THE ECCLESIASTICAL EXEMPTION
I. ORIGINS

by Ivor Bulmer-Thomas

BY the ecclesiastical exemption is understood the exemption of ecclesiastical buildings from the legislation protecting ancient monuments and from important features of the town and country planning laws. Until 1969 the exemption was confined to ecclesiastical buildings for the time being used for ecclesiastical purposes, but since 1969 it has been extended to redundant churches[1].

The origin of the exemption is to be found in the discussions leading to the Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment Act, 1913, and there are so many misunderstandings about what then took place, repeated even in official or semi-official publications, that it may be as well to set out exactly what happened.

In the earliest legislation concerning ancient monuments in the United Kingdom, the Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1882 and the Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1900 no distinction was drawn between ecclesiastical and secular monuments, but these statutes had no element of compulsion. They merely entitled the Commissoners of Works to accept the ownership or guardianship of ancient monuments. The creation of Royal Commissions on ancient and historical monuments in 1908 was a symbol of the growing concern about ancient monuments and a recognition of the inadequacy of the existing law to protect them, and their first reports stimulated that concern. The first-fruits of this growing anxiety are found in the Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1910, but this was a minor Act to allow the Commissioners of Works to accept bequests of monuments according to the extended definition of the 1900 Act, and in this statute also no distinction was drawn between ecclesiastical and secular structures.

This new concern came to a head in 1912 when two private bills and a government bill giving greater powers for the protection of ancient monuments were introduced into Parliament.

The Ancient Monuments Protection Bill was a private member's bill introduced into the House of Lords by Lord Southwark and given a first reading on 14 March, 1912. The explanatory memorandum noted: "This Bill rests upon the report of the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments that valuable monuments are being lost and urgently need protection." Churches in use were not excluded from its provisions.

The government bill, the Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment Bill, was introduced in the House of Lords on 26 March, 1912 by Earl Beauchamp, First Commissioner of Works,

and was given a first reading. Parts I and II consolidated previous legislation. Part III provided for the making of preservation orders in the case of monuments in danger of destruction or damage, and Clause 9 exempted from Part III—that is, from preservation orders but not from the rest of the bill—"an ecclesiastical building which is for the time being used for religious purposes".

On 25 April, 1912 Lord Eversley introduced in the House of Lords another private member's bill, the Ancient Monuments Protection (No. 2) Bill. Clause 7 exempted from the operation of the Measure "any structure which is in ordinary use as a church, chapel or other place of worship".

The government bill and Lord Southwark's bill were set down for second reading on 30 April, 1912. The second reading of the government bill was moved by Earl Beauchamp. Lord Eversley took the opportunity of saying that his Ancient Monuments Protection (No. 2) Bill had originally been introduced in the House of Commons at the instance of the National Trust, but it was thought best for it to be introduced also in the House of Lords to be considered along with the other two bills. Earl Curzon of Kedleston, the future Marquess, made a major contribution to the debate. The Marquess of Crewe, Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for India, wound up for the government, and said *inter alia*:

"The noble Earl (Curzon of Kedleston) made, if he will allow me to say so, some most interesting observations on the subject of ecclesiastical property. There, again, there has been a quite deliberate abstention on the part of His Majesty's government in this Bill from attempting to deal with ecclesiastical property. I quite agree with the noble Earl that there are cases in which one laments that there is not some authority, public or other, which is in a position to prevent the defacing, and even in some cases the destruction, of ancient ecclesiastical monuments. One is tempted to go further and apply the same wish to objects which would not be the subject of a measure such as this at all. One has heard of cases where old church plate of the highest interest from its antiquity, which also, of course, adds enormously to its value, because, as the noble Earl knows, there is no plate except ecclesiastical plate in England older than the fifteenth century and very little as old as that, whereas there is a certain proportion of ecclesiastical plate which is considerably older—one has heard of cases in which parochial authorities have sold for large sums, very possibly to go abroad, old church plate with which they should not have been permitted to part. That, however, is by the way, because it is not one of the questions which come under this Bill. We have deliberately, as I say, refrained from raising the difficult and delicate questions arising out of the care of ecclesiastical buildings."[2]

Lord Crewe's speech was presumably meant to close the debate but it led the Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, to intervene. He said:

"My Lords, I should not have intervened in this debate but for the fact that from both front benches reference has been made to ecclesiastical property and the possible misuse of and injury to ancient monuments. I should be exceedingly sorry if, from the words which have fallen from noble Lords tonight, it were supposed that at this moment ecclesiastical property, whether fixed or movable, is under the unrestrained and unfettered control of the local custodians. It is not so, and it would be very unfortunate if I were taken by my silence as acquiescing in such a view. I would be the last to deny that on occasions in the past ecclesiastical property has not been protected as it ought to have been, but the utmost care is now taken to prevent a repetition of anything of the kind. I am sure that those of your Lordships who are familiar with the working of ecclesiastical matters know how constant is the tutelage exercised over property of every kind against impecunious churchwardens or other people desiring to raise money or, what is even a greater danger, against ecclesiastical restorers. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Crewe) spoke of church plate as though that was in a more disposable condition than stained-glass windows. I would point out that that is not so, and that the smallest particle of plate could not legally be parted with without a faculty obtained from the Diocesan Court. I only rose to prevent the impression going out that there was on the part of clergy and churchwardens power to dispose freely of such things, or that diocesan control was not being exercised carefully and cautiously in these matters."[3]

The house thereupon gave a second reading to the bill without a division and resolved that it was desirable to refer it to a joint committee of both houses.

The house next gave a second reading to Lord Southwark's bill and likewise resolved that it was desirable to refer it to a joint committee.

Lord Eversley's bill was read a second time on 2 May, 1912, and the house resolved that it was desirable that this bill also should be referred to a joint select committee.

On 13 May the House of Lords received a message saying that the House of Commons concurred in the desirability of sending all three bills to a joint select committee.

The upper house on 14 May appointed five lords to sit with five members of the lower house, but on 16 May they resolved to add a sixth, and to ask the Commons also to nominate six members. The joint select committee was therefore composed of twelve members, half of them peers, half members of the House of Commons. The membership changed from time to time as a peer or M.P. resigned and another peer or M.P. took his place.

The committee proceeded to the examination of witnesses, and the volume of evidence still makes fascinating reading. Throughout the hearings the position of ecclesiastical buildings, especially cathedrals, was one of the major topics of interest, and the com-

mittee also paid attention to movable objects in churches, especially plate. From Mr. C. R. (later Sir Charles) Peers) Inspector of Ancient Monuments, who was the first witness, to Sir Hercules Read, President of the Society of Antiquaries, whose letter read to the committee concluded the evidence, almost all the expert witnesses thought there was need for ecclesiastical buildings to be brought under some form of supervision. The one notable exception among the witnesses was Sir Lewis Dibden, Dean of Arches (that is, the Church of England's chief ecclesiastical officer), who bluntly told the committee: "Anything like control by the Office of Works or any other body of ecclesiastical buildings I should regard as absolutely mischievous, and under existing circumstances wholly impossible".[4]

The individual views of members of the committee are not recorded, but can be gathered from their votes on proposed amendments to the government bill. It is clear that on the issue of the ecclesiastical exemption the peers were generally in favour and the members of the House of Commons were against. Among the peers the influence of the Bishop of Bristol was great in persuading them to accept the ecclesiastical exemption. He was George Forrest Browne, who had been Professor of Archaeology at Cambridge.

There were two critical votes. On 31 October, 1912 it was moved by Mr. Bennett-Goldney on page 5, Clause 9, line 39, after "building" to insert "other than a cathedral church". The effect would have been to make cathedrals subject to preservation orders but to leave other churches in use outside their operation. The voting was:

Contents (6)	*Not Contents* (5)
Lord Stanmore	Earl of Powis
Mr. Bennett-Goldney	Earl of Plymouth
Mr. Grant	Bishop of Bristol
Mr. Charles Price	Lord Stanley of Alderley
Mr. Mark Sykes	Lord Southwark
Mr. Llewellyn Williams	

The motion was therefore carried. It will be noticed that all the five members of the House of Commons who were present voted for the motion, and five of the six peers present voted against it. The motion was carried because Lord Stanmore defected from the ranks of the peers and voted with the M.P.s.

It was then moved by Mr. Charles Price on page 5, Clause 9, line 39, to leave out from "family" to the end of the Clause. The effect would have been to bring all ecclesiastical buildings within the scope of the whole measure. The voting was

Contents (5)	*Not Contents* (5)
Lord Stanmore	Earl of Powis
Mr. Bennett-Goldney	Earl of Plymouth
Mr. Charles Price	Bishop of Bristol
Mr. Mark Sykes	Lord Stanley of Alderley
Mr. Llewellyn Williams	Lord Southwark

The voting being equal, the question was resolved in the negative. It is not clear from the record what happened to Mr. Grant, whether he was called away to some other engagement or whether he abstained on the second amendment.

The joint select committee reported their opinion that the Ancient Monuments Protection Bill and the Ancient Monuments Protection (No. 2) Bill should not be proceeded with, and that the Ancient Monuments Bill should be allowed to proceed, and they recommended the amendments on which they had decided; their report was ordered to be printed on 6 November, 1912.

The following are the paragraphs in the committee's report relevant to the ecclesiastical exemption:

"8. The committee are of opinion that it is most important that churches now used for public worship should be protected in the preservation of their architectural and historic interest at all times, and especially when faculties are applied for in order to restore, alter or repair them.

"9. The committee are aware that the ecclesiastical authorities along with the general sense of the nation are increasingly alive to the necessity of protecting old churches while doing what is necessary for their use as places of public worship, but they are of opinion that there are still cases where due regard is not had to architectural and historic considerations in dealing with their fabrics.

"10. The committee hope that the bench of bishops may take this matter under early consideration with a view to taking collective action. They would, however, suggest that, in all cases where a faculty is asked for, a public advertisement in the principal papers circulating in the diocese should be published with a notice that the plans might be examined in the diocesan chancery, and a reasonable interval should be allowed within which criticisms or suggestions might be sent to the Chancellor. They think further that whenever serious criticisms are made the Chancellor should secure the advice of a small committee, say three competent architects of repute, and that in granting the faculty, due regard should be had to their report, such report and the final forms of the faculty being made public.

"11. Although the committee's recommendations as to churches only apply to England and Wales, yet they think that suitable provision in accordance with Scottish law should be made to protect the historic ecclesiastical buildings of Scotland.

"12. The committee think that cathedral churches should be placed in a different category, and in view of their importance as national monuments should not be exempted from the operation of Clause 9.

"13. The committee are strongly of opinion that although chattels do not come under the definition of 'ancient monuments' as set out in Clause 18, yet such movable property as plate and other articles of historical and artistic interest as belong either to a municipal corporation or to the Established Church should be subject to protection similar to that extended by this bill to fixed objects."

The government did not accept the committee's advice with regard to cathedrals and re-introduced the bill in the House of Lords on 11 April, 1913 without that amendment. In his speech moving the second reading on 24 April, 1913 Earl Beauchamp said:

"The other important point on which I have not agreed to introduce the recommendation of the joint select committee is with regard to ecclesiastical monuments. My reason for that I have already stated to your lordships. I am convinced that the introduction of ecclesiastical monuments into this bill would create a host of difficulties which would make it far more difficult for the bill to become law during the present session. But there is yet another reason, and it is this, that when you come to deal with ecclesiastical monuments it is very desirable that you should deal also with movable ecclesiastical objects. The moment you begin to deal with things of a movable nature your problem is entirely a different one . . . Therefore the suggestion I make would be that those who are interested in this matter should give me an opportunity of conferring with them and also with the ecclesiastical authorities with a view to introducing a bill dealing with the whole ecclesiastical problem by itself".[5]

In the same debate the Bishop of Bristol, G. F. Browne, asked why he had signed the select committee's report though he disagreed with a major proposal, said:

"That recommendation (that cathedrals should be placed under the protection of the Bill) was carried by a majority of one. There were eleven members present, and I was not one of the six who voted for it. A motion to include all parish churches was only lost by a tie. I spoke and voted my hardest against including either parish churches or cathedrals".[6]

The bishop assured the house that the faculty jurisdiction was a satisfactory method for securing the protection of churches because the chancellor and the bishop were normally on the best of terms. As this may be considered a *non sequitur* it is best that his actual words should be cited:

"I was surprised to hear the noble Earl (Earl Curzon of Kedleston) say that the protection of a faculty was merely nominal.

It is quite true that the chancellor is guided by questions of law, but the chancellor and the bishop are generally on very friendly terms. In my own diocese a faculty is not thought of until the bishop has been consulted on the question. Then it goes before the chancellor, and, as I have said, the chancellor and the bishop being on exceedingly friendly terms I should have thought that every parish church in the diocese of Bristol was absolutely protected under the present arrangement".[7]

The second reading was carried without a division and the bill was considered in a committee of the whole house. On 28 May, 1913, on Clause 9, Earl Beauchamp moved to delete the words "or to an ecclesiastical building which is for the time being used for religious purposes". He explained (though not very clearly) that he was doing so because he would be moving an amendment to the clause defining an ancient monument which would make these words unnecessary. The amendment was carried, and later, on Clause 22, which defined "ancient monument", Earl Beauchamp moved to add, "other than an ecclesiastical building which is for the time being used for ecclesiastical purposes". The amendment was carried.

The effect of these two amendments was that ecclesiastical buildings for the time being used for ecclesiastical purposes were excluded from all parts of the bill because excluded from the definition of an ancient monument.

The bill, as amended, was reported on 24 June, 1913 and was set down for third reading on 8 July, 1913. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, spoke first, and as this speech is the one which is commonly referred to as his pledge, it is necessary to cite in full his exact words and to consider their import.

"My Lords, I desire to say a few words upon one point in this bill before we give it a third reading. There has been some misunderstanding on the subject outside this house, though I do not know that there has been any within its walls. Your lordships will remember—indeed attention has been called to it—that in the bill as introduced buildings which are now used for ecclesiastical purposes were excluded from Part III, but under Parts I, II and IV such buildings still fell within the provisions of the bill so far as they were applicable. By subsequent amendment a change was made excluding buildings now used for ecclesiastical purposes from the purview of the bill from beginning to end; but I am anxious to say a single word to avoid misapprehension as to the manner of that change.

"I am very far from saying that buildings which are subject to the control of ecclesiastical authorities have always and invariably been protected in the most ideally perfect way, while other buildings were suffering which were not under ecclesiastical control. Ecclesiastical authorities, like other people, have changed their views on these subjects very much for the better in recent generations, and though I believe that, speaking generally, the control

exercised by the ecclesiastical authorities has been well exercised, I do not for a moment claim infallibility for them throughout the years that have gone. Nor do I maintain that at this moment the ecclesiastical authorities ought to be turning a deaf ear to criticisms which have appeared in the evidence before the select committee and elsewhere as to possible dangers which may arise in regard to the reparation or the alteration of ancient buildings of an ecclesiastical character which have historic and aesthetic value beyond all words. But while I maintain that we are prepared to give attention, increased attention if need be, to the needs of such buildings in consequence of criticisms which have now been, happily, made from many quarters as showing what different people think on this subject, I am not in the least disposed as things at present stand to believe that any change for the better would come about by transferring from the ecclesiastical authorities to public authorities or to Parliament the buildings which are now subject to that ecclesiastical control.

"But in view of the criticisms which have been rife on the matter the Archbishop of York and I have been considering carefully whether we could profitably take any step which would be likely to be advantageous to secure additional protection when changes are made so that they may not be made rashly and harm may not be inadvertently done. We have requested our chief ecclesiastical officer, the Dean of Arches, before whom all questions of faculty go on appeal, to make inquiry throughout the dioceses of England as to what are the precautions taken at this moment by our different ecclesiastical judges or courts to secure that no harm shall arise to the ecclesiastical buildings whose value is so immeasurable, and my belief is that we shall collect sufficient information in a short time to show whether or no it is desirable that we should formulate for our courts any further direction with a view to additional protection or whether that protection is adequately given at present. All I am anxious to say is that this is not a case in which the ecclesiastical authorities are simply trying to push aside as contemptible or as unworthy of notice any criticisms made. We are prepared to give them the fullest possible consideration, while at the same time we believe, speaking largely, that the authority which at present controls these matters is the authority which can best control them in the years to come".[8]

At this point it is desirable to interpolate that Davidson's speech led to the setting up of a committee under the chairmanship of Sir Lewis Dibden, Dean of Arches, and that the recommendations of this committee in turn led to the setting up of diocesan advisory committees for the care of churches, at first on a voluntary basis but made statutory in 1937, for the purpose of advising, when requested, both petitioners for faculties and chancellors.

This speech is commonly referred to as Davidson's pledge, and it has been equally strongly denied in recent years that he gave any such pledge. Davidson was a master of the art of conveying

an impression on his hearers which was not subsequently borne out by an examination of his words, but my own judgment is that his words are fairly taken as a pledge that the Church of England would so reform its faculty system that there would be no ground for criticism about the way the Church of England looked after its historic buildings.

What was the immediate purpose of his remarks? It must be remembered that the bill was leaving the Lords for the Commons, and the Commons members of the select committee had shown themselves hostile to the ecclesiastical exemption. There was every reason to fear that in the Commons an amendment to delete the ecclesiastical exemption would be moved and carried. Davidson sought to prevent this happening by using words which, while committing the Church of England to nothing except an inquiry, would create the impression that the ecclesiastical exemption could safely be left. This was clearly understood by Davidson's hearers. The Earl of Plymouth, chairman of the joint select committee, who rose immediately after him, said:

"My Lords, I should like to express my pleasure at hearing these words from the most reverend primate. Strong feeling was expressed on this matter in the joint committee, and especially by the members of the committee from another place. I welcome the remarks which the most reverend primate has just made, for members of the other House and the public will now know that steps have been taken to institute an inquiry into the state of things, especially in reference to ecclesiastical buildings. While I entirely agree with what the lord archbishop said as to the advisability of not interfering with the jurisdiction and the authority of the ecclesiastical courts, I am very glad that he has been able to make the statement we have just heard, because I believe that it will make the passage of the bill through the other house smoother and easier than would otherwise have been the case".[9]

Lord Sheffield, a little later in the day, showed himself alert to the fact that church plate was not protected and that the archbishop's argument was fallacious to the extent that the cathedrals, the most important ecclesiastical buildings of all, were not subject to the faculty jurisdiction.

"I feel sure that the action which the two Archbishops are taking will tend to conciliate a very strong body of opinion which feels that something substantial ought to be done to safeguard ecclesiastical buildings from misguided and ill-directed reparation which often means the destruction of the most interesting features. . . . There was another matter brought very strongly before us which we thought belonged to a slightly different category, but in connection with which we all felt that protection was needed. I refer to the chattels held in connection with worship—chalices, church plate and things of that sort, in connection with which faculties for sale have been granted too freely in the past on the ground that the stipend was too small or that the church wanted

repair. . . . But there was a point not mentioned by the most reverend primate. I refer to the fact that those buildings which are pre-eminent in the eyes of the general public—namely the cathedrals and the great collegiate churches—do not need a faculty at all when altered".[10]

The bill received its third reading without a division, and went to the Commons. There its fortunes were helped, not merely by Davidson's "pledge", but by the fact that the house was in the throes of the bitter controversy caused by the Parliament Bill and the Established Church (Wales) Bill, and still more by the fact that the end of the session was only a month away, and if the bill were not quickly passed it would be lost for that session, and possibly for ever. The bill was introduced on 11 July, 1913. Mr. Wedgwood Benn (later Lord Stansgate) was in charge for the government, and on the second reading, on 23 July, after Mr. J. King had said he would like to move certain amendments, he said:

"I trust he will not put down any amendments of a controversial kind, because I am afraid if he does so time would scarcely be found for them and it would be hard for the bill".[11]

Benn did not make a speech in moving the second reading and the debate occupied less than two columns of *Hansard*. The second reading was carried without a division. The necessary money resolution was passed on 12 August and the bill was considered in committee the same day. On Clause 8, which had the marginal title unaltered from the original version, "Saving for Buildings Used for Ecclesiastical Purposes or as a Dwelling House", Mr. F. H. Booth pointed out that there was no mention of ecclesiastical purposes, and Mr. C. E. Price, a member of the joint select committee, said:

"As a member of the Ancient Monuments Committee which had to report to the House, I may say that the point raised by the Hon. Member for East Edinburgh (Mr. Booth) was discussed very carefully by the committee. In point of fact this bill is not anything like so advanced as the report made to the Commissioners. But we could not get any other bill through this session, therefore we thought it infinitely better to accept the bill, defective though it is. There are many very valuable things left out, which, if the house knew of, this bill would not go through this year. There was absolutely no difference of opinion on the committee. I found myself in agreement with men with whom I most often differ in politics. The bill as it stands is really a compromise arrived at in order that we may without delay get something done".[12]

The circumstances in which the bill passed through the House of Commons without a division at any stage are illumined by two members during the committee stage:

Mr. Goldsmith: "I have no intention of delaying the House at this hour of the morning".[13]

Mr. Hogg: "I think we ought to have some explanation from the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Benn). He has gone round the lobbies

getting us not to move amendments on the ground that if we move them we would not get the bill".[14]

The third reading was taken on 12 August, 1913—traditionally the day on which the session must end to enable members to get to the Scottish moors for the grouse shooting. The debate was brief and there was no division, but the following words by Mr. C. E. Price, a member of the joint committee as already noted, are worthy of being recorded:

"I want to impress on the house that this bill in no sense covers the representations contained in the report. We had no end of evidence in favour of ecclesiastical buildings, and particularly of cathedrals, coming under this bill. It was only because we wanted to get something this year that we allowed the bill to pass".[15]

As a result of the amendments mentioned above the ecclesiastical exemption first appeared in United Kingdom legislation in the form of the following section of the Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment Act, 1913:

"22. In this Act the expression 'monument' includes any structure or erection, other than an ecclesiastical building which is for the time being used for ecclesiastical purposes; and the expression 'ancient monument' includes any monument specified in the schedule to the Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1882, and any other monuments or things which, in the opinion of the Commissioners of Works, are of a like character, and any monument or part or remains of a monument, the preservation of which is a matter of public interest by reason of the historic, architectural, traditional, artistic or archaeological interest attaching thereto, and the site of any such monument or of any remains thereof; and any part of the adjoining land which may be required for the purpose of fencing, covering in or otherwise preserving the monument from injury, and also including the means of access thereto".

Section 22 of the 1913 Act was repealed by the Ancient Monuments Act, 1931, and the ecclesiastical exemption from the ancient monuments code has since been contained in Section 15.-(1) of the 1931 Act, which reads:

"15.-(1) The definitions contained in section twenty-two of the principal Act of the expressions 'monument' and 'ancient monument' shall cease to have effect, and for the purposes of the principal Act and this Act

(a) the expression 'monument' shall include any building, structure, or other work, whether above or below the surface of the land, other than an ecclesiastical building for the time being used for ecclesiastical purposes, and any cave or excavation".

The Town and Country Planning Act, 1932 inaugurated a new code of legislation for dealing *inter alia* with buildings in use, and the ecclesiastical exemption was carried into this code. Section 17

empowered the county councils to make orders for the preservation of certain buildings, but subsection (5) read in part:

"Nothing in this section shall

(i) empower a council to make an order

(a) with respect to any ecclesiastical building which is for the time being used for ecclesiastical purposes".

From the inauguration of this code the exemption of churches in use from the ancient monuments legislation ceased to be so important an issue. An understanding grew up that structures not in use (including disused churches until 1969) would be covered by the ancient monuments code and buildings in use by the town and country planning code. This was explicitly stated in the *Sixteenth Annual Report*, 1969 of the Ancient Monuments Board for England:

"The Board considers it desirable that the legislation should restrict itself to ancient monuments as traditionally defined and should include neither places of worship in use nor occupied dwelling houses, for the preservation of which quite different bodies of legislation have grown up over the years".[16]

We need therefore concern ourselves from this point only with the exemption of ecclesiastical buildings in the town and country planning code. The exemption given in the 1932 Act was continued in subsequent Acts (1944, 1947, 1962, 1968), and the present form of the exemption is given in Sections 56 and 58 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1971, which give ecclesiastical buildings in use exemption from the need to obtain "listed building consent" and from "building preservation notices".

(To be concluded)

Notes

[1] By Section 50.–(8) of the Pastoral Measure 1968, and Section 2 of the Redundant Churches and other Religious Buildings Act 1969.

[2] H. L. Deb.[5], 891-2.

[3] H. L. Deb.[5], 893-4.

[4] House of Commons Sessional Paper, 1912, No. 360, Q. 1184.

[5] H. L. Deb.[5] 14. 298.

[6] *Ibid.*, 312.

[7] *Ibid.*, 310-11.

[8] H. L. Deb.[5] 14. 792-4.

[9] *Ibid.*, 794.

[10] *Ibid.*, 794-5.

[11] H. C. Deb.[5], 55, 2179.

[12] H. C. Deb.[5], 56, 2451.

[13] *Ibid.*, 2456.

[14] *Ibid.*, 2458.

[15] *Ibid.*, 2463-4.

[16] *Loc. cit.*, p. 7.