

So far as the long-term policy for beef is concerned, this is a matter which we are considering. We have gone most carefully into this subject of beef, and we believe that the prices which we set out here are just about right when we regard the alterations in the subsidies for calves which we are including in this year's Price Review, and the further subsidies for hill cattle, which will particularly add to the beef that will be available to us in the future. But as far as the long term is concerned, this is, of course, a matter for further consideration.

Regarding the cut of 1s. 1d. and 1s. 4d. respectively on wheat and barley, I rather think that this is just about the limit that would be possible under the 1957 Act. It also carries out the intention of the last Government in regard to ensuring that there is a balance between imports of cereals and home production. I do not think that this is a mouse of a Review.

LORD BLYTON: My Lords, would the noble Lord tell me how this Review compares with those of previous years? Can he tell me what the Minister has given to help the small farmer and those who farm in the hills? Can he tell me how much this award gives to the milk producer, and how this award compares with those of previous years? Can he further tell me who pays—is it the consumer or the State?

LORD CHAMPION: My Lords, so far as past years' Price Reviews are concerned, I may say that in the past 13 years, omitting the three Election years when, oddly enough, the Review was agreed, the Review has been disagreed five times out of ten. In five years out of those ten non-Election years the award, after allowing for costs, was less favourable than that for this year. So far as small farmers are concerned, we

are helping the small farmer through the extension of the Small Farmer schemes which will bring in another 40,000 farmers, and through the widening of the credit facilities and grants for co-operatives. We are helping hill farmers by fixing a generous flat-rate subsidy for hill sheep instead of the present variable one, increasing the hill cow subsidy and the stocking ratio, and putting the winter-keep grant on a headage basis for England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

The noble Lord also asked me about milk prices and how they compare with those of recent years. This year's 1d. a gallon increase, together with the increase in the standard quantity, will give the dairy farmers an extra £11 million. This is the largest single increase since the present system was instituted ten years ago, except for last year's General Election award. Indeed, by this increase of 1d. we are giving the farmers just about as much again as the overall increase of the guaranteed prices over the whole of the period from 1954, when the present system started, right up to last year.

THE EARL OF DUNDEE: My Lords, is the noble Lord aware that this extra award of £10 million is about one-third of the additional burden laid on the farmers by the increase in the petrol tax?

LORD RATHCAVAN: My Lords, may I ask the noble Lord a question about the hill sheep subsidy? I think he said that it would continue for some years. Did he mean that it would continue at the present rate, which is, I think, 18s.?

LORD CHAMPION: My Lords, yes. In past years, the hill sheep subsidy has been a variable one and, as I said in my Statement, it averaged out at 9s. plus over the past five years. In order to prevent this variation difficulty, it has been decided that in future, without having regard to weather conditions or anything else, it will be at a flat rate of 18s. per head.

THE LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN: My Lords, may I ask the noble Lord whether the Minister has given serious consideration to the effect of the reduction of the egg subsidy on the medium-scale producer? Does it not mean that this is

going severely to affect the small producer and encourage the factory production of eggs, which undoubtedly is responsible for the surplus of eggs? What many of us would question is whether it produces the quality.

LORD CHAMPION: My Lords, we have given considerable thought to this matter of the small producer and the subsidy on eggs. Egg production can be highly profitable under the present subsidy and price arrangement. What we had to do in this Review was to avoid over-production, which would be bad for everyone. I cannot accept that all small egg producers are doing badly. Those who sell directly to the consumer, for example, will not be affected at all by this cut. We have to remember that this Annual Review is not merely a matter of handing out taxpayers' money; it is bound to be also a regulator, and must be used to regulate the production of the crops which the farmers of this country can provide.

VISCOUNT ECCLES: My Lords, may I ask the noble Lord what effect the Government think all these changes, including the 1d. on milk, will have on the dairy herds? Do the Government think that the dairy herds will continue to decline, or that these changes will arrest the decline?

LORD CHAMPION: The decline in milk production has already stopped. Indeed, we think that this balance will be just about right to keep the production of milk to just about the standards which we require, particularly for our liquid milk consumption, without adding unduly to that portion which goes for manufacture in this country.

LORD BALERNO: My Lords, may I ask the noble Lord whether he is aware that the increase in price to the consumer of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a pint is equivalent to 4d. a gallon, and that the additional sum to the producer is being raised by only 1d. per gallon? Is he aware that this will probably mean that after next August there will, in effect, be no subsidy, or a very small subsidy, for milk?

LORD CHAMPION: Yes, my Lords, I am aware of this. Some of this, of course, will go to the retailer. The retailer's position is something which my right honourable friend is looking into. We are not entirely satisfied that the margin which at present exists for retail is quite right, and my right honourable friend is, in fact, at the moment instituting inquiries into this very matter.

EARL FERRERS: My Lords, can the noble Lord elaborate on one point? He said, I think, that Her Majesty's Government were going to encourage small farmers to increase voluntarily the size of their holdings. Could he explain how this is to be done? If it is to be done by amalgamation, is there to be some form of financial inducement for small farmers to give up their farms for the advantage of others?

LORD CHAMPION: This is a matter on which I cannot pretend to have the answer ready. I recognise, with the noble Earl, that it is extremely difficult to get people to give up voluntarily the farms in which they live. Something of this sort will have to be attempted, but it must be done voluntarily—I particularly stress that. Certainly, so far as I am concerned, I would never be a party to the compulsory amalgamation of small farms. One must do it by encouragement, by help, and I hope, perhaps, by some of the means which the noble Earl clearly has in mind.

LORD ST. OSWALD: My Lords, I do not think the noble Lord actually answered my question on whether the Review was agreed. I quite understand that he hardly thinks it necessary, but I think that we ought to have it on the record.

LORD CHAMPION: Perhaps I did not answer that, but I was so anxious to show that many of the Annual Reviews over the past years were not in fact agreed, and what happened in those years.

THE CRATHORNE REPORT ON SUNDAY OBSERVANCE

4.24 p.m.

Debate resumed.

LORD EGREMONT: My Lords, it seems a considerable time ago that we were listening to a most charmingly delivered speech by the right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Leicester. So nice, if I may say so, was his speech that I have remembered it in the limbo through which we have since passed. I should like to take up the debate from what the right reverend Prelate was saying—and in case any of your Lordships has forgotten, we are now talking about Sunday observance.

This subject has become a ridiculously complicated one. Before the Reformation, Church attendance was formally observed, but there was considerable freedom in the way everybody spent the rest of Sunday. I will not add to the tedium of your Lordships by recounting, step by step, and century by century, how that freedom was eroded; but that the noble Lord, Lord Crathorne, and his Committee have managed to cover this vexed question in 81 pages, including Appendices, does them immense credit. Their Report is a model of terseness and lucidity.

I venture to say to your Lordships that there should be two approaches to this question, one religious, the other social. As Lord Crathorne's Report points out, the Industrial Revolution, the social reformers, the religious revivalists connected with John Wesley and others, and the foundation of Sunday Schools, all contributed to the profession of moral earnestness and voluntary religious observance during the Victorian era. These changes came about through the force of public opinion, without any alteration in the law relating to Sunday entertainments and amusements.

On the other hand, the long hours of work common during the Industrial Revolution increased the demand for Sunday trading. Many workers did not receive their wages until late on Saturday. Many, for lack of domestic storage facilities, were forced to buy perishable goods on Sundays. So here we have a social problem which has lasted a long time. But what we also have is the certainty that laws which have been passed since the Reformation no longer secure

the purpose of encouraging church attendance, and any attempt to do so now by legislation would be considered contrary to the freedom of the individual. Indeed, the Churches themselves no longer claim such a privilege in law.

As regards the religious aspect, different people approach religion in different ways. I do not want to be unkind to anybody, but I do not believe that you can necessarily obtain grace by not going to the cinema; by not going to a concert; by not going to the ballet; or, for that matter, to public dancing, circuses, funfairs, sports, or even to a gaming table, on a Sunday. I do not believe you can obtain grace by not doing those things, any more than you can obtain grace by taking a walk in the country on a bright Sunday afternoon with sinful thoughts in your mind about your neighbour.

I do not want to get "soppy" about this, but a thought was put into my mind as I left my home in the country this morning. I saw a kingfisher, in all its beauty, moving about over the rivers and marshes and lakes by my home. It dipped, and it skimmed the water with its wings and set up ripples. So, my Lords, I believe that the outstretched wing of Providence can touch pools in some people's minds. But what I think is arrogant and sinful is that we miserable creatures should be so puffed up with pride that we should really suppose that we ourselves can legislate for such a Divine happening.

As I have said, different people approach religion in different ways. There was once a captain in Joan of Arc's army. His prayer before battle was the not very humble one:

"Oh God, please do for me what I would do for you if you were Captain and I were God."

Then there was a character in Disraeli's novel, *Endymion*, who said:

"Sensible men are all of the same religion."

On which the Prince inquired:

"And pray what is that?"

The answer came:

"Sensible men never tell."

But there was also King David and his Psalms. I am now thinking of the words in the fourth Psalm:

"commune with your own heart upon your bed, and be still.

Offer the sacrifices of righteousness, and put your trust in the Lord."

I think that your Lordships could do that and still support the recommendations of the Crathorne Report.

What about the social side? The pattern of spending the day in relaxation and family pursuits has a special value to national and family life, quite apart from its religious basis. I entirely agree that, apart from religious reasons, it is undesirable as a matter of social policy to make changes that would result in, or encourage, a substantial increase in the number of people who have to work on Sundays. But it is also obvious that a large section of the general public regards the law on Sunday entertainments as obsolete. I think that we all recognise. This subject, down the years, has become ridiculously complicated and controversial, and the energies which have been devoted to it would have been better employed if devoted to something more constructive. I hope that one result of this able Report will be that that will happen.

My Lords, in a humane reaction against 19th century *Laissez-faire* Liberalism, and in an age in which the Government, whether Tory or represented by noble Lords opposite, play an ever greater part in our lives, those of us who cherish liberty, as we all do, must be increasingly watchful for opportunities to promote liberty for fear that there might one day be a divorce between liberty and paternalism. Day by day, week by week, year by year, we should strive to polish up the terms of the marriage settlement between liberty and the Welfare State, to ensure that the marriage remains constant. I, for one, believe that the Crathorne Report is a helpful contribution to that end.

4.35 p.m.

LORD AIREDALE: My Lords, I am indeed grateful for the presence of the Lords Spiritual, because, but for them, in order to address most of my audience I should have to cross the Floor of the Chamber. I wish to make only one small point on Chapter 8 of this Report which is headed "Sports", and to mention briefly noisy sports which, I think, are exemplified best by those events known as motor-cycle scrambles, and, indeed, events which involve the use of the unsilenced internal combustion engine. I should like to raise the question of whether these sporting activities should be allowed to take place on Sunday after-

noons, particularly in the summer time, within earshot of people's private homes.

We cannot, I think, in this crowded island, hope to protect from noisy sporting activities all the lovers of peace and quiet at all times, but I should hope that we could protect them at least on Sunday afternoons. Saturday afternoon seems to be the time usually appointed for these activities, and I suppose that the lovers of peace and quiet, most of them being elderly people, can probably, in any event, contrive to find a good deal of peace and quiet during the remainder of the week when the rest of the population is either out at work or at school. Even on Saturday afternoons, there are so many activities of all kinds going on that I suppose many people whose homes would otherwise be shattered by some sporting activity which is going on next door and making a great noise would be able to find something interesting to do. But it is surely upon Sunday afternoon, particularly in the summer time, that everybody really has some right to peace and quiet, whether he prefers to go and spend it in a hammock in the garden or whether he prefers to sit indoors with all the windows open.

The motoring and motor-cycling organisations gave evidence before the Crathorne Committee, and they are quoted in paragraph 111 as saying :

"It was explained that Sunday was the only practicable day for these meetings because many motoring enthusiasts were not free to compete on any other day of the week."

I do not think the Committee make it altogether clear to what extent they accepted that piece of evidence. I am bound to say that I read it myself with some cynicism. I should have thought that probably the truth was that on Saturday afternoons the people who like this kind of sporting activity can find plenty of it, and that Sunday afternoons tend to be the times which people of this sort find dull. So that is the reason why, although they may not wish to destroy other people's peace and quiet, they are prepared to do so in order themselves to enjoy a noisy Sunday afternoon as well as a noisy Saturday afternoon.

Then, in the next sentence of the Report, we are told :

"A considerable amount of organisation by members was involved, which often had to be done on Saturday."

[Lord Airedale.]

A good deal of organisation no doubt has to be done in order to put on a point-to-point race meeting, for instance, but those meetings are able to be held on Saturdays. So this piece of evidence, too, I should not myself have thought was very convincing. So my only plea in this debate is this. If these noisy sports with un-silenced engines are going to be allowed on Sunday afternoons at all, can they not be allowed only in places where they are completely out of earshot of people's private homes?

4.40 p.m.

THE LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD:

My Lords, in a large provincial town some years ago now there was a proposal that the cinemas should be opened on Sunday, and the representatives of the Church of England and the Free Churches consulted together as to whether this proposal should be resisted. It was at that point that the representatives of the union to which the cinema operatives belonged came along to these Church representatives and begged them to oppose the proposal by every means in their power; because, they said, "We work late six nights in the week already; we do not want to work late on Sunday as well; and a day in lieu will not be the same." It was very largely on the basis of that advice given by those union representatives that the Church representatives decided in the end to oppose the proposal.

The result was a town meeting, at which it was confidently expected that a representative of the union would be one of the speakers. When it came to the meeting no representative of the union was there. That gave much food for thought because, in view of the sincerity with which those men had spoken in the first instance, there was no doubt, and it is a conjecture as to what happened in between their visit to the Church representatives and the meeting they did not attend.

That leads me to say that in all these proposals I do not think we should forget that it is a possibility that there are some people who want a considerable extension of Sunday amusements, and so on, in order, frankly, that they may make a good deal of money. I am not myself, I hope, a puritan in these matters, and I would agree with a great deal of what my right reverend friend the Lord

Bishop of Leicester was saying, in that I do not think it is very wise to start prohibiting people from doing what they want to do. But if to-day Sunday has become, as in one sense I fear it has, not so much a day of rest as a day of greed, there is another sense in which that is not true because there are some people who, if they have the choice between a day of rest on Sunday or extra pay, will definitely choose the day of rest because they want to have a bit of peace and quiet and to be at home with their families. It is my endeavour this afternoon to plead that people like these should not be thrown to the wolves.

I am fully prepared to agree that the laws about Sunday are in need of reform. The law must surely have the solid backing of public opinion if it is really to be effective. Laws become useless, or perhaps even worse than useless, if they are virtually unenforceable. I agree that parts of the law about Sunday may now well be in that category, and parts, it may be said, are even absurd. But I would plead that, if changes are made in the law concerning Sunday, those changes should be of a conservative nature, because I think that radical changes in these matters might well inflict a good deal of hardship on many people.

In this Report there is much that undoubtedly is wanted by many people. Whether it is needed by such people is another matter, but let that pass. As to the services that are suggested, the facilities to be provided and so on, there are now many people who are very ready to render them. My Lords, why? Is it always out of an altruistic desire to serve their fellow men? I am bound to say myself that I think sometimes there are people who are pressing for changes because they realise that changes might well be lucrative for them and offer good profits. I agree that many people would avail themselves of the services rendered. But if as the result of changes in the law some people are able to make a good deal more money, let us remember that there are other people who will be forced to work, quite likely against their will. I am thinking of the employees of some shops, of the owners of some small shops and of employees in places of amusement. I do not believe that it would be possible for owners

of small shops to remain closed on conscientious grounds if they found that their large and booming neighbours round about were open. I think it would eventually drive them out of business. I believe I am right in saying that certain trade journals, such as the meat traders' journal and the hardware trade journal, have pointed this out in no uncertain terms. I would repeat, let us think well before such people as these are thrown to the wolves.

It cannot be overstressed that drastic reform in regard to the laws about Sunday would undoubtedly lead to a great increase in Sunday work. This would surely be the case in regard to Sunday sport. As I remarked just now, I hope I am no puritan in these matters. I, for one, see no harm in people playing a quiet game on a Sunday if, as I hope is the case, they have observed their religious obligations; I see no harm in that kind of game at all. But big sporting events greatly increase work for many people. Apparently, from this Report, paragraph 117, the criterion by which the Report is guided in this matter is whether the participants in these sports receive any remuneration in money or kind. If they receive such a remuneration, then the sport should not be allowed to take place on Sunday; if they receive no such remuneration, then, according to the Report, it might be possible to have it. I would suggest that this might well lead to evasions of a flagrant kind, and I think it should be watched. I would also say that I think it is slightly illogical that, if this idea went through, a vast crowd at Twickenham would be in order, but not at White Hart Lane.

If I may go back to my own (I fear now rather distant) past, in my last year at the university the university boat club was reduced to "scraping the bottom of the barrel" and, to my intense surprise, I found myself one day slogging on behalf of my university from Putney to Mortlake. I can assure your Lordships that I was not paid for that activity, but there were about one million people who, for one reason or another, were lining the banks watching us. In order that the Boat Race might take place, the Port of London Authority had very kindly closed the river. I can well imagine that, if such proposals as this

went through, the Port of London Authority might well say, "Now we cannot close the river on a weekday, you know; you will have to have it on a Sunday". Do we want to have great sporting events such as this on a Sunday? I realise that I am taking as an illustration an event which occurs only once a year, but I think the point which has already been made by one or two other speakers to-day should be remembered: that it is pretty hard if we get to a situation where some people, if they do not believe in taking part in such sports on Sunday, are forced to choose—either they are not allowed to participate or else they are regarded as being thoroughly awkward and unobliging. Let us also remember that, if you have an enormous sporting event such as this, you will have very large numbers of people working in connection with it.

I hope that I am not being unduly critical. I realise that the Crathorne Committee were faced with a most difficult situation, and I join in the tributes paid to their conscientiousness and to the careful way in which they have gone about their working. But there is another side to all this which I think deserves mention. What effect are considerable changes in the law going to have on children? In regard to adults, I am not for a moment pleading that we should make Sunday so boring that people go to church simply because they cannot think of anything better to do. One of the great strengths of the religious life of this country to-day is that the people who go to church go out of a deep conviction, often having made a choice between that and many other activities. But when it comes to the children it is rather a different matter. They have no previous experience on which they may base a wise choice; and I am afraid that in this matter of their religious upbringing we do not always get from their parents the kind of support we should like. What would happen in respect of day schools if they did not have school attendance officers behind them? The absenteeism in some areas, I am quite sure, would be very great.

In the light of the current situation to-day, I am sometimes amazed that we do as well in our Sunday schools as we do, and I welcome this opportunity to

[The Lord Bishop of Lichfield.] pay a warm tribute to those ladies and gentleman who give up their time to teach in Sunday schools. But let us remember that the more amusements we provide on Sundays, the more counter-attractions, the more difficult it will be to get hold of children to give them religious instruction.

What is the situation in this country to-day? We are bound to be concerned about the fact that the crime rate continues to rise, that juvenile delinquency figures have been very disturbing. If we feel that religious instruction in youth is of real value in trying to bring up the children in the way in which they should go, then I hope that it will not be made unduly difficult for those people who try to give that instruction. Again, whilst I do not think it is any good proceeding on the lines of trying to stop people from doing what they want to do, at the same time let us balance against that the fact that any real increase in Sunday amusements and trading must necessarily involve a great deal of extra work for many people. Let us also remember that any changes may have a very real effect on the upbringing that is given to the children of our land.

So, while in many ways I welcome the Report, and am most grateful to the noble Lord, Lord Crathorne, and his colleagues for what they have done, I felt that I should like to take part in this debate in order to plead that, if changes in the law are made, they should not be radical but careful and conservative, so that we may not find, having tried to take away some anomalies, that we have let in certain evils which we should not like to entertain.

4.55 p.m.

LORD AUCKLAND: My Lords, the House will be very grateful to my noble friend Lord St. Oswald for having initiated this debate, and especially so to my noble friend Lord Crathorne and his Committee for the patience and conscientiousness with which they compiled this excellent Report. There are portions of it which have been subjected to criticism in the Press and elsewhere; but much of that criticism is quite unreasonable, because this is one of the most difficult subjects to tackle that can be imagined. I believe that, within its limits the

Report before us is a model of brevity and common sense.

It is perhaps a happy coincidence that both my noble friends come from Yorkshire, for on one of the few Sundays which I have spent in that very lovely county, I was asked (my hostess being a friend of the local vicar) to preach the sermon in the parish church at Horsforth. This I regarded as a great honour and I hope I acquitted myself properly. It was an evening sermon and during the day I had indulged in a ramble over the neighbouring moors, and had spent a really pleasant fresh-air Sunday. I think the important point to remember here is that just because a person is a regular churchgoer it does not necessarily mean to say that he or she is a saint. On the other hand, because a person is not a regular churchgoer he or she is not necessarily a sinner.

I personally should regard as obnoxious either a turn to the full Continental Sunday or a complete recognition of the principles behind the Lord's Day Observance Society. I should like to speak on behalf of the young people in this country, for I still regard myself as being, to some extent, one of them. It is said that young people are bored because they cannot always go dancing or to cinemas or such like. This argument does not convince me one iota. We have in this country of ours mountains, dales, hills and commons which give ample opportunity for walking and rambling; and it always grieves me to see, particularly in the summer, that while the beaches in Eastbourne (a resort I know well) are crammed full, over the lovely Sussex Downs there are all too few people enjoying a really healthy Sunday afternoon, which I am certain our Lord himself would approve of their doing. It has been suggested in some centres that the reason for the altercations which take place in places like Clacton is that there is nothing to do in those places. I would disagree strongly with that point of view. There are some glorious walks in that part of the country which many of these young people could quite profitably indulge in, even if it were wet; because, to my mind, there is nothing more pleasing, provided one is properly clad for it, than walking in the rain.

The Report itself advocates, as does my noble friend Lord Derwent, that there

should be no opening of amusements before 12.30 p.m. on Sunday. I would agree with the view which the most reverend Primate expressed, that that is much too early. It seems to me that one of the main causes of accidents is the fact that our public houses are open at that hour. What happens is that people have a lunch-hour drink and then drive too fast, and often there is a fatal accident. I am the father of three young children and I regard Sunday very much as a family day. Like most people, I work for my living during the week, and Sunday is the only day I can really spend with my family. It grieves me to hear that often fathers turn up at home about half-past two, while the Sunday dinner has been spoiling in the oven or on the hotplate. There are some who would regard these as parochial and narrow views, but I believe that family happiness would be much enhanced if the male population, especially, spent rather less time in the public house and on other entertainments up to 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

So far as sporting events are concerned, I would certainly oppose the playing of any professional football, rugby or other sport on a Sunday, but I feel that Sunday club cricket is a good thing. It gives people something to do, especially old-age pensioners. At our local cricket ground many old-age pensioners and elderly people come to watch the matches. What disturbs me is that in some localities the Lord's Day Observance Society have threatened action against the taking of collections for charity at these matches. I think that that is wrong.

As regards Sunday cinemas, I have no deep-rooted objection to their being open. On a wet night, it is a good thing to see young people going to the cinemas rather than smashing up somebody's front yard. But I hope that some of the exhibitors will be more careful in their choice of films. Too often one sees a rather third-rate horror film being shown on a Sunday. I do not think that it is being too puritanical to ask that films of an educational, or even of a religious, nature should be shown on Sundays.

I think that the churches can, and in many cases do, give a lead on Sunday evenings. My own local church is nearly always full for Evensong and there is a

large number of young people. We have a thriving 17-plus club, and after the evening service they always have some form of activity, either a drama group rehearsal or a talk or discussion. This gives them something to look forward to and work for.

Shops present one of the greatest problems. Whilst the Report does not tackle this subject with perfect efficacy, nevertheless it has a very good try. One of the anomalies is the chemist's shop. One can buy aspirins and other medicines but cannot buy hair cream or a comb—at least, not legally. This is particularly difficult in coastal areas, which, as your Lordships know, rely very much on seasonal trade, and Sunday trading in coastal resorts is of great importance to the welfare of the local people. If the Government act on this Report quickly, as I hope they will do, I trust they will give close consideration to this problem and at the same time see that the rights and privileges of the shop workers are clearly safeguarded. This has been a good and serious debate on an excellent Report, and I hope the Government will act on it with speed.

5.8 p.m.

VISCOUNT FURNESS: My Lords, I do not intend to follow my noble friend Lord Auckland in his admiration of a walk in the rain. As can be imagined from my girth, I do not walk too much anyway, and certainly not in the rain. I should like to thank the right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Leicester for his observations on the Lord's Day Observance Society and for putting the efforts of that well-meaning, but positively misguided, Society in their proper perspective.

I wish to draw your Lordships' attention to only two aspects of the admirable Crathorne Report. In the first of these, I suppose that I ought to declare an interest, in that I am a member of the Society of West End Theatre Managers. Regarding the proposal to open theatres on Sunday, I think it ought to be stated in your Lordships' House that the British Actors' Equity Association contacted the whole of the membership on this question. This is referred to in paragraph 81 of the Report, where it states that out of 11,000 questionnaires sent to actors all over the country, only 1,244 bothered to reply. Approximately one-third were opposed

[Viscount Furness.]

to the opening of theatres on Sunday under any conditions, and two-thirds were not so opposed.

I think it is important to remind your Lordships of the opinion of the Equity Council on this matter, which the Crathorne Committee thought so important as to include in their Report. It is quoted in paragraph 81 as follows:

"The opinion of the Equity Council is that most of our members who are opposed to the Sunday opening of theatres under any conditions will have taken this opportunity of registering the fact, whereas many of those who are not opposed in principle, will not have troubled to reply. Accordingly, the Council believes that the figure of 401 is probably close to the total of those opposed in principle, and that it is certainly reasonable to assume that the overwhelming majority of members are not so opposed."

When you have 401 out of 11,000, even allowing for a few errors and omissions, it is not a significant proportion of the total.

I should now like to turn to another facet of the Crathorne Committee's Report; and it is a minor point, coming in Chapter 16, under the heading "Miscellaneous Recommendations". It deals with shops for international airports. As your Lordships may remember, Commander Kerans, the former Member for Hartlepoons in the last Parliament, introduced the Shops (Airports) Bill in 1962. It was a Private Member's Bill. It was successful in the ballot, and succeeded in passing through another place; and eventually I had the honour of piloting it through your Lordships' House. As the Bill was introduced in the other place it extended to Sunday trading restrictions. But this provision was deleted there because it was felt that it should await the recommendations of the Crathorne Committee. It is interesting to note that the Crathorne Committee

"came to the conclusion that a complete exemption was justified and we recommend that shops provided at designated international airports for the use of travellers should be exempt from all Sunday trading restrictions." I do not know how far the noble Lord, Lord Stonham, will be able to go when he comes to wind up the debate, but it would be of great interest if we could have from him some indication as to whether there will be legislation on some of these minor matters, apart from dealing with the major matters of sport and entertainment which form the main body of the Report.

5.13 p.m.

LORD REDESDALE: My Lords, it is difficult to follow the many excellent speeches that have been made this afternoon, but I must begin by saying what a really excellent Report, in my opinion, is the Report of the Departmental Committee under the chairmanship of the noble Lord, Lord Crathorne. I have seldom read a Report, looking for something on which to comment, and found, to my surprise, that there was nothing upon which I could comment, because it was all so excellent and so absolutely in agreement with my own views. However, I am not entirely at a loss for words, and I would crave your Lordships' indulgence to take up a little of your time on one or two aspects of the Report.

The first thing I would say is a further piece of praise for the Report, in that I thought the historical survey was particularly clear, informative and concise. It also makes interesting reading, whether you are desperately concerned with the subject or whether you are not. I think it gives an interesting picture of English law and Parliament's attitude. I confess that I am a little disappointed that Parliament through the ages has tended to shy away from this subject, and I hope that now, at last, Parliament will be able to face up to it. The early laws, of course, were purely restrictive, on religious grounds. There is still, obviously, some need for restriction, so as to ensure that Sunday is, in the words of the Report, "a different day" or a special day. The present attitude of the Church is, I feel, most reasonable; and the speeches by the most reverend Primate and the right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Leicester were particularly good; and they showed the informed attitude of the Church and its attempt to keep in touch with younger people.

Even if Sunday is kept as a special day, and a day for worship, that does not mean to say it should not be a brighter day. For instance, the particular church that I attend has a 9.15 a.m. family service, and the time was chosen carefully, to allow the rest of the day for other activities. This, I think, is a sensible and informed attitude, and certainly it has a very full following in our church. The excessive restrictions demanded by some bodies can do more

harm than good, and would certainly not increase the 12 per cent. of churchgoers referred to in the Report: in fact, further restrictions could reduce the number. I believe that some liberalisation of this law, showing the Church's attitude as being for a proper Sunday, but at the same time a special day, a family day, could increase churchgoing, because it would show that the Church still has its feet on the ground and is in touch with the masses.

As I said earlier, I believe that Sunday should be a day of worship; but it need not necessarily be depressing. I feel that the old attitude is summed up in the remark made by a French Canadian M.P. to Lord Thomson, when he said:

"I spent a fortnight in Toronto last Sunday".

Another point raised earlier is that Sunday is a quiet day. This obviously has relation to the younger section of this country. One thing that I have seen—and I am sure many of your Lordships have also seen it—is that on a wet Sunday, whereas some people may like walking in the rain, a great many others are content to stand on the street corner. But standing on the corner will not be the end: some people want a little more excitement, and it can end up in vandalism and sometimes in crime.

The history of legislation on Sunday observance is a little disturbing, in that, as I have said, very little has so far been done. Apart from the restrictive laws, few additional laws have been added. Admittedly the 1932 laws, and one or two others, had a liberalising effect. I think it is slightly unfair that anyone keen on bowling should be still labouring under a law which says:

". . . and—at all times, in the meaner sort of people by law prohibited—bowling."

Admittedly this referred to nine-pin bowling, as opposed to the more sophisticated ten-pin bowling. The irrational situations that have been mentioned have produced a state where the law can be held in ridicule, which has been said by various noble Lords to be a very unsatisfactory situation. The Crathorne Committee, I feel, have done a wonderful job in trying to overcome this and to bring back a sensible set of laws which can be enforced.

Without using the well-known clichés to describe change, I feel it necessary that the twentieth century should not be labouring under laws made in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. Society's needs are changing ever faster, and in fact every year they change a little faster still. The trend of automation has already been mentioned, and shorter hours and more shift work have become necessary. Now this is unfortunate for those people who have to work shifts on Sunday; but if, as has been mentioned, some factories work round the clock, unfortunately some people have to do their stint on Sunday. The trend towards shift work has resulted in a need for a wider spread of hours for entertainment and trading. The Committee's recommendations on sport and entertainment were, I considered, particularly well thought out, and can hardly give rise to much criticism. Perhaps there is something in 12.30 p.m. being rather an early hour, and I do not entirely agree with that.

I am not in agreement with the noble Lord, Lord Airedale, on the subject of motor sports, but I would say that if any laws are to be passed which allow activities of this type to take place on a Sunday it would be a pity if those people who win championships in that kind of club event or, as is mentioned in the Report, ping-pong championships, should not receive some prizes. As the law is at present, it would probably prevent anybody from receiving any prize at all.

At this stage I must declare an interest as one concerned with the washing of other people's dirty linen in public. I am concerned with launderettes, which are covered in paragraphs 149 to 151, and therefore I have a particular interest. The noble Lord, Lord Derwent, has already raised this subject, but I should like to elaborate it a little. The evidence submitted by the National Association of Launderette Owners, of which I am a member, was presented in 1961. Since then there has been a radical change in the launderette business. In 1961, most of the shops were of a certain type, and were for essentially attended operations. Since then, these shops have moved over to top loading machines, which can be left for 24-hour operation. The advantage of these is that they do not

[Lord Redesdale.]
require staff. Some are attended during the day, but are left totally unattended at night.

The membership of NALO has changed since their evidence was submitted to the Crathorne Committee. There was a rather restrictionist attitude in the original evidence, because it meant that staff had to be provided on Sunday, and this created problems; therefore, if everybody was shut, it was much easier for all concerned. Since then, there has been the introduction of the 24-hour shops and the shops with attended operations had to stay open in order to compete. This was unfortunate on the attended operations shops, but the point is that most of these old, attended, shops are moving over quite rapidly to machines which can be left unattended, because the old type of machine is now becoming obsolete and has to be replaced in any case.

There is the further aspect that launderettes are not yet defined within the law. The noble Lord, Lord Derwent, referred to the recent case of *Ilford Corporation v. Betterclean (Seven Kings) Limited*. As has been stated, Betterclean won their case on the ground that the launderette was not offering a personal service, but the Lord Chief Justice subsequently said that although this case had been won on those grounds, it was fortunate that he did not have to make a ruling on whether the launderette was a shop or not. But he stated that in his opinion the launderette was a shop. The relevant section of the Shops Act, 1950, is Section 74(4). This point, so far as launderettes are concerned, will have to be cleared up at some time, but it is not part of this debate, and I should prefer it if the noble Lord, Lord Stonham, could at some time afford me the opportunity of discussing under what section of the 1950 Act launderettes come.

The launderette business has expanded considerably over the years, and there are now about 2,500 of them, of which about 800 are unattended. As I have said, the proportion of unattended shops is increasing. Launderettes supply to the public a very real service. The right reverend Prelate, the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, mentioned that not all operators who provide a service do so entirely altruistically. I must confess that it is

true that when I provide a service on Sunday it is not entirely altruistic. Trying to view this matter as impersonally as possible—I hope your Lordships appreciate this—I have talked to a number of people who use these establishments on Sunday, and it is interesting to note their type. Most of them say that they have a very real need to use them on Sunday because they have no other time to do so.

That argument can be faulted, I agree, and I tried to fault it in discussing it with these people. The breakdown of people who use these places is not an economic class one at all; it is a category breakdown. Mainly, they use these launderettes on Sunday because more married women are working during the week and, therefore, their load of housework has to be spread across the family—or it certainly should be in a good family, as, for instance, with the washing up. The people who take their laundry to the launderette vary from the children to the husband. The husband usually carries it because it is too heavy for the wife. That is one class of people.

The other is the single, bachelor type of people, men and women, who find that they are working long hours during the week. One was a lady solicitor who found that Saturday was a day on which she had to do her shopping and a lot of things which she could not find time for on other days of the week. Sunday was the only day when she had a chance to catch up on personal administration. Talking to secretaries and people like that, I found that Saturday is the day on which they do their shopping, and Sunday is a personal day when they catch up. Saturday is an entertainment day. One said, "When else can I see my boy friend?" Therefore, I feel that it is not unreasonable to say that launderettes supply a very real need on Sunday for certain people who find it difficult to find time during the rest of the week.

I must ask your Lordships' forgiveness for taking up so much of your time on these three paragraphs of the Report. In concluding, I should like to come to the question of those people who have to be employed on Sundays. I have already said that there are very few people who have to be employed in launderettes. Another completely separate point was with regard to those

people who are part-time workers, or those who have one job and find that they have to make a bit of extra money, and therefore work on a Sunday. For instance, girls who are soon to get married, who are desperately trying to save up, take on a Sunday job which is quite separate from their own employment. The recommendations of the Crathorne Committee, I thought, were very reasonable on this point. They did not wish inflexible rules to be laid down that people had to have one Sunday off in three. If Sunday is a part-time work day and they chose to work on Sunday for special reasons, they should be allowed to do so. I am sorry I have taken up so much of your Lordships' time, but I sincerely hope that at long last, after 500 years, Her Majesty's Government will start pushing through some legislation, and will be able to feel proud that they have at last taken courage and done something about it.

5.30 p.m.

LORD BELHAVEN AND STENTON: My Lords, first of all I would apologise for addressing your Lordships on the subject of this Motion as I live in the land of Sabbath calm, or (should we say?) Sabbath gloom, and Scotland is not specifically dealt with in this Report, although I rather wish it were. None the less, and perhaps even because of this, I feel impelled to say a few words on the subject of this excellent Report, and if my words sound a little extreme to some of your Lordships who come from South of the Border I hope that your Lordships will bear in mind that I am not very well acquainted with the English Sunday. I have not had much experience of it since I was a schoolboy. I am sure it is very nice—a thing you could hardly say of our Sunday.

I do not propose to say a great deal about the Report itself as it has already been fairly extensively dealt with by other noble Lords. I think it is a very good Report and, unlike many of these documents, is very readable. I have a feeling myself, perhaps because of my Northern origin, that some of the recommendations err a little on the side of relaxation, but I think it is generally a very fair and balanced Report. I must confess that I am not myself a Sabbatarian. I am a Protestant—other noble Lords have raised this point before, but I do not feel that

I should apologise to your Lordships for raising it again because it is rather more particularly referring to my own country, where the Fourth Commandment is still very much in evidence and is cited as a theological justification for making Sunday a perfect misery for everybody—but I have never been able to understand the insistence of certain Protestant churches on turning Sunday into a Jewish Sabbath. If the Ten Commandments are to be rigidly obeyed, then surely it is illogical to apply the Fourth Commandment to Sunday, which is the first day of the week, when the Commandment is quite specific that the Sabbath is the seventh day of the week.

By custom, Christians have adopted Sunday as the day of rest and worship, but it remains even now, after I do not know how many thousand years, the first day of the week. It is one thing that has not changed at all and it is consequently, I should have thought necessarily, divested of the severe regulations which were laid down for the Jewish Sabbath. In view of what our Lord said about the Sabbath—and I think this has been borne out by certain right reverend Prelates and other people with much more experience of theology than I have—the early Fathers must have intended this and taken the first day of the week as the Holy Day in commemoration of our Lord's resurrection and in order to get away from the Jewish Sabbath.

I therefore welcome this Report as a step in the right direction and a move to relax the rigidity of the Sunday laws, the sternest of which had their origin in the 17th century, an age of violence, fanaticism and civil war, from which this nation fortunately emerged 250 years ago. Most people even nowadays have to work very hard and—I am now referring mainly to Scotland—I think it is perfectly fantastic that the one clear day off should be so hedged about by restrictive laws as to make half the usual forms of relaxation quite impossible. I do not think I am exaggerating. Anybody who has a son at a prep school in Edinburgh and has to take him out on a Sunday and entertain him will know exactly what I mean. Scotland—again, I cannot refer to England as I do not know enough about it—is at present a perfectly miserable place on Sunday, and I am glad I live in the country, where nature observes no

[Lord Belhaven and Stenton.]
Sabbath and one is not subjected to the unbearable pall of gloom which hangs over our towns.

I hope that the recommendations of this excellent and enlightened Report are carried out, with certain reservations. If England leads, I hope that Scotland—and, dare I say, Wales—will follow and that we shall get rid of some of this compulsory misery. I think life is too short for it.

5.35 p.m.

LORD CRATHORNE: My Lords, I should like at the outset to give your Lordships the satisfaction of knowing that I have no intention of making a long speech about the detailed recommendations of the Report of the Committee of which I had the honour to be the Chairman. In fact, I considered very seriously whether it was right for me to take part in this debate at all; but then I thought that your Lordships would probably like a few points of elucidation towards the end of the debate, before we had the reply from the representative of Her Majesty's Government. So my speech will be limited to that sphere.

I should like in the first instance to thank my noble friend Lord St. Oswald, a fellow-Yorkshireman, for arranging this debate and putting down this Motion, which has been so well received. I should like also to offer my grateful thanks to Members of your Lordships' House for their speeches today, to some of which I shall refer in my few remarks. It is abundantly clear from the debate we have had this afternoon that there is a wide measure of support in this House, in general terms, for the Committee's recommendations. And I would say that, by and large, this is also true throughout the country as a whole, because when our Report was first published, though it concerned a subject of this sort, one that was open to controversy and to conflicting views, it aroused little public controversy. Curiously enough, when the Committee first set out on their voyage on this work we looked at this problem from this angle; because there is no doubt that in recent years there has been decreasing interest in the subject of Sunday observance law.

Two quite separate interpretations have been put upon this decline of in-

terest. One interpretation, is that the public, as a whole, show no demand for any change of law; and the second interpretation is to the effect that the law has been so widely ignored or avoided that it has fallen into disrepute; that revision is long overdue, and the public have given up hope that any Government of any particular colour would take the trouble to go into these problems and revise the law as it should be revised. My Lords, your Committee took the second view. That is why, in all the years that we considered this problem, we gave particular attention to cases where this law was being avoided in what was actually taking place; and we were very much helped by the evidence which we received, both in written form and from verbal evidence given to the Committee.

My Lords, I should like to make just one or two general observations. The first is of thanks to the last speaker, who brought a breath of fresh air from North of the Border, because I would impress upon your Lordships that in many parts of the country it is not yet clearly understood that our terms of reference specifically excluded Scotland, although, on the other hand, they specifically included the Principality of Wales. And those of your Lordships who have studied social matters in the Principality will, I think, agree that it is very remarkable to see how far the distinguished representative from the Principality that we had on our Committee has gone in completely following the recommendations of the whole Committee.

We took as our first consideration: what should be the purpose of Sunday observance? And we set out our views, and how they were arrived at, in Chapter 3 of the Report. Our conclusions, and the principles on which we based our proposals, are summarised in paragraphs 48 and 52. I should like to quote one or two sentences of paragraph 48, where we use these words:

"There were some witnesses who, from religious convictions, looked upon Sunday recreation and work (apart from work of necessity) as contrary to Divine law. There were others who regarded all restrictions based on Sunday observance as an unjustifiable infringement of their freedom. Between these two extremes there was a considerable number of people who, for a variety of reasons, were in favour of keeping Sunday as a 'different' day."

I have quoted these sentences to emphasise the words "a different day", because it was a great surprise to the Committee, if I may put it in this way, that people holding entirely different views on this problem all came together, in cross-questioning at the end of their examination, and all came to the conclusion that they wished Sunday to be a different day from any other.

For this desire there were a variety of reasons—all very good ones. Some were definitely religious—and, of course, really it all goes back traditionally to religion right through the ages. Some had this view for family reasons; others because of the advent of the motor car, and because Sunday is the only day when the family can get together and can be together. But, for one reason or another, they all thought this day should be different from any other day in the week. This gave the Committee very great satisfaction, and having that background from which to start our labours made our task very much easier.

Perhaps I might just touch upon one or two points in elucidation of the various sections. With regard to that on entertainments, there is no doubt that our task here was simplified owing to the effect on the attitude of the public mind of television. This is a new factor since this problem was previously considered, and it has had a definite impact, I think, on the public mind, on their ideas as to what should be done, so far as entertainment on Sunday is concerned. We considered most carefully the special position of live performers, actors, variety artists, before deciding on our recommendations. We had no reason to doubt, as the noble Viscount, Lord Furness, said in his speech, the opinion of the Equity Council who told us that they believed that 401 is probably close to the total of those opposed to Sunday theatres in principle, and that the overwhelming majority of their members were not opposed.

We accepted that view, and although I appreciate that in his very helpful speech this afternoon the most reverend Primate did not go quite so far as we do in this particular aspect, I believe that in general principle he welcomes the recommendations of the Report. I would only say to him that, so far as the reservation of one of our members is concerned, which was really the only reservation in the whole of the Report and recommendations, he went

out of his way to say that this was not a difference in principle but a question of where the line should be drawn. That appears in paragraph 84, and I accept that completely, as no doubt the most reverend Primate will, too.

As to his point about the time of 12.30 p.m., there is no law of the Medes and Persians about that. I think, without divulging secrets from the Committee, it is one of those things where, when we started our discussions, some members of the Committee did not want any time fixed at all; others wanted entertainments to start early in the morning; and we came down on 12.30 p.m., upon which we all agreed. There is no law of the Medes and Persians there, and I think, if I may say so in my personal capacity and very humbly, there is very much to be said for the view expressed by the most reverend Primate and also other who have spoken this afternoon.

Leaving that for a moment, if I may, I will come to what was, I suppose, the most difficult and controversial question which we had to consider, and that was whether spectator sports should be permitted on Sundays. To start with, it is very difficult to divide sports between the sports which everybody takes part in and sports which people want to see and enjoy as a spectacle. We came down in the end on this particular provision, because we believed there was a good case for some relaxation of the law to help local clubs who organised games primarily for the recreation of the players but who need financial help and encouragement from spectators. At present some clubs organise Sunday matches and make a voluntary collection or charge for special facilities. We were told this was not satisfactory to the organisers and those responsible for controlling traffic and spectators. Your Lordships will realise what was behind all that—people trying to avoid paying for car parks whose motor cars block up the traffic, and altogether it is highly unsatisfactory. In the end, after a lot of consideration, the Committee came to the conclusion that the payment of the participants—and I use these words deliberately—would be a less unsatisfactory alternative. If Her Majesty's Government, when the time comes, can suggest a better way of achieving the Committee's aim, the Committee will welcome it wholeheartedly.

[Lord Crathorne.]

Of course, the right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Lichfield mentioned Wimbledon. We gave a great deal of thought to that, and our thinking was that this gets through the net, but it happens only once a year and the advantage accrued to stop wholesale organised sport, such as professional football, racing and the like, where large crowds are gathered together incurring very large additional employment of people, justified us in taking this line—which, we agree, is completely illogical. We started with this consideration: whatever we do in this Report, let us make common sense, because we cannot be logical and if we try to make the position logical it will not be sensible.

I should like to refer to Her Majesty's Government, because I know that this matter is going to be extremely complicated. Although they were very complimentary to the Report, I know very well that when it comes to forming legislation all sorts of problems will arise. We said we would try to be as helpful as we could be to any Government; but when it comes to proposing legislation it is very difficult to define it in the Report. In these paragraphs on this aspect we based ourselves on the Wolfenden Report, so much so that we included the appropriate passages from the Wolfenden Report as an Appendix to our Report. That is again exactly the same thinking as that in our Report, and I believe it is nearly the same thinking as that of noble Lords who have spoken in this debate.

I do not want to take up too much time at the end of this discussion, but I should like to refer to some points which have been made, although I will not mention just those which are complimentary to the Committee. The noble Lord, Lord St. Oswald, said, quite correctly, that T.V. was excluded from our consideration. There was no secret about this. In the middle of our consideration we suddenly realised that, long though our deliberations had been, if we had had to deal with T.V. they could have gone on for much longer, and the whole matter would have been much more complicated. So we sought the guidance of Her Majesty's Government of the day, and we were told definitely that we had not to consider T.V. programmes and T.V. problems. Although we did not seek guidance on

this, the same applies to points of great validity raised by the most reverend Primate in regard to future legislation in connection with shift workers in factories. We did not consider them because they were in a different field. I have dealt with the 12.30 o'clock point. The noble Lord, Lord Derwent, called attention to points which are really for Her Majesty's Government, and I hope that they will be answered by the Government.

From the Committee's point of view, in Recommendation 12 we included vending machines because they created no additional employment on Sunday, and we did not consider the point which was made. With regard to launderettes, we did not mean them to include other services. We looked upon them as a shop. But there is a question of law here. Question 19 posed rather an important point. We were here dealing with holiday resorts. This question has got out of balance and is all wrong. But when we first had holiday resorts it was quite easy to say that such-and-such a place was a holiday resort. With the advent of the small family motor car, people can go out into the country as a family, but they cannot obtain all sorts of things that they may require, perfectly reasonably, because the place is not a holiday resort. We have suggested that local authorities be given power to say that part of their area is a holiday resort and part is not, according to the wishes of the particular local authority at the time; and we think that they will be sensible. We hope that this suggestion will commend itself to Her Majesty's Government.

I cannot pass the speech of the right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Leicester without, on behalf of our Committee, thanking him most cordially. In his speech, in a short time, he entirely reflected our point of view. Speaking personally, I would say that he absolutely reflected our point of view towards the Lord's Day Observance Society. The point of view which he suggested to the House was exactly that which we took when we were assessing their evidence. We are most grateful to him for everything that he said.

Other noble Lords made speeches which were of great interest and most helpful. But I do not think there is any particular point that it would be right for me to answer; answers would come

more appropriately from Her Majesty's Government. In the course of my few remarks I have not mentioned trading. I have not mentioned trading because, by and large, the recommendation appears to have met with general support. In short, what we on the Committee tried to do was to simplify the complicated and ambiguous laws on exempted goods and transactions which were becoming, and are, quite fantastic. Without going into detail, the kind of thing of which your Lordships have heard so much is that, while one may buy a razor blade to cut a corn, one may not do so in order to shave. How can one enforce a law like that? There are any amount of laws like that. You can sing Harry Lauder's song, but you cannot wear a kilt unless, like some noble Lords, you come from North of the Border. These things do not make sense. The whole of this part of our Report on trading is an endeavour to bring the law dealing with trading matters into line, and to do away with all unnecessary restrictions, while keeping the principle that there should be no general trading on Sundays exactly the same as it is now. That should be remembered.

I turn now to the Joint Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Home Office, the noble Lord, Lord Stonham, who is going to reply to the debate. I have no doubt that we shall be much interested in what he is going to say. In another place, the Home Secretary was, I think, reasonably complimentary about the Report; but he said he was there to listen, to hear the views of Members in all parts of the House, and he gave no indication as to any Government action at all, or what he or Her Majesty's Government propose to do. The noble Lord will probably do the same to-day. That is what I expect. But I hope he will be able to go just a stage further, because although noble Lords will appreciate that the Government's legislative programme is quite full at the present time, that is no reason at all, in my view, why the preparation of legislation to deal with the many anomalies that exist in our laws concerning Sunday observance should not be commenced straight away. My noble friend Lord Derwent made this point, and I hope that the noble Lord opposite will be able to say that something is on the move, that something is happening, and

that our Report will not be pigeon-holed, not to emerge for many, many years.

I am not going to detain your Lordships any longer. I shall simply end my remarks where I began by saying that when the Committee began their deliberations in the autumn of 1961 we were told on all sides that when we had completed them there would be eight different Reports. In actual fact, our Report is virtually unanimous. This surely gives the Government of to-day, or any Government, a wonderful opportunity for taking the necessary action to deal with the present law. As we said, in our paragraph 52:

"In framing our recommendations we have endeavoured to make proposals which, if adopted, would produce a law that would be respected and could be enforced. To achieve this, the law must be clear, certain, and acceptable to a majority of the public."

6.0 p.m.

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, we have had an extremely valuable and, I think, high-level debate, of which I think the two main features are that Yorkshire have had a good innings, both in the middle and at both ends, while we have had also three invaluable speeches from the Bench of Bishops. I must confess that I have been delighted to hear the forthright—one might say brave—statements which have emanated from the Bishops' Bench.

The most reverend Primate the Lord Archbishop of York, I was glad to see, would welcome the removal of anomalies which bring Sunday observance into ridicule. The right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Leicester, in what was I thought a most wise and witty speech, assured us that the survival of the Lord's Day Observance Society and its propaganda is an anachronism from which the Church of England must dissociate itself. And again, as a Bishop and a Christian, he assured us that he was reluctant to ask for any restriction at all for which the Church was not absolutely obliged to ask. I think they are very helpful statements. I would also mention that during at least two hours of the debate, throughout some six or seven speeches, we had the presence here of the noble Lord, Lord Butler of Saffron Walden, who was responsible in 1961 for appointing the Committee, whose Report we are now considering.

[Lord Stonham.]

I am sure the House is extremely grateful to the noble Lord, Lord St. Oswald, for giving us this opportunity to debate the Report, and also for a speech which, even by his standards, was remarkable. The noble Lord took us on a Sunday tour through Greece, Spain, Israel, Burma, Thailand, Hawaii, Tahiti—and those are quite some of the places I noted. My trouble is that, although I am vastly well briefed by the Home Office on Sunday in Wales and Scotland, nobody thought to tell me about Sunday in Hawaii; so on that I shall not be able to comment. But I would at once thank the noble Lord very much for a speech that was forceful, devout, erudite and, at times, moving, yet which, nevertheless, was full of common sense. It was a fitting speech for a Christian gentlemen and the incumbent of Nostell Priory.

I want on behalf of the Government to join with everybody in thanking the noble Lord, Lord Crathorne, and his colleagues on the Committee most warmly for the thorough and painstaking review which they have made of this subject, and for the balanced and eminently readable nature of the Report. The noble Lord, Lord Redesdale, said that it was the only Report which he had ever read through. I would never make a confession of that kind; but this Report is very much easier to read to the end than others, and we are very grateful for it. This is a quite remarkable fact, because this is an area where differing views are sincerely, and sometimes tenaciously, held. I am sure the Committee are to be congratulated on having achieved such a large measure of unanimity in their recommendations. It is this unanimity which, in my view, is responsible for the Report's quiet reception, which I interpret not as apathy but as acceptance.

Proposals for relaxation of various aspects of Sunday observance have been made in another place at intervals during the last twenty years; and always they have met with a most fierce and skilful opposition, and almost always they have been defeated. I was thinking, as the noble Lord, Lord Belhaven and Stenton, was speaking, that if we followed logically the position of Sabbatarians who have fought, as they have every right to, so forcefully against any kind of change over the past half century, we should be in

precisely the position in which he finds himself when he tries to give his small boy, now at an Edinburgh prep school, some kind of recreation on a Sunday. I can speak feelingly on this matter, because at the age of 20 I went to Scotland for the first time in my life. It was a very wet Saturday night in Glasgow, in February. I was there alone all day on Sunday, and quite literally the only place that was open, apart, I suppose, from public lavatories, was the museum. There I shared the delights of the Battle of Langside with some young people.

The noble Lord, Lord Crathorne, pointed out that his Committee were not asked to consider Scotland, but I understand that in that country, although there are still on the Statute Book some very restrictive Sabbath observance laws, only a judicial decision could decide whether they are obsolete. But they are not enforced; there is no question of prosecution under them, and general Sunday observance in Scotland, therefore, is maintained not by the criminal law but by the pressure of public opinion. No doubt if public opinion changes, conditions will change also.

I was speaking about opposition in another place to proposals for relaxation of Sunday observance. The Commous debate on this Report, on February 15, was the most poorly attended on this subject in memory, which I regard as proof of the fact that the Crathorne Report is accepted by the majority of Members in another place.

LORD AIREDALE: My Lords, may I interrupt the noble Lord for one moment? If he is talking about poor attendance, is there no single supporter of Her Majesty's Government in this House who is interested enough to come to the House to hear what Her Majesty's Government's proposals are on the Crathorne Report? Look at the number of noble Lords opposite who are here and take an interest in what the Government have to say. Have none of their supporters in this House any interest in this matter?

LORD STONHAM: My Lords, I always believe that a good soldier never looks behind him. It is enough to face noble Lords in front of me without worrying who is or is not behind me. In any case, the noble Lord, Lord

Airedale, could not expect me to be armed with the knowledge to give an answer to his question, though I have no doubt that it will be noted.

I was speaking about the debate in another place and the attendance there being the poorest in memory, which I regard as acceptance of the Report. During the debate some Members urged adherence to the Sabbatarian principle. Indeed, my honourable friend and fellow Joint Under-Secretary of State—the underside of the joint, as it were!—Mr. George Thomas, who is a leading and beloved Methodist, praised some aspects of the Sunday Observance Act, 1625, which prohibits meetings and assemblies of people out of their parishes for any sport or pastime whatsoever. But with the freedom which attaches even to Ministers on this subject, I must say that I do not myself rejoice in the fact that this year that Act celebrates its 340th anniversary. In my view, there is no question that the 1625 Act is now completely obsolete and unenforceable in modern conditions. I believe this is true of most of the later Sunday Observance laws and that it is wrong to continue Statutes which are archaic, often incomprehensible and therefore unenforceable.

As a humble Anglican, I take the view that religious observance and the teaching of Christian doctrine cannot be secured by law, and that some, at least, of the present restrictions have become an embarrassment to the Church. I believe that the most reverend Primate the Lord Archbishop of York virtually said that, but he indicated by implication that, in his view, in a society only partially Christian it is impossible to have statutory observance of Christian principles. It would, I think, help make our society much healthier and even more moral if we removed stupid anomalies and unjustifiable restrictions, and created conditions in which people, each in his own way, were able to enjoy Sunday as a day off with a difference. That, I think, is the burden of the Crathorne Report. And it was also the main theme of the debate in another place, which proved that there is a considerable body of opinion which would welcome a wise and moderate relaxation of the present law, provided that Sunday retained a special character as a day

primarily devoted to relaxation and family pursuits.

I expect that when I was a small boy my experience was much the same as that of your Lordships who are in the same age group. We went to Church every Sunday morning, to Sunday School in the afternoon, to Church Gymnasium on Monday and to something else on one or two other days of the week. Church was a dominant factor in one's life. But the family Sunday, the Sunday of family worship, no longer exists for the considerable majority of our people. Indeed, there is some substance in the argument that there is more true recreation of the family together, and, perhaps, even more religion, on the Continent, despite what is said about the Continental Sunday. In my view, there are few more appalling experiences than a journey to the seaside on a summer Sunday, yet millions of people take a sadistic pleasure in inflicting this punishment on themselves as frequently as possible. And why not, if they do not harm others?

But here we come to the point which the noble Lord, Lord Airedale, made about these motor-cycle and motor car rallies, which make a fiendish noise, cause people acute discomfort, and prevent other people from enjoying themselves. I heartily agree with the point that he made that this has to be looked into, but whether it would come within the scope of any legislation which might eventually be contemplated on this subject I could not say. But it would seem to me that these people are constituting a nuisance and the trouble could be dealt with under that heading.

There is no sound reason why those who belong to golf or cricket or tennis or polo or swimming or motoring or flying clubs, or even pot-holing clubs, should not enjoy their recreation without restriction or blame. We cannot compel them to go to church—although a great many do—but people should be at liberty to enjoy their day of leisure in the way they choose, even if they work harder at it than in their weekday jobs. And provided we do not inflict unfair conditions on those obliged to work, we should strive to remove the anomalies. Some have been mentioned. I understand it is the case that you can buy fish and chips on a Sunday, anywhere but in

[Lord Stonham.]
a fish and chip shop. Tripe lovers can satisfy their addiction but must dispense with the cow heel. You can salve a hurt finger at the chemist's, but you cannot buy the perfume to soothe the hurt feelings of a lady. You can watch or take part in a live television show, but you cannot buy a ticket to see the same show in a theatre. You can buy almost nothing in Balham and almost everything in Brighton. These things just do not make sense, and they cause people to lose respect for the law. I believe that, overwhelmingly, people treasure Sunday as a break in the rhythm of work, but also, overwhelmingly, they want, within reasonable limits, freedom to choose the manner in which they spend their day.

There is further support for this view in the reception which public opinion and the Press have given to the Committee's proposals. In general, the Press have commented favourably on the Report as succeeding for the most part in reconciling conflicting views. Some newspapers have expressed the view that the recommendations might have gone further; in particular they are doubtful about the proposal to forbid professional sport on Sundays. But the Home Office has received astonishingly few letters from the general public. Of these, some are favourable to the Report, but the majority expressing objection to it do so mainly on rigid Sabbatarian principles. Another pointer which noble Lords may have noticed was that on February 22 the *Daily Telegraph* published a Gallup Poll showing that 56 per cent. of those questioned favoured the Sunday opening of places of entertainment, 53 per cent. the holding of professional sport on Sundays, and 67 per cent. Sunday trading.

The noble Lord, Lord Derwent, dealt with some of the Committee's recommendations in detail, and I shall be talking about his points on Sunday trading and employment in a moment. But I do not want to go into all the recommendations in detail, because from all the information, views and opinions which the Government have been able to obtain, all the Committee's recommendations have met major acceptance, apart from reservations—not opposition—regarding recommendations Nos. 4, 6 and 7. I have, of course, noted the objection which the most reverend Primate the Lord Archbishop had to recommendation No. 3.

But although we must take note of that objection, nevertheless we are convinced that the great majority of people are in favour of recommendation No. 3. Therefore I propose to confine my remaining remarks to those three recommendations about which some doubts have been expressed.

In their recommendation No. 6, the Committee propose the abolition of the present prohibition on Sunday sports matches and meetings to which the public are admitted on payment, and the substitution of a prohibition on matches for spectators to watch where the players are paid. The noble Lord, Lord Crathorne, told us why his Committee had come to their decision, and made it clear that the Committee were concerned to distinguish between those sports matches organised to attract large crowds—which they believed should be prohibited in order to help preserve the special character of Sunday—and the small, local events likely to attract only a few people, which they thought should be allowed. The noble Lord has said that they found difficulty in drawing this line of demarcation, but they felt they had drawn the right one.

The distinction between amateur and professional players in many sports has become increasingly blurred, and in some sports so-called amateurs are employed by firms because of their prowess and skill in a particular sport. Then there are organised amateur sports—Rugby Union matches, lawn tennis tournaments and athletic events—which attract large crowds and create a good deal of incidental employment. But whatever the present views of the controlling bodies of these sports, if the law were to be changed in the way proposed by the Committee it is possible that at some future date some, at least, of them might wish to promote amateur contests on Sundays which might well attract considerable numbers of people.

The right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Lichfield mentioned the Boat Race. There is nothing to stop the Boat Race from being held on Sundays, now, because the crews are all amateurs—at least, I have always been led to believe they were—and, of course, the public does not pay for admission. So whatever might be done with the law, it would not affect that case. But it would seem very difficult

to defend the position if England were to play France at Twickenham before a capacity crowd and Wigan could not play Warrington at Wigan before a much smaller crowd. But, my Lords, if a distinction is to be maintained between sports liable to attract large numbers of spectators and other sports, then, as a purely practical matter, it seems that there is much to be said for the present criterion of payment for admission—and I gather that the right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Leicester supports that view.

Now I recognise that this prohibition on the payment for admission is capable of evasion (as indeed the Committee pointed out), by devices such as charging for car parks, collections on the ground and so on; but it is very doubtful whether enough profit could be made through that kind of practice for any large-scale sporting events. An alternative course, therefore, would be to remove all restrictions on Sunday sports, whether professional or amateur. As I have already said, this proposal has received some support from the Press, and the Government are very grateful for the views which your Lordships have expressed in the present debate. But I am bound to say that the rough poll which I have taken indicates that most people would, on the whole, be in favour of retaining the *status quo*. It seems that the choice lies not in the noble Lord's proposal but between leaving things as they are and removing altogether restrictions on Sunday games, whether the players are amateurs or professional.

My Lords, the other point at issue is the one in proposal 4 and proposal 7: that theatres, and so on, should open at 12.30, and that games should start at 12.30. Here, the overwhelming view of the House seems to me to indicate, from what I have heard, that 12.30 is not the right time, but that 2 o'clock should be the time at which either these sports or entertainments should be allowed to start.

With regard to Sunday trading, the Committee's recommendations are, of course, far less radical than those on entertainment and sport, although they do represent some liberalisation. The whole question of Sunday trading is at present being examined as part of a general review of shop hours, and the Government hope to be able to announce

their provisional conclusions within the next few months. Certainly, as the right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Lichfield insisted, we must see that the position of employees is fully safeguarded.

The noble Lord, Lord Derwent, first of all raised a point about paragraph 204, where he was in disagreement with the Committee's Report—and as I am advised, the noble Lord was right. As this is a matter of some immediate importance, I should like to state precisely the position. Section 47 of the 1950 Act originates in the Shops (Sunday Trading Restriction) Act, 1936, and it was the Home Office view in 1937, when the circular to which the noble Lord referred was published, that the provisions in the 1912 Act relating to evening closing hours applied, notwithstanding the general exception for certain transactions set out in the Fifth Schedule to the 1950 Act. Now that the 1912 Act and the 1936 Act appear in one Statute—the 1950 Act—there could be some doubt as to whether the provisions of Section 2 override the exemption conferred by Section 47. If there is a doubt, it is for the courts to interpret the law. In the meantime, on behalf of the Home Office, I must express the view that exempted transactions on Sunday must not take place after 8 p.m. That is as we understand it on that point.

The noble Lord, Lord Derwent, also expressed views on automatic vending machines, on launderettes (as indeed did the noble Lord, Lord Redesdale), on the *Ilford* case, on souvenirs and on the definition of "fancy goods". I will not attempt my own definition of "fancy goods" at the moment, but I will give an undertaking that all these points will be taken into account and thoroughly considered in the general review of retail trading legislation that is now being undertaken; and, similarly, the point which the noble Viscount, Lord Furness, raised on international airports. Furthermore, I shall of course be very pleased indeed to discuss with the noble Lord, Lord Redesdale, the relationship between launderettes and the 1950 Act. I am glad to have his assurance that Sunday opening will not mean much increase in employment, and I do indeed agree that launderettes are of considerable value to quite a number of people.

[Lord Stonham.]

The noble Lord, Lord Crathorne, expressed the hope that I would be making some positive statements this evening ; and, indeed, some ten to fourteen days ago I was delighted to read in the *Daily Express* that I was going to do so. I have not announced any definite conclusions which the Government have reached on this most valuable Report, but this certainly does not mean that the Government intend to shelve the Report, as the noble Lord feared and as indeed has been suggested in certain sections of the Press. That is emphatically not the case. The Government have already had the benefit of the views expressed in another place ; but, with this debate following so soon afterwards, it would have been a grave discourtesy to your Lordships' House, and in particular to the Bench of Bishops, if I had come here to announce decisions instead of to listen to the opinions which your Lordships have so ably and eloquently expressed. Moreover, the Church Assembly has not expressed its considered opinion on the Report, and we wished to avail ourselves of the opportunity provided by this debate to hear the views of the most reverend Primate the Lord Archbishop of York and his colleagues.

Her Majesty's Government entirely support the principle which has animated this whole debate and the Crathorne Report, that there should be one day of rest per week ; and we support also the right of every man to attend a place of worship on his own equivalent of the Sabbath day—it is not always the same day. The Home Secretary is determined to secure that any proposals for amendment of the law should be such as to command a wide measure of support in all sections of the community. It would be quite wrong to rush headlong into legislation without proper regard to the many different opinions sincerely held throughout the country ; but, equally, my right honourable friend is anxious that the law on Sunday entertainments and sports, which is acknowledged to be full of anachronisms, should be rationalised and brought into keeping with modern thought and conditions as soon as that can reasonably be done. It will be my right honourable friend's objective (if I may paraphrase the words of the Committee) to produce a law which is clear, certain and

acceptable to the majority of the public, and which would thus be respected and could be enforced. My Lords, the debate this afternoon—and I thank everyone who has spoken—has made a most valuable contribution to that end, and your Lordships can confidently expect that definite legislative results will flow from it.

6.30 p.m.

LORD ST. OSWALD: My Lords, I should like to thank all noble Lords who have taken part in this debate. I thank them not formally, as I am expected to, but with great gratitude for the thought that went into their speeches and the lucidity with which those ideas were expressed. My noble friend Lord Crathorne was told when his Committee began their task that at the end he would have eight Reports, one for each member. We might have expected thirteen policies or attitudes from this debate. This has certainly not been the case. We have seen a remarkable solidarity of attitude in the whole House.

This must have given great encouragement to the noble Lord, Lord Stonham, who has just delivered the crowning speech of the debate. I know that it would have given great encouragement to me had I been at the Dispatch Box, but I am sure that I could not have dealt so ably with the winding-up of this debate. His remarks about me were so complimentary that I was waiting for the sting in the tail. I think there was no sting ; or, if there was, I did not hear it. As so often, I am very grateful to the noble Lord. His words have undoubtedly heartened us by the assurance that something will be done—not merely that nothing will be shelved, but that something will be done. For so long and so far as action remains in his hands, we have every cause to be confident that the highest human qualities will be applied to this important endeavour. With those words, I beg leave to withdraw my Motion.

Motion for Papers, by leave, withdrawn.

DANGEROUS DRUGS BILL [H.L.]

Reported from the Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills, with an Amendment ; and recommended to a Committee of the Whole House.

House adjourned at twenty-eight minutes before seven o'clock.