

1935.

Kenya.

No. 38005/6A

SUBJECT

C0533/453

Land Commission Report

Native Lands Trust Order in Council (Draft)

Publication for Parliamentary Discussion

Previous

38005/6/34
38005/5/35

Subsequent

25
Lead Lines

- 1. Extract from Memorandum of 25 July '55.
- 2. To. E.C.E. Lead Lines (S.O) - cons — 29 July '55
- 3. O. King (S.O) _____ 29 July '55
 Transmits the reasons of his publication & discussion of
 the draft C. in 6

It now seems improbable that there
 will be a Question before the House, 23rd;
 but this should be carefully noted
 by the Press, & can then be put by.

Shaw
 29/7

... ..

If the question does arise, here are
 things, in order of priority, that
 the Press should know, & which
 are being advised to be asked.

Notes
 [Signature]

Prof. C.A.S.
 30.7.55

✓ [Signature]
 Director of Information
 [Faded text]

14 The Anti Slavery & Aborigines Petition Society — 2. Aug 10
Enquire whether it is proposed to admit Sir L. Hamilton's
suggestion that the O.C. might be named as a draft & if so
whether they might be allowed to see a copy of the Act.

? No - draft It seems rather
necessary now prep to draw the
distinction between - statutory & -
parliamentary C. in C.

The letter - as mentioned C. & L.
mentioned - as to this and on the
draft
C. & L. draft 7/10
1/11/10

15 To Anti Slavery & Aborigines Petition Society 12/10/10
(10.10.10 - 10.10.10) (10.10.10)

16 A. & S. Slavery & Aborigines Petition Society — 10. Oct 10
State that the letters have asked that they may be
allowed to see a copy of the Act from the O.C. & the O.C. requests that
if they are allowed to see a copy of the Act, they may also be
allowed to see a copy of the Act.

M. Hood

The letter had a p. a
that we might have it at the
10.10.10 & say that the request

is noted might be interpreted as a
of receding from the firm tone of N. 5!
? P. 10

J. P. Martin
7/10

(What the Society has to do with the terms & conditions of the
letters has rather made me but they are built that way)

As the letter is signed by Sir L. Hamilton I think it had
better have a formal acknowledgment - but nothing more.

11.10.10
7/10

Sir J. Thorne,

You did not see us on 4th & the 5th.

11.10.10
10.10.10
I enclose the enclosed containing Sir P.
Murray's letter's statement about the
sanctioning of paragon Orders.

As regards 10.7, I understand that
Sir J. Thorne has mentioned, S.O., the
Fleeted members request and that he
encouraged them to them in the
idea

I suspect that in fact the
subject will be discussed both
in London and here (see Sir P.
Murray's letter reference to the O.C.
10.10.10 and that the sanctioning of the
documents will remain in violation.

I would be happy to

10.10.10

10.10.10

J. P. Martin

14 - The Anti Slavery & Aborigines Petition Society. — 2. Aug 10
Express whether it is proposed to admit Sir L. Hamilton's
suggestion that the O.C. might be issued as a draft & report
whether they might be allowed to see a copy of the letter

? No - draft It seems rather
necessary now paper to show the
distinction between - statutory & -
provisional C. in C.

The letter - as mentioned C. & D.
mentioned - as to this not in the
draft
Let it stand
11/10

5 - To Anti Slavery & Aborigines Petition Society 12/10/10
(1891 - not in copy) (to read)

6 - A. & S. Slavery & Aborigines Petition Society — 11. Oct 10
State that the letter has asked that they may be
allowed to see a copy of the letter & the answer, reports that
if they are allowed to see a copy but better, may also be
handed to the

To: Home
The letter had a (p. 9)
that we might have done at the
is with a copy that the report

is noted might be interpreted as a
of reading from the form letter of N^o. 5!
? P. 17
J. P. Franklin
7/10

(What the Society has to do with the letter & business of the
letter has rather much to do but they are small the way)

As the letter is signed by Sir L. Hamilton I think it had
better have a general acknowledgment - but nothing more.

11.10.10
7/10

Sir J. Thorne,
You did not see us 4 & the rally.

I enclose the Hansard containing Sir P.
Cockfield's statement about the
sanctity of Foreign Orders.

As regard No. 7, I understand that
Sir J. Thorne has mentioned, & so, the
Fleets' members' request and that he
encourage attention to them, in the
idea

I expect that in fact the
subject will be considered with
in the House of Commons (see Sir P.
Cockfield's reference to the CP
1870) but that the sanctity of the
document will remain in doubt.

I remain truly
Yours
J. P. Franklin
11/10

At an
11/10

No 11 34
Oct. 1941

J. P.

1 Anti Slavery & Aborigines Protection Society - 8.1.36

Request reply to (6)

DESTROYED UNDER STATUTE

Reverend's letter of the
4th October (No. 6) was
let by.

I submit draft reply to
No 7 on the lower lines of No 63
on 30/05/36. C. J. Crossin
10.1.36.

To Anti Slavery & Aborigines Protection Society 14/1/36
(7 and)

9 copy of with in Pol. file
attached
and
2.5.36

3/12/37

Orders in Council issued under the Foreign
Jurisdiction Act of 1900,

1. Sir J. Haffey discussed this question on the 30th April with Sir C. Buxton, Sir S. Buxton, Sir C. Parkinson and Mr. Williams.

2. It was explained that the reason for taking up the matter was that Lord Lethbride had put down a Motion in the House of Lords for the 2nd April, part of which reads:-

"That any Order in Council setting up a Legislative Council for Palestine should be laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament for one month, in order that Parliament may have an opportunity of discussing it before it is promulgated".

That Motion has been withdrawn temporarily, but there is every reason to think that it will be put down again, when the question of proceeding with a Legislative Council for Palestine is renewed. Hence, we thought it desirable to decide, while there is time for full consideration, what line of action should be recommended to Ministers in the matter.

3. Sir C. Buxton explained the position:-

The Foreign Jurisdiction Act 1900 declared that it should be lawful for the King to hold, exercise and enjoy any foreign jurisdiction obtained by treaty etc. (and that is how jurisdiction was acquired in Palestine) in the same and as ample a manner as if the King had acquired that jurisdiction by conquest or conquest.

8

Where Colonies have been acquired by cession or conquest the King can legislate for them under the prerogative without reference to Parliament. The effect of the Foreign Jurisdiction Act therefore seems to be that the King's jurisdiction in foreign countries is to be exercised in the same way as similar jurisdiction is exercised in a conquered Colony, that is to say, by Order in Council.

Parliament does not legislate directly for the Protectorates or Mandated Territories, and the arrangement by which the power to legislate for the King's jurisdiction in foreign countries was delegated to His Majesty has been scrupulously kept. Where it is desired that an Act should be applicable to Protectorates etc., provision is inserted giving His Majesty power to apply it by Order in Council.

In some recent Acts of Parliament, for example in the Government of India Act, where Parliament has conferred power on the King to legislate by Order in Council it has stipulated that the draft of such Orders should be laid before Parliament. No such provision appears in the Foreign Jurisdiction Act. The only reference to the point is a provision by which Orders in Council are to be laid before Parliament after they have been made. To lay before Parliament the draft of Orders in Council to be made under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act has no statutory authority and would be a breach of the tradition which has been observed for 46 years.

4. Sir G. Buxton explained further that, in his view, although Orders made under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act were to that extent made under statute, they were

Where Colonies have been acquired by cession or conquest the King can legislate for them under the prerogative without reference to Parliament. The effect of the Foreign Jurisdiction Act therefore seems to be that the King's Jurisdiction in foreign countries is to be exercised in the same way as similar jurisdiction is exercised in a conquered Colony, that is to say, by Order in Council.

Parliament does not legislate directly for the Protectorates or Mandated Territories, and the arrangement by which the power to legislate for the King's jurisdiction in foreign countries was delegated to His Majesty has been scrupulously kept. Where it is desired that an Act should be applicable to Protectorates etc., provision is inserted giving His Majesty power to apply it by Order in Council.

In some recent Acts of Parliament, for example in the Government of India Act, where Parliament has conferred power on the King to legislate by Order in Council it has stipulated that the draft of such Orders should be laid before Parliament. No such provision appears in the Foreign Jurisdiction Act. The only reference to the point is a provision by which Orders in Council are to be laid before Parliament after they have been made. To lay before Parliament the draft of Orders in Council to be made under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act has no statutory authority and would be a breach of the tradition which has been observed for 46 years.

4. Sir G. Danks explained further that, in his view, although Orders made under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act were to that extent made under statute, they were

none the less in the position of Prerogative Orders as distinct from those which are known as Statutory Orders.

From the practical point of view, there would be great inconvenience in laying such Orders in draft before Parliament even if it were held that this would be constitutionally proper:-

First. There are very many Orders which have to be made under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act.

Secondly. If such Orders were laid in draft, they could presumably be debated by Parliament in detail.

Thirdly. Once the Order had been laid in draft, it would not be possible to vary the wording without further submission to Parliament. In Sir G. Bushe's opinion, the Government had done all that could reasonably be asked of them by giving Parliament the substance of the proposed Palestine Legislative Council Order in Council in Command Paper 5119.

5. Sir William Malkin at the Foreign Office had agreed that there was no obligation to lay Orders in Council under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act in draft form before Parliament prior to enactment, and that section 11 of the Act, which provides that such Orders are to be laid forthwith after they are made, would appear to be inconsistent with any such obligation. At the same time he was not sure that it followed that there would be anything improper in adopting that course if, in a particular case, it were desired, for special reasons, to do so.

none the less in the position of Prerogative Orders as distinct from those which are known as Statutory Orders.

From the practical point of view, there would be great inconvenience in laying such Orders in draft before Parliament even if it were held that this would be constitutionally proper:-

First. There are very many Orders which have to be made under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act.

Secondly. If such Orders were laid in draft, they could presumably be debated by Parliament in detail.

Thirdly. Once the Order had been laid in draft, it would not be possible to vary the wording without further submission to Parliament. In Sir G. Bushe's opinion, the Government had done all that could reasonably be asked of them by giving Parliament the substance of the proposed Palestine Legislative Council Order in Council in Command Paper 5119.

5. Sir William Malkin at the Foreign Office had agreed that there was no obligation to lay Orders in Council under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act in draft form before Parliament prior to enactment, and that section 11 of the Act, which provides that such Orders are to be laid forthwith after they are made, would appear to be inconsistent with any such obligation. At the same time he was not sure that it followed that there would be anything improper in adopting that course if, in a particular case, it were desired, for special reasons, to do so.

6. Sir C. Bottomley said that it would be very embarrassing if the draft of the Kenya Native Lands Trust Order in Council had not been submitted to Parliament and to the Kenya Legislative Council. Yet, there would be no ground for resisting a demand for this, if the Palestine Order were laid in draft.

7. Sir J. Parkinson said that, judging from the line taken by certain speakers in the House of Lords debate about the Palestine Legislative Council, Government might be faced with the position that if they refused to lay that particular Order before Parliament in draft despite what they could do by publishing the substance of a Bill, they would be a target for amendment of the Bill for a further Act, and it would be argued that it was an obligation of the Government and that it must be laid in draft. He would say in the sense that every Order in Council should be laid in draft before being made. In fact, those were the only alternative, and it would be better to give way on the Palestine Order than to have to accept amendments to the Kenya Order. He was saying of all Orders in Council that they should be laid in draft before being made. He would say that if the Government refused to do so, they would be a target for amendment of the Bill for a further Act, and it would be argued that it was an obligation of the Government and that it must be laid in draft. He would say in the sense that every Order in Council should be laid in draft before being made. In fact, those were the only alternative, and it would be better to give way on the Palestine Order than to have to accept amendments to the Kenya Order.

8. It was agreed that the Government should lay the Kenya Order in draft.

6. Sir C. Bottomley said that it would be very embarrassing if the draft of the Kenya Native Lands Trust Order in Council had now to be submitted to Parliament (and to the Kenya Legislative Council). Yet, there would be no ground for resisting a demand for this, if the Palestine Order were laid in draft.

7. Sir C. Parkinson said that, judging from the line taken by certain speakers in the House of Lords debate about the Palestine Legislative Council, Government might be faced with the position that if they refused to lay that particular Order before Parliament in draft despite what they had done by publishing the substance in a Command Paper, there would be a demand for amendment of the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, i.e. it would be argued that this was an old and out-of-date Act, and that it must be revised in these more advanced days in the sense that every Order made under that Act should be laid in draft before Parliament. If, in fact, these were the only alternatives, it would certainly be better to give way on the particular case than to have to accept amendment of the Act involving the laying of all Orders in draft.

8. Sir G. Danks suggested that Government could refuse to amend the Act, if that should be pressed, not only on the question of principle but on the ground of the extreme inconvenience and waste of time which would be occasioned; but he doubted whether sufficient interest would be taken in the matter by Parliament to launch such a demand.

9. It was agreed to suggest that Ministers
should

should be guided by the advice already given, but it was for consideration whether the Attorney-General should be asked for his opinion. If the Attorney-General's opinion was desired, it would be well that Sir G. Bushe should write to him now rather than wait until Lord Lethian put down his Motion again, so that there might be ample time for consideration.

3P007/6A/35.

C. O.

Mr. *Green* 19/1/36
Mr. *Flood* 11/1/36
Mr.

- Sir C. Parkinson
- Sir G. Tomkinson
- Sir C. B. B. B.
- Sir J. Skelton
- Paras. U.S. of S.
- Paras. U.S. of S.
- Secretary of State

130

January 1936

DRAFT.

*Parliamentary
The Hon. Secretary
and Ministers
Parliamentary Secretary*

I am able to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th of January and to inform you that it was not proposed to communicate the terms of the Order in Council to define the rights and of Kenya & in its draft form to any official body or individual.

(5) In the letter from this Office of the 12th of August last, your attention was

considered

FURTHER ACTION

invited to the statement
 made by Sir Philip Cunliffe-Lister
 (now Viscount Swinton) in Parliament
 on the 16th of November, 1924,
 that it would be entirely
 unconstitutional to lay
 such an Order in draft
 before Parliament. ^{It is to be appreciated that}
 Considerations apply to
 Communication to private
 bodies or individuals.

Can be
 Signed J. E. W. FLOOD

C.O.
 Mr. Justice 7/10
 Mr.
 Mr.
 Mr. Parkman
 Sir G. Toulson
 ✓ Sir C. Buxton 7/8
 Sir [unclear] 7/10/25
 Post [unclear]
 Post [unclear]
 Secretary of State

38005/6A.
 Kemp-

5
 10
 15
 20

12 AUG 1935

DRAFT.

The Secretary
 And (Hon. A.P.S.)

Sir
 I am in accord.

The rest of your letter of the
 13th of August, and any other
 which perhaps will be
 accord to the draft of
 the Order-in-Council which
 is proposed to affect
 the Highways of Kenya.
 I am

Proposed

I write you refer to
 the same you to
 you by Sir Philip Cunliffe-
 Lister to a question on
 this subject in the House of Commons

FURTHER ACTION.

D.A. (with [unclear])
 H.C. [unclear] [unclear]
 10/10/35

Nov. 1934. A copy is enclosed
for your convenience. Mr.
Macdonald has no intention
of departing from the attitude
of his predecessor towards this
question.

(Signed) L. B. FREESTON

Telegraph:
30 CITIESNEY, CHEURTON LONDON
Telephone:
VICTORIA 6045

The Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society

(in which are incorporated the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society and the Aborigines Protection Society)

11
4

Joint Presidents:

THE RT. HON. THE EARL OF LYTTON, K.G., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E. THE RT. HON. LORD MINTON, K.C.S.I. THE RT. HON. LORD NOEL-BUXTON

Chairman: CHARLES H. ROBERTS, Esq.

Vice-Chairman: CHARLES RODEN BUXTON, Esq.
TRAVERS BUXTON, Esq.

Joint Hon. Treasurers:

ALFRED BRIDGE, Esq., J.P.
H. J. TAPSCOTT, Esq.

Secretary: SIR JOHN HARRIS.

Assistant Secretary: MISS E. K. BATTY.

RECEIVED
- 6 AUG 1935
C. O. REGY

DENISON HOUSE,
206 VAUXHALL BRIDGE ROAD,
LONDON, S.W.1.
(CLOSE TO VICTORIA STATION.)

2nd August, 1935.

To:-

The Rt. Hon. MALCOLM MACDONALD, M.P.,
Colonial Office,
Downing Street,
S.W.1.

R

ACKD. BY P.C.

Sir,

at a meeting of the general committee of this society held yesterday in the house of commons, a discussion took place upon the proposal to issue an order in council affecting the highlands of Kenya, as referred to in our letter to the department, dated 10th May last.

(5)
Answer.

No 28
36006/5/35
none

attention was drawn to the speech of sir Robert Hamilton in the house of commons on the 25th ultimo, in which he made the suggestion that this order in council might first be issued as a draft.

No 1

I beg leave to ask, on behalf of my committee, whether it is proposed to adopt sir Robert Hamilton's suggestion, and if not, whether we might be allowed to see (if necessary, in confidence) a copy of the proposed order in council.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your humble and obedient servant,

John Harris

Secretary.

The Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society

(in which are incorporated the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society and the Aborigines Protection Society)

Joint Presidents :

THE RT. HON. THE EARL OF LYTTON, K.G., G.C.S.I., G.C.L.E. THE RT. HON. LORD MANTON, K.C.S.I. THE RT. HON. LORD NOEL-BURTON

Chairman : CHARLES H. ROBERTS, Esq.

Vice-Chairmen : CHARLES ROBIN BURTON, Esq.
TRAVERS BURTON, Esq.

Joint Hon. Treasurers :

ALFRED BROOKS, Esq., J.P.
H. J. TAPSCOTT, Esq.

Secretary : SIR JOHN HARRIS.

Assistant Secretary : MISS E. K. BATTY.

RECEIVED
- 6 AUG 1935
C. O. REGY

DENISON HOUSE,
296 VAUXHALL BRIDGE ROAD,
LONDON, S.W.1.
(CLOSE TO VICTORIA STATION.)

2nd August, 1935.

TO:-

The Rt. Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, M.P.,
Colonial Office,
Downing Street,
S.W.1.

R

ACKD. BY P.C.

Sir,

at a meeting of the general committee of this society held yesterday in the house of commons, a discussion took place upon the proposal to issue an order in council affecting the highlands of Kenya, as referred to in our letter to the department, dated 10th May last.

(5)

Answer

No 18
3606/3/35

attention was drawn to the speech of sir Robert Hamilton in the house of commons on the 25th ultimo, in which he made the suggestion that this order in council might first be issued as a draft.

No 1

I beg leave to ask, on behalf of my committee, whether it is proposed to adopt sir Robert Hamilton's suggestion, and if not, whether we might be allowed to see (if necessary, in confidence) a copy of the proposed order in council?

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your humble and obedient servant,

John Harris

Secretary.

Telephone: 10 CLEVELAND, CHRISTIAN, LONDON
Telegrams: VICTORIA only

The Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society

(in which are incorporated the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society and the Aborigines Protection Society)

11
4

Joint Presidents:
The Rt. Hon. The Earl of Lytton, K.G., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E. The Rt. Hon. Lord Minto, K.C.S.I. The Rt. Hon. Lord North-Brooke
Chairman: CHARLES H. ROBERTS, Esq.
Vice-Chairman: CHARLES ROBIN DIXON, Esq.
THOMAS DIXON, Esq.

Secretary: Sir JOHN HARRIS.
Assistant Secretary: Miss E. K. RATTY.

Joint Hon. Treasurers:
ALFRED BRADSHAW, Esq., J.P.
H. J. TAYNOR, Esq.

RECEIVED
- 6 AUG 1935
C. O. REGD

DEINSON HOUSE,
44 VAUXHALL BRIDGE ROAD,
LONDON, S.W.1.
CLOSE TO TOWER BRIDGE STATION.

2nd August, 1935.

To:-
The Rt. Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, M.P.,
Colonial Office,
Downing Street,
W.1.

R

ACKD. BY P.C.

Sir,
At a meeting of the General Committee of

(6)
Answer

this Society held yesterday in the House of Commons, a discussion took place upon the proposal to issue an Order in Council affecting the High Courts of Kenya, as referred to in our letter to the Department, dated 10th May last.

No 28
36008/0/11

Attention was drawn to the speech of Sir Robert Hamilton in the House of Commons on the 28th ultimo, in which he made the suggestion that this Order in Council might first be issued as a draft.

No 1

I beg leave to ask, on behalf of my Committee, whether it is proposed to adopt Sir Robert Hamilton's suggestion, and if not, whether we might be allowed to see (if necessary, in confidence) a copy of the proposed Order in Council.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your humble and obedient servant,

John Harris
Secretary.

29th July, 1936.

Dear Busha,

Your letter of the 29th instant and enclosures regarding the proposed Order in Council dealing with the occupancy of lands in Kenya Colony.

Leadbitter is on leave, but it happens that I had drawn his attention to Sir R. Hamilton's speech on the Colonial Office Vote on Thursday last, and we apprehended that the matter might form the subject of a further question before the House rises.

I can say quite definitely that he shares your view that the prior publication and discussion of such a draft Order would be contrary to constitutional practice. For your confidential information, I have the authority to state that if pressed to agree to such an

Order

H.G. Busha, Esq., C.B., C.M.S.,
COLONIAL OFFICE.

No 2

copy to Sir W. Mackinnon (on 75/102/106) (all)

Order being submitted to Parliament in draft he would refuse, unless the Law Officers of the Crown formally advised that such a course was permissible.

Naturally, the foregoing remarks apply to the purely Prerogative Order, and not in a case where an Act of Parliament has directed a different procedure, e.g., British Guiana Act, 1928, Section 1 (2).

Yours sincerely,

Atkinson

Order being submitted to Parliament in draft he would refuse, unless the Law Officers of the Crown formally advised that such a course was permissible.

Naturally, the foregoing remarks apply to the purely Prerogative Order, and not in a case where an Act of Parliament has directed a different procedure, e.g., British Guiana Act, 1928, Section 1 (2).

Yours sincerely,

Atkin

C.O. Vote.

The Order in Council
referred to will deal with
the occupancy of lands
in Kenya Colony. They
will derive from no statute,
Imperial or local, other than
the British Settlements Act.
So far as my experience
goes, there is no precedent
for submitting to Parliamentary
criticism the draft of a such an
Imperial Order. As it
is possible that a further question
may be put down before the
House next, I should be most
grateful to learn whether you
share my opinion that the
prior publication & discussion of such
a draft Order would be contrary
to constitutional practice.

Your sincerely

[Sir R. Hamilton.]

the normal position there being restored. One has to hop rather rapidly from place to place in our discussions on this Vote, and I want now to say a few words on Kenya. Following on the Morris-Carter Report, it has been proposed that an Order in Council should be issued defining and regulating the position of what is known as the highland area. Various questions have been asked in the House on the subject, but I am afraid that a not very accurate idea exists as to the true history of this matter. I will try briefly to put it before hon. Members.

When the invitation was issued to settlers first to go into that country, the highland area, it was on the understanding that an area would be reserved for them. The country was then a Protectorate, and the Indians who were there wished to have an opportunity of taking up land in that area. Lord Elgin, who was Colonial Secretary at the time, was most unwilling to pass any legislation of a discriminatory character against British subjects, and he therefore directed that as a matter of administration titles to land could only be issued to Europeans by the Governor, and that any transfers of land should be subject to his approval. That procedure has been continued for nearly 30 years. It is merely a matter of administrative procedure. The Protectorate has since become a Colony, and it is now proposed that a law should be passed by Order in Council reserving a defined highland area entirely for Europeans. In other words, that means passing legislation discriminatory against our own British subjects—British Indian subjects and British African subjects, and excluding both of them from any right of holding land within that area. If that were to be done it would be a thing that has never before been done in a British Colony. It would not exclude, say an Italian or a Frenchman, but it would be in the nature of a colour bar against the Indians and against the Africans.

The Secretary of State has been asked whether it would not be possible to publish the projected Order in Council in draft so that it might be criticised, but he replied that it was unusual and contrary to constitutional procedure that Orders in Council should be published for criticism. May I remind the right

hon. Gentleman that in the Government of India Bill, which was recently before this House, provision was definitely made for certain definite important Orders in Council to be submitted to Parliament before they are passed into law. This is a matter of vast importance. There is the possibility of creating a precedent of a character in the British Empire which it would be impossible to do by Order in Council in regard to a mandated territory. It is proposed to do in Kenya, one of our Colonies, something which we could not do in a territory over which we hold a mandate. Therefore, I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to reconsider, if it is decided to go on with the Order in Council, whether the draft of it might be published, so that it might be fully and fairly criticised by Parliament before it is passed into law.

Mr. SPEAKER: Am I to take it that the hon. Member does not intend to move any reduction of the Vote?

Sir R. HAMILTON: No, Sir. I do not intend to move any reduction because that would immediately limit the Debate. As you have ruled that we might have a general Debate on the two subjects, I have refrained from moving a reduction.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no notice on the Order Paper of any reduction to be moved. That was one of the reasons which led me to suggest that we should take the two Votes together. If no reduction is to be moved, I must put the Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution." If I put that Question to the House, no Motion for a reduction will be possible.

Mr. LUNN: I intend to move a reduction. I had no idea that the moving of a reduction would limit the Debate, and I should be glad if you would tell us in what way it would be likely to limit the Debate if I moved a reduction.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know for what reason the hon. Member would wish to move a reduction. It should be for some particular purpose and can only be moved to one Vote at a time.

Mr. LUNN: A reduction in the Vote would be moved, as it is usual to move a reduction, for the purpose of expressing dissatisfaction at the statement of the right hon. Gentleman with regard to administration in the Colonies.

visions that I ought to have done in the way of reference, but in the course of this discussion hon. Members will no doubt be very quick to point out my sins of omission, and possibly, with the leave of the House, I shall have an opportunity of making some of them good before the discussion comes to an end. But this is a tremendous field. The Colonial Office, as I said, administers the affairs of a very large number of countries. It is concerned with the affairs of a great variety of interesting and attractive peoples and with a very great variety of fascinating problems. Perhaps I might close with this reflection. To-day many attacks are being launched by various critics upon our parliamentary institutions. We are told of superior forms of Government. We shall be quite ready to acknowledge the equal merits of those other forms of government when they can show an equal achievement with that of this Parliament over the last 200 years. One of the greatest of the achievements of this Parliament is that governing after generations, in many stresses and many changes, it has guided successfully and wisely, and, on the whole, successfully the affairs of the widest and the most complex Empire the world has ever known.

4.45 P.M.

By ROBERT HAMILTON : I am happy to be in a position to-day of being the first to be able to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman upon the very admirable way in which he has presented his Estimates for the first time at this hour. Had he not told us, or had we not known we should not have thought that he had only been six weeks at the Colonial Office, but that it was more like six years. He spoke with a wonderful knowledge of the subject, and considering the wide field from which he had to choose, I think that what he has told us about was very admirably chosen. The House will, I am sure, be satisfied to know that the Colonies as a whole have improved their financial position markedly during the last year. They have been through an extraordinarily bad time owing to the economic disaster that has blown around the whole world, and the facts and figures that have been given us to-day show conclusively that they are beginning to overcome their financial difficulties.

There are one or two questions to which I wish to direct the attention of the right hon. Gentleman and to ask for a reply, which, I hope, we shall get later on. Before I come to deal with the general question of the economic policy, I should like to call attention to what we must all regret very much, and that is that one of our Colonies, namely, Cyprus, an island Colony, is not connected to our own country by a British line of ships. It seems to me an intolerable position that that Colony which has been in our possession now for a great number of years should be dependent for its communication with this country on what is a subsidized foreign line. I know that the Colonial Office are taking steps to remedy that position, and I hope the Colonial Secretary will be able to tell us that something definite is in view to remedy a state of affairs which we all regret. In connection with the question of shipping I should like to ask what, if anything, is being done in regard to the harbour of Famagusta. It is only a partially made harbour, and until it is completed there is no proper harbour for the whole island. In these days of extended touring by large cruise liners it is exceedingly unfortunate that such incidents should occur as have occurred lately, where a cruise liner has been unable to land her passengers and had to leave the island because she could not get sufficient harbour accommodation. In connection with the communications with Cyprus I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will be able to tell us something with regard to the air communications as they exist at present and as they are planned for the future.

Leaving Cyprus, I wish to ask a question with regard to Malta. We all know that the constitution of Malta, unfortunately, was suspended some few years ago owing to a state of emergency. We should like to be told what the position of the state of emergency is to-day if the emergency is still continuing, or whether it is showing any signs of improvement. We all know that a state of emergency may be drawn out like a piece of elastic or it may be shortened. Therefore, action taken in the state of emergency can be continued for a shorter or longer period. We should like some reassuring information as to the position in Malta and what possibility there is of