

1954 - 1955

Kurpiakó

ααα lia ετ. με Maitland.

K. 18

Νοεμ 1954 - Μαρς 1955

Βουλευτής Άγγος του Patrick
 Maitland, M.P. ενδιαφέρεται για
 το κυπριακό και κρατεί ενδιαφέρον
 τον Κ.Τ.

ΚΥΠΡΟΣτο Κρατίπροσάρτη

(Ενν. κ. Α. Μωυσιά)



From The Hon. Patrick Maitland, M.P.,
Master of Lauderdale.

R. 14

[3]

3rd November, 1954.

Dear Mr. Tsatsos,

Now that I am back in London, and working hard at Westminster, it is with great pleasure that I look back on our conversation some time ago.

You will remember that I outlined one idea toward which I thought persons of goodwill here and in Greece might work, and to explain it a little more I am enclosing a copy of an article which the former Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. L. S. Amery, wrote on this subject in 1947. Of course some of the remarks in that article do not apply to present circumstances altogether.

I think that the statement made on October 28 last by the present Colonial Secretary, Mr. Alan Lennox-Boyd, does mark a slight improvement. At all events, he did not close the door upon Greek national aspirations. And he did promise a slight easement of the Press laws.

On the other hand, it is important to notice, I think, that all but one of the Labour Members who intervened are Bevanites. The exception was Griffiths who took a more cautious line. Those who spoke on the Conservative side were Fraser, Alport and myself.

I hope that we shall keep in touch on this general subject and that if you come to London I may have the pleasure of knowing beforehand.

With kind regards

*Yours very sincerely
Patrick Maitland*

K. Konstantinos Tsatsos,
Kidathenaon 9,
Athens, Greece.

Athens, December 26, 1954.

Dear Mr Maitland,

After the issue of the debates in the UNO this is I think the right time for a new approach of the Cyprus problem. We have to take it as granted that this problem still exists. I don't think that the idea of postponing for the present any decision would be the best way to create a normal situation in Cyprus and in the Middle-East. Of course the initiatives must be yours; the responsibility for a creative answer must be ours.

I have extremely appreciated your sincere sympathy for my country, as it appears in the debates of the House, you were so kind to send me and during our long talk in Athens a few months ago. So I hope to keep in touch with you for these coming months on this critical problem.

May I send You my best wishes for a merry Christmas and a happy new year.

With Kind regards

Yours very sincerely

Dr Constantine Tsatsos

9 Kydathineon str.

ATHENS

Ι Δ Ι Ω Τ Ι Κ Ο Ν Σ Υ Μ Φ Ω Ν Η Τ Ι Κ Ο Ν

Ἀφ' ἑνὸς ὁ κ. Δαμπρίδης καὶ Ἀφ' ἑτέρου ὁ κ. Κων-
σταντῖνος Τσάτσος συνυπολόγησαν τὰ κάτωθι:

Ὁ κ. Τσάτσος παραδίδει εἰς τὸν κ. Δαμπρίδην ἓν κλει-
δοκύμβαλον μὲ οὐρανὸν μεταχειρισμένον, μάρκας
μὲ τὴν ἐντολὴν ὅπως τὸ πώλησῃ ἐντός τριμήνου ἀπὸ σήμερον ἀντὶ
δραχμῶν 10.000

Παρελθόντος τοῦ τετραμήνου ὁ κ. Δαμπρίδης ὑποχρεοῦται
ἢ νὰ καταβάλλῃ εἰς τὸν κ. Τσάτσον δραχμὰς 10.000 ἢ ἀντ' αὐτῶν
νὰ μεταβιβάσῃ εἰς αὐτόν κατὰ πλήρη κυριότητα κλειδοκύμβαλον
ἡσοῦνος ἀξίας τῶν 10.000 δρχ., τοῦ ὑπολοίπου τοῦ τιμήματος
καταβληθῆσομένου πάλιν τοῖς μετρητοῖς μέχρι συμπληρώσεως τῶν
10.000 δρχ. ἢ ἄλλως νὰ ἐπιστρέφῃ τὸ κλειδοκύμβαλον εἰς οἶον
κατόχασιν τὸ παρέλαβε πρὸς πώλησιν.

Αἱ δαπάναι μεταφορᾶς καὶ ἐπιστροφῆς τοῦ τε πωληθῆσομένου
ὥς καὶ τοῦ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ παραδοθῆσομένου κλειδοκυμβάλου ἔσονται
εἰς βῆρος τοῦ κ. Δαμπρίδης,

Εἰς τὴν περίπτωσιν ὁ κ. Δαμπρίδης κρίνῃ ὅτι διὰ τὴν πώ-
λησιν τοῦ κλειδοκυμβάλου ἀπαιτεῖται λουστράρισμα καὶ κουρδισμα
αὐτοῦ, παρέχει εἰς αὐτόν ὁ κ. Τσάτσος ὅπως προβῇ εἰς τὰ ὅσα ὡς
καὶ εἰς οἰσodήποτε ἄλλας μικροεπισκευὰς, ἐφ' ὅσον δέν δαπανήσῃ
πλεόν τῶν δρ. 800 εἴτινες ἐν τοιαύτῃ περιπτώσει θὰ παρακρατη-
θοῦν ἐκ τοῦ τιμήματος, ὅπερ ὡς ἀνωτέρω θέλει καταβληθῇ εὐθὺς ᾧ μ
ᾧμα τῇ παρελεύσει τοῦ τριμήνου.

Ἡ προῦσα συμφωνία συνταγέται εἰς διπλοῦν ὑπεγράφη παρ'
ἀμφοτέρων τῶν συμβάλλομένων, εἰς δὲ ἕκαστος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔλαβε ἀνὰ
ἓν ἀντίτυπον.

Ἐν Ἀθήναις τῇ 27ῃ Δεκεμβρίου 1954

οἱ συμβαλλόμενοι

From The Hon. Patrick Maitland, M.P.,
Master of Lauderdale.



24th December, 1954.

Dear Sir,

The Master of Lauderdale has asked me to write and let you know that he plans to be in Athens on business between January 1 and 8, on his way to Cyprus and Cairo, and he hopes it may be possible to see you.

Telephone messages could be left with Miss Stuart-Richardson (Telephone 23904 and 90141).

Yours faithfully,

Allen E. Maitland
Private Secretary.

K. Korstantinos Tsatsos,
Kidathenaon 9,
Athens,
Greece.

From The Hon. Patrick Maitland, M.P.,
Master of Lauderdale.



31st January, 1955.

L. M. Tsatsos,

Thank you so much for the advice that you gave me when I came to see you in Athens recently. I have only just got back from the Middle East; otherwise I would have written to you beforehand.

I am very anxious to learn how the debate went in the Greek Parliament about the Cyprus issue. I do not know whether there is any summary - any lengthy summary - in any language that I can comprehend; but if for example there were any cuttings from the Athens News or Messenger d'Athenes I should be very grateful.

With regard to the points that you made in our conversation I have taken good care to pass them on to the right quarter.

When I was in Beirut I did have the pleasure of seeing Sefheriades. It was a great pleasure to see him again.

Do please give my kindest regards to Madame Tsatsos.

Belony
for my wife
Patrick Maitland

K. Constantine Tsatsos,
9, Kidathensiaion,
Athens,
GREECE.



From The Hon. Patrick Maitland, M.P.,
Master of Lauderdale.

23rd February, 1955.

L. M. Baber,

Thank you so much for kindly sending me copies of the Cyprus Debate reported in the Messenger d'Athènes and Athens News. I have read these with great interest and care and would much like to know what might be described as the significance of the proposal to vest the execution of the Greek Government's Cyprus policy in a Crown Council. Is this proposal likely to be accepted by the Government? Is its object to lift the problem outside of party politics?

Another kind friend has sent me a copy of the Daily News Bulletin issued by the Prime Minister's Office on February 8, 1955, No. 2638, containing the authorised English translation of the speech which Marshal Papagos made to the Greek Parliament on February 7 about Cyprus.

Paragraph two on page two of this Bulletin quotes the Prime Minister as saying:

"I was in absolute disagreement with him (the British Ambassador) on this point (the Cyprus question) because increasingly unpleasant news continued to reach us from Cyprus. The British Authorities there were taking educational measures designed to de-hellenise the island. The countryside groaned under oppressive economic measures intended to discourage and morally enslave the population."

As you know, I am deeply concerned about the present estrangement between Greece and Great Britain about Cyprus and am anxious to do anything in my power to help heal the breach. I am wondering, therefore, whether you could kindly let me have a full and authoritative statement of the facts



- 2 -

to which the Prime Minister takes exception incorporating both the "increasingly unpleasant news" to which he referred and any previous measures of the Cyprus Government to which the Greek Government objected.

I am also interested in paragraph six on page three of the same Bulletin which quotes the Prime Minister as saying:

"During the debate in the House of Lords the Under-Secretary for the Colonies stated that the British Government did not envisage any change in the regime of Cyprus. It would be worth telling you, honourable members, that on that same day (February 22, 1954) the same Under-Secretary told the House of Lords that the British Government had decided to grant the right of self-determination to the natives of Uganda."

I am taking the liberty to enclose a copy of the Official Report of the House of Lords proceedings for February 23, 1954, which in columns 1061, 1062, and 1063 shows the authorised text of the Earl of Munster's statement, in case you have not seen it.

Am I right in understanding that the right of self-determination which Marshal Papagos describes as having been offered on that occasion to the natives of Uganda is the same right of self-determination which the Greek Government claims for the people of Cyprus?

I notice that the Earl of Munster's statement talks about building the Protectorate of Uganda "into a self-governing State". He proceeds: "When the time for self-government eventually comes, Her Majesty's Government will wish to be satisfied that the rights of the minority



- 3 -

communities resident in Uganda are properly safeguarded in the Constitution". Later on he states: "There will be strict control of immigration".

*My kind regards to Madame Datin
Schwartz*

*From my friend
Pavlovskikh*

M. Constantine D. Tsatsos,
9, Kydathineon Street,
Athens,
GREECE.



From The Hon. Patrick Maitland, M.P.,
Master of Lauderdale.

7th March, 1955.

Mt - Dr. T. S. Atkin

May I draw your attention to the enclosed cutting from Hansard?

In column 2058 at the bottom you will see that the Colonial Secretary implies that the British Government's constitutional offer will be an advance on that announced on July 28, 1954. I can assure you from my own knowledge of the way things are going here that that is a distinct and will be an important advance.

Columns 2059 and 2060 state the position with regard to immigration to Cyprus. I hope to elicit further information about this. But I am told that there is considerable opposition both officially and unofficially in Cyprus to the immigration of Greeks who wish to work there.

On the other hand, as you will see from the Colonial Secretary's reply to my supplementary, there is a possibility of admitting that absolute freedom of movement between Cyprus and the Kingdom of Greece should be a proper goal of British policy in Cyprus.

I think that is a further advance.

On the other hand, may I draw your attention to the enclosed excerpts from Athens Radio's broadcasts to Cyprus? In cannot be shown from them that there has been any improvement since Kyrrou left the Foreign Office in Athens.



- 2 -

On the other hand it is difficult to bring even persons of goodwill here to an objective discussion of the problem while these poisonous broadcasts continue. I am taking the liberty to enclose some extensive extracts because when I was last in Athens I got the impression that very few people were aware of their style and content.

With all good wishes

Yours

Patrick Abernethy

Dr. Constantine Tsatsos,
9, Kydathineon Street,
Athens,
GREECE.

11th March, 1955

My dear Mr Maitland,

I thank you for sending me the cutting from Hansard and for the Official Report of the 23d February which has been extremely enlightening to me.

The idea of using the Crown Council is not limited to the Cyprus problem, but extends to every problem of Foreign policy which should be lifted above political parties.

I am sorry not being able to give for the time being any further explanation of the two paragraphs of Marshal's Papagos speech you mention in your letter. The Uganda phrase is of course a complete misunderstanding of what has been said in the House of Lords.

In spite of the radio broadcasts and of some press reactions I have the personal impression that the atmosphere is now calmer here and many solutions considered impossible some months ago, appear now as possible to me, if, from both sides we don't commit blunders.



From The Hon. Patrick Maitland, M.P.,
Master of Lauderdale.

23rd June, 1955.

M1 - 2. Tsatsos

Now that a new Parliament has been elected I lost no time in trying to suggest a new approach to the Cyprus problem and I am enclosing a copy of Hansard for the first Foreign Affairs debate that we have had.

I think the Labour attitude, propounded by my good friend Francis Noel-Baker, is open to a number of objections because of positions that have already been taken up by the two sides. My hope is that by looking forward to "freedom of movement" as a new objective, and proposing this in a wider setting than the British-Greek controversy, it may gradually win acceptance.

But as you will see from the final speech of Mr. Anthony Nutting, the broadcasts from Athens Radio - which are considered over here to be incitements to violence - are a very great obstacle.

Patrick Maitland

Dr. Constantine D. Tsatsos,
9, Kydathineon Street,
Athens,
GREECE.

From The Hon. Patrick Maitland, M.P.,
Master of Lauderdale.



21st July, 1955.

Dear D. Roberts

Thank you so much for your letter of July 17. I think you can take it that once a suitable atmosphere has been created in Cyprus and once it is evident that the Cypriots would be willing in principle to work a constitution seriously, they will in fact be offered a liberal and democratic regime. But at present they are doing everything possible to make such a thing impossible and I think one of the first requirements is that the Ethnarchy Council should denounce the campaign of violence *and that Athens Radio should adopt a different tone (see attached).*

The point about "freedom of movement" is that once established it would be a very long step toward actual Enosis. If you people in Greece would grasp the opportunity of it and reciprocate the idea it could be used to ease the whole situation without barring the way to future developments. But of course if your people in Greece, or the people in Cyprus, go on clamouring now for self-determination they will merely compel the Tory Party here to dig in its toes and instead of abolishing the word never repeat it many times more loudly and firmly.

Thank you again for writing to me.

*Believe me
Ever yours
Patrick Maitland*

Dr. Constantine D. Tsatsos,
9, Kydathineon Street,
Athens,
GREECE.

1124



From The Hon. Patrick Maitland, M.P.,
Master of Lauderdale.

Kings

19th September, 1955.

My dear Dr. Tsatsos.

All being well I am hoping to be in Athens for a week arriving about October 5 from Cyprus. I do hope I may have a chance of seeing you. I am not quite sure where I am going to stay but messages can be left for me care of Miss Gladys Stuart-Richardson whose office telephone number is 23904 and whose home telephone number is 90141.

Might it be possible for me to meet Mr. Richardson. Do you think?

*Very sincerely
Patrick Maitland*

Dr. Constantine D. Tsatsos,
9, Kydathineon Street,
Athens,
GREECE.

Vol. 185
No. 38



Tuesday
23 Feb. 1954

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF LORDS

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

Question—World Conference on Cardiology
Motion—Sunday Entertainments Act
Food and Drugs (Scotland) Bill—Committee
Statement—The Future of Uganda [Col. 1061]
Bills Brought from the Commons
Motion—Cyprus

65. 1066

Cyprus

LONDON: HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
NINEPENCE NET

HOUSE OF LORDS

Tuesday, 23rd February, 1954

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

Prayers

WORLD CONFERENCE ON
CARDIOLOGY

2.35 p.m.

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

[The Question was as follows:

To ask Her Majesty's Government whether the Treasury have now had an opportunity of reconsidering the application of the British Cardiac Society for permission to send a large number of delegates to the World Conference on Cardiology in Washington during September, and if so, with what result.]

LORD HAWKE: My Lords, after full consideration the Treasury has allowed currency for the full number of delegates applied for—namely, thirty-two.

LORD CROOK: My Lords, I thank the noble Lord. Is the noble Lord aware that the medical profession will be most grateful to Her Majesty's Government, and that the effect which this action will have in America will be of considerable value?

LORD HAWKE: My Lords, Her Majesty's Government are always pleased to receive the gratitude of their faithful subjects.

VISCOUNT STANSFORD: Since when have we become the faithful subjects of Her Majesty's Government?

SUNDAY ENTERTAINMENTS
ACT, 1932

THE JOINT PARLIAMENTARY UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (LORD LLOYD): My Lords, I beg to move that this Order be approved.

Moved, That the Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, extending section one of the Sunday Entertainments Act, 1932, to the Urban District of Bromyard, a copy of

H.L. 79 A 8

which was laid before the House on February 16, be approved.—(Lord Lloyd.)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

FOOD AND DRUGS (SCOTLAND)
BILL [H.L.]

2.40 p.m.

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

Moved, That the House do now resolve itself into Committee.—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee accordingly:

[The EARL OF DROGHEDA in the Chair]

Clause 1:

Offences in connection with preparation and sale of injurious foods and adulterated drugs.

(5) In determining for the purposes of this Act whether an article of food is injurious to health regard shall be had not only to the probable effect of the consumption of that article by a person of normal health, but also to the probable cumulative effect of the consumption by such a person of articles of substantially the same composition in ordinary quantities.

THE MINISTER OF STATE, SCOT- TISH OFFICE (THE EARL OF HOME) moved, in subsection (5) to omit "of the consumption of that article by a person of normal health" and to insert:

"of that article on the health of a person consuming it."

The noble Earl said: The purpose of this Amendment is to dispense with the words "of normal health" which it is thought would make unnecessary difficulties in the courts and elsewhere. I beg to move this Amendment, and the two following Amendments which are consequential.

Amendment moved—

Page 2, line 8, leave out from ("effect") to ("but") in line 9, and insert the said new words.—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

Page 2, line 10, leave out ("of the consumption by such a person")—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

Page 2, line 11, after ("composition") insert ("on the health of a person consuming such articles")—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

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

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

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

PRICES AND SUBSCRIPTION RATES

DAILY PARTS

Single copies:

Lords, 9d. (by post 10½d.); Commons, 9d. (by post 11d.).

Annual subscriptions:

Lords, £3 15s. 0d.; Commons, £5; Both Houses, £8.

Short period subscriptions to cover 40 consecutive daily issues:

Lords or Commons, £1 10s. 0d.

WEEKLY HANSARD

Single copies:

Lords, 1s. 6d. (by post 1s. 8d.); Commons, 2s. (by post 2s. 6d.).

Annual subscriptions:

Lords, £2 15s. 0d.; including Index, £3 5s. 0d.

Commons, £3 15s. 0d.; including Index, £4 10s. 0d.

Index—Single copies:

Lords, 4d. (by post 5½d.); Commons, 6d. (by post 7½d.).

Annual subscriptions: Lords, 12s. 6d.; Commons, 17s. 6d.

BOUND VOLUMES of Debates are issued periodically during the session. There is no fixed subscription rate, but prices will be quoted and standing orders entered on application.

THE INDEX to each Bound Volume of House of Commons Debates, which may be used in conjunction with the corresponding Daily Parts and Weekly Hansard, is published separately at 2s. (by post 2s. 2d.) and can be supplied to standing order.

All subscription rates are inclusive of postage.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

To be purchased from

York House, Kingsway, LONDON, W.C.2 423 Oxford Street, LONDON, W.1
P.O. Box 569, LONDON, S.E.1

13a Castle Street, EDINBURGH, 2 1 St. Andrew's Crescent, CARDIFF

39 King Street, MANCHESTER, 2 Tower Lane, BRISTOL, 1

2 Edmund Street, BIRMINGHAM, 3 80 Chichester Street, BELFAST

or from any Bookseller

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

LORD DOUGLAS OF BARLOCH moved, after subsection (5) to insert:

"(6) A food shall be deemed to be injurious to health if it contains or has been processed with any synthetically produced chemical unless the use of such chemical in relation to that particular food stuff has been permitted by regulations made by the Ministers."

The noble Lord said: This Amendment is intended to prevent the use of chemicals in foodstuffs unless and except in so far as they have been officially approved under regulations made, as they can be made under this Bill. On the occasion of the English Bill we had some discussion about similar matters. I understand, of course, that the English Bill is in substance similar to this one. I understood then that one of the objections which the Government had to an Amendment which was moved was that it would prevent the use of such things as salt as a flavouring material, or bicarbonate of soda in baking, and a number of other things which are traditionally used in the preparation of food. I cannot myself see that there is any real objection to disclosing that things of that kind have been used, nor do I think that it would impose any great burden upon manufacturers if they were required to say so.

In order to meet that point, however, I have put down this Amendment in its present form, so that regulations may be made which would exempt from the necessity of disclosure such well-tried and customary ingredients in foodstuffs. But it is extremely important that there should be full disclosure to the public of other chemical substances, now running into many hundreds, which are used for various purposes in connection with the preparation of foods intended for sale to the public. Many of these have properties which are, as yet, quite unknown. A number of them have been found to be definitely toxic. Quite a number of articles which are still permitted to be used in this country have been banned by the Food and Drug Administration in the United States because, as a result of experiments, they have been shown to be likely to be injurious to health. Examples of these are numerous. One class consists of the so-called Azo dyes, some of which have been proved to be toxic or to lead to the development of cancer, and all of them are under suspicion. So far I understand it is still permissible in this

country to use most, if not all, of them. Then there are many other colouring and flavouring matters of a synthetic nature on which no adequate research has been done, and I submit that there is a *prima facie* case for preventing the use of them in foodstuffs. If they are to be permitted to be used in that way, the Government ought to take the responsibility of saying they can be used, and making it perfectly clear that they consider them to be safe. That is the purpose of this Amendment, and I beg to move it.

Amendment moved—

Page 2, line 11, at and insert the said subsection.—(Lord Douglas of Barloch.)

LORD SALTOUN: Before the discussion proceeds, I should like to know what is the noble Lord's definition of "synthetically produced." It brings to me to be a difficult thing to bring into an Act of Parliament. I do not know what the definition of the term is.

LORD DOUGLAS OF BARLOCH: If I may be allowed to say so, I think the words define themselves. Most of us— and chemists in particular—know very well what it is to produce an article synthetically instead of using one which has been found to exist in nature.

THE EARL OF HOME: The noble Lord, Lord Douglas of Barloch, is being quite consistent, in that he has pursued this objective right the way through the English Bill and now he hopes to gain his object in the Scottish Bill. He wants, as his Amendment says, to prohibit the introduction of any synthetically produced ingredient in food unless it is approved in regulations. I think it simply would not be possible to review the whole of this field before the Bill becomes law. I would remind the noble Lord of the different requirements in the various clauses. Clause 1 places the onus on the manufacturer not to use substances injurious to health. That is one safeguard. Under Clause 5, the Ministers can call for any information they want, and under Clause 4, if the Ministers, after receiving that information, are convinced that the use of a certain substance is injurious to health they can make regulations accordingly. As I have said, I do not think it would be possible to review this whole field before the Bill becomes law. But on the assurance that

it is the intention of the Ministers to work out, as soon as possible, a considered programme under Clauses 4 and 5, I hope that the noble Lord, Lord Douglas of Barloch, may feel that that is as far as we can practically go in existing circumstances, and will, therefore, be inclined to withdraw his Amendment.

LORD DOUGLAS OF BARLOCH: If it is the intention of the Government—and I should like to be quite clear about this point—to use the machinery which is provided in Clauses 4 and 5 in order to achieve the object which is envisaged in my Amendment, then, of course, I shall be happy to withdraw it. If that is the assurance which is given, I shall welcome it very much indeed. There is just one other thing I should like to say. It is true, in a sense, that, under Clause 1 of the Bill, the onus is imposed upon the manufacturer of a foodstuff not to sell anything which is injurious to health. But it is also true that under the scheme of this Bill the onus of proving that, in fact, it is injurious to health is thrown upon the consumer or else upon the public health authorities, who are not given any notice of what the content of any foodstuff is or of what has been added to it. I think that ought to be made clear, because, in fact, there were an onus thrown on manufacturers to prove, before they sold anything, that it was not injurious to health, that would be a very different story from what is actually in the Bill.

THE EARL OF HOME: The Government have deliberately adopted the machinery of Clauses 4 and 5, by which the Ministers can first of all call for information and then, if, on that information, they are satisfied that a substance is injurious to health they can make a regulation which will ban the use of that substance. The noble Lord, Lord Douglas of Barloch, asks whether we shall arrive at the same goal as he wishes to reach? I am not sure whether we shall arrive at quite the same goal, but we shall get some way towards it, perhaps, under regulations made under the Bill. I hope, therefore, that the noble Lord will not feel inclined to press his Amendment.

LORD DOUGLAS OF BARLOCH: The noble Earl has not given me as complete an assurance as I had hoped for.

On the other hand, I know that these things must move by stages, and, in the circumstances, I would ask leave of the House to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 (Fraudulent sales of food and drugs):

2.49 p.m.

LORD DOUGLAS OF BARLOCH moved to add to the clause:

"(4) A food shall be deemed to be not of the quality demanded by the purchaser if any constituent has been abstracted so as to reduce its nutritive value, or if some synthetically produced chemical has been used in substitution of a natural substance."

The noble Lord said: This Amendment deals with the abstraction from foodstuffs of matters which have nutritive value, and also with the substitution for natural food substances of other things which may or may not have any nutritive value at all. Neither of those matters is dealt with in the Bill as it stands. It is serious if valuable nutritive elements are extracted from foods and the usefulness of food to the consumer is diminished. If that is done, some remedy ought to be provided. If this Amendment is accepted, it will still be permissible to do that under the Bill, provided there is a disclosure to the purchaser that has been done. What I am proposing is not unduly onerous and need not necessarily interfere with any of the existing courses of manufacture. If a manufacturer wishes to continue to do what he has been doing, then he is afforded a defence by Clause 3 by disclosing to the purchaser what it is he has taken out of the food.

The same kind of argument applies with regard to the substitution of things which are not natural foodstuffs for substances which are. They may take many forms—for example, the substitute of artificial sweetening agents, such as saccharine, which have no nutritive value whatsoever, in place of sugar, which has a considerable nutritive value. Other examples are afforded by the baking industry, where many kinds of fat substitutes are used in place of lard and other natural fats which have long been a traditional means of producing cakes and other bakery products. If that is done, I think the consumer ought to have

[Lord Douglas of Barloch.] some protection. Again, a manufacturer can do it under this proposed Amendment if he makes use of the machinery under Clause 3 and discloses to the contrary what it is he has done. Therefore I commend this Amendment as affording to the general public a protection against having the value of their foods diminished. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 2, line 28, at end insert the said subsection.—(Lord Douglas of Barloch.)

THE EARL OF HOME: I do not think that I can accept the contention in the last part of the noble Lord's Amendment. The use of synthetic chemicals in substitution for natural constituents of foodstuffs may be justified. There is the case of the injection of vitamins into "white" bread and margarine. I have considered whether it would be possible to think again about the first part of the noble Lord's Amendment, and I will do so before Report stage, although I can hold out little chance of finding words that are likely to be suitable to him. As I see it, the first part of the Amendment, dealing with the abstraction from food of substances of nutritional value, might have the effect of making it impossible for anybody to produce corned beef, and it would be a roundabout way of making it illegal for anybody to eat anything but wholesome bread. I cannot get over these practical difficulties by finding new words which would suit the noble Lord's objective. If the noble Lord wishes, I will have a look at the first part of his Amendment before Report stage, but I do not hold out any hopes of an alteration which would suit him and I would ask your Lordships to resist this Amendment.

LORD SALTOUN: I should be sorry if your Lordships were to accept the first part of the Amendment. When I was young, children were fed on bread and jam, which was made of glucose. I do not know whether the noble Lord considers glucose to be synthetic, but we cannot get jam like that nowadays, made with glucose. In those days that would have come under the noble Lord's ban.

LORD DOUGLAS OF BARLOCH: It is interesting to know that jam is less good to-day because of a lack of glucose. If the noble Lord wants to find

out the reasons—because there are a number of them—they lie in another direction. A great deal of jam is made not out of fresh fruit, but out of fruit which has been preserved with anti-staling agents, such as sulphur dioxide, and it has to be bleached and recoloured with chemical dyes in order to make it look like natural fruit. It is adulterated by pectin or other extenders in order to reduce the amount of the more valuable ingredients which are contained in it, and in fact it does not contain, as the best jam made at home does, fresh fruit and sugar, which is all that is necessary to make the most excellent jam. I do not want to pursue the details of this matter.

Let me come back to what the noble Earl in charge of the Bill has said. He said the second part of my Amendment would prevent the addition of vitamins to foodstuffs such as margarine and bread. I do not think that is correct, because, as I explained to your Lordships, this clause has to be read with Clause 3, which succeeds it; and, as I understand it, Clause 3 affords a defence to a food manufacturer if he discloses to the consumer what it is he has done. I would far sooner have my vitamins as natural products than as synthetic products, and there is evidence to show that the synthetic products do not achieve quite the same results as the natural ones. Perhaps that is not altogether surprising, because the more we know about the subject the more complex we find the constituents of natural foodstuffs to be. In the last twenty or thirty years innumerable things, which are shown to be essential to health, have been discovered which nobody ever dreamed of before. That is why I think, on the face of it, there is a case against the addition of synthetic chemicals to foodstuffs. I think it is right to make that clear, but I am willing to withdraw this Amendment and upon Report stage try to produce it, in part at any rate, in a form which meets the difficulties the noble Earl has explained.

THE EARL OF HOME: I do not want to mislead the noble Lord. I do not see any chance of meeting his point on the Report stage. I have tried as hard as I can to see whether there is any way in which I could do so, but I have failed to find one. I cannot see how we could get

away from the words of the noble Lord's Amendment, or talk round them. However I will look at it again, but on the understanding that I am afraid I shall not make much progress in the direction the noble Lord wants.

LORD DOUGLAS OF BARLOCH: I understand that this is not a pledge on the part of the noble Earl.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 [Defences available in proceedings under s. 2]:

THE EARL OF HOME moved, in subsection (1) to omit paragraph (a). The noble Earl said: This Amendment is moved to ensure that nobody will be able to plead in defence that the addition or subtraction of any constituent in the food was necessary to preserve it in carriage. It is a clarification made after the English Bill went through your Lordship's House, and I feel that it is desirable to include it in this Bill. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 2, line 37, leave out lines 37 to 40.—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF HOME: This is a drafting Amendment to clarify the wording. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 2, line 44, after the first ("or") insert "was sold".—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF HOME: This is a further drafting Amendment to clarify the wording. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 2, line 44, leave out ("containing") and insert ("displaying").—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4:

Regulations as to composition of food, etc.

4.—(1) The Ministers may, so far as appears to them to be necessary or expedient in the interests of the public health, or otherwise for the protection of the public, make regulations for all or of the following purposes:—

(a) for requiring, prohibiting or regulating the addition of any specified substance, or any substance of any specified class, to food intended for sale for human consumption

or any class of such food, or the use of any such substance as an ingredient in the preparation of such food, and generally for regulating the composition of such food;

(b) for requiring, prohibiting or regulating the use of any process or treatment in the preparation of any food intended for sale for human consumption or any class of such food;

LORD DOUGLAS OF BARLOCH moved, in subsection (1) (a) to leave out "requiring." The noble Lord said: This Amendment and the one immediately following are directed to the same purpose and, for convenience, I will speak on them both at the same time. This is a matter which was discussed upon the English Bill, and I shall not detain your Lordships by repeating at any length what I then said. The object of this Amendment is to deprive the Government of the power to insist upon the addition of anything which they please to some article of food—for example, the proposal which we discussed not long ago to add iodine to salt, or the practice which is now in operation of adding chalk to bread. This latter may not be a particularly obnoxious practice because, though it is probably of no value, it has little detrimental effect. However, a power of this kind is one which we ought not to admit. It is an infringement of the liberty of the subject to oblige him to take medication whether he needs it or not, and it is the antithesis of all rational medical practice. Although I do not expect to be successful in persuading the Government to accept this Amendment, I feel that, as a matter of principle, this point must be made upon the Scottish Bill just as it was made upon the English Bill. So far as I know, it is the first time that anything of this kind has been proposed as part of the permanent legislation of this country. As we all know, it was done under emergency powers during war time, and it may or may not have had some temporary justification. But to make it part of the permanent machinery of the State that the Government can oblige people to eat or drink things, irrespective of their inclination, is a power so arbitrary and so far-reaching that I feel it ought not to be accepted. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 3, line 25, leave out ("requiring").—(Lord Douglas of Barloch.)

THE EARL OF HOME: We must all respect the pertinacity of the noble Lord: if he cannot get a thing one way, he tries another. His slogan is "Pure natural food, undiluted and unadulterated in any way." However, there is a strong belief held by others that health is not only maintained but improved by the addition of certain substances; and our experience in the war would seem to sustain that point of view. If this Amendment were accepted, it would be impossible to add nutrients or vitamins to flour, or to the various substances about which we have been talking—iodine to salt, fluorine to water, and the rest. Of course, Ministers will make it their business to obtain the best possible advice in applying this clause. The noble Lord said that he does not expect me to accept this Amendment, and I will not disappoint him: I am afraid that I cannot do so.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

LORD DOUGLAS OF BARLOCH: I beg to move the next Amendment formally, in order to have it on record.

Amendment moved—

Page 3, line 32, leave out ("requiring")—*(Lord Douglas of Barloch.)*

On Question, Amendment negatived.

3.9 p.m.

LORD TEVIOT moved to add to subsection (1),

("for publishing lists of chemicals and other ingredients which may be added to any article of food.")

The noble Lord said: When I was in the other place we there had a Pharmacy Bill, under which it was decided that all patent medicines—in fact, any medicine in a bottle or other container—should have the ingredients stated on the outside. I want to ensure the same thing with regard to natural food, so that the housewife will know what she is giving to her children. She may find that she is giving her children for breakfast a particular food with a certain chemical in it. That infinitesimal amount of chemical may be all right, provided that it is given for breakfast only, and not during the rest of the day. My point is that, if the housewife knows about these chemicals being in the food, she will make sure that her children do not get too much of a particular chemical. My suggestion on the English Bill did not meet with the approval of the Govern-

ment, and so I have tried here to put it in a different way. I now want to know whether they will publish a list of chemicals and other ingredients which may be added to any article of food. If that could be done, and if the list could be easily obtainable by the housewives, then I should have gone some way towards getting what I want. We know perfectly well, and the medical profession know perfectly well, that a person can take a certain amount of chemical without its doing him any harm. If he takes more, however, it builds up in his system, and I wish to obviate all that sort of thing. I take the view that this matter is a serious one in regard to the health of the people in this country. I hope that the noble Earl will be able to accept this Amendment, which it seems to me will enable housewives and all those who take an interest in this subject to know what is permissible in the way of adding drugs and chemicals to foodstuffs. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 4, line 3, at end insert the said paragraph.—*(Lord Teviot.)*

THE EARL OF HOME: The object of this Amendment can be achieved under the regulations for which the Bill provides. Under the regulations the Ministers may prohibit or they may allow. In the case when they allow ingredients to be used in a particular foodstuff, or when they prohibit them, regulations will be published. If I can help the noble Lord, Lord Teviot, by arranging for more comprehensive lists, I shall be glad to do so, but it can be done administratively without an Amendment such as he has moved.

LORD TEVIOT: I thank my noble friend for his reply to my Amendment. It seems to me that he has met me all along the line, and with the permission of the House I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE EARL OF HOME: This Amendment directs Ministers, in making regulations as to the composition of food, to restrict, so far as possible, the use of substances that are of no nutritional value. I think that, for that reason, this Amendment will be welcomed by the Committee. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 4, line 3, at end insert—
("2) In the exercise of their functions under this section the Ministers shall have regard to the desirability of restricting, so far as practicable, the use of substances of no nutritional value as foods, or as ingredients of foods.")—*(The Earl of Home.)*

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 [Labels and advertisements describing incorrectly food or drugs]:

THE EARL OF HOME: It is proposed by this Amendment to leave out the words "nature, substance or." It is thought that if these words are left in the Bill there will be room for endless argument in court proceedings as to whether the advertisement misled as to the nature or the substance or the quality of the food, and that it is better to rest on the quality of the food, rather than include the words "nature" and "substance" as well. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 5, line 29, leave out ("nature, substance or")—*(The Earl of Home.)*

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7:

Regulations as to labelling and description of food.

7.—(1) Without prejudice to the provisions of the last foregoing section, the Ministers may make regulations for imposing requirements as to, and otherwise regulating, the labelling, marking or advertisement of food intended for sale for human consumption, and the descriptions which may be applied to such food.

LORD SEMPILL moved, in subsection (1) to substitute "shall" for "may" where that word first occurs. The noble Lord said: When your Lordships last debated this Bill I submitted a suggestion in regard to the clear labelling of all packaged foodstuffs. I suggested that the regulations which normally maintain in all chemists' shops under which when one goes in there to buy medicines of one kind or another all are clearly labelled, should maintain also so far as foodstuffs are concerned. Since there may be up to 700 different chemical substances used in the production, processing and packaging

of food, it is essential, in my view, that these substances should be specifically declared on the label of the container. At other times when food has been debated in your Lordships' House this suggestion has been strongly supported by the noble Lords, Lord Sillkin, Lord Hankey, Lord Teviot and Lord Douglas of Barloch. On a previous debate, the noble Lord, Lord Webb-Johnson, said (OFFICIAL REPORT, Vol. 184, col. 491):

"... the parts of this Bill that appeal to me are those designed to deal with misleading labels and advertisements."

Surely, that is a clear indication that the labels should state what is in the package.

When this matter was before your Lordships on December 3, the noble Earl the Minister of State for Scotland referred sympathetically to this suggestion and spoke of "honest labelling." He pointed out that labelling provisions were taken out in Clauses 6 and 7. When a like suggestion was made on the English Bill, the noble Viscount, Lord Woolton, referred to Clause 5 of that Bill as having similar provisions. The clause to which I particularly wish to direct attention this afternoon is Clause 7, which most certainly gives the Ministers power to label. This clause is entirely permissive, and I hope your Lordships will support my Amendment, and that the noble Earl the Minister of State for Scotland will agree to change this one word "may" to "shall," so as to make that clause obligatory.

As the bulk of foodstuffs which the housewife buys is in a container or wrapper, the rapid implementation of clear labelling provides no difficulty. The housewives are becoming more and more food conscious, and are rightly alarmed at the adulteration, sophistication, substitution, abstraction, medication and contamination, and, all too often I submit, do occur in the production, processing and packaging of foodstuffs.

I beg the noble Earl to agree to my Amendment. I can assure him that this is no fancy of a few Members of your Lordships' House, but the keen wish of the housewives of Scotland who this morning, through Mistress Elizabeth Pattullo of Glamis, the Secretary of the Scottish Housewives Association, sent me the following telegram which, with your

[Lord Sempill.]

Lordships' permission, I will read. It is very short and to the point, and says:

"We wish you in the name of the Scottish Housewives' Association to secure honest labelling of foodstuffs as suggested by you in the House of Lords in the debate on February 16."

I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 6, line 2, leave out ("may") and insert ("shall").—(Lord Sempill.)

THE EARL OF HOME: It is not the first time that this controversy, as to whether the insertion in a Bill shall be "may" or "shall," has been raised in Parliament. The trouble with the word "shall" is that it makes it absolutely mandatory on a Minister, and would imply that the Minister should, therefore, make regulations about every sort and kind of food without exception. I do not think the case is made out for that wholesale treatment of the word in the country. It would be better to give the Minister some discretion, and it is the intention of the Minister to continue the policy of making regulations as to labelling of food wherever there seems to be justification. I do not know if the noble Lord has appreciated that his Amendment would make it absolutely mandatory in the case of all foodstuffs.

LORD DOUGLAS OF BARCLOCH: Is that interpretation of the noble Lord's Amendment correct? If the Amendment is accepted, this subsection will say:

"...the Minister shall make regulations for imposing requirements as to, and otherwise regulating, the labelling, marketing or advertising of food."

But it is not possible in the regulations to say that certain articles of food need not be labelled? Would not that be a regulation made under the mandatory provision? In other words, the regulations would require articles of food generally to be labelled but could provide that there would be certain exceptions. Therefore, I venture to submit that the noble Earl's objection to the noble Lord's Amendment is not entirely well-founded. Certainly it is extremely desirable that as a general rule there should be some kind of regulation requiring foodstuffs to be labelled. That is something which is done in almost every civilised country. Many of us were very thankful to see, during the course of the late War and the subsequent stringency, food parcels

given by generous donors in other countries, all carefully labelled to explain the composition of the food, and, in many cases, going a stage further than that and explaining in what ways the foodstuffs had been processed. Therefore there is nothing unusual about this proposal, nor is there any insuperable difficulty in carrying it out.

LORD SILKIN: I should like to say a few words about this Amendment. Throughout the debate on this Bill and, if I may make reference to it, on another Bill also, the same point has figured and the same principle applies. It has always been an answer, on this question of labelling, that the Minister has power to make regulations: and in some instances the Bill has gone further and said that it is the intention to make regulations. On that statement I and many others have thought we might let the matter rest. If it really is the intention of the Minister to make regulations on this question of labelling, then we should be satisfied, but as things stand at present he is not under any obligation. Now the noble Earl says that under this Amendment the Minister would be required to make regulations in respect of all foodstuffs. It may be so: I should not wish to enter into any legalistic argument on the subject. But that is not a reason for entirely rejecting the principle of the Amendment. It is no doubt a reason for saying that this particular Amendment will not do. I ask the noble Earl to look at it again and see whether he cannot meet the wishes of those who have been pressing this matter all along, and, in fact, fulfil what he has given the Committee to understand is the intention of Her Majesty's Government.

THE EARL OF HOME: I have not rejected this Amendment out of hand because I wanted to hear what noble Lords felt about the matter. My trouble is that under the subsection as it is drafted the Minister may make a regulation saying that something shall be labelled, but he cannot make a regulation saying that something shall not be labelled. But if the noble Lord, Lord Sempill, asks me to do so, I will certainly look again at the wording of this clause. We think that the present wording allows the Minister to fulfil this discretion: and if the Minister intends to exercise the discretion to label fairly large numbers of

foodstuffs it may not be necessary to label the whole. We think that that discretion is necessary, but, as I say, I will look into the matter again.

LORD SEMPILL: I am grateful to the noble Earl for saying that he will look into this matter again. May I ask him whether he would be in favour—I presume he would—of all manufacturers of products who wished to do so fully labelling their products, stating clearly just what they contain? I think it would be useful if the Minister were to say an encouraging word in regard to that. As your Lordships know, the official mind is very label-conscious at the moment, and there may be a certain resistance in the noble Earl's mind, in view of the fantastic stories that are going round about what is alleged to have been happening in the dungeons under Waterloo Station, where, and all because of a label, a lot of useful crockery is being broken, so great an Aunt Sally show as any, or your Lordships could ever hope to attend. It would be a good idea if the noble Earl could invite his Scots colleagues to such a party and arm them with pots of "Witches' Brew Jam"—a product of fruit pulp preserved in sulphur dioxide—to shy at the plates with the offending letters. I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment in view of the Minister's promise to look into the matter again.

LORD SALTOUN: As the noble Lord has mentioned the matter, I think I ought to draw his attention to the fact that this story about Waterloo Station has been contradicted to-day in *The Times*—I think officially.

LORD CROOK: May I suggest that, in fairness to the British Railways and their catering department, the noble Lord should withdraw this imputation, because it is a newspaper mares' nest, which has been completely refuted to-day.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 12 agreed to.

Clause 13 [Regulations as to food hygiene].

THE EARL OF HOME: We thought we should define persons who were to be responsible for food hygiene regulations. We have been able to define such persons in the Bill, and that is the object of this Amendment. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 10, line 3, leave out from ("may") to the end of line 9 and insert ("impose responsibility for compliance with those requirements on the occupier of the premises and, in the case of requirements of a structural character, on any owner of the premises who either lets them for use for a purpose to which the regulations apply or permits them to be so used after notice from the authority charged with the enforcement of the regulations").—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

On Question, Whether Clause 13 shall stand part of the Bill?

LORD MATTHEWS: I should like to say a few words on this subject. This is a great regulation-authorising clause, and I want to make special reference to the first part of it, where the nature and the substance of the regulations are not so specifically defined as they are in subsection (2). I particularly want to make reference to regulations regarding the exposure of the various goods that come within the ambit of the Bill. The word "contamination" has already been used in connection with the previous Amendment, and it is to guard against contamination that I ask the Government to make sure that the regulations are made in very firm, strong, and clear terms. I will give only two instances of what I have in mind. Dogs are admitted into shops and in green-grocers' shops, for example, many goods are standing about, exposed, without protection, and they are down on the level of the floor. One finds dogs in the shop, sniffing and blowing around the food—and worse. Either there should be a prohibition on dogs entering shops where goods are exposed in that way, or there should be an obligation upon the shopkeeper to see that any possibility of contamination is prevented. I will not dwell upon that matter. I am sure that what I am aiming at in the remarks I have just made will be quite clear.

Another instance I cite is that of the baker's shop, where fine cakes are shown on the counter, temptingly laid out. I know that many ladies go into those shops and regard those cakes as most tempting of wares; it is a real temptation to them to buy them, and it is a real struggle for them to refrain to refrain from buying them. They do so only by the severe discipline that they impose on themselves, a kind of "Waste not, want not" idea. If they do not refrain from

[Lord Mathers.]

buying those things, then they will have no waist-line worth talking about or looking at. I look upon this sort of thing as perhaps the most wasteful way—another spelling of “waist”—of using sugar, fats and flour. However, that is by the way. These goods are exposed and people, including ladies, go into these shops, sometimes smoking. It seems to me that smoking should be prohibited where delicate goods of that nature are exposed and within reach of being contaminated in that way, not only by the smoke itself but also by the tobacco ash, about which some people are careless. I have made my point and given two instances. I hope that I can have an assurance from the Minister that this form of possible contamination will be looked at carefully, and that regulations will be made to ensure that goods are handed over to the people in as clean a state as possible.

THE EARL OF HOME: I will certainly give that assurance. This clause has deliberately been made wide enough to cover such instances and possibilities as those mentioned by the noble Lord, Lord Mathers. In the framing of regulations I shall be glad to have discussions with him as to what might reasonably be covered, and to deal with any further points he has in mind.

LORD MATHERS: I thank the noble Earl warmly for the way in which he has received my remarks.

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 14 [Registration of slaughterers, manufacturers and traders]:

THE EARL OF HOME: This is really a clarification Amendment. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 11, line 25, after “(premises)” insert “(‘‘ vehicle, stall or place ’’).—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 14, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 15 [Refusal, etc., of registration under s. 14]:

THE EARL OF HOME moved, in paragraph (c) of subsection (1), after “unsuitable” to insert:

“having regard to their situation, construction or condition, or to any activities carried on therein.”

H.L. 79 A 12

The noble Earl said: In the English Bill I believe that it was thought that the word “unsuitable,” occurring in the corresponding paragraph of the Bill, might lead people to take into account matters not relevant to the public health. This Amendment seems to provide a more reasonable qualification here. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 12, line 2, after “(unsuitable)” insert the said words.—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 15, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 16 to 25 agreed to.

Clause 26 [Establishment by local authority of cold stores]:

THE EARL OF HOME moved, in subsection (1), to omit “who have provided or are about to provide a slaughterhouse.” The noble Earl said: In Scotland, we want a definition which will give power to any local authority to provide a cold store where necessary. English local authorities have a wide power to provide cold stores under Section 62 of the Food and Drugs Act, 1938. This Amendment gives a similar power to Scottish local authorities. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 18, line 1, leave out from “(authority)” to “(may)” in line 2.—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 26, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 27 and 28 agreed to.

Clause 29 [Powers of sampling]:

THE EARL OF HOME: Under subsection (4), as it stands at present, the sampling officer is restricted as to the places at which he may take samples on request. There is no such restriction on him if he himself initiates the taking of samples. We think it reasonable that there should not be any restriction on him when he is requested to take samples. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 20, line 30, leave out “(in the course of or at the place of delivery)”.—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 29, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 30 [Right to have samples analysed]:

THE EARL OF HOME: This Amendment again corresponds to one in the English Bill. It is intended to ensure that a private person who is submitting a sample for analysis under this clause will not be permitted to send substances unconnected with food. The local authority sampling officer is already limited, by the terms of Clause 29, to substances connected with food. I commend this Amendment to your Lordships as bringing this clause into line with the other clause. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 21, line 2, after “(substance)” insert “(‘‘ capable of being used in the preparation of food ’’).—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF HOME: This Amendment is to enable the public analyst who is unable to perform an effective analysis, probably because he does not possess the necessary equipment, to make use of the superior facilities which may be available in the laboratory of another public analyst. It is a convenience which I think we should put into the Bill. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 21, line 13, after “(vacant)” insert “(‘‘ or if the public analyst for that area is, or for any reason unable to perform an effective analysis, ’’).—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 30, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 31 [Disposal of samples taken for analysis]:

THE EARL OF HOME: The effect of this Amendment is, that where the name or address of a manufacturer or packer appears on an article sampled the sampling officer must inform him that he has taken a sample and from whom it was taken. The underlying reason for this is, I think, quite fair—namely, that where goods have been pre-packed by a manufacturer, and proceedings may eventually be brought against him, he should be notified at the earliest possible moment that a sample has been taken. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 22, line 10, at end insert—
“(‘‘ If it appears to a sampling officer that any food, drug or substance of which he has

H.L. 79 A 13

procured a sample was manufactured or put into its wrapper or container by a person (not being a person to whom one part of the sample is required to be given under this section) having his name and an address in the United Kingdom displayed on the wrapper or container, the officer shall within three days of procuring the sample send to that person a notice informing him that the sample has been procured by the officer and where the sample was taken or, as the case may be, from whom it was purchased.”.—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF HOME: This is a drafting Amendment. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 22, line 27, after “(section)” insert “(‘‘ except subsection (4) ’’).—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

On Question, Whether Clause 31, as amended, shall stand part of this Bill?

LORD SALTOUN: May I ask the noble Earl in charge of the Bill whether he thinks that “three days” is correct? Would not “immediately” be more satisfactory?

THE EARL OF HOME: I will look at that point.

Clause 31, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 32 [Special provisions as to the sampling of milk and proceedings subsequent thereto]:

THE EARL OF HOME: The next two Amendments are merely drafting Amendments. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 22, line 39, leave out from “(area)” to “(authorised)” and insert “(‘‘ an ’’).—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

Page 22, line 40, leave out “(‘‘ the medical officer or other ’’ and insert “(‘‘ an ’’).—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 32, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 33 agreed to.

Clause 34 [Provision as to cases in which division of sample into parts is impracticable]:

THE EARL OF HOME: This is really a drafting Amendment to simplify the wording. The clause makes special arrangements for the sampling of goods in unopened containers. The practice is

[The Earl of Home.]

to divide a sample into three parts—or, where it is not possible to divide the sample into three, to have three separate tins of tinned food. I am afraid that, as a result of this Amendment, the clause now reads rather like the instructions for the "three-card trick." I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 24, line 18, leave out ("the requisite number of") and insert ("three")—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 34, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 35 to 41 agreed to.

Clause 42 [Proceedings]:

THE EARL OF HOME: This Amendment makes it clear that the day on which the sample is procured is counted in the two months within which the proceedings, if any, must be commenced. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 28, line 46, leave out ("from the time when") and insert ("beginning with the date on which")—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 42, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 43 and 44 agreed to.

Clause 45 [Power of court to require analysis by Government Chemist]:

THE EARL OF HOME: This is a drafting Amendment which makes good an omission in the drafting of the Bill. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 31, line 27, after ("be") insert ("sufficient")—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 45, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 46 to 56 agreed to.

Clause 57 [Orders and regulations]:

THE EARL OF HOME moved, in subsection (6), to leave out all words after "such" and to insert:

"organisations as appear to them to be representative of interests substantially affected by the orders or regulations, as the case may be."

The noble Earl said: I think this is a provision which the Committee will welcome. It is an attempt to render somewhat more precise the obligation upon Ministers to carry out adequate consultations before making regulations. I beg to move.

H.L. 79 A 14

Amendment moved—

Page 36, line 29, leave out from ("such") to end of line and insert the said new words—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 57, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 58 agreed to.

Clause 59 [Interpretation]:

THE EARL OF HOME: This is an attempt to see that the word "analyse" is interpreted in the same way as the word "analyse." I am assured that those who work out these things know what this Amendment means, and that it is necessary. I hope the Committee agree. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 37, line 35, as end insert ("and 'analyse' shall be construed accordingly")—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF HOME: This Amendment and the next are intended to cover a case which is not purely that of a slaughter-house only, but may be that of a stable or premises which are essential to the business of a slaughter-house. It is a slight widening of the term "premises." I beg to move this and the following Amendment.

Amendment moved—

Page 39, line 4, after ("premises") insert ("or place other than premises")—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

Page 39, line 40, after ("premises") insert ("or place other than premises")—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF HOME: This Amendment is intended to secure that, where meals are supplied free of charge by a catering establishment—for instance, to their employees—the supply shall be regarded as a sale and, accordingly, is brought within the ambit of the Bill. The ordinary business of catering establishments is, of course, undoubtedly within the ambit of the Bill. This Amendment brings in that part of the business which would otherwise have been outside. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Page 40, line 3, after ("any") insert ("catering establishment")—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 59, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 60 agreed to.

Clause 61 [Minor amendments, repeals and savings]:

THE EARL OF HOME: Subsection (4) was included in the Bill by an oversight. It was put into an earlier draft of the Bill, but is now no longer necessary. I beg to move that we leave it out.

Amendment moved—

Page 41, line 17, leave out subsection (4)—(The Earl of Home.)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 61, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clause and Schedules agreed to.

House resumed.

THE FUTURE OF UGANDA

THE PARLIAMENTARY UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (THE EARL OF MUNSTER): My Lords, perhaps I may interrupt the Business of your Lordships' House for a few moments in order to make a statement, similar to that which is being made in another place by my right honourable friend the Colonial Secretary, on the future of Uganda.

The long-term aim of Her Majesty's Government is to build the Protectorate into a self-governing State. In working towards this we shall ensure that Africans play a constantly increasing part in the political institutions of the country, in the Civil Service and in economic development. When self-government is achieved, the government of the country will be mainly in the hands of Africans. The advancement of Africans and the economic development on which that advancement depends cannot take place without the help of the other races. When the time for self-government eventually comes, Her Majesty's Government will wish to be satisfied that the rights of the minority communities resident in Uganda are properly safeguarded in the Constitution, but this will not detract

H.L. 79 A 15

from the primarily African character of the country. I have placed in the Library copies of two speeches made by the Governor to the Protectorate Legislature on November 20 last year and on February 5 this year. These speeches set out the comprehensive measures which the Protectorate Government is taking for African advancement, and I would commend them to the attention of noble Lords.

Some fears have been expressed that the development of Uganda's economic resources will bring in large numbers of permanent immigrants. These fears are groundless. We must expand mining and secondary industries in order to diversify the economy and to pay for the expansion of social and other services. For this outside capital and technical staff are needed and must have their proper reward. But there will be safeguards to ensure that the future interests of the Africans are not prejudiced. There will be strict control of immigration and of the alienation of land, and the Uganda Government and industry itself will train Africans for higher positions and ensure proper conditions of labour. No industrial colour bar will be tolerated in Uganda. The Governor is ready to discuss with African representatives any suggestions that they may make to help allay any fears, if such still remain.

It is too early to forecast the form of the constitution of Uganda when self-government is eventually achieved, though it is clear that only as a united country will Uganda be strong enough and prosperous enough to meet the growing needs of the people. There are, however, constitutional questions relating to Buganda—in particular the future relationship between the Kabakship, the Ministers and the Great Lukiko, and the relations between the Great Lukiko and the Legislative Council—which must be looked at now so that we can decide on what lines it is best for these relationships to develop. The Baganda themselves should clearly take a leading part in working out these problems. To help in this, the Governor and my right honourable friend the Colonial Secretary have agreed that an independent expert should be invited to go out to Uganda. He will consult with representatives of the Baganda and with the Protectorate

H.L. 79 A 16

[The Earl of Munster.] Government to help reach agreed recommendations for Her Majesty's Government to consider. In the meantime my right honourable friend has agreed that the Buganda reforms announced in March, 1953, need not be held up.

In Bunyoro, Toro and Ankole, the Councils are becoming more representative. I do not think there will be any difficulties, but the Governor will arrange for the expert to talk over with the rulers of these districts their future relationships with their Councils, if they so wish. The Governor will pursue these matters on his return to Uganda, and, as far as Buganda is concerned, will discuss them with the Regents and will make an early statement to the Lukiko.

3.55 p.m.

VISCOUNT ALEXANDER OF HILLSBOROUGH: My Lords, first I say I thank the noble Lord Munster for making to your Lordships this statement which has already been communicated by the Secretary of State for the Colonies? To-day we have had a little more time to consider the very important statement which has been made, and perhaps it will satisfy the noble Earl straight away if I say that, having had time to study the Paper, we on this side of the House welcome it. And we welcome it because we feel that there is at least a record here of the initiation of a policy which is in the right direction and which, if carried through as it is suggested it has already been currently put into operation, will certainly be upon the right lines.

The opportunity does arise in a case like this to say something with which I am sure noble Lords here will agree—that is, that in these difficult circumstances in this very important country, I think we have reason in view of events and of what he said over here, to have confidence in the Governor. That is important when we have to make policy here. We have appreciated very much the general reports we have heard of the work of Sir Andrew Cohen in this matter. On the other hand, we have one small criticism to offer and it is this. While we are grateful for the fact that the records of Sir Andrew's speeches in Uganda are to be put into the Library of your Lordships' House, where many of us will read them, I should have

thought, listening to the statement which the noble Earl has just made, that the policy outlined is mainly the substance of what was said in those two speeches by Sir Andrew Cohen. I think, therefore, that it would be very convenient, and in the interests of the wider dissemination of knowledge, if we could have those speeches put in the OFFICIAL REPORT. If that seems impractical because they are too lengthy, could we at least have them put into a White Paper, so that we may have a permanent record in our hands of what is behind the short and summarised statement which the noble Earl has just made?

We welcome that section of the statement with regard to the constitutional difficulties and the policy proposed to be followed. We are very glad indeed that there is an agreement that an independent expert shall go out to Uganda, for we certainly feel that that will mean a great opportunity for clarification of the difficulties—which seem to be very involved—with regard to the different parts of the country and the various issues which arise. I would only suggest, in conclusion, that we might have an assurance from the noble Earl that when the independent expert has been out to Uganda and has reported to the noble Earl's right honourable friend—so that he will know exactly what is being proposed—a statement will be made as soon as possible to the House, explaining what the views of the independent expert are with regard to the situation which he finds. The noble Earl will recognise from what I have said that we are not only obliged to him for making the statement which he has made, but that we do not seem to be very far apart in the objectives which we have.

3.59 p.m.

THE EARL OF LISTOWEL: My Lords, I think your Lordships will agree that in view of the noble Earl's statement I should withdraw my Motion on Uganda which stands on the Order Paper for March 10. I do not think any of your Lordships would wish to debate policy in relation to Uganda until the discussions foreshadowed by the noble Earl have taken place and we know their outcome. I very much hope that the Great Lukiko, whose representatives over here in London some of your Lordships have met, and who have shown themselves extremely

reasonable and indeed statesmanlike, will take full advantage of the offer made them by the Government, and that they will use it to secure a constitutional advance for the Buganda people and to increase their influence in the Legislative Council of Uganda.

THE EARL OF MUNSTER: My Lords, I am obliged to the noble Lords opposite for their comments on this statement. I can assure the noble Viscount who leads the Opposition that I will see that the views of the independent expert are communicated to Parliament, either in the form of a statement such as I have given to-day or as a published document.

VISCOUNT ALEXANDER OF HILLSBOROUGH: My Lords, that is excellent and I am much obliged to the noble Earl, but what about the White Paper suggested? What is obviously a basic policy should be in our hands in some tangible form. Is that promised?

THE EARL OF MUNSTER: Yes.

COTTON BILL

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

HILL FARMING BILL

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

INDUSTRIAL DISEASES (BENEFIT) BILL

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

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY (WIDOWS' PENSIONS) BILL

Brought from the Commons, endorsed with a Certificate from the Speaker that the Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of the Parliament Act, 1911; read 1st, and to be printed.

4.2 p.m.

LORD WINSTER rose to call attention to affairs in Cyprus; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: My Lords, I have noticed over a considerable period of time that Cyprus is rarely mentioned in Parliament. Over a period of some six years there have been just a handful of Questions in another place, and the only reference to Cyprus in your Lordships' House has been a reference from a strategic point of view that I made to the island during a debate not long ago. I have felt it proper to remain silent on the subject during the period of office of my successor. Sir Andrew Wright has now completed his term of office, leaving behind him, if I may say so with great respect, a record in the form of addresses to the Executive Council, which points to wise guidance and steady progress during his Governorship. I think that perhaps I ought to mention that I have had no conversation with Sir Andrew Wright's successor on the matters which I am going to raise this afternoon, except briefly to wish him the best of good fortune in the office which he has taken up. May I also say to your Lordships that I am sure that the Cypriots themselves, though they may not agree with all that is said, will greatly appreciate the fact their affairs are attracting the attention of your Lordships' House. On that account I share the regret which I am sure will be felt in Cyprus that no supporter of the Government, except the Minister who is going to be good enough to reply, has found it convenient to intervene in this debate to-day.

The first thing I should like to refer to is the disastrous earthquakes which afflicted the island last year. They struck at one of the most beautiful parts of a beautiful island, and they brought suffering and distress to some of the most deserving and most industrious inhabitants of Cyprus. As it happened, the Governor was absent when those earthquakes occurred. He speedily returned, of course, but in his absence the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Fletcher Cook, rose most admirably to the situation and was supported in doing so with great ability and competence by the Commissioners for the districts and the officers of the health service. I am

[Lord Winter.]

sure all noble Lords would wish to commend them for their remarkable service at that distressing time. In that connection I should also like to mention the work of succour which was done by Her Majesty's Navy. The arrangements for relief and help went with that smoothness and efficiency which we associate with anything that Admiral Mountbatten undertakes. He now has very considerable experience of earthquakes, and if I am ever involved in one, I hope that the Admiral may be around. I think that, after fighting, the thing that a sailor does best is to bring help and assistance wherever a great calamity has visited some part of the globe. I know that the humanity, the genuine kindness and cheerfulness of the sailors on this occasion is something which will be long remembered in Cyprus.

What I want to say this afternoon I am dividing into two parts. First, administration; then after I have mentioned a few facts in regard to our administration of the island, I will deal with the political questions which distract it. We took over the island in 1878, and since then we have accomplished great achievements. Let me enumerate just a few of them, as briefly as possible. When we took over, there were two wheeled vehicles on the island. Interior communications were by path and mule track. There are now over 700 miles of asphalted roads, 18,000 miles of secondary roads and a network of forest roads. Secondary and forest roads may perhaps sound primitive, as roads go, but I happen to know that over every mile of these roads the largest car which the Daimler Company make can be driven in perfect safety and complete comfort. I think these facts point to a remarkable achievement in road-making. As regards exterior communications, so greatly have we improved the economy of the country that to-day no fewer than thirty-four shipping lines find it worth their while to call regularly at Cyprian ports. A modern, completely up-to-date air terminal has been built, and air traffic increases monthly. The island is now in swift and rapid communication with every other part of the world. So much for communications.

As regards health services, every big town has its hospital, and there are no

fewer than fifty doctors employed. There are travelling medical clinics and a travelling dental clinic. So good is this service that not one of the 620 villages of the island is more than an hour's travel from skilled medical and surgical help. It is a great pleasure to see how quickly the women of Cyprus have taken to child welfare work. The leper establishment and mental hospital have both been moved to admirable sites, and the most modern treatment is given to these unfortunate people. The death rate in Cyprus is the second lowest in the world. But what stands out above everything else in regard to these health services is the victory over malaria. At one time, quite recently, in a village sixteen miles from the capital of the island, the incidence of malaria was 100 per cent.; but to-day you can not find a case there. The malaria-carrying mosquito has been eliminated from the island. If the noble Earl, Lord Munster, will allow me to say so, I do not think Dr. Shelley, the Director of Medical Health Services at the time, who directed the campaign, and Mr. Aziz, who was responsible for the additional work involved, have ever received adequate recognition for their remarkable services in this respect. With regard to justice, that is swiftly and impartially administered. That was not always the case. The prison adheres to every modern recommendation on the subject of prisons—diet, hygiene, recreation, and the work that the prisoners do. It is a great pleasure to see, and reflects the greatest credit on those concerned. I have mentioned recreation, and I may say that the army have found the prison team formidable opponents on the football field.

However, the matter to which I would call particular attention this afternoon is agriculture. The economy of Cyprus is 80 to 90 per cent. agricultural, and that is the main employment of the inhabitants of the island. Two things in the past have been the curse of agriculture in Cyprus: first, the free-ranging goats and, secondly, soil erosion. The forests have been ravaged by these free-ranging goats, and literally millions of pounds worth of damage has been done by those animals: the forests have been destroyed, and the undergrowth eaten. The water catchment areas have consequently been destroyed, and there has followed soil erosion and infertility. Now, thanks to the work of

two devoted and skillful conservators of forests, the forests are being restored. Now, too, thanks to the patient propaganda which these conservators have carried out on the subject, the free-ranging goat is steadily being replaced by the tethered goat, and in this way a valuable asset is being restored to the island. With regard to soil erosion, the officers of the department of agriculture have been carrying on steady educational work about contour ploughing and terraced agriculture. Great strides have been made, and I hope that the day will come, in the not too distant future, when we shall cease to go up into the hills when the rains come and see some of the best soil of Cyprus staining the sea for three-quarters of a mile offshore, which is the melancholy sight we see to-day.

The island is studded with a system of research and educational stations—agricultural, horticultural and viticultural. New strains of livestock have been introduced, with the result that Cyprian mules and donkeys are now regarded as the finest in the Mediterranean, and in one year alone we exported 5,000 of them. Mechanised farming is making steady headway. In all these respects great work is being done, and I feel that the successive Directors of Agriculture deserve a great deal of praise, not only for their own work, but for the work which they have encouraged in their officers. Water is the life of Cyprus, and year by year the Water Department carries out work after work which adds to the welfare and amenity of the island. A very small amount of work, costing perhaps £300 or £400, may add 400 or 500 acres to the cultivable area. One only has to see it for oneself to realise what the bringing of a piped water supply may mean to some of the villages, which from time immemorial have never enjoyed such a thing. Work is going forward in covering the island with an electric grid, a most remarkable enterprise; and when that is completed light and power will be brought to every village in Cyprus, to the great benefit of their agriculture and, also, their domestic life.

On the matter of education, 15 per cent. of the island's budget is devoted to that subject. In 700 elementary schools, 1,500 teachers teach 62,000 pupils; in 50 secondary schools, 500 teachers teach 13,000 pupils. The Cypriots have a quick

and lively intelligence, and anything we can do to satisfy the real demand that exists for education will redound greatly to our prestige in the island. As to the general economy, overseas trade has tripled in five years; and at the present moment it is ten times what it was in pre-war. The Cyprus Government, with great foresight, have spent £12 million on public services which are essential to industry, in order to attract industry to the island. For instance, there has been considerable expenditure on the modernisation of the three main ports. The range of industry is very wide indeed, covering asbestos, mining in many forms, brewing, wine, cement, cigarettes, animal feeding-stuffs; and in addition, the agricultural exports of barley, potatoes, locust beans, grapes, citrus fruit and dried fruits. I would mention the Cypriot workman is very versatile; there are few strikers, and there is a Department of Labour in the charge of a most experienced officer who has conciliation machinery at his disposal.

I would mention one other industry, and that is, the tourist industry. That has been bounding ahead now for years, and I am afraid that in the near future the tourist industry will have outstripped the hotel industry. The noble Lord, Lord Mancroft, said the other day that there was an opening for a noble Lord to invent a teacup which would not break. Here, too, there is an opening for someone to erect a large hotel in Cyprus, because at the rate the tourist trade is growing such an enterprise could not fail to be remunerative. So much for what I want to say about the administrative side of the work—I hope that I have not gone into too much detail. I feel that I can fairly say that it is work in which all of us here at home can take great pride, as one of Britain's great achievements in Colonial administration.

I now come to a more difficult and regrettable side of the picture—namely, the political situation in Cyprus. That is dominated entirely by the Enosis movement for Union with Greece. It is a movement which provides a common platform for the Church and the Communists, which I think must probably be exceptional over the whole of the world. I must confess that I was interested to see this linking up at a period when the Civil War was raging in Greece, and there were

[Lord, Winstler.] times when one felt that the war might have gone either way: it might have come down on the side of the Communists or the Royalists, and I always wondered how these rather strange bed-fellows would react to a victory for either side.

There is one point I should like to make clear about that matter, and I am sure your Lordships will be generally aware of it. The more fanatical supporters of Enosis are apt to press for the restoration of the island to the maternal bosom of Hellas. That requires a little analysis. Even if Cyprus ever did go to Greece, it would not be a return to Greece. Greece has never owned or administered Cyprus. I want to be strictly fair about this. I think the Greeks have some shabby claim, based on the division of the Roman Empire into east and west. I believe that at that time the Greeks did feel that some right to Cyprus accrued to them. In fact the matter is mentioned in *Gibbon*, and *de facto*, I think I am quite fair in saying that Greece has never owned or administered the island. Nor have the Cypriots ever really had self-government. One book I have read said that in certain times the Cypriots once or twice had a short period of self-government, but again I do not think that was of such a nature as to enable us to say *de facto* that the Cypriots have ever governed their own island.

On the other hand, a great many other people have. The Egyptians, the Phoenicians, the Persians, the Hittites, the Assyrians, the Macedonians, the Romans, the Byzantines, the Franks, the Venetians, the Turks and, finally, the English, have all owned and administered the Island. Of all those who have governed the island, the English brought with them a completely new idea—the idea that the island was inhabited by Cypriots, a fact which seems to have escaped the notice of their predecessors, and that the interests of the inhabitants of the island should be considered in such matters as education, in relief from crushing taxation, and the idea of a Legislative Council with a Cypriot majority, freedom, security and respect for human dignity and human rights. These were all novel and strange ideas that the British brought with them to Cyprus.

To skip a good long period of time, the reward for trying to bring these new ideas were the events of 1931, when that Government House was burnt down. As a result of those disturbances, the Governor of the island has since had to govern with the aid of an Executive Council, composed, in my experience, of certain of his officials and of two Greek Cypriots and one Turkish Cypriot. We need not be mealy-mouthed about this matter. It is not a system of government that one likes at all. Nobody in these days would choose such a system of government for one moment. It is a system of government under which the Governor has no means of appealing to public opinion. There is no way in which he can reply to any propaganda, and there is no way in which he can advocate the policy of Her Majesty's Government. There is now a broadcasting system, but no one would wish to see the Governor of the island engaging in a running debate on the radio with his political opponents. I repeat that it is a system which is forced upon us and not one of our own choosing—on the contrary, it is one which we are most anxious to reform.

The late Labour Government made a determined effort to get the Cypriots to make a new start. They said, "Certainly the Archbishop shall return," and they conceded that there should be the election of an Archbishop and, of course, the accompanying hierarchy. They gave large sums of money in the form of a development grant spent over a period of ten years, and they invited the Cypriots to come together in a consultative assembly to assist in drafting a liberal Constitution for the island. I am not aware of the facts in this connection, but I feel there can have been few instances of one of our Colonies being asked itself to assist in drafting the Constitution under which it was to live. At any rate, we had in view a Constitution which would give full expression to public opinion, paving the way to that self government which is the declared Colonial policy of all political Parties in this country.

The reply to these offers was a complete boycott by the Church. I do not know whether or not history ever records much good for a country resulting from the activities of political predators, but at any rate that was what we encountered when we brought those offers—complete

boycott by the Church and any form of co-operation whatever rejected by the Archbishop. As one instance of how far that refusal went, I may tell your Lordships that in connection with alterations to the system in the prison I had an invitation addressed to the Archbishop to ask him whether he would nominate one of the board of prison visitors. I did this because the rather scurrilous Press of Cyprus was almost daily publishing accounts of prisoners being flogged to death to give the Governor an appetite for his breakfast, of men being done to death in dungeons and starved, and that sort of thing. It was all so completely untrue that I addressed this invitation to the Archbishop. I should have thought that that was a fair thing to offer. Even that was refused. That will give the measure of the opposition of the boycott.

The refusal to co-operate which we met with from the Archbishop. Through his efforts the consultative assembly was wrecked. We could not even make any progress with local government. Apart from destroying the consultative assembly and the hope of a Constitution, the Church and the Communists simply dug their heels in and said, "Enosis or nothing."

There was only one course left open to the British Government in that situation, and that was to say, "If you will not go on with the work of the consultative assembly and draft a Constitution, then things must go on as they are." They also said, "The offer is not withdrawn. At any time whatever, if any body of responsible Cypriots likes to come to us and say, 'We should like to go on where we left off,' we will have no recrimination and no ill-will, and we will start straight away." That offer was left open, but I emphasise that it was open if responsible Cypriots asked for it, for the display of irresponsibility which attended the last attempt towards a Constitution makes that qualification, in my opinion, an essential requirement in renewing that work. I wish, with all my heart, that we could get off this dead centre. Hardly a week goes by without my thinking about these things, exercising my brain upon them, and trying to find some way out of the impasse with which we are confronted.

However, there are some very difficult features in the situation, and it is no good

ignoring them. Never having governed themselves, and having at times been governed very harshly and unjustly, Cypriots have developed some of the characteristics of the governed. They have no grievance, of course, with the art of government, which is not easy to learn. Moreover, there is in them a strong streak of reluctance to express their political feelings and opinions in public—they are what we call "cagey" about that; they dread revealing their inmost thoughts about politics. The other characteristic, of course, is their fear of taking responsibility, especially political responsibility. I ask your Lordships not to judge them too harshly on this matter because, as I say, they are qualities which result from the long centuries of subjection which has been their lot. These things are inherent in their history, and I do not blame them. I only deeply regret their refusal to let us develop in them the qualities of which fate has deprived them.

For instance—these are days of nationalism—I very much wish that we could see the young Cypriot aspiring to self-government. He is a man of lively and quick intelligence. I should like to see him aspire to self-government in his island and to a place in that Government. It would be a great pleasure to guide and encourage him along such lines. But all he aspires to is merely to have yet one more ruler, to exclude one ruler for another. There is no thought of independence for his country, with its great history, which was once a jewel in medieval civilisation. There is no thought of restoring those things—merely, as I say, a desire to exchange one Government for another.

As I have said, there is a great fear among the Cypriots of coming out with their true political opinions. Responsible Cypriots know perfectly well that transfer to Greece would mean a recession in the island's industry and prosperity. In private, they make no secret of that fact—they have told me this frankly, to my face. I give as one instance an occasion when a business man asked for an interview with me, and made a long journey in order to see me. The object of his visit was to ask me to take a responsible hand in the matter of political justice in the island, and to deal firmly with the people who were resisting the good things we were offering. I was delighted and

[Lord Winter.] I told him so. I said, "I am glad that you are on our side, and I hope you will take opportunities, as they offer, to express these feelings which you have just expressed to me." He shrivelled up with horror at the idea—and a few days later he was on the same platform at an Enosis rally with the Archbishop and the Communists. That is the sort of thing which one has to contend. Undoubtedly, under Greek administration the island of Cyprus would go back. We have the evidence before our eyes in what is happening in the Dodecanese Islands—I speak in no spirit of depreciation of Greece and the Greeks, those courageous and intelligent people. But progress in Cyprus depends in a particular way on skilled and trained men, on technicians; and the Greek Government simply do not dispose of such men in the necessary numbers, or with the necessary skill and training to carry on the work of progress in so many directions in the island. That is the harsh and inescapable fact, and that is what I see on that side of the picture. The prosperity of Cyprus would be bound to suffer a setback if such a transfer took place.

Having said that, let me emphasise that in my experience the Greek Government have always behaved well in this matter of Enosis. I am happy to have this opportunity of saying so. To my knowledge, there was never any encouragement of propaganda or of agitation emanating from the Government of Greece. Some got the impression that perhaps the Government rather deplored the importunities of the Archbishop. I think that is quite likely, but I have no authoritative evidence for saying so. But ever since the days of Socrates the Greeks have shown that they do not like a gadfly upon their backs—indeed, that was one of the charges, perhaps, upon which Socrates was put to death. So, as I say, I think the Greek Government have behaved well. There was one rather glaring indiscretion, but that did not emanate from the Government in Greece. Their line is very fair. No one would expect them to throw cold water on the claim—they are bound to uphold the claim. But their line seems to be: "We welcome the desire of Cyprus to accede to Greece, and we hope that one day it may come about, but the present time is not opportune; we hope very much that as some

future day we shall be able to discuss the matter in friendliness with our very good friends, the British." That seems to have been roughly the line which they have taken. I hope that I do not misinterpret them in any way.

I know perfectly well that the Archbishop has carried out propaganda in the island and that, following the best Russian example—or the example of countries that are Russian-dominated—the result has been a 100 per cent. vote in favour of Enosis. I never expected anything else. To my mind, the plebiscite ran absolutely according to form. I should just like to say this about the plebiscite. I visited pretty well every village in the country. The villagers used to assemble under the big fig tree, and the headman would step forward and tell me the wants and needs of the village. They might want a road asphalted, or a piece of road re-made, or to rebuild a bridge; or they would ask me to do something about the ravages of the carab rat, and so on. But never once was the question of Enosis raised with me, nor did anybody with whom I was talking say one word on the question. I never heard the subject raised—and I believe me, your Lords, the Cypriot is not reluctant to raise whatever is uppermost in his mind, bearing on the results of the plebiscite.

As I say, we are on this dead centre. The matter seems intractable. It is regrettable. Sometimes when I think about it I remember what was said about the old Austro-Hungarian Empire, that its position was completely hopeless but not at all dangerous. As I say, we jog along in this way and the island makes progress and headway. I should like to briefly to ask your Lordships to look at the alternatives with which we are confronted in Cyprus. We can cede the island to Greece, or we can cede the island to Greece but retain leases of the bases and of the harbours. I should not like to see either of those things done. I would not agree to the second course when there is a Communist element at work, but even if we take those two alternatives of ceding the island to Greece, with or without the leases of the bases, what will be said by the Turks, by the Armenians and by the Maronites, responsible minorities in the island, who

have been very law-abiding? The Turks governed Cyprus for 300 years. Like Greece, they are a partner with us in N.A.T.O.—in fact, think in the policies which are developing in the Near and Middle East, we are regarding Turkey as a very strong bastion of the policies we are trying to initiate there. What are the Turks going to say? For those reasons alone, I feel that the idea of ceding the island, and our own international obligations, is completely out of the question. I mentioned the Turks just now. I feel sure that some of your Lordships will remember that passage in *Othello* which runs like this:

"When we consider the impotency of Cyprus to the Turk"—

then it goes on:

"We must not think the Turk is so unskilful"

To leave that latest which concerns him

We must really take other countries into consideration when this proposal is urged upon us.

Then there was the proposal by Mr. Amery, who suggested a dual Greek and British nationality for the Cypriots. I never found that that suggestion received much encouragement, and my own opinion is that it is probably not practicable; and in any case it is not a solution. We might impose a Constitution upon them. This is something about which we hear a good deal; that the Cypriots not being willing to assist in drafting a Constitution, we should draft a Constitution and impose it upon the island. I am not certain that if we were to do that we should not meet with the same boycott and the same obstruction from the Church that we met with over the offers about which I have told your Lordships. That is why I repeat that the Cypriots themselves must have a share in drafting whatever Constitution is drafted for their island, so that they have some responsibility in the matter and cannot oppose it with a blank boycott or obstruction.

Those are four alternatives. I do not know whether any of them commends itself to your Lordships. I think we come back to the fifth, and last, alternative; that we must go on as we are, with the offer, of which I have spoken, still standing, and that we would resume with good will. That seems to me the only practicable alternative before us. There

is some talk of the Archbishop appealing to the United Nations. With great respect, I should not let that possibility keep us awake at night. The Cypriots can bring forward no complaints of inhumanity, injustice or indifference to their welfare on our part. There is a clean record of progress, of which I have enumerated a few particulars this afternoon, and our offer of the Constitution stands. There is nothing that stands between Cyprus and a Constitution except Cypriots. On that account, as I say, I cannot see the Archbishop receiving much encouragement should he in fact decide to appeal to the United Nations.

In conclusion, may I say this? I know that, if they read my remarks this afternoon, Cypriots will not like much of what I have said. They do not think that you are a friend unless you say what they wish to hear you say. Of course, there are other people like that—it is not necessary to go all the way to Cyprus to find them. Englishmen with experience of Cyprus have very deep feelings of regard for the island and its inhabitants. In spite of all these political difficulties, I walked absolutely alone all over the island. I never met with a discourteous word. They are friendly, courteous, hospitable; and, if I may say so without vanity, I think that when I went into the villages they were as glad to see me as I was to see them. I quote some further words from *Othello*:

"I have found great love amongst them,"

and so echo Shakespeare's words:

"Heaven bless the Isle of Cyprus!"

My Lords, I beg to move for Papers.

4.47 p.m.

LORD OGMORE: My Lords, I am sure I speak for all my noble friends on this side of the House when I say that I should like to congratulate the noble Lord, Lord Winter, on a first-class exposition of this difficult subject. I am afraid that there was one omission in the noble Lord's speech—that is, that in recounting the great advances that have been made in the economic and social fields he did not tell us of the work that he himself did in those fields when he was Governor of Cyprus. The people of Cyprus certainly had in him a friend and one who worked unremittingly for their welfare. My noble friend Lord Listowel and myself were in the Colonial Office

[Lord Omore.]

during the time that the noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, was Governor, and we had every opportunity of appreciating the great work that he did for the people of Cyprus. Therefore, noble Lords on this side hope that the people of Cyprus will listen to the words of wisdom and the advice that he has given them to-day.

I agree with him, too, that this debate affords a good opportunity of welcoming the new Governor. I have met the Governor; I knew him when he was an official in West Africa, and I have no doubt at all that he is an excellent choice for the post. We wish him well in his difficult task. I would also agree with the noble Lord that it is a pity that there are not a few Back Benchers on the other side who might have joined us to-day. We should have liked to hear speeches from Back Benchers on the Government side. On several occasions lately we have had Colonial debates; there have been speeches from other parts of the House but not one speech from Government supporters. Frankly, I do not think that is good enough. There are greater numbers on the Conservative Benches than there are on ours, and I cannot understand why Back Benchers oppose do not speak in these debates.

We must remember that this House, as another place, is one of the Houses of Parliament of all these Colonies. The people in the Colonies look to us to regard their interests and to discuss their problems. It is no good having five or six people speaking from the Opposition side and no one at all, except the Minister, from the other side. We feel strongly about this matter, and I am glad that the noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, raised it to-day. Of course, noble Lords opposite may say that they know nothing about the question, and plead modesty; but, as we all know, ignorance has never been an excuse for not making a Parliamentary speech, otherwise, on occasion, there would have been precious few speeches made in either House. A House of Parliament is not necessarily a place where experts talk; it is a place where often the ordinary man without very great knowledge may make a useful contribution to the subject under discussion. Having said what I intended to say in that respect, I move on.

My Lords, there is a difference between Cyprus and the other Colonies upon which the noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, has touched—namely, that nowadays nearly every other Colony in the British Empire (to use an old term) is pressing for self government in some shape or form. Cyprus is one Colony which will not have it; there is, in fact, considerable pressure from a portion of the electorate or population to merge with another sovereign State. That is a curious feature in the constitutional structure of the Colonial Empire at the present moment. For several years at the United Nations Assembly two deputations have trudged in a melancholy manner around the corridors, one from Cyprus and the other from the Blackfoot Indians who inhabit a portion of the United States. It may be because of the presence of the Blackfoot Indians, but it is a fact that nobody has taken any notice of those two deputations. Everyone looks embarrassed when they come along, and tries to side past them in the corridors. For years past they have sent a deputation to the United Nations, but of course it is not within the Charter that they should be heard.

I should like to point out at this stage the inadequacy of the Colonial Annual Report, a subject which I have mentioned before. There is no mention at all in the Report, which otherwise deals with certain features of Cypriot life, of Enosis, which I should have thought was the burning issue in Cyprus. On turning to the Report there is nothing on this subject, except for one reference—and a very curious reference—alluded to in part by the noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, that the question of Enosis has caused a purge in the Communist Party in Cyprus. We have heard of purges in the Communist Party in various places. This must be the most peculiar purge of all—the purge of those who do not want Enosis with Greece and not of those who want Enosis with Greece. I am glad to read in the Annual Report of the economic and social progress of Cyprus and to find that the value of the external trading in Cyprus in 1952—£38 million—was the highest recorded. I think we ought to congratulate all those who have worked so hard on the economic side—officials, traders and others, for that excellent achievement.

The noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, has said that in 1948 we offered Cyprus a new Constitution. So far as I am aware, that offer still stands. There is a deadlock. The noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, has summed up brilliantly the various courses which are open to us at this juncture, and he has given some reasons for and against each course which he has suggested. There being a deadlock, how can we remove or break it? This is the problem which we have to face this afternoon. We are highly unlikely, I suggest, to obtain any answer to our problem this afternoon, but at all events it is a problem which we, as members of the British Parliament, and the Government, as the responsible Government for Cyprus, have to solve. I must say that so far as I am concerned, having listened with great attention to the noble Lord, I agree with him that at the present moment we can take no other course than the fifth course he suggested—namely, to continue as we are. That is a sad conclusion, as I am sure the noble Lord will agree. It is one which statesmanship on the part of us all, official and unofficial, should aim at altering. We do not like deadlocks; they are no good to anybody, and I am sure we all want this particular problem solved.

Of course, the defence issue arises here. I do not feel that this is the time to embroil yet another part of the Middle East in the difficulties of a new Constitution or of new government by another sovereign state. So far as the Middle East is concerned, there never was a more difficult time in so called peace time than that in which we now find ourselves. Therefore any suggestion which is made has to be made with delicacy, bearing in mind the great problems of that particular theatre. In a way, this is only one particular facet of the larger problem as far as the Colonial territories are concerned. Suppose for the moment that Enosis is out of the question, what is going to happen to countries like Cyprus? I am looking at it, as I think we can only look at it, as purely a Colonial territory, and one likely to remain so. What is going to happen? I have asked this question on many occasions and have got no answer whatsoever, either from the noble Earl, who will brush me off to-day as he has brushed me off so many times before, from his right honourable

friend, from the officials of the Colonial Circumlocution Office, or from anyone else. They have never answered this question which, time after time, comes up for answer.

We saw this particular problem arise in regard to Malta, when the other day there was suggested the extraordinary idea that the Home Office should run Malta. That is an official offer by the British Government. I see that the noble Lord who has just joined us looks surprised, but it is in fact an official offer of the British Government, that the Home Office shall run Malta—without, I may say, any alteration in the Constitution of Malta or any such thing. I should like to hear the views of the noble Viscount, Lord Waverley, on that point. Perhaps he will tell us later on what he, with his great experience of the Home Office, thinks about it. At all events, the Government are not grappling with this problem at all.

In my view, there are at least 30—it may be 25, but not far short of 30—Colonial territories which can never in the ordinary way be entirely independent of this country. There are islands like St. Helena and places like the Gambian. Can anybody suggest that the Seychelles or the Leeward Islands, or any of those other territories, will ever stand on their own feet as independent countries? Yet, so far as I know, no thought, or, at least I am sure, no results of any thought, are apparent either from Her Majesty's Government or from the Colonial Office on this most important question which, time after time, is going to arise in the next few years. I have put forward a suggestion with which they do not agree. They may be right, but it is at least a challenge to them to put up some alternative and agreeable suggestion.

My Lords, may I say finally that in considering this issue we must not blind ourselves to the economic aspect. About a month ago I took my family to dinner at a restaurant in London where there was a waiter whose inefficiency was noticeable. We got into conversation with this man, who admitted that which was apparent—that he was not really a waiter at all. He told us that he was a farmer who grew water melons or pumpkins on the island of Cyprus, and he had come over here to be a waiter because

[Lord Omore.]

he could not earn a living as a small-holder or farmer selling water melons or pumpkins on the island of Cyprus. He showed us photographs of his family, and said how anxious he was to go back to Cyprus. He made no reference whatsoever to Enosis. He did not object to British rule; he objected only to the British weather, which he thought was shocking. I guarantee—and this bears out what Lord Winstanley says—that if your Lordships went around among the rural population of Cyprus you would find a very large number of people who would agree with that pumpkin farmer. In other words, the economic aspect of this matter would loom much larger in their minds than the constitutional aspect. There is nothing more I wish to say, except just this: whatever suggestions we make must be based on sound considerations, and should be made with the utmost care. In these days, in this area, foolish proposals might have the most disastrous consequences.

5.2 p.m.

THE EARL OF LISTOWEL: My Lords, I should like to intervene very briefly in this debate because, as my noble friend Lord Omore has said, I was, like him, one of the Ministers at the Colonial Office responsible for relations with Cyprus at the time when His late Majesty's Government made an effort to restore Parliamentary rule to that territory. I think your Lordships will agree that the future of Cyprus is a very grave problem, and one which deserves serious consideration, in Parliament and by Her Majesty's Government. Lord Winstanley, whose speech we all very much enjoyed, spoke at some length, and quite rightly, of the great advances that have been made since the war in the social services in Cyprus—especially in the health services—and in the island's economic development. But however efficient and progressive our administration of the island may be—and I think it deserves both those epithets—it will not win the cardinal good will of Cypriots while they have no share in political power and responsibility.

The political deadlock, which I think every speaker this afternoon has deplored, is unfortunate not only because it deprives us of co-operation on the part of

the local population in the administration of the country, and blocks their political advances towards a measure of self-government; it is no less unfortunate—and this, as I think, extremely weighty argument has not been put forward this afternoon—because it would lessen the strategic value of Cyprus in time of war. As I am sure your Lordships will agree, the use of air bases and military installations and harbours in the island by our own Services, or by the Services of one of our Allies, in war time would be much hampered if the local population were unfriendly and unco-operative. It is, therefore, from the strategic point of view, as well as from the economic and political points of view, that this deadlock is so unfortunate.

Of course, I do not blame the present Government, or any Government that preceded it, for the existence of the deadlock. The offer of 1948, I believe, still stands. In spite of changes of Government in this country, it has not been withdrawn, and it is not our fault that the offer has not been accepted. With its guarantee of an elected majority in the Legislative Council, its safeguards for the Turkish minority in Cyprus, and its measure of executive responsibility for the elected members, it is a Constitution which would surely give Cyprus a genuine parliamentary system and a very sound start for parliamentary rule. And it is extremely sad that there is no sign of any change of mind in Cyprus in regard to this offer of a Constitution. The regrettable fact remains, that this offer has now been open for six years, and is still rejected. I fear that we must now ask ourselves whether there is any real hope that it will be accepted, either at the present time or at some future date. If the answer to this question is in the negative, we must choose between some of the alternatives mentioned by Lord Winstanley in his speech.

We must prepare—and I think, without arguing the different alternatives, that these would be the only practicable alternatives—either for an indefinite period of direct rule, with the continuing dissatisfaction of the local population, or make some fresh attempt to break the deadlock. Such an attempt, even if it proved unsuccessful, would at least convince our critics of the honesty of our intentions. The only alternative, so far

as I can see, to this stalemate would be to impose the 1948 Constitution on Cyprus. Lord Winstanley put forward that alternative and, at the same time, a weighty objection to it, to which I will refer a little later. As I think the noble Lord rightly said, constitutional changes in the Commonwealth have, as a general rule, been imposed; they have not been made with the agreement of the people concerned. We do not make constitutional changes in our dependencies subject to the prior approval of the people in the territories in which those changes occur. The most striking example of an imposed Constitution was that for India in 1935. Of course, it has to be granted that an imposed Constitution is not likely to work so well as a Constitution that is introduced by mutual consent—and which obviously has behind it the force of public opinion. This, indeed, was shown in the case of the Indian Constitution of 1935. This Constitution would have worked better if it had been supported by Congress and by the Princely States, but I think it will be agreed that, if we had not imposed the 1935 Act on India, the progress of India towards orderly self-government, and cordial relations between India (in the sense of the Indian sub-continent) and ourselves, would have been very different from what, in fact, they have been.

I noted with special interest (no reference has so far been made to this in the course of the debate) a recent article in the *Sunday Times* about Cyprus. In that article, the writer, the Cyprus correspondent of that journal, expressed the view that opinion, both in the majority and in the minority communities in Cyprus, was veering towards an imposed Constitution. I venture to wonder—having regard to the objection put forward by Lord Winstanley to the imposition of a Constitution—whether it may not be because public opinion in Cyprus has changed since the noble Lord was Governor. I do not know whether that is so; I merely put that forward as a possibility. What I would hope is that when a new Governor goes out to Cyprus, one of the instructions that will be given him by Her Majesty's Government will be to report as soon as he has had time to make proper inquiries into the state of public opinion in the island. And I hope that, whatever the Government may decide to do in the

future in regard to the political situation in Cyprus, they will not regard this deadlock as something inevitable, something that must be accepted, something that defies all our resources of statesmanship. There is this alternative which is apparently now canvassed in Cyprus, and which surely deserves most careful examination and exploration. I hope that the Government will make every possible effort to break the deadlock, and will take advantage of the presence of the new Governor to review the whole political situation.

5.10 p.m.

LORD KILLEARN: My Lords, I had intended to intervene in to-day's debate, and should not have done so but for what the noble Lord, Lord Omore, said, about a bit of variety in the bowling. My only justification for addressing your Lordships is that I have just returned from Athens. There is one angle to this question which has not been touched upon in this debate, and although it is not the ruling angle, nevertheless it is an angle—that is the Greek angle to the question. I came back from Greece just one week ago. I was there for a fortnight, and met all and sundry, and I should like to confirm that people in Greece are very much wrought up on the question of Cyprus. Whether they are right or wrong is another matter, into which I would not venture to go; but there is no doubt that in Greece, where there are the most cordial feelings of sympathy for this country, feelings which are deeply rooted over a long series of years of war and rehabilitation, this Cyprus question risks running across that sentiment and, to some extent, marring it. I am sure we shall all agree that that is a thousand pities.

When I was tackled on this subject in Greece, as I was tackled, I did my best to point out to my friends that there could hardly be a worse time to raise this subject. I told them that it would certainly not fall on receptive ears in this country, for reasons we all know. I am afraid that I did not convince them. I repeat, then, that my only reason for getting up to speak to your Lordships this evening is this feeling in Greece. How the problem is to be solved I will not endeavour to suggest, but undoubtedly it has its repercussions in Greece; and Greece has its importance in our general policy. I should have

[Lord Killaren.] thought that the suggestions put forward by my noble friend Lord Winstanley in regard to pressing on with the Constitution, were sound and right and proper. Go ahead with the Constitution if we can: therein lies the best hope of a true solution. I repeat that I had not intended to speak to-night, but as there was a certain comment about lack of speakers from anywhere else but one Bench, I have done my best to leap into the breach.

5.13 p.m.

EARL AMHERST: My Lords, I had not proposed to address your Lordships, but there is one aspect of this rather troublesome situation which has not yet been touched upon. I should draw attention to the fact that by virtue of my personal connection with one of the air corporations my relations with Cyprus are rather special, and perhaps there are some things which cannot discuss. I would entirely support everything the noble Lord, Lord Winstanley said in his speech, and I think he would be supported generally from these Benches. He touched particularly on the question of education, and said, as did other speakers, that the people in Cyprus are reluctant to express their opinions. They are reluctant to assume responsibility for what might happen in due course. I think that can be explained in many cases by the fact that they cannot speak good English. I should like to give one instance of a young Cypriot who was training in engineering. He was very promising technically, but when he tried to take his examination his English was simply not good enough. Before the noble Earl replies for the Government, I should like to ask whether it might not be considered a good thing, and helpful to the development of the Cypriot mind towards a point where it will be ready to take more responsibility than it is at the present moment, if the question of the compulsory teaching of English in schools could be considered. I believe that it is not the case at the present moment.

5.15 p.m.

LORD HANKEY: My Lords, like my noble friend, Lord Killaren, I had not the slightest intention of intervening in this debate, and I will speak for a short time only, but I am moved to do so by

what my noble friend Lord Ogmore said. After his reflection on the Conservative Benches, I wish to show that the Cross Benches are ready to take part. I am not surprised about the Conservative Benches, because, in my opinion, the inhabitants of Cyprus are very conservative people. My first visit to the island was in 1907. I was then Intelligence Officer to the Mediterranean Fleet and my Admiral paid a visit to the Governor. We took rather a long tour. It was before the days of motorcars and we had to go in four-horse coaches. I had taken out an interpreter in modern Greek and I was very anxious to learn all I could about the military and, more particularly, the political state of the island. From the moment I landed I heard nothing from British officers of all kinds but the cry, "Who will rid me of this troublesome priest?" The then Archbishop was making exactly the same trouble as exists today, and my own inquiries amongst all and sundry seemed to show that among the mass of the people there was very small feeling for the Enosis which the Archbishop was advocating.

I agree with the noble Lords, Lord Winstanley and Lord Ogmore, that the situation is one that cannot be changed at the present time—and I may say that I have visited the island within the last year or two. I do not think it would be wise for the British Government to try and force a Constitution on the island, but I should like to ask the noble Earl who is going to reply for the Government whether anything has been attempted in the way of local government. In the science and art of government do we not sometimes build up from local government to complete government? I did not like to interrupt my noble friend Lord Winstanley to ask if that had been tried, but it would be interesting if we could learn whether that could be considered.

5.20 p.m.

THE EARL OF MUNSTER: My Lords, the noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, who initiated this debate this afternoon, has spoken with that care and restraint that we should normally expect from one who has occupied the important post of Governor of Cyprus. From his experience the noble Lord is well acquainted with every aspect of the constitutional position, and it is not surprising, therefore, that the greater part of the speech which he delivered to your Lordships

to-day dealt with that point. But in doing so, if I may say so, the noble Lord did not underestimate the difficulties which confronted him, confronted the previous Government and, I suppose, confront the present Government as well. Here let me say at once that I should like to associate myself with the tribute paid by the noble Lord, and also by the noble Lord, Lord Ogmore, to Sir Andrew Wright, who was a most successful and popular Governor. At the same time, I should like to convey my good wishes to Mr. Armitage who took over the Governorship last week. Before I deal with the constitutional problem, I am as anxious as the noble Lord that I should endeavour to explain to the House some of the social and economic matters which have recently been introduced in this important strategic island.

The noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, gave some interesting particulars about the improvement of the economic life of the country since the earliest days of the benevolent British occupation. We may well be proud of our achievements: it is quite true to say that Cyprus is to-day more prosperous than ever before in its history. Its trade is flourishing at the present time, and the budgetary position is strong—although of course, as the result of the earthquake, there may be difficulties in the immediate future. The ten-year development plan which was begun under the noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, in 1946 has gone well ahead, and, aided by grants under the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, much has been done to improve irrigation, communications and all sides of the agricultural industry. In addition, new industries have been, and are being, established; improvements have been, and are being, made in certain of the port facilities; and a new central power station has commenced operating.

In all, a sum of £15½ million has been earmarked for these development projects, £2 million of which has been provided under the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, and a sum of £5 million is being raised in the United Kingdom for the central electrification scheme. Although, as the noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, and I believe other speakers, correctly pointed out, agriculture is the main industry of the island, employing some 55 per cent. of the working popula-

tion, new industries are becoming established on the island in a most encouraging way. I should like to give the House one or two examples of what has recently occurred. The Cyprus Cement Company is erecting a factory for the manufacture of cement and by-products. The Cyprus Asbestos Mines have installed plants which can produce 300,000 asbestos sheets annually. An additional number of small factories have been set up throughout the island for the manufacture of confectionery, and I have been informed that a concern from this country intends to operate a fruit and vegetable canning factory in the island. So much for the industrial picture, with which I have dealt only briefly, but I thought it necessary to remind the House of what has been done. Some of your Lordships may regard it as small, but let me remind you—and I am sure this will be borne out by the noble Lord, Lord Winstanley—that these things have an important bearing, and an equally important effect on the inhabitants of that small island.

I turn now for a few moments to the social side. A sum of £829,200 has been, or will be, spent on medical and health services. I would bear out what the noble Lord, Lord Winstanley, said, that, due to the complete disappearance of the malarial mosquito, the death rate in Cyprus is today one of the lowest in the world. A sum of £629,000 has been or will be spent on education, and nearly £500,000 on village improvement. The Government of Cyprus may well be proud of the fact that last year there were 66,000 children in elementary schools, and some 16,000 in secondary schools. The local Government are now in the course of preparing, with the help of a senior officer who was sent out from the Ministry of National Insurance in this country, an outline of a scheme for social insurance. I feel that, having mentioned these facts, the House will be aware at once that Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Cyprus have done a great deal over recent years for the welfare, prosperity and good government of the island.

The noble Lord who moved the Motion made reference to the earthquake which struck the island on the morning of September 10 last year. The Royal Navy, and indeed the other Services, did

[The Earl of Munster.] magnificent work to relieve suffering; and did, in fact, provide all kinds of relief measures. But much damage was done. Some 110 villages, or about 18 per cent. of the total number of villages in the island, were affected, and 6 villages were almost completely destroyed. In 35 other villages, from 50 to 90 per cent. of the buildings were damaged beyond repair, and in a further 53 villages from 10 to 30 per cent. of the buildings were damaged. No time was lost in starting immediate repairs, however, and within a few months of the disaster about 13,000 buildings were surveyed. Nearly 1,200 prefabricated houses have been provided by the Government, and grants for repairing houses, under a carefully worked out and detailed scheme, have been made to over 10,000 owners. The administrative staff of the Government of Cyprus, and, indeed, the Colonial Secretary, mentioned by Lord Winster, and the Commissioner, Paphos, deserve to be congratulated on this remarkable achievement. I feel that I should remind your Lordships, in passing, that the people of this country subscribed most generously towards earthquake relief, and donations, in all, totalled some £67,000. It is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to make a very substantial contribution, but I am not in a position to-day to tell the House the sum of money involved. I can say, however, that Her Majesty's Government have decided to bear the whole cost of the material aid already given, which includes the loan of 6,000 tents and the provision of blankets and foodstuffs.

I now turn to deal with the constitutional question. I do not intend to go into the historical survey which the noble Lord, Lord Winster, undertook from the early days of history, however interesting that may be. I want to start my story from 1931, because up to that date, as many noble Lords will know, Cyprus was administered by a Governor, aided by an Executive and Legislative Council. That Legislative Council consisted of the Governor, nine officials and fifteen elected members, three of whom were chosen by the Mohammedan and twelve by the non-Mohammedan voters. Let me remind the House, very briefly, that owing to a complete deadlock in the Legislature over financial questions owing to the campaign

for union with Greece, culminating with the burning down and destruction of Government House, the British Government at that time decided that that part of the Constitution providing for the existence of a Legislative Council should be revoked. That was accordingly done. From that day up to the present time the island has been administered by the Governor with the advice of an Executive Council, consisting of himself, the Colonial Secretary, the Attorney-General, the Commissioner of Labour, the Financial Secretary and three non-official members, of whom (as I think Lord Winster mentioned) two were Greek and one a Turk. But although therefore there is no wholly or partly elected Legislature, there are throughout the island elected local government bodies. At the centre, the elected element has, in fact, ceased to exist. The noble Lord, Lord Hankey, was quite right when he said that there are in the island a number of elected, shall I say? local authorities.

In 1946, during the time when the noble Lord, Lord Winster, was Governor of the island, an effort was made to bring about a new Constitution. In the proposed Constitution provision was made for the setting up of a Consultative Assembly to consider the question of constitutional reform, including the establishment of a Central Legislature. That Assembly met in November, 1947, but the Eiharchy refused to attend, on the grounds that a local Constitution was no substitute for Enosis. Greek and Turkish-speaking representatives, and those members who were nominated by the Government, did, however, attend. It was in 1948 that a paper was published which contained the outline of a Constitution. It proposed that a new Legislative Council should have a substantial majority of elected members. A Chamber consisting of twenty-two members was suggested, eighteen to be elected on a general electoral register and four on a Turkish communal electoral register. There were to be a small number of senior officials (I think the figure of three to four was mentioned), so that the Legislature could be properly informed on executive subjects, and also on the policy which the Government were pursuing. There was never any intention that the field of debate for this Legislative Assembly should be restricted or curtailed, but under the new scheme the Legislature was not to be

empowered to discuss the status of Cyprus within the Commonwealth and Empire. Arrangements had also been made for three Greek members and one Turkish member to be appointed to the Executive Council and to be associated with certain specific departments of State.

That, briefly, was the Constitution suggested. It was not designed—as, indeed, Lord Winster, said—to be the last word within the general framework of the offer, for a number of details had been left open for further discussion by a Consultative Assembly. Unhappily, when that body met in November, 1947, the Right Wing elements, together with the Eiharchy, declined to attend. The Assembly which did meet was therefore only partly representative, and the proposals were accepted by the narrow majority of eleven votes to seven. His late Majesty's Government were led to the conclusion that, in view of the narrowness of the vote, and bearing in mind the fact of the composition of the Assembly, it would be quite wrong for them to proceed further with the implementation of this new Constitution. Shortly afterwards, in August, 1948, Lord Winster himself informed the Assembly, in the following words—which I will read:

"His Majesty's Government have concluded that, having given ample proof of their sincere desire to give Cyprus a Constitution enabling the island to advance along the road to political development, they must now leave the matter as it stands. The offer of a Constitution of the nature outlined in the Secretary of State's Despatch of May 7 is not withdrawn. If at any time responsible and fully representative political leaders in Cyprus come forward to ask that those or comparable constitutional proposals may be re-examined and implemented, or if there is any genuine manifestation of public opinion in their favour, His Majesty's Government will readily take the necessary steps to enable this to be done."

I could not, if I tried, find better words than those which the noble Lord, Lord Winster, used on that occasion.

The noble Lord made a further remark, at the time when the 1948 offer was made. He said:

"The Constitutional issue has been to some extent obscured by manifestations in favour of Enosis . . . once again . . . I must repeat that no change in the sovereignty of the island is intended."

That statement reflected the attitude of the United Kingdom Government at that

time. It was reaffirmed in similar terms in June, 1950, by Mr. Dugdale, who was, then the Minister of State for the Colonies. The attitude of Her Majesty's Government to-day in this matter remains unchanged. As regards the constitutional position, the matter, as we see it, stands now as it stood in August, 1948, when it was so ably summed up by the noble Lord, Lord Winster, in the words which I have quoted to the House. That offer has never been withdrawn, but it is up to the leaders of the people in Cyprus to show the will to take an active and constructive part in constitutional advance.

5.39 p.m.

LORD WINSTER: My Lords, may I reply, very briefly indeed, to one or two remarks which have been made this afternoon? I should like to thank my noble friend Lord Omore for his generous remarks to myself, and to tell the noble Lord and the noble Earl, Lord Listowel, that I remember, with gratitude, the friendliness, the assistance and the help which I always received from the Colonial Office during my period as Governor. I must also tell my noble friend Lord Omore that if his waiter could not earn a living on the land in Cyprus, there must have been something wrong with him. It is quite easy to earn a living there. He could not have been a very competent fellow. I should like to echo the noble Lord's remark that the conclusion to which we have to come is a sad one, although, indeed, we are forced to it. I noted, with great care, what the noble Earl, Lord Listowel, said about imposing a Constitution. The people in Cyprus, as I tried to point out in my speech, will say many things in private that they will not say in public; and I have not seen any public statements in the Press that they would accept an imposed Constitution. I do not think that there would be much hope in imposing a Constitution unless the Archbishop is amongst those who the noble Earl, Lord Listowel, has said may possibly alter their opinion. I know it is quite true that in most cases it has not been made a condition for the granting of a Constitution that it should meet with the prior approval of the people concerned; but that is quite a different matter from attempting to give a Constitution in the sure and certain knowledge that it has

[Lord Winster.]
been refused before it is offered and that it will be refused again.

I wish to thank the noble Lord, Lord Killearn, for his most interesting intervention, and to say that I am sure nobody concerned in this matter would for one moment underrate the feelings of the Greeks and of successive Greek Governments in this matter. One can only look to the future and say that, for reasons which we cannot foresee at the moment, one day a solution will offer itself which does justice to the emotions and requirements of both Governments. With regard to the Consultative Assembly breakdown, I should like to say to the noble Lord, Lord Hankey, that I had to consider the resulting situation, and an extension of local government was one of the things that I put forward. Very willingly would we have assisted to that end, but there again, there was no sort of answer; and although it is true as the noble Earl, Lord Munster, said, that there are certain elected bodies, the mayors. Those—with perhaps one or two exceptions—are not only Communist but completely incompetent. One of the last things I had to do was to withdraw the fire brigades from them and put them in charge of the police, because I had heard from one of them that even if the brigade had been ordered to a fire, it would have been of no use whatever when it got on the spot. So I thought it much better to put the fire brigade into other hands. But I can assure Lord Hankey that the desirability of the steps he mentions has never been out of sight.

I thank Lord Munster very warmly for his reply about malaria. It is not only a fact that the death rate is high, but generations upon generations of malaria thin the blood and lowers the powers of resistance. The people of Cyprus are said to be lazy. I did not think so; but one has to think about the effect on the population of century after century of malaria. I am sure that industry will get greater production in the future. I was delighted to hear of the progress which is being made in social insurance and welfare generally. This is very important, and it is a great pleasure to hear how it is going ahead. I have nothing to disagree with

in what the noble Earl said about the course of events immediately prior to and during 1931. I think that what he said is substantially in accordance with what I said, although I did not go into very great detail.

But what I am particularly grateful to the noble Earl for is his restatement of Government policy in regard to Cyprus. That was what I had hoped would result from this debate, and I thank the noble Earl warmly for having given it to us. I believe personally that it will assist the Governor as he takes up his task to know that there is no doubt whatever that the situation has in any way changed. I think it will also assist the officers of the Administration. They are men who every morning have to encounter virulent articles in the Press. The least offensive thing they are called in the Press is "Slave driving lackeys of Anglo-American imperialistic oil interests." They then have each day to go out and carry on with their work of trying to do the best they can for the Cypriots. But under that sort of repeated attack these officers like to know where they stand; and I hope they will be encouraged to go on with their work knowing that the conditions under which it has to be done have been fairly stated by the Government. Certainly the situation is a distressing one, but some situations have to be accepted; you cannot do anything about them. Here in a larger sphere we have to accept the fact that we shall be living for a long time under the conditions of cold war. We believe a solution will come, but so far as the immediate future is concerned we must live under those conditions and we must accommodate ourselves to them. Similarly, in Cyprus a solution will eventually come to these problems which we are discussing; but for the moment we have to go on with the situation as it is—though to our very great regret. With those few words, I beg leave to withdraw my Motion.

Motion for Papers, by leave, withdrawn.

House adjourned at a quarter before six o'clock.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : A thoroughly worth-while contribution, and the thanks of all of us are due to those who carried it out.

Mr. Osborne : If we can grow all that cotton in that short time, does the Secretary of State think that he might grow a little bit more tea fairly quickly?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : I feel that I must answer the hon. Gentleman's supplementary question. I am afraid that the qualities of land required for one crop are not, unfortunately, always suitable for the growing of another crop.

FIJI (CONSTITUTION)

39. **Mr. Reeves** asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies what proposals are under consideration by his Department for political advancement in Fiji.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : No further change in the constitutional arrangements for Fiji is at present contemplated. In December, 1954, however, the Letters Patent were amended to empower the Governor to appoint a Speaker of the Legislative Council. It is his intention to appoint Ratu Sir Lala Sukuna, who was until recently Secretary for Fijian Affairs.

Mr. Reeves : Does the Secretary of State realise that the Fijians themselves are very disappointed at the slow progress in this direction?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : I think that the hon. Gentleman has got that altogether wrong. There is no sign of a substantial kind in favour of any change. I share the view of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Llanelly (Mr. J. Griffiths) that, until there is such a sign, there is no reason to make constitutional innovations.

Mr. Reeves : If I supply the right hon. Gentleman with some evidence is he prepared to look at it?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : I am always ready to receive any communications.

CYPRUS

Constitution

44. **Mrs. Jeger** asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies what progress has been made towards the implementation

of the new constitution for Cyprus announced to the House on 28th July, 1954.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : The Governor is engaged on the many questions of substance and detail that have obviously got to be carefully worked out. I shall make a further statement as soon as practicable.

47. **Mrs. Jeger** asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will call a conference of representatives of the main interests in Cyprus to consider the constitutional future of the island.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : No, Sir, but the Governor of Cyprus has on several occasions made it clear that he is ready to meet such representatives to discuss constitutional development.

Mrs. Jeger : Can the right hon. Gentleman say what steps have been taken by the Government to make this willingness to meet representatives perfectly clear? Has this been a public invitation to the leaders of the Cypriot people?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : There have been constant statements by the Governor, both broadcast and spoken, and there have been statements by me in this House. I do not think that anyone who knows him would deny that the Governor of Cyprus is one of the most accessible people it is possible to find in that part of the territory.

Mr. Rankin : Is the Minister aware that a number of these territories do not seem to like the constitutional proposals of the Government, and is he further aware that Nyasaland is a possible source of trouble in that respect?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : The hon. Gentleman must not make the mistake of confusing the problems of one territory with another.

Mr. Rankin : I used that as an illustration.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : The constitutional proposals for Cyprus have not been disclosed, but they will be when people are prepared to come forward and discuss them.

Immigrants

40. **Mr. Patrick Maitland** asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies the number of Greeks and non-Greeks, respectively, who have received visas to visit, reside or work in Cyprus in each year since the war; the number of applications in each category which have been refused; and if he will make a statement on Her Majesty's Government's policy toward immigration into the island.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: As the reply to the first part of the Question calls for a table of figures I will, with permission, circulate it in the OFFICIAL REPORT. The policy is normally to issue visas freely to *bona fide* visitors, but to restrict the immigration of aliens intending to work, or engage in any trade or profession, which would result in unfair competition with Cypriots. In all such applications, the chief immigration officer is advised by an Immigration Control Board.

Mr. Maitland: Can my right hon. Friend say whether there is opposition in Cyprus to the free immigration of Greeks from the kingdom of Greece, and would he say whether it is part of the policy of Her Majesty's Government to work for absolute freedom of movement between the island of Cyprus and the kingdom of Greece?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: In reply to the first part of that supplementary question, I would say that there is a general desire in Cyprus to see that there is no unfair competition with Cypriots for jobs in their own country, but in practice the number of Greeks who have been let in is far more considerable, in proportion to those refused, than those of any other nationality. In answer to the second part of the question, that is one of the matters which I think time will help to solve. I hope that the sooner we get on with constitutional talks the quicker we can get to discussion of matters of that kind.

Following is the information:

IMMIGRATION OF GREEKS AND NON-GREEKS INTO CYPRUS ANNUALLY SINCE THE WAR

Since *bona fide* visitors are normally issued with visas without reference to the Cyprus Government, it is not possible to give the number of Greeks and non-Greeks who have received visas for visit purposes to Cyprus during the period stated. The following table shows the number of persons, not being British subjects, who have applied for immigration

permits to work or reside permanently in Cyprus.

Year	Greeks		Other aliens	
	Ap-proved	Refused	Ap-proved	Refused
1946 ...	23	*	28	*
1947 ...	45	*	31	*
1948 ...	64	*	43	*
1949 ...	34	19	12	4
1950 ...	23	26	4	24
1951 ...	19	13	9	18
1952 ...	61	33	15	54
1953 ...	27	26	6	29
1954 ...	22	16	6	19
	318	133	154	148

* No record available.

KENYA

Arrested Persons

41. **Mr. Hector Hughes** asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies how many people in Kenya have been arrested to date as a result of the Mau Mau trouble; how many have been released after screening and where they now are; how many are still in custody and where they now are; and how many have been executed.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: As the reply contains many figures, I will, with permission, circulate it in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Mr. Hughes: Can the Secretary of State say what steps are being taken to protect those who are released and those who declare themselves in favour of law and order? What steps are being taken to enable people to return in safety to their homes?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: That is one of the considerations we must always bear in mind, but with the progressive improvement in the situation that safety is being improved, too.

Mr. F. Harris: Can the right hon. Gentleman speed up the work of some of the screening camps, because in some it is deplorably slow?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: The Government of Kenya are conscious of that difficulty and they recently set up a committee under Sir Vincent Glenday which has reported and says that the new arrangement, in its view, should meet all genuine fears.

of the House or the Foreign Secretary tell the House whether it is the Government's intention to have a debate on the ratification of the South-East Asia Treaty before the time limit for a debate has run out?

Mr. Harold Davies : In view of the fact that the South-East Asia Treaty affects the people of this country, because many of our young men might have to be sent to South-East Asia if ever the Treaty were brought into force, perhaps I may put this point to the right hon. Gentleman: it is understood that, under the Ponsonby rules, if a certain number of days pass without the House of Commons having discussed a treaty made overseas, then it is assumed that that treaty is ratified. I beg of the Leader of the House not to be facetious about this, but to tell the House, in a straightforward way, whether we are to have an opportunity to discuss this treaty before the assumption of ratification.

Mr. Crookshank : As hon. Members have pointed out, the procedure is well known to the House. Ratification is an executive act, but if there is a demand for a debate in the House or complaint against any treaty before it is ratified, then no doubt, just as debates took place in the past, no doubt they will take place in the future. But there has been no request at all by the Opposition for such a debate.

DOCK STRIKES

3.45 p.m.

The Minister of Labour and National Service (Sir Walter Monckton): Talks took place in the Ministry of Labour this morning with representatives of the National Amalgamated Stevedores and Dockers and of the Port Employers in London. Some progress was made, and certain proposals were formulated. The General Secretary of the National Amalgamated Stevedores and Dockers has taken these proposals to his Executive, which meets this afternoon. I am not able to make any further statement at the present moment, but I will inform the House as soon as there is more to report.

Mr. Robens : I am sure that the whole House will be delighted to know that these talks are so successful so far. We

hope that they will lead to a resumption of normal working at an early date. If Mr. Speaker gave permission, would the right hon. and learned Gentleman be prepared to answer a Question on this matter tomorrow?

Sir W. Monckton : I should be happy to do so.

CYPRUS

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Alan Lennox-Boyd): With permission, I wish to make a statement on some aspects of affairs in Cyprus.

Since the statement in this House on 28th July, there has been a good deal of discussion about the affairs of the Colony both in this country and abroad. I should like to take this opportunity of making the position of Her Majesty's Government clear.

I will deal first with the Questions asked last week about the sedition laws in Cyprus as they relate to the Press. No new law relating to sedition or the Press was promulgated or announced in Cyprus at the beginning of August. All that the Attorney-General of Cyprus did was to issue a statement drawing attention to the existing laws, and to the penalties on conviction by the courts for violations of them. These included the sections of the criminal law relating to publications with seditious intentions which have not been amended since 1949, and have in broad outline been in effect for much longer than that; also the Press law, which was last amended in 1947.

Copies of these parts of the law of Cyprus and of the text of the Attorney-General's statements have been placed in the library. The Attorney-General of Cyprus, on whom alone rests the responsibility for deciding whether proceedings should be instituted, has made it plain that no prosecutions would take place for the reproduction of articles printed or speeches made in this country, unless the publication was being made a pretext to incite to sedition or violence in Cyprus.

As there has been some misunderstanding of the Attorney-General's statements of the law, I must recall that, in seeing the local Press, he emphasised that constructive criticism was welcomed, and he made it clear that he would approach each case in a broad-minded fashion.

[MR. LENNOX-BOYD.]

There have, in fact, been no prosecutions since his statement. With regard to the question why one issue of a British newspaper was withheld from sale in Cyprus, I understand that this decision was the responsibility of the local distributor.

I have carefully examined the law of Cyprus relating to seditious offences. There is a provision, over 20 years old, which makes seditious an intention to bring about a change in the sovereignty of the Colony. This was added to the pre-existing law shortly after the serious troubles which occurred in 1931. Apart from this, the law in Cyprus is similar to that in most other Colonial Territories, and I see no reason to take steps to have it repealed or amended.

I have, however, invited the Governor to consider repeal of a provision in the Press law of 1947, which empowers the courts to order the suspension of newspapers convicted by the courts of seditious libel. This would mean that a person found guilty in Cyprus of a seditious offence connected with the Press would only be liable to fine or imprisonment as is a person found guilty of sedition in this country. The effect of this would be to leave the Press in Cyprus liable only to penalties under the criminal law for seditious offences.

I turn now to some other questions. Hon. Members will know that the United Nations have acceded to a request by the Greek Government to inscribe the question of Cyprus on their agenda. I am not proposing to go into Her Majesty's Government's attitude towards this request, as this was described in a White Paper issued on Tuesday; but I must, however, repeat that British sovereignty over Cyprus was recognised by the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923, to which the Greek Government was a party.

I must emphasise that Her Majesty's Government have to pay regard to the well-being and long-term interests of the whole population, and to the rights of minorities, as well as to strategic needs and the requirements of peace and stability in the Eastern Mediterranean. The agitation by certain Church leaders and by the Communists for Enosis must not be allowed to obscure the real achievements of British rule in Cyprus, especially since the war.

Mr. Bevan : On a point of order. Is this not a further serious abuse of the rules? Instead of merely making an announcement of policy, the right hon. Gentleman is arguing his case. There is no Motion before the House on which it can be discussed. Is this not going too far in Ministerial statements, and ought not the right hon. Gentleman to confine himself to bare statements of policy and not to include arguments about policy?

Mr. Speaker : I saw nothing but a statement of policy in the point in the statement at which the right hon. Member for Ebbw Vale (Mr. Bevan) interrupted. I think the Minister was about to say what the policy of the Government was in relation to this matter.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : Perhaps I had better go back to the sentence on which I was interrupted, because it deals with our achievements.

"The agitation by certain Church leaders and by the Communists for Enosis must not be allowed to obscure the real achievements of British rule in Cyprus, especially since the war."

Mr. Bevan : On a point of order. In that sentence the right hon. Gentleman has not stated his policy, Sir. He is propounding an argument and, with all respects, I suggest that that is an abuse of the rules governing a statement made by a Minister.

Mr. Speaker : I do not so regard it. I took it from what the Minister said that it was part of the policy of Her Majesty's Government not to allow the real achievements of British rule in Cyprus to be obscured. It would be straining language too tightly for our purposes in Parliament to say that that was not a statement of policy.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd : I am sorry that the right hon. Member for Ebbw Vale (Mr. Bevan) should find so distasteful a sentence redounding to the honour of this country.

Mr. Driberg : Further to that point of order. We have been told by the Leader of the House that there are no plans for an early debate on Cyprus. This matter is shortly to come before U.N.O. and it is surely evident that, by couching his purported policy statement in this very argumentative language, the right hon.

Gentleman is trying to influence and pre-judge the U.N.O. debate by having a purely one-sided argument in the House.

Mr. Speaker: It is very difficult to separate by any hard and fast line a statement of policy from some mention of the facts and opinions—

Mr. Driberg: And opinions.

Mr. Speaker:—and opinions on which that policy is based. As for the debate, I heard that we were to have a debate on Tuesday on the Middle East, on a Motion for the Adjournment. Any matter of administration which does not involve legislation is in order on that.

Mr. Driberg: Further to that point of order. While we are most grateful for your advice, Mr. Speaker, about Tuesday, is it not the case that it is always for the convenience of the House that a debate, even on the Adjournment, when it has been prearranged, should be confined to the subject announced and agreed, and although the question of Cyprus is, of course, relevant to the general question of the Middle East, that would it not be much more for the convenience of the House if we could have a special, separate debate on Cyprus, on a Motion?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is asking me to give an opinion on what I really cannot decide. It is not for me to decide what days are given to debates. As he has rightly said, I think, I do not see myself, speaking at short notice, how the Middle East problem can be discussed without mention of Cyprus. I hope that the House will listen to this statement.

Mr. S. Silverman: On a point of order. May I put a slightly different point arising out of this matter? Is it not an abuse of the custom by which Ministers are able to make statements to the House, when there is no Motion before the House, in order to explain their policy, to make a statement on policy when there is no new policy to be announced, no new development of policy, no new turn of policy, and all that the Minister is really doing is defending the Government's policy of which the House is already fully aware?

Mr. Speaker: Ministers must be the judge of what is in the public interest and what is not. They must be the judge of whether they think a statement should

be made or not; I cannot possibly judge it. It is for the House to comment on it when the proper time comes.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: Conditions in Cyprus compare very favourably with those anywhere else in that part of the world. Constitutional progress has so far lagged behind economic, and the policy of Her Majesty's Government is to encourage political responsibility within the framework of the new constitution which we have proposed as the first step towards internal self-government.

Agitation for a change of sovereignty can only hamper these efforts. We are determined to persevere with this new constitution, and all responsible Cypriots should now co-operate in making a success of this important move towards self-government. The Governor is still engaged in working out the detailed proposals, and I shall lay them before the House at the first opportunity.

I repeat: these arrangements contemplate no change in the sovereignty of Cyprus. The question has been asked what is to be the ultimate goal of constitutional progress in Cyprus. Before an answer can be given the Cypriot people must first join with us in taking the first steps towards managing their own affairs.

Mr. Hale: The House has now had an opportunity to judge whether there is anything in this statement. There has been a clear statement by the Minister, first, that the only thing that is happening now is that the Government are continuing to think, and, secondly, that the people of Cyprus must not think, or certainly not think aloud. No information has been given about any alteration of principle at all; and I beg respectfully to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, as the result of the ruling that you gave a few minutes ago, that one cannot say anything because until the Minister says it he does not know what he is going to say, and, when he says it, it is too late to object.

Mr. Speaker: I think that the hon. Member is putting his own gloss on what has been said. If he looks at it in another way, I think he will agree that the fair thing is to allow the statement to come to a conclusion.

Mr. Benn: Ministerial statements take up a considerable time of the House, and I think that Members should know what is the proper procedure. Unless I am mistaken, every Minister should have the courtesy to begin by saying, "With the permission of the House, I should like to make a statement." I should be grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, if you would tell back benchers in what circumstance they can signify or not, whether, in fact, we wish a Minister to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker: I think that that phrase of courtesy has been used on this occasion also in regard to this statement. [HON. MEMBERS: "No."] My copy of the statement reads, "With permission, I wish to make a statement . . ." The hon. Member for Bristol, South-East (Mr. Benn) said that these Ministerial statements sometimes take a little time. I am very conscious of that, and I am anxious to get them over as soon as possible so that the House shall get on with its business. I would ask the House to co-operate with me to that end.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: I repeat that these arrangements contemplate no change in the sovereignty of Cyprus. In the present troubled state of the world we cannot foresee a time when a relinquishment of our sovereignty over Cyprus would be compatible with our responsibilities for security in the Middle East. I have not attempted to prophesy where constitutional development may ultimately lead. I am not prepared to look into the distant future at a time when we still cannot see clearly the outcome of our fresh step towards constitutional advance.

Mr. J. Griffiths: Will the Secretary of State clarify something that seems rather obscure in the statement; he has made about constitutional development? When we had a statement from the Minister some time ago, there was some discussion about the evolution of any constitution which began in Cyprus towards eventual Dominion status. Do I understand the Secretary of State to say now that that earlier statement does not stand, and that the future development can be discussed with the people in Cyprus?

Further, as he may know—and I think he does know—there has been an important change in the views expressed by the Archbishop and other leaders in

Cyprus in recent weeks. Whereas, in the past, they have refused to discuss or to work a constitution at any stage on the ground that all that they would consider would be Enosis, they have now stated publicly that they are prepared to consider a constitution. It is true that they say that they want this constitution to be of Dominion status in a very short time, but it is an important change that they are now prepared to consider a constitution.

In view of that, will the Secretary of State now reconsider a suggestion I made when the earlier statement was made in the House? Instead of putting forward again the constitution which has already been announced, which is less liberal than that of the 1948 Constitution, in view of the changed situation and the change of policy on behalf of those who advocate Enosis, would it not be wise for the Government now to invite the responsible leaders in Cyprus, including the leaders of the minorities as well as of the majorities of the people, to sit down and discuss with the right hon. Gentleman, or, alternatively, to authorise the Governor to convene a conference of representatives of the people to discuss, a possible new constitution, rather than again repeat the offer of this constitution?

If the Government are anxious, as I hope they are, for a settlement of this matter, is it not wise now to take advantage of the change which has taken place and the readiness to discuss a constitution? Will the right hon. Gentleman therefore consider whether it is desirable quickly to call a conference of the leaders of the people in Cyprus to discuss a constitution?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: May I, first, welcome the right hon. Gentleman into these interchanges?

Mr. Manuel: Get on with it.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: In reply to the questions asked by the right hon. Member for Llanelli (Mr. J. Griffiths), I made it quite plain in my statement that what we are dealing with is the immediate future and the need for all Cypriots who want to see their country progress to co-operate in the making of a new constitution. If the right hon. Gentleman was able to hear my concluding paragraph, he would find there the answer to his first question.

Secondly, the right hon. Gentleman asked a question in regard to the change of policy by the Ethnarchy in Cyprus. Perhaps it would be only reasonable for him to understand, if he looks at the White Paper, that that change of view may well be due to the fact that the Greek claim has had no real support from those to whom it looked for support at the United Nations. I am not prepared to alter Her Majesty's Government's policy to fit in with the change to which the Ethnarchy has come for other considerations.

The answer to the third question is that the Governor has made it perfectly plain that he would welcome talks on the constitution with responsible leaders in Cyprus. I think it is better to leave it for the Governor to do it.

Mr. J. Griffiths: Does it really matter to what the change of policy is attributable? Is not the important point that there is a change and there is now a readiness to sit down and discuss a constitution? Since this is the first time in recent years that the Ethnarchy has indicated that it is prepared to sit down and consider a constitution, would it not be the wise course to accept this change of view and invite the leaders to discuss a constitution for the future?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: I think that the invitation to the Ethnarchy or to any other responsible body in Cyprus to discuss a new constitution with the Governor has been made perfectly plain. That invitation still stands.

Mr. Clement Davies: The most important part of the right hon. Gentleman's statement is that the Government do not contemplate any change whatever of sovereignty. How does the right hon. Gentleman reconcile that statement and attitude with the solemn pledge made in the Atlantic Charter by the Prime Minister on behalf of this country, in a time of peril, that people would be allowed to determine their own form of government?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: I have repeatedly made it plain that we are anxious that there should be steps towards self-government in Cyprus. We are anxious that people in Cyprus should co-operate but, to use my own words:

"In the present troubled state of the world we cannot foresee a time when a relinquishment of our sovereignty over Cyprus would be compatible with our responsibilities."

Mr. Patrick Maitland: Is my right hon. Friend aware that several facets of his statement, particularly with regard to the goal of constitutional development and the easing of the Press laws, will be studied with care and interest by Greek opinion? Sober elements will welcome them. Will my right hon. Friend bear in mind that among our strategic interests in the Middle East is the friendship of the Greek people, which has been proved in two wars with valour and glory?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: I entirely agree that friendship with Greece is of very great importance, and so, also, is friendship with Turkey. The Turks are an important part of the population of Cyprus.

Mr. Lee: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that some weeks ago the then Minister of State got into serious trouble for using the word "never" in connection with independence and was then repudiated by the Prime Minister? The right hon. Gentleman has now confirmed that the word "never" should come into consideration as far as he is concerned.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: I refuse to regard as accurate the repetition of what my right hon. and learned Friend was supposed to have said but, in fact never said.

Mr. Bevan: In view of the fact that the Secretary of State said that a change of sovereignty cannot be allowed in Cyprus, will he say what he means by our staying there for strategical reasons? As we have been informed that the hydrogen bomb was relevant to the Suez Canal Zone, is it not relevant to Cyprus?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: This is really outside the scope of my statement.

Mr. Bevan: May I press for an answer? The right hon. Gentleman said that we were staying in Cyprus for strategical reasons. What we want to know and what is being asked in various parts of the country is this. How does it come about that the Prime Minister states that the advent of the hydrogen bomb made the Canal Zone base untenable but, at the same time, apparently, the hydrogen bomb has no effectiveness

[Mr. BEVAN.]
in relation to Cyprus? How does the right hon. Gentleman explain this situation?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: The hydrogen bomb may have all sorts of effects here and elsewhere, but that is certainly no reason for relinquishing sovereignty over a British possession.

Mr. Alport: Is my right hon. Friend aware that the decision of Her Majesty's Government to bring the sedition laws of Cyprus more into accord with those which exist in this country will be considered as a sign of the confidence of Her Majesty's Government in the British position in Cyprus? In so far as that is the case, will my right hon. Friend now further consider how far it is possible to make any progress in bringing into effect the proposals for the constitutional changes which the Government have in respect of that island?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: We shall press on with the constitutional talks with the utmost vigour.

Mrs. Jeger: Why did the Minister, in his statement, refer to agitation for Enosis by Church leaders and Communists but not mention that the whole body of Conservative political opinion in Cyprus, which still represents the majority party in that country, is in the leadership of the Enosis propaganda? Would it not be a little more accurate and fair, and a little less tendentious, to give the whole body of support for Enosis and not pick on simply two wings of the movement?

When the Secretary of State is looking into the sedition laws, will he look at the position regarding meetings in Cyprus? At present, it is impossible for the citizens of Cyprus to meet together even to discuss this constitution, in case somebody present wanted to say that he did not want it, which would be seditious. Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that it is necessary to get a permit before a meeting can be held in Cyprus and that a condition on which a permit is issued, when one is issued—I possess one—is that the police must be present and may disperse a meeting by force if the subject which is stated is departed from or if there is infringement of the conditions? Would it not help the discussions to take place

if there could be honest public discussion without fear of police intervention?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: From my reading during the summer, neither the hon. Lady nor some of her hon. Friends had any difficulty in attending or holding public meetings in Cyprus. Clearly, the Governor has a responsibility for law and order. If, in his view, it is desirable that the police should be present to prevent a breach of law and order, I am not prepared to intervene. It must be the hope of us all that after the first talks and the steady development of the constitution, any penal sanctions of that kind can be continuously lifted. The best contribution of the people of Cyprus would be for them to discuss the constitution with the Governor and to raise that point in any of their talks with him.

The hon. Lady questioned me about what she suggested was the overwhelming body of opinion in Cyprus. I ask her to look back to the answers given by her right hon. Friends the Members for West Bromwich (Mr. Dugdale) and Wakefield (Mr. Creech Jones) in regard to the rather "phoney" nature of the plebiscite, to which so much attention is constantly drawn.

Mr. J. Griffiths: If, as I gather from the Minister's further replies, invitations to discuss the constitution have gone out from the Governor, are they invitations to discuss, not only these proposals, but any other proposal that may emerge? Is it the right hon. Gentleman's intention shortly to issue a White Paper? If so, we shall want to debate it in the House.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: I said nothing whatever about issuing a White Paper, but I am placing in the Library certain documents relating to the Press laws. I did not say that I would—and I do not intend to—issue a White Paper. As for the invitations, the Governor has not sent out any formal invitations, but he has made it known, both by talks and by broadcasting, and certainly by talks—and it has also been said in the House—that he will welcome discussions with the leaders of opinion in Cyprus about the constitution, but the talks, of course, must be about the constitution. There is no question of the talks being about the curtailment or abolition of Her Majesty's sovereignty.

[157]

Mr. H. Fraser: From the point of view of the facts, which certain hon. Gentlemen opposite have been trying to suppress by their interruptions all the afternoon, does my right hon. Friend not agree that this step to loosen the force of these laws is a step showing the strength and confidence of the Government in Cyprus? Further, will my right hon. Friend confirm that the last time any person was imprisoned for sedition in Cyprus was in the period of office of the last Socialist Government, in 1947?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: It is quite true that actual imprisonment took place for the last time under the Administration of the party opposite. I share with my hon. Friend the view that the move we are now making in regard to the Press laws is a move from strength.

Mr. Driberg: If the last reply of the right hon. Gentleman shows that he has some confidence in the responsible conduct of the people of Cyprus, does he not think that they are responsible enough to discuss the constitution, and, at the same time, if they wish to do so, to discuss a possible future change of sovereignty? Does not the right hon. Gentleman realise that it is futile to say that "the invitation stands" so long as it is coupled with this bar on all discussion on a change of sovereignty? Does he realise, further, that it is really almost as unfortunate to use the word "must" as to use the word "never"? The right hon. Gentleman said this afternoon that the Cypriot people "must" co-operate. Does he not want their voluntary co-operation?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: Of course I want voluntary co-operation. I posed the ideal at which we are aiming, and, in order to achieve it, there must be co-operation. [HON. MEMBERS: "Must?"] Of course.

If the Cypriots do not want to achieve it, there need not be co-operation, but, to achieve it, there must be co-operation on both sides—on the side of Her Majesty's Government and that of the people of Cyprus.

Mr. Mikardo: The right hon. Gentleman did not say that in his statement.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: As to what the talks should be about, I should have thought that, in a country where there has been no Legislative Council since 1931, there is plenty to discuss about the constitution without bringing in other subjects.

UNITED STATES PROSECUTION (POLICE INQUIRIES)

Mr. Hamilton: On a point of order. May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether the Home Secretary has asked your permission to make a statement to the House on the case of Professor Lattimore, on which a number of Questions have been put down for Oral answer, or whether he did not consider it of sufficient importance?

Mr. Speaker: There was no such request.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Proceedings in Committee on Civil Defence (Armed Forces) [Money], on the Overseas Resources Development Bill, on the Expiring Laws Continuance (No. 2) Bill and in Committee on Expiring Laws Continuance [Money] (No. 2) be exempted, at this day's Sitting, from the provisions of Standing Order No. 1 (Sittings of the House).—[Mr. Crookshank.]

CYPRUS AND GREECE

by

The Rt. Hon. L. S. Amery, C.M.

(Extract from an article printed in the Sunday Times, 6.4.1947)

It is nearly seventy years since Disraelian statecraft included Cyprus in the British orbit as an advanced base for the defence of Turkey against a Russian menace. We may still need her as a link in the chain of bases for airborne troops on which our future defence must rest. That will depend largely on what alternative sites we retain or abandon. Meanwhile we can at any rate claim to have done our duty to the island and to its people. What was once a derelict and poverty-stricken backwater of the Ottoman Empire is today one of the most prosperous communities in the whole Mediterranean world.

Its population of 450,000 is two and a half times what it was in 1879, and its standard of living infinitely higher. There is none of the ostentatious display of wealth that is seen in Egypt or even in the Lebanon, but also none of the glaring contrast with rural and urban poverty. Much good work, especially in recent years, devoted to forestry, irrigation, agricultural research and demonstration, and, not least, to agricultural co-operation and credit, all helped by war expenditure, have cleared the peasantry of their debts and set them well on their feet. Even more rapid progress is expected from the Ten-Year Development Plan which the Colonial Development and Welfare Act has made possible. The streets of Nicosia on a Sunday afternoon give an impression of well-dressed middle-class comfort and self-respect which one would have to travel far from here to match.

What is more, the people themselves have travelled far from their former state. More than two generations separate the vigorous, go-ahead Cypriot youth who are making their way, not only in their own island, but in Egypt, South Africa or England, from the down-trodden rayah of Turkish days. Nor has the once indolent Turkish minority been left untouched by the general awakening of a people, long intellectually fallow, but well able, in innate wit, to hold their own with any others. It was a young Turkish student from Cyprus who only the other day won all the highest legal honours of his year at Cambridge.

In the late war Cyprus raised some 15,000 volunteers, over 5,000 of whom served abroad and won their fair share of military distinctions as well as of knowledge of the world and of confidence in themselves. Such a community will naturally wish to conduct its own local affairs and to feel satisfied with its own place in the world.

Here we come up against a problem which, if left unsolved, must sooner or later end in increasing misunderstanding and eventual deadlock. For a generation and more past, all political activity in the island has centred, so far as any rate as the Greek majority is concerned, not on immediate local issues, but on the demand for union with Greece. The demand was bound to be raised more insistently than ever after the war. It has now once again been presented to the Colonial Secretary by a formal delegation and has been met with the customary reply that no change in the status of the island is in contemplation.

No other reply was possible. To hand over Cyprus to Greece in her present condition would, indeed, be a tragedy for the islanders. It would mean for them the loss of all the present and prospective benefits of the new British policy of generous development in order to share in the catastrophic financial situation of Greece. It would mean sacrificing the opportunities open to Cypriots all over the Empire as British subjects. Above all, it would mean the intrusion into the quiet life of the island of the fierce party conflicts which are tearing Greece to pieces and threatening to make her recovery almost impossible. No wonder such a prospect is viewed with inward misgiving, not only by the Turkish minority, but also by many who in public ardently profess their advocacy of "Enosis".

For all that, the agitation will persist and will continue to face the British Government with the alternatives of conceding an extension of self-government which will only be used to further the "unionist" campaign, or of keeping the island indefinitely under Crown Colony government. Is there no solution which can preserve for Cyprus the practical advantages of her position in the British Commonwealth and yet moot those elements of genuine sentiment, as well as of personal interest and ambition, which underlie the campaign?

To find an answer to that question it is necessary to ask what are the driving forces behind the movement. There is, of course, the Greek Church, still under the influence of the Ottoman tradition which identified nationality with religion. There are the able young men who feel that their professional and political ambitions would have much wider scope, not only in the island, but in the kindred kingdom. Did not Venizelos, the Cretan insurgent, become Prime Minister of Greece and a leading figure in European politics? There is a certain inferiority complex attached to being inhabitants of a colony and not part of a Mother Country. Above all, there is a genuine desire for some sort of outward expression of the Cypriot Greek's desire to be recognised as a member of the wider Hellenic community.

Can this desire, these natural ambitions, be met without severance from the practical advantages, as well as from the wider spiritual community, of the British Commonwealth? Many years ago, when I was Secretary of State for the Colonies, I studied the possibilities of a solution which the turn of the political wheel prevented me from following up, but which may still be worthy of serious consideration. It is a solution all the more appropriate, perhaps, because it is based both on the experience of ancient Greece and on that of our modern British Commonwealth. In ancient Greece certain city states expressed their sense of special relationship to each other by a treaty admitting the citizens of each to the political rights and social privileges of the other. In our British Commonwealth today, where the several Governments are entirely independent of each other, they yet all recognise the "common status" of British subject and, even where there are special local conditions for the exercise of full national citizenship, they are acquired on much easier terms by fellow subjects than by aliens.

Why should not such a situation be created by special treaty between the British and Greek Governments for the benefit of Cyprus? What I would suggest is that any Cypriot should, after a minimum period of residence in Greece, be entitled to enjoy all the rights and privileges of a Greek citizen without forfeiting his status as a British subject outside Greece. Conversely, any Greek citizen settling in Cyprus should, without loss of his citizenship, similarly become entitled to all the rights and privileges of a British subject in Cyprus - and possibly, after a longer period of domicile, to those of a British subject outside of Cyprus as well.

In that fashion it should be possible to meet both individual Cypriot ambitions and the wider sentiment, both in Cyprus and in Greece, for a recognition of an underlying community of culture and ideals. Instead of a source of conflict Cyprus would become a recognised link of union between Britain and that small nation for which she has always felt a special affection. As Cyprus attained to complete self-government she would, in fact, be simultaneously a member of two Commonwealths, enjoying two wider patriotisms which are never likely to be in conflict with each other. What I suggest may be a new and unfamiliar approach to the problem. But then we live in a new world.

RECENT BROADCASTS ON ATHENS RADIO'S CYPRUS SERVICE

1. January 31, 1955 - quoting the newspaper "Ellinikos Vorras"

"The Governor of Cyprus, Armitage, immediately ordered the arrest of Greeks on the island and simultaneously announced that the ship carried guns, grenades, mines and other explosives. But what did you expect the Greek vessel to bring to Cyprus honourable Mr. Armitage? Gifts from Santa Claus and the thanks of the Greeks to your Excellency? It would be guns and gunpowder it carried so that the Cypriots might fight for their freedom. Besides, these matters are pretty clear. It was shouted from here by the free Greeks. It was clearly stated by the Ethnarch, Makarios, and it was repeated with fierce determination by 450,000 Cypriots: Liberty or death! This column, for its part, proclaimed it on the day after the unjust and contemptible UN decision when it wrote that small vessels would leave the coast of Greece and even boats would cross the sea, in storms or sunshine, to the place where the dark night reigns and would land on Cyprus men and guns for guerrilla fighting. And so there it is; everything we said has begun to happen. The Ayos Georgios was of course captured the other day. But that does not mean anything and is not taken into account because other small vessels will get through like the Ayos Nikolaos and the Ayos Eleftherios. Greece has many saints as well as small vessels and brave men."

2. January 30, 1955

"Brother Cypriots, the tools of the rulers of Cyprus, Robert Armitage, and of British imperialism have begun to rave and rant again. These two-faced tools and agents of the foreign Government are now quite accustomed to finding plots and disobedience against the British authorities of tyranny rampant in Cyprus. Each day they seek more patriots to throw into prison, slanderously accusing them of not obeying the tyrants of Cyprus and their harsh measures. As a result of their long colonial exploitation of various peoples the British rulers are quite accustomed to these methods and know that it is very easy for them to sentence all those who do not obey their harsh commands, for all people, white or black, have to work for Albion and send the British lion the (life) he lacks in his country and without which he would die."

"The murderous efforts by the British rulers in Cyprus during the demonstrations last December in Limassol and Nicosia as well as in other towns and villages are very significant of the British mafia. They were even examined by the British Parliament allegedly to find the soldiers who committed the murders, but this is wont to be very slow in its investigations and it seems that the result will be that the British Colonial Office will decorate those who are so adept in using murderous weapons on all occasions."

"The simple, innocent Greek students were sentenced by British courts in Nicosia because they were brave enough to proclaim their feelings in the most peaceful and direct manner. The vandalism of the British tyrants in Cyprus employs every inhuman means when it expresses its barbarous sentiments towards the enslaved Cypriot people. Cyprus has known many rulers, but we must admit that none in her history has been worse or more tyrannous than those of today, with the exception of the Sultan. People who fire on innocent youths during peaceful demonstrations remind us of barbarians."

3. January 29, 1955

"Slanders, attempts to buy consciences, oppression by diplomatic means, attempts to deceive the British people themselves - the London ostriches have omitted nothing to create an artificial smokescreen behind which they hoped they could hide undisturbed to continue to terrorize and oppress the unfortunate Cypriot people. At the same time they hoped that by their various protests against the allegedly anti-British broadcasts from Athens radio and manifestations of Greek public opinion the ultimate means for informing the international public about the continued abuses of the Government of the Greek island might be extinguished. But our microphone will never be prevented from proclaiming the truth to the whole world and particularly to the British people themselves."

4. January 23, 1955

"'Enosis', the illegal paper appearing in Cyprus, said that the Cypriots must use the language of the colonial peoples against their tyrants - the language of blood and sabotage. That is what the secret paper says, and all Cypriot fighters agree with its line. But at the same time we should like to make the following observation. We must clear the ground of other things which are not as they should be. One of them is the retention of honours, titles, decorations and (diplomas). This is unacceptable and incompatible with the Cypriots' struggle. Let those who have not yet understood this follow the example of the Cypriot Gen. Pandelides or the Kastanitsa community; the latter refused to accept a diploma from the New Zealand Government recognising the services of its inhabitants to New Zealand soldiers in 1940. Those who continue to keep the British ones (diplomas, etc.) cannot at the same time retain the seal of the Cypriot struggle. We therefore invite the Cypriots and the Etnarchy to take the necessary measures as soon as possible. We Cypriot students have often drawn attention to those elementary things which we regard as the first steps in the Cypriot people's struggle."

5. January 17, 1955

"The time has come to disturb the ostriches' dreams. Their latest, that Athens will exert pressure on Makarios to prevent damage to Greece's relations with NATO and the Balkan pact countries and to induce him to compromise in order to preserve his prestige, has evaporated under cold reality. The British authorities think that there are leaders in the movement who listen more to Athens than to Makarios and try to widen this alleged gap. We must declare that there are no gaps among the Enosis leaders and also that Athens could never renounce Makarios. All that will happen is that the barbed wire and the police alarms will multiply until the whole world learns that Cyprus is nothing but a concentration camp for all free-thinking Cypriots. On January 16 the blue sky of Cyprus was filled with the cry "Liberty or death". The British authorities were surprised, but it is the age-old cry of the Greeks since Marathon and Salamis. Liberty or death, what beautiful words! They are the symbols of the Greeks which have been so quickly forgotten by the inventors of the words "closed" and "nover". The latter have lost their composure to such an extent that on the 16th Makarios was even forbidden to use a microphone."

"We shall reject every proposal", said the Etnarch, "and all cooperation with the British Government which does not provide for a round-table conference on the subject of granting the Cypriots self-government." He added the following words: "No Cypriot will be found who prefers to become a traitor, irrespective of justification." No, traitors will be found. The five or ten, whom Armitage has gathered together, are known not only to the Cypriots but to all the world. They are the various "sirs" and prospective "sir-traitors" whom the very last worker in his proud Greek poverty refuses to recognise as Greek. No one can shake the true Cypriots, so how will you be able to enforce the famous Constitution, noble lords? By closing down the schools, perhaps? By imprisoning and firing the pupils? You can close the schools. They were closed under the Turks but the flame of freedom was kept alive in the hearts of the Greek children in the crypts of the churches and in the cells of the monasteries. If you continue to supervise the execution of the Greek children of Cyprus the schools will be closed by the people themselves and the "secret schools" will be revived once again."

6. January 16, 1955

"The voices of the slaves were heard by the Powers all over the world."

"Armitage's police and troops did not hear them, however, and what happened in 1931 was repeated. Three valiant young Cypriots coloured the streets with their blood; and this was only a few days after the new Deputy-Director of Public Relations had said: "In a little while British soldiers will be welcomed as guests in Cypriot homes." How wrong he was. The war-time period of 1940-45, when relations between the Cypriot population and British soldiers were cordial, has gone for ever; the welcome given by the Cypriots to British soldiers now belongs to history, thanks to the policy of the Foreign Office. The blood shed by our fellow-fighters has not been shed in vain, however; it is now adorning freedom, which is assuredly coming to the island, like a flower."

"Convictions, fines and other repressive measures followed the events of December. One of our representatives has already gathered from the trials elements which will be presented in our future transmissions and which will shed full light on the naked effects of the legislation in force in the island. Armitage's dictatorship is becoming more and more totalitarian. It does not merely provoke bloody schemes; it embraces other spheres of life, even that of the education of youth. All our people know about the new ignominious blackmail which is attempting to scare the Cypriot students, and above all the teachers of the secondary schools by denying them licenses, if they have expressed themselves against slavery. We all know that the ostrich is a most laughable animal but we never thought that the Downing Street authorities would surpass him. The Cypriot students are proud to be the victims of persecution and are determined to continue the struggle. Despite the administration's measures the anniversary of the 1950 plebiscite is being celebrated in Cyprus."

7. December 30, 1954

"After the recent troubles in the great island all the nations know that this heroic island is now transformed under the British administration into an immense concentration camp. Education is given by suggestion; history, Greek history, is taught under restrictive directives in a way which is unworthy of a chivalrous and great nation. Certain British circles have lost their composure to such a point that a British naval officer has suggested - as we remarked yesterday - deporting to Greece those inhabitants of Cyprus who desire Enosis. In view of the fact that almost all the inhabitants of the island desire Enosis, and in order to calm Armitage and allow him to govern without any trouble just the turban-wearing Mufli and his lot, the only solution that the ostriches can think of is the deportation of the entire population. This road leads imperceptibly to Hitler's conception of genocide, which when sponsored by him roused not only Britain's but the entire world's indignation. We are bound to declare to the world from this microphone that a concealed attempt at genocide against the Cypriot people is now in progress in Cyprus."

8. December 5, 1954

"We have today, people of Cyprus, the eighth issue of your militant newspaper 'Enosis' in our hands. This paper's motto is 'Liberty or death'. As far as the British are concerned, the paper is illegal because it expresses without fear the burning desire for Enosis and because it denounces our tyrants' fascist methods and blackmailing deeds. There can be no Cypriot who does not read 'Enosis'. Secretly in the evening, under the cover of darkness at a time when the employees of the Colonial Office in the Cyprus Government are plotting to forge the Constitution and fresh chains of slavery, a handful of fighters are distributing our paper and spreading national hopes in the hearts of the slaves. It will not be long before these hopes become reality."

9. November 16, 1954

"Today's Cyprus is like a concentration camp in which four-fifths of the population are informed. Concentration camps are a purely British invention, dating from the Boer War."

10. November 16, 1954

"...Another form of sheer hypocrisy on the part of the present British rulers is in that their weightiest argument has been that if Cyprus were given to Greece she would run the risk of falling into the hands of the Communists. Yet today, except for a few well-known traitors, they can find no Greek who is prepared to cooperate with them for the new constitution and are spending lavishly to buy the cooperation of certain communists to this end."

"Greek Cypriots be very careful. Stigmatise relentlessly all the Renegades! Whoever cooperates in any way in the imposition of the constitution on Cyprus, and not for the freedom of Cyprus, is unworthy of the name of Greek. He is but a traitor to his country. People of Cyprus, the British cannot impose a constitution, because to implement it they need traitors, and, except for five or ten stigmatised renegades, they cannot find any."

