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Parliament

1. The Cabinet were informed of the business to be taken in the House of Commons in the following week.

Foreign Affairs

2. The Foreign Secretary informed the Cabinet that in the course of recent riots in Phnom Penh Her Majesty's Embassy had been damaged. We had addressed an appropriate protest to the Government of Cambodia. The incident provided fresh evidence of Cambodian dissatisfaction with the attitude of the Western Powers towards the proposal that the neutrality of the country should be internationally guaranteed.

Libya

The Foreign Secretary said that the Libyan Government had invited us to review the Anglo-Libyan Treaty, which was not due to expire until 1973. In view of the importance of our military bases in Libya, this was an unwelcome proposal; and we should have to consider its implications carefully.

Cyprus

The Foreign Secretary said that the United States Government had now agreed to contribute $2 million towards the cost of the proposed international force in Cyprus; and we ourselves had undertaken to provide a further $1 million. Additional contributions would probably be provided by other countries; and it should then be possible to ensure that an international peace-keeping operation could be sustained in the Island for a period of three months.

In discussion there was general agreement that it was becoming very urgent to establish the proposed force in Cyprus. In their efforts to maintain order our troops were encountering increasing resistance and obstruction by the Greek Cypriot community; and their position would rapidly become intolerable unless they could transfer their responsibilities to an international force in the very near future. Meanwhile, the Commander, British Forces, Cyprus, although reluctant to increase tension in the Island still further by evacuating the families and dependants of British Service personnel, had been given full discretion to take this step at whatever moment he judged it necessary to do so.

The Cabinet—

Took note of these statements by the Foreign Secretary and of the points made in discussion.

East Africa

3. The Commonwealth Secretary informed the Cabinet of the results of his recent visit to Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika and Zanzibar. He had found the Government of Kenya anxious to strengthen their armed forces and to improve their arrangements for maintaining internal security. As a result he had reached broad agreement with them that we would establish a training mission in Kenya in order to advise and assist the Kenya Army, that we would co-operate in the training of the Kenya Air Force and that we would consider the possibility of transferring certain items of equipment and accommodation to the Kenya forces. In return the Government of Kenya would be prepared to grant staging and overflying rights to our military aircraft and to provide facilities at Mombasa for ships of the Royal Navy. They had also agreed that British units might visit Kenya at intervals for military training and exercises. This agreement would now need to be elaborated in detailed discussions with the Government of Kenya. In addition we should have to consider what further assistance we might have to provide for the European farmers in the territory, who were becoming increasingly discouraged in the face of the persistent encroachment by Africans on their farms.
The Government of Uganda had been anxious to take part in the air training project to be established in Kenya; and they were also prepared to accept a small British military training mission in Uganda. The situation in Tanganyika had been less satisfactory. It was doubtful whether President Nyerere now had either the will or the ability to control developments; and it was significant that the Government of Tanganyika were apparently unwilling to accept any assistance with the training of their armed forces. The British troops who had been sent to Uganda and Tanganyika to assist the Governments in restoring order after the recent mutinies were no longer required and would be withdrawn from both territories in the near future.

The position in Zanzibar remained very confused. Although President Karume commanded a greater degree of popular support than any other local leader, his position was precarious and a new attempt to overthrow his régime might develop at any moment. In these circumstances the Governments of the three mainland African territories had been informed that, if further disturbances broke out in Zanzibar and they were disposed to appeal to us for help in restoring order, we should be prepared to consider such a request.

The Cabinet—

Took note of the statement by the Commonwealth Secretary.

4. The Prime Minister said that in the course of his recent visit to Northern Ireland he had been impressed by the importance of maintaining production at Messrs. Shorts’ factory; and the Cabinet should therefore give further consideration to the possibility that the outstanding contract for light helicopters for the Army should be placed with this firm.

The Minister of Defence said that the two helicopters which were under consideration in this context, the Bell and the Hiller, were of equal operational capability, although the Hiller had the marginal advantage of being already in service with the Royal Navy. On the other hand Messrs. Shorts, who would manufacture the Hiller, had initially submitted a tender which was some 20 per cent higher than the tender submitted by the Westland company in respect of the Bell; and a revised tender, which they had subsequently submitted at a figure slightly more favourable than the tender by Westlands, was presumably prompted by knowledge of that tender and was received after the original closure date. In these circumstances it was for consideration whether the Government could properly accept the revised tender of Messrs. Shorts.

In discussion it was suggested that there were several arguments in favour of accepting the Westland tender. The company had greater experience of helicopter manufacture than Messrs. Shorts; and the Government’s policy for reorganisation of the aircraft industry had been based on an assumption that the manufacture of helicopters would be concentrated at their works. A substantial amount of sub-contract work had already been placed with Messrs. Shorts; and the recent decision to authorise them to complete development and initial production of the Skyvan civil freighter aircraft was an additional earnest of the Government’s desire to maintain employment at their factory as far as possible. Moreover, they had been able to reduce their original tender only by drawing on the grant of £10 million which they had recently received from the Government; and it could be argued that it would be improper to acquiesce in an arrangement which would in effect subsidise the company, at the expense of the taxpayer, in competition with a private firm. If, despite these considerations, it were still suggested that the tender of the Westland
company should be rejected, the firm should first be given the opportunity to submit a revised tender in competition with the revised tender submitted by Messrs. Shorts.

On the other hand it was of considerable importance to maintain employment in Northern Ireland. It could also be argued that some of the less satisfactory aspects of the Westland company’s production reflected a certain complacency on the part of the firm, which might be eliminated if they were exposed to the competition of a rival undertaking in the field of helicopter production.

In further discussion it was agreed that the additional employment which would be provided by the helicopter order in question would be marginal in relation to the total numbers already employed by both Messrs. Shorts and the Westland company and that in these circumstances the arguments of principle against entrusting the order to Messrs. Shorts should prevail.

The Cabinet—

(1) Agreed that the outstanding order for Army helicopters should be placed with the Westland company.

(2) Invited the Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Aviation, in consultation with other Ministers concerned, to advise the Prime Minister whether there were other means by which the Government could ensure the maintenance of production and employment at Messrs. Shorts’ factory in Northern Ireland.

5. The Minister of Agriculture said that, although the Farmers’ Unions were still seeking an increase of £34½ million in the price guarantees and production grants covered by the Farm Price Review, he hoped to be able to reach agreement with them on the basis of changes involving a total increase of about £31½ million. £24 million of this sum would be attributable to a proposed increase of 2d. a gallon in the price of milk. This increase, although substantial, would not provide any greater return to the producer than he had received six years before; and his costs had risen considerably in the interval. Moreover, there had been a considerable reduction in the size of the dairy herd during the last year; and the increase in production which would probably result from the increase in price was not likely to exceed the requirements of the market. The cost, which would be met by the consumer, would be reflected in an increase in the retail price of milk from 8½d. to 9d. a pint from 1st April.

The most important of the remaining increases were related to price adjustments for pigs and fat cattle. Agreement had been reached on standard quantities for cereals and on revised arrangements for the marketing of fat stock, which would reinforce the incentive to farmers to vary their sales according to the strength of the market and would therefore reduce the cost to the Exchequer of the guaranteed price.

The total cost to the Exchequer of the price guarantees and production grants had fallen from £343 million in 1961–62 to £301 million in the current financial year; and the present proposals were estimated to increase the Exchequer’s liability by no more than £7 million.

In discussion the following main points were made:

(a) The total increase proposed was considerably greater than had been envisaged at the outset of the review. Moreover, it would represent an increase of some 7½ per cent in farmers’ incomes and
would therefore be seen to be closely in line with the proposals which had been put forward by the Farmers' Unions themselves for the first year of a three-year period in which they considered that incomes should rise. Those proposals had been widely criticised as excessive; and the present review might therefore be interpreted as indicating that the Government were in fact proposing to surrender to the farmers' demands. It would be essential to make it clear that farm prices were reviewed annually and that the increase granted this year carried no implications as regards subsequent years.

(b) The increase in the price of milk, which would then be higher in the United Kingdom than in any other European country, might be embarrassing in relation to the Government's efforts to promote price stability in industry and would be liable to be strongly criticised by the consumer. It would be important to justify this increase by reference to the course of milk prices and dairy costs over the previous 10 years and to demonstrate that prices of United Kingdom foodstuffs as a whole were still well below the general European level.

The Prime Minister, summing up the discussion, said that there was general agreement that, in order to secure a settlement which would be accepted by the Farmers' Unions, the Minister of Agriculture should offer a total increase in the price guarantees and production grants of about £31½ million in accordance with the proposals outlined in the discussion. But, if agreement could not be reached on this basis, the matter should be further considered by the Cabinet.

The Cabinet—

(1) Authorised the Minister of Agriculture to seek to reach agreement with the Farmers' Unions on the basis of the adjustments in the price guarantees and production grants which he had described.

(2) Agreed that, if a settlement could not be reached on this basis, the issues involved should be considered further.

Food Aid

The Minister of Agriculture said that he had it in mind to include in the White Paper on the Farm Price Review a short passage indicating that the Government welcomed the initial programme of food aid projects which had been undertaken by the World Food Programme authorities and would sympathetically consider participating in an extension of this programme. Such a statement would be in accordance with the Government's agreed policy; and there would be a presentational advantage in including it in the White Paper.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that a statement of this kind would be inappropriate in a White Paper dealing with domestic agriculture, since it might encourage United Kingdom farmers to press for a deliberate expansion of production in order to increase the surpluses available for disposal to developing countries. Although we were prepared to continue to take part in the World Food Programme, it would not be in our interests to acquiesce in an uneconomic expansion of production ostensibly for the relief of hunger in the developing countries overseas but in reality for the benefit of our own farmers.

In discussion there was general agreement with this view.

The Cabinet—

(3) Agreed that no reference should be made to the World Food Programme in the White Paper on the Annual Farm Price Review.
6. The Cabinet had before them a memorandum by the Minister of Labour (C.P. (64) 68), to which were appended, at Annex A, the draft of a public statement on trade unions and the law, and, at Annex B, the draft of a supplementary statement on trade union practice.

The Minister of Labour said that, in the light of the Cabinet's earlier discussion, the statement at Annex A had been drafted on the assumption that the formal enquiry which the Government had in mind to promote would be confined to issues arising from the state of the law in relation to trade unions and that the problem of restrictive practices adopted by the unions would be examined by a more informal procedure, e.g., discussion in the National Economic Development Council. The draft statement was therefore confined to indicating that, in the Government's opinion, the law in relation to trade unions should be reviewed in an atmosphere free from political controversy and that the Government would therefore discuss with the Trades Union Congress and the British Employers Confederation, at the appropriate time, the scope of an enquiry which might be established for this purpose and the methods by which it might best be conducted. But the statement also included a paragraph emphasising that, since the law on this subject was last reviewed, full employment and improved social services had transformed society, while new industrial methods and the approach of automation threw out fresh challenges for the future. Since this paragraph might be thought to imply that the proposed enquiry would embrace restrictive practices as well as issues of law, it might be better omitted.

In discussion considerable support was expressed for these proposals. Many of the Government's supporters were anxious that the law relating to trade unions should be comprehensively reviewed; and a considerable body of opinion in the trade union movement itself was known to be privately in sympathy with this attitude. The Government could therefore afford to accept the risk that their proposal might be misrepresented as an attempt to undermine the industrial power of the unions. At the same time, even if the public statement were confined to the question of trade unions and the law, the Government would at once be asked whether they intended to promote any corresponding enquiry into the restrictive practices of the unions; and it would be the more important to be prepared to give a clear answer to such enquiries in that the law relating to trade unions had a direct bearing on certain types of restrictive practices and an enquiry into the state of the law could hardly avoid dealing with such practices to some extent. For this reason, while it would be wise to omit from the statement the supplementary passage in Annex B dealing specifically with restrictive practices, it would be appropriate to retain the reference to the challenges presented by new industrial methods and the approach of automation; and it would also be desirable to be prepared to give a clear and authoritative description of the scope of an enquiry to be conducted on this basis.

The Cabinet—

(1) Invited the Minister of Labour, in consultation with the Ministers concerned, to reconsider, in the light of their discussion, the draft public statement on trade unions and the law at Annex A to C.P. (64) 68 and to circulate a fresh draft of this statement, together with a definition of the scope of an enquiry to be conducted on this basis.

(2) Agreed to resume their discussion at a subsequent meeting on the basis of the fresh draft of the public statement to be circulated in accordance with Conclusion (1) above.
7. The Cabinet had before them memoranda by the Postmaster-General (C.P. (64) 66) and the Secretary of State for Scotland (C.P. (64) 69) about the removal of the Post Office Savings Bank from London.

The Postmaster-General said that only about 1,000 of the Bank’s present staff would probably be moved from London and the balance of some 6,000 would have to be locally recruited from the area to which the Bank was transferred. Glasgow, Liverpool and Tees-side appeared to offer the most suitable sites. All three had high levels of unemployment, were in need of clerical employment and could meet the Bank’s requirements of staff. Glasgow was the least acceptable to the staff who would have to move, primarily because housing was only available at some distance from the proposed site for the Bank. Moreover, only 5 per cent of the Bank’s total business related to Scotland. Housing was not available in Liverpool on such favourable terms as on Tees-side; but Liverpool had a higher level of clerical unemployment. The junior staff concerned had expressed a preference for Tees-side.

The Secretary of State for Scotland said that since the war central Scotland had had a consistently higher rate of unemployment than any other comparable region in the country. The emigration of young people, which was much higher than from the North-East, was a particularly serious feature of the situation and was largely attributable, especially in the Glasgow area, to a lack of opportunities for the large numbers of school leavers, who would be well suited to work in the Savings Bank. Glasgow also had rather easier and more rapid communications with London than Tees-side. Both the North-East and the North-West of England had benefited from the programme of dispersal of Government offices; but this programme had not so far been of any advantage to Scotland. It was important that the Government should give a lead in this respect, since otherwise industry would not be persuaded of the sincerity of their regional policies; and, if the Savings Bank were not moved to Glasgow, Scottish opinion would regard this as proof that the Government were not in earnest as regards the development of Scotland.

In discussion the following main points were made:

(a) The success of the programme of dispersal of Government offices from London depended to a considerable extent on retaining the co-operation and goodwill of the staffs concerned. In the present instance there seemed little to choose between the three areas involved; and it might therefore be wise to give full weight to the fact that the staff had expressed a preference for Tees-side.

(b) It could be argued in favour of choosing Liverpool that the existing level of unemployment on Merseyside was broadly equivalent to the level in central Scotland and was higher than on Tees-side. Local opinion in the North-West was concerned at the apparent preference given to Scotland and the North-East in the Government’s regional development policies.

(c) On the other hand juvenile unemployment on Tees-side was proportionately higher than in either of the other two areas; and, in terms of reinforcing the other measures which the Government had already taken to promote development in the respective regions, a transfer of the Bank to Tees-side might yield a greater dividend than its removal to either Glasgow or the North-West.

The Prime Minister, summing up the discussion, said that the Cabinet would wish to give further consideration to the issues involved before taking a final decision on this difficult question.

The Cabinet—

Agreed to resume their discussion of C.P. (64) 66 and 69 at a subsequent meeting.
8. The Cabinet had before them a memorandum by the Home Secretary (C.P. (64) 64), to which was appended the draft of a White Paper on compensation for victims of crimes of violence.

The Home Secretary recalled that the Cabinet had decided on 15th October, 1963, that arrangements for the payment of compensation to victims of crimes of violence should be introduced in the form of a non-statutory ex gratia scheme and that the Government should announce in due course the principles of the scheme and the arrangements for its administration. The draft White Paper, which had been approved by the Home Affairs Committee, proposed the establishment of a Victims of Crimes of Violence Compensation Board, composed of independent persons with legal experience, who would award compensation on the basis of common law damages, subject to modifications designed to set reasonable limits to the amount of the awards. Decisions would be taken initially by one member of the Board after an examination of claims by the Board's staff with the help of reports from the police; but, if the applicant was dissatisfied with the decision, he would be allowed a judicial hearing by three other members of the Board, who would determine the application in the light of evidence brought at the hearing. If a scheme on these lines was approved by Parliament, it could be introduced experimentally without legislation. It was proposed, therefore, that a debate should be arranged shortly after the publication of the White Paper; and any useful suggestions which emerged could be embodied in a revised White Paper, which would constitute guidance of the Board.

In discussion the following main points were made:

(a) It might be desirable to state publicly that the Board would have an office in Scotland, where applications would have to be considered against the background of a different system of law. If so, an office might need to be established in Wales as well. Paragraph 11 of the White Paper should therefore refer to the possibility that offices might be established outside London, where need arose.

(b) The payment of compensation ought not to duplicate other payments from public funds, whether in the form of social benefits or in the form of pensions payable to public servants. But, while it might be right that payments directly related to the injury should not be so duplicated, it was not equally clear that preferential retirement pensions—to which police officers were entitled in recognition of the special risks of their employment—should be taken into account in calculating compensation awarded for a particular injury. This point required further examination.

(c) The White Paper would preferably be published before Easter. In view of Parliamentary interest in the subject, an announcement should be made in both Houses of Parliament that it would be published shortly.

The Cabinet—

(1) Invited the Home Secretary to consider further, in consultation with the Chief Secretary, Treasury, the relationship of public service pensions to awards of compensation under the scheme described in C.P. (64) 64 and to report their conclusions to the Prime Minister.

(2) Invited Ministers who wished to propose drafting amendments to the White Paper appended to C.P. (64) 64 to inform the Home Secretary as rapidly as possible.

(3) Subject to any amendments proposed under Conclusion (2) above and to any further action required in the light of Conclusion (1) above, invited the Home Secretary to arrange for the publication of the White Paper before the Easter recess and to make an early announcement to this effect.
9. The Cabinet had before them a memorandum by the Home Secretary (C.P. (64) 67) on the appointment of a Royal Commission on the treatment of offenders.

The Home Secretary said that penal principles and practice had last been examined comprehensively by the Gladstone Commission on Prisons, which reported in 1895. The White Paper on Penal Practice in a Changing Society, published in 1959, had foreshadowed a fundamental re-examination of penal policy on the basis of the knowledge to be gained from research about the causes of crime and the effectiveness of present methods of treatment; and, in view of the continuing increase in crime and the widespread doubt about the appropriateness of existing methods of dealing with offenders, particularly young offenders, it seemed desirable to institute this re-examination without further delay. It was accordingly proposed that a Royal Commission should be appointed to examine both the concepts and purposes which should underlie the punishment and treatment of offenders and the existing methods of treatment available to the courts and to review the work of the services providing treatment and the responsibility for their administration. The Home Affairs Committee, in agreeing in principle to the appointment of a Royal Commission, had suggested that it would be helpful to publish, simultaneously with the announcement of the decision, a White Paper explaining the background of the inquiry and the reasons why it was thought necessary to undertake it. The draft of a White Paper for this purpose was appended to C.P. (64) 67.

In discussion the following main points were made:

(a) The Government's supporters might not readily understand why the Government regarded it as urgent to announce the appointment of a Royal Commission on the treatment of offenders but were apparently not prepared to take similar action in relation to the trade unions or to go further, in this respect, than indicating that they would consider instituting, at the appropriate time, some form of enquiry into the state of the law concerning the unions. It was for consideration whether, for this reason, the appointment of the proposed Royal Commission on the treatment of offenders should be deferred for a time. On the other hand the appointment of the Commission would be welcomed by those most closely concerned with the problems of crime and of the treatment of offenders; and, in view of the pending publication of the report of a Committee on Penal Policy established by the Labour Party under the chairmanship of Lord Longford, it was desirable that the Government should be seen to take an early initiative.

(b) It was doubtful whether it would be appropriate that the terms of reference should require the Commission to re-examine the concepts and purposes which should underlie the punishment and treatment of offenders, since these were now well understood and generally accepted. Such a re-examination might be valuable, however, in relation to the treatment of young offenders, in view of the decreasing rate of success in the approved schools and of the suggestion in the report of the Central Advisory Council for Education on children of average or less than average ability (the Newsom Report) that consideration should be given to the appropriateness of the goals which were sought for young people in this category.

(c) It was desirable that the Commission should consider not only the treatment of offenders but also the factors which fostered and inhibited crime. To direct them explicitly to examine these, however, might lead them into unnecessarily extensive and prolonged investigations; and it would be sufficient for them to take account, in accordance with the proposed terms of reference, of modern knowledge on the subject.

(d) The content of the White Paper might with advantage be more closely related to the concept of "the war on crime", although
the use of that phrase in the title might be reconsidered. A good deal of the material on the administration of justice, for example, might not appear to the public to be of immediate relevance to the prevention of crime; and there might be some embarrassment in providing details of measures relating to England and Wales which could not, within the compass of the White Paper, be reasonably accompanied by a similar recital in relation to Scotland. On the other hand the White Paper might well take more credit for the programme of prison building; and greater prominence should be given to the reasons which had led the Government to the conclusion that the time had come to institute a comprehensive review of the problems of crime and of the treatment of offenders. In the revision of the draft care should be taken to ensure that the concept of treatment was not emphasised to the exclusion of that of punishment.

(e) The White Paper should, if possible, be published before Easter; and further consideration should be given to the timing of its publication in relation to the publication of the White Paper on compensation for victims of crimes of violence.

The Lord President, summing up the discussion, said that there was general agreement that it would be desirable to appoint a Royal Commission with terms of reference on the lines of those proposed in Annex A to C.P. (64) 67. The draft White Paper should be considered further by the Ministers principally concerned in the light of the Cabinet’s discussion and of any amendments which Ministers wished to propose. The timing of its publication should be discussed with the Lord Privy Seal and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Deedes).

The Cabinet—

(1) Agreed that it would be desirable that a Royal Commission on the treatment of offenders should be appointed, with terms of reference on the lines indicated in Annex A to C.P. (64) 67.

(2) Invited the Home Secretary to give further consideration, in the light of their discussion and in consultation with the Ministers principally concerned, to the draft White Paper appended to C.P. (64) 67 and to circulate a revised draft for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

(3) Invited the Home Secretary to consider the timing of the publication of the White Paper in consultation with the Lord Privy Seal, the Secretary of State for Scotland and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Deedes) and to report their conclusions to the Prime Minister.
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