

unt

CONFIDENTIAL FUNDS

P.M.'s meeting with John Carlisle
M.P. ~~Revan~~

PRIME

MINISTER

SEPTEMBER 1981

Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date
to T.A							
16.9.81							
17.9.81							
PREM 19/571							



10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

17 September 1981

Dear Ray,

JOHN CARLISLE MP

John Carlisle, MP, called on the Prime Minister this evening as arranged, to discuss the Gleneagles Agreement and CHGM.

Mr. Carlisle referred to his association with a new organisation called Freedom in Sport dedicated to taking sport out of politics and encouraging freer contacts among sportsmen. He said that he had made a number of visits to South Africa in recent years and had seen that sport there was becoming increasingly multi-racial. Indeed, in many instances, sport there was fully integrated. He referred to cricket as having a particularly good record. However, the sportsmen in South Africa felt that their efforts were getting no recognition internationally. They were having to bear the brunt of breaking down apartheid but they could not be expected to go on doing so if there was no response. Mr. Carlisle said that against that background he was concerned about the likely discussion of the Gleneagles Agreement in Melbourne. He appreciated that it was unrealistic to hope that the Gleneagles Agreement might be denounced. However, it was important that, at least, nothing should be done in Melbourne to make the Gleneagles Agreement more binding.

The Prime Minister said that her objective in Melbourne would be to keep discussion of the Gleneagles Agreement to an absolute minimum. She hoped it might be possible to get away with no more than a brief confirmation of the Agreement. She agreed with Mr. Carlisle that it was altogether unrealistic to expect that the Agreement might be denounced. Any attempt to reopen its terms would cause more difficulties than it would solve. But she would certainly resist any attempt to toughen it up.

Mr. Carlisle asked whether there was any possibility of reaching an agreement to exclude from the operation of the Agreement those sports which could be shown to be fully integrated in South Africa. The Prime Minister said that she saw little prospect of this. The Gleneagles Agreement was directed against apartheid as such. Those who supported the Agreement were unlikely to be moved by evidence of improvements in individual sports. They would be looking for evidence that the system

/ itself

itself was being changed. She herself, of course, had always thought it important to welcome publicly any amelioration of the situation in South Africa and would go on doing so.

The Prime Minister asked whether the Freedom in Sport Campaign intended to make any kind of representations during the CHGM in Melbourne. Mr. Carlisle said that he himself had in fact been invited to go to Melbourne. He was hesitating as to whether or not to accept. The Prime Minister said that she thought that the events which had accompanied the Springbok tour to New Zealand meant that sport would be a very sensitive topic in Melbourne. She thought that it would be an inauspicious occasion for Freedom in Sport to make its presence felt. She hoped that Mr. Carlisle would not go. Mr. Carlisle said he was grateful for the Prime Minister's advice. He implied that he would take it.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Roderic Lyne (Foreign and Commonwealth Office).

Yours sincerely

Richard Alexander

Ray Higgins, Esq.,
Department of the Environment.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

Prin Higgins



DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT
2 MARSHAM STREET LONDON SW1P 3EB
01-212 3434

My ref: M/PSO/17509/81

Your ref:

Miss C Stephens
Private Secretary
10 Downing Street
LONDON SW1

16 September 1981

Dear Caroline

Thank you for your letter of 10 September to Warwick Smith about the Prime Minister's meeting tomorrow with Mr John Carlisle MP.

As requested, I enclose a brief for this meeting, which has been approved by my new Minister. It has been agreed by FCO at official level.

A copy goes to Roderic Lyne, Lord Carrington's office.

*Yours sincerely
Raymond M Higgins*

MISS R M HIGGINS
Private Secretary

C O N F I D E N T I A L

SPORTS CONTACTS WITH SOUTH AFRICA

BRIEF FOR THE PRIME MINISTER'S MEETING WITH
JOHN CARLISLE MP - 17 SEPTEMBER

POINTS TO MAKE

1. We all abhor 'apartheid'.
2. Aware of Mr Carlisle's strong views against Gleneagles. Others attack it equally strongly as ineffective.
3. Sporting contacts with South Africa are potentially the most contentious item at the CHGM. They could sour the atmosphere, jeopardise next year's Commonwealth Games in Brisbane and at worst split the Commonwealth.
4. Determined that differences over interpretation of 'Gleneagles' should not disrupt Commonwealth relations in other fields.
5. Have some sympathy for Mr Carlisle's views. Reports confirm that some sports have moved towards non-racialism. Welcome announced intention of South African Government to amend certain apartheid laws to exclude sport. Wish to encourage those developments and to recognise progress. Some believe this would be better achieved by contact. But cannot act alone since the majority hold that only isolation has stimulated change.
6. After the Springbok tour of New Zealand dilution of Gleneagles by agreement inconceivable. We attach great importance to individual freedom and could not accept any amendments which would involve coercion.
7. Mr Carlisle must recognise the sensitivity of our position. It is essentially similar to New Zealand's. But we are in a minority of two. Even Canada and Australia are prepared to exclude South African sportsmen: other members prevent their sportsmen from visiting South Africa. In these circumstances our best course at CHGM will be to seek a reaffirmation of the present text of Gleneagles. To do less could split the Commonwealth.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

8. The UN 'Blacklist' is quite separate. It is not binding and we will not apply it.

9. Sports organisations led the way in seeking to isolate South Africa. There is little evidence yet of a changed attitude (eg the International Amateur Athletics Federation recently confirmed its ban on South Africa.)

BACKGROUND BRIEFPRIME MINISTER'S MEETING WITH JOHN CARLISLE MP - 17 SEPTEMBER
SPORTS CONTACTS WITH SOUTH AFRICA

Mr Carlisle is the most persistent Parliamentary critic of the Government's support for the Gleneagles Agreement. It is his personal view that there has been significant progress towards integrated sport in South Africa, and that Gleneagles is now irrelevant and should therefore be scrapped. Furthermore, he has expressed concern that others are using Gleneagles (and thereby sport) to further wider political objectives in Southern Africa. Mr Carlisle undertook a personal fact-finding visit to South Africa in May which, although of only short duration, seems to have increased his convictions. Since then he has tabled 2 Adjournment Debates on the subject (3 June and 31 July - Hansard Extracts attached). Mr Carlisle is also associated with the Freedom in Sport Club formed in June; this is a pressure group whose main aim appears to be the promotion of sporting links with South Africa.

A majority of Commonwealth opinion, particularly in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean, would subscribe to the view that "normal sport is not possible in an abnormal society". Such opinion argues that progress towards non-racialism in sport has only been brought about by the isolation of South Africa. Such countries firmly believe that the sporting isolation of South Africa must continue even if Gleneagles has to be strengthened to achieve it.

After the recent Springbok tour of New Zealand there can be little hope of achieving a diluted text of Gleneagles at the CHGM. Failure to reach agreement could however have far reaching consequences for next year's Commonwealth Games, and beyond that, the Commonwealth itself and international sport generally. Mr Carlisle nonetheless advocates the scrapping of Gleneagles even if it leads "to the break-up of the Commonwealth, however sad that might be" (Hansard Col. 1474 - 31 July 1981). This price would obviously be too high. Even if the Commonwealth itself remained intact, such a move could also lead many countries to boycott British sport.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

Mr Carlisle has also expressed concern about the effect of the United Nations "black list" on the forthcoming cricket tour of India. Two players whose names feature on the black list are in the tour party. Should the Indian Government decide to refuse entry to either, it is likely that the Test and County Cricket Board would call off the tour.

South Africa (Sporting Links)

Motion made, and Question proposed, That this House do now adjourn. —[Mr. Goodlad.]

11.57 pm

Mr. John Carlisle (Luton, West): I congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on bringing the previous proceedings to a close before midnight. As hon. Members know, this is Derby day. I started a tradition last year in this House that on Derby day we discuss sporting matters. It is a cause of sadness to some hon. Members that we do not discuss sport more often. Apart from my pleasure in seeing the Minister present for the debate, I am also delighted that the right hon. Member for Birmingham, Small Heath (Mr. Howell), who is greatly interested in this subject, should have been able to attend.

Twelve months have elapsed since I brought to the attention of the House the Sports Council report that followed the mission to South Africa, led by Mr. Dick Jeeps, which was funded by the Government. The mission reported on the progress made on integration of the races in South African sport. It was a factual, comprehensive and, as I think those who have read its findings will agree, an accurate report. It was well received by sportsmen throughout this country, dealing, as it did, with a delicate subject.

The Minister himself acknowledged that the report was thorough. My hon. Friend recommended that the report should be circulated to other countries. I hope that his suggestion has been adopted. The report came to no conclusion, although Mr. Jeeps gave his opinion after publication and opinions have also been expressed by representatives of similar missions to South Africa over the past few years.

The opinions expressed show that multi-racial sport in South Africa has come a long way towards full integration. Many people recognise that, despite the strong opposition in South Africa shown in the recent general election to the great reforms that the Government party has made.

The report is a measure of progress in the last several years. The progress has been made by a Department which is seeking information. It is therefore disappointing that the Minister and the Prime Minister have said that although sport has made progress towards multi-racial activity in that country, they are still not satisfied that it has gone far enough. Many people ask how far South Africa must go to satisfy Her Majesty's Government and the rest of the world.

Only this week in another place, Lord Kinnoull raised the question of segregation in sport in South Africa. The reply from Lord Avon was about rumours of recent initiatives. That was unfortunate because it shows that the Government are not taking account of what has happened in South Africa. I appeal to the Minister, who was in South Africa some years ago, to go back and see the progress for himself.

Since the report was presented and since the debate 12 months ago, events have taken a nasty and vicious turn. I regret that our Government, perhaps because of their intransigent attitude towards the Gleneagles agreement, have not recognised the progress as much as many would like. They must take some responsibility. Indeed, the South African Non Racial Olympic Committee, the London-based political weapon of the South African

council on Sport, is using the new political weapon of a blacklist of sportsmen throughout the world. It contains many British sportsmen.

SACOS is a totally unrepresentative body in opposition to the National Government in South Africa. It is racially discriminatory in that it is dominated by Indian and coloureds. Very few, if any, whites, and few blacks are on its board. Yet it has taken upon itself to produce a blacklist through its organisation in London. I am sad that it has captured the imagination of the media and has held many headlines throughout the world. It is a vindictive list relating to the spiteful policy which SANROC is pursuing.

The activities of SACOS in South Africa should be catalogued here. The report tells stories of tyres being slashed and intimidation against people who are not members of SACOS. When I was in South Africa recently, I was told the story of the world boxing championship in the Orlando stadium in Soweto. SACOS distributed leaflets round the township before the event saying that it had been cancelled in an attempt to reduce the 40,000-strong crowd. The crowd turned up and the event went ahead. SACOS tried the same tactics when the O-Jays—an American singing group—gave a concert in the same stadium.

I was also told of the story of an 11-year old school girl who took part in a sporting event, not organised by SACOS and who was chastised in front of her 1,400 school mates. SACOS is dominated by teachers. It is not unknown for examination results to be affected by teachers if that is in the interests of SACOS.

Mr. Denis Howell (Birmingham, Small Heath): Would the hon. Gentleman care to comment on the extraordinary incident of the cricket match between two schools, where because two players on one side were coloured, the headmaster and school authorities refused to allow the match to continue? There was the even more appalling case of blind people taking part in a Braille contest who refused to continue when they learnt—although they could not see—that some of the opponents, who were also blind, were coloured. Does not that suggest that progress is not quite what the hon. Gentleman suggests? Will he condemn those actions along with any other condemnation that he cares to put forward?

Mr. Carlisle: The right hon. Gentleman should be grateful for the fact that I gave him so much time. There was a similar instance in the Craven week when schools refused to play against black teams. They were banned by the organiser and the authorities took a dim view of the incident that the right hon. Gentleman has brought to the attention of the House.

When I was in South Africa the SACOS organisation seemed to be in some disarray and disillusionment. The president did resign but then changed his mind because of the pressure put on him. Only yesterday we heard from South Africa that Norman Middleton, the president of the South Africa Soccer Federation, which is a SACOS organisation, said that he would tell all. He said:

"For the sake of unity and our fight to bring true non-racialism to our sport, I have always accepted these backhanders. Now it has all changed."

That shows the sort of organisation that we are discussing.

Only recently, in a new magazine called "Pace", the admirable journalist Ian Wooldridge, who is well known in Britain spoke of Sam Ramsamy, the SANROC leader in London, and said about the funding of that organisation:

"Ramsamy's friends as the years progressed included several with strong Russian accents."

It is only right that the House should realise that that organisation, which purports to speak for many millions of South Africans—although I believe that it is unrepresentative—has a doubtful means of origin for its funds.

The first example of the blacklist in Britain was brought to our attention by Lord Chalfont in an admirable article in *The Times* about John Feaver, a well-known English tennis player. He went to Nigeria to play in a tournament. He was detained in a cell overnight and then sent home with two of his colleagues, his crime having been that he played sport in South Africa, where tennis is played on a multi-racial basis. Despite my questions in the House, I was disappointed that the Government made no protest to the Nigerian Government about that incident. Not many days later the President of Nigeria was feted in this country by Her Majesty the Queen and my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister. I could only wish that many organisations would take the view of the International Tennis Federation, which has now banned Nigeria from the Grand Prix circuit.

The first blacklist that appeared was well known and has been well publicised. The most prominent name on the list was that of Dick Jeebs, the chairman of the Sports Council, who said that he would lose no sleep through being on the list. But it shows the importance of that list. To cap it all, to obtain the official seal of recognition SANROC received the support of the committee of the United Nations against apartheid—a committee which hon. Members know full well is dominated by those with Eastern European sympathies. I congratulate the Minister and the Lord Privy Seal on their utter condemnation of the affair at that time. We await the full United Nations decision on the matter, but I hope that the Government will take the same line as the Minister.

The list is blatantly political, as is obvious for all to see. There was the recent example of Mr. Bill Hicks who spent a holiday in South Africa, returned to Britain, reported his activities to *The Times*, and was immediately blacklisted. There is Geoff Cook, the Northamptonshire cricketer, who spent the winter and previous winters coaching the blacks out there. Everyone who has been there realises the desperate need there is for coaching, when some 500 turn up for each coaching session. For his efforts he was put on a black list.

There is Charles Palmer, the well-known cricket administrator, who went with the ICC in 1979 on a fact-finding mission, the results of which were kept secret. He has been put on the black list because he went to see for himself. As hon. Members will know, there are several names, including Lester Piggott, Geoff Boycott and Mark Cox, people who have brought much pleasure to South Africa and given an enormous amount of instruction to less-privileged members of South African society and in South African sport. To cap it all, not many weeks ago we had the incident of Robin Jackman in Guyana, when the English cricket team was on the verge of coming home. Again I congratulate my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister on her comment at that time. This had absolutely nothing to do with Gleneagles.

Mr. Sam Ramsamy has promised that several more names will be added to the list. It could be considered as a fairly amateur production. As reported by Ian Ball in the *Daily Telegraph*, it had several tell-tale marks and

[Mr. Carlisle]

duplicator mistakes when it came out. It had obviously been compiled at the last minute from newspaper reports here and in South Africa. We are told that it is to be updated. Only this week there was an attempt to blackmail three Cardiff rugby players, three British Lions, who were going on a rugby tour to Rhodesia. They were told that they would not be allowed to enter that country unless they signed a declaration that they would not return to South Africa. Thank heaven, reason prevailed and the tour went ahead.

The aims and objectives of this political organisation are obvious. They are being used as a weapon against South Africa and against individuals and take no account of the feelings of individuals. They are nothing more than a personal vendetta. Who knows but that, if this movement were to grow, it could affect the Olympic Games, rugby in New Zealand, the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane, and test matches with the West Indies, India and Pakistan. If the list included discrimination against South Africans in this country even Wimbledon and the Open Golf might be threatened. If the effort to exclude all South Africans continues it could lead to a sporting desert throughout the world.

I am told that SANROC intends to extend its activities into entertainment. An excellent article in *The Guardian* by Donald Swann highlighted the terrible problem now becoming evident where entertainers are being denied the opportunity to go to South Africa to entertain in front of all colours. In that article he showed how far South Africa has gone down the road.

One wonders where this is going to stop. Will a list be brought out to discourage business people from going to South Africa? There are some 350 British companies working in South Africa worth some 250,000 jobs in this country and investment of up to £7,000 million a year. One may think that the list is reaching almost farcical proportions. One can understand the temptation for some people to let the list grow. Many who might be are not on it. Perhaps we should feed names to SANROC so that the list would become completely manageable and there could be no sporting competition anywhere without those on it. I wonder what the cricketers of the West Indies, India and Pakistan would say if they had to stay away from the rich financial pastures of Lords, Adelaide and Christchurch.

This is a serious matter, because it is a gross infringement of the British citizen's personal liberty. There was much in South Africa which I did not like and which many hon. Members do not like. There was also much to encourage me. They have made massive strides towards integration and there is no doubt that sport has led the way. Only this week the Government have announced, following a special sports report, that they will accept the recommendations of the report that the Liquor, the Group Areas, and the urban area for blacks Acts, are to be abolished for sport. Spectators are integrated, players change together and there is multi-racial competition throughout South Africa. The authorities there are very hard on recreants who do not follow that policy. They are being forced into change. The biggest barrier is probably the local authorities and some Government Departments. In this way we should give credit to the sportsmen of South Africa for the lead that they are taking in trying to change the politicians' minds, an endeavour in which they have enjoyed a certain amount of success over the years.

South Africa was committed to a 20-year sentence. That was a long time ago. It has had no remission for good conduct, and I suggest that it is about time that that was considered. I hope that my hon. Friend the Minister will deplore the list. I hope that he will give an assurance that in the United Nations the Government will speak out against, and not just abstain on this issue. I hope that he will continue to encourage the sports administrators in South Africa to maintain the progress that they have made and encourage sports administrators in this country to go out to see for themselves.

We are much encouraged by what has happened in the United States and by the initiative of President Reagan in seeing my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary. The South Africans are much encouraged by the new Administration in Whitehall. I hope that I shall receive that encouragement from my hon. Friend tonight.

12.15 am

The Under-Secretary of State for the Environment (Mr. Hector Monro): I am grateful to my hon. friend the Member for Luton, West (Mr. Carlisle) for raising this subject and to the right hon. Member for Birmingham, Small Heath (Mr. Howell) for being present.

This is a particularly important topic, and I have no doubt that many of our sportsmen and women share my hon. Friend's concern. This must apply particularly to those who regularly participate in international competition.

I therefore welcome the opportunity to clarify the Government's attitude to the black list. I hope that I shall clear up one or two misconceptions.

Let me begin by explaining once again the Government's attitude generally towards sporting relations with South Africa. It is against this background that we can best consider the United Nations black list or any other.

As the House will know, the Government's policy rests wholly on the 1977 Commonwealth statement on apartheid in sport—the Gleneagles agreement. This requires Commonwealth Governments to take every practical step in accordance with their laws to discourage sportsmen and women of their countries from playing against South Africa.

At the same time, we are firmly committed to maintaining the established autonomy and independence of sport and sporting organisations. Beyond that we will uphold the traditional freedom of our citizens to travel and work when and where they wish.

I cannot believe that any hon. Member would deny the evils of apartheid, but I recognise that many—particularly on the Conservative side of the House—are becoming uneasy. They fear that Governments of the Commonwealth have chosen to place sport in the forefront of a battle against apartheid in South Africa. They see the United Nations following suit.

I share that concern and sense of unease. But we also have to recognise the immense and lasting value of the Commonwealth as an institution. It is perhaps the one organisation that brings together people from all parts of the globe in a real spirit of co-operation. It is this that we must set against the value of absolute freedom to play sport without hindrance. We must, therefore, face political realities. So, too, must our sportsmen and women.

In an ideal world politics and sport would not be mixed. But, regrettably, our is not an ideal world. One can argue that our sportsmen are individuals and citizens first.

They must, therefore, have regard to the wider consequences of their decisions and actions. This is especially true when they may impinge on their fellow sportsmen.

I am not suggesting that these considerations should be paramount, simply that they should be recognised and taken into account. Since we came into office in 1979 our commitment to the principles of the Gleneagles agreement has been reaffirmed many times. No one can be in any doubt about where we stand.

I do not now propose to catalogue the actions I have taken in consequence, but we have sought to fulfil our obligations as best we can in a free society—by advice and persuasion. Often this has been rejected by the independent governing bodies concerned. When it has been we can do no more. The Government have no powers which allow us to take further steps to prevent contacts taking place. Nor do we wish to take any.

In a free and democratic society such as ours it is right that we can seek only to advise and persuade. It is entirely up to the governing bodies and individuals concerned whether they accept this advice. Of course, the Commonwealth statement is open to different interpretations. However, we firmly believe that it concerns action by Governments with their own nationals. Others may interpret it differently, but we do not believe that the Commonwealth statement requires action by us, or any Commonwealth Government, against the nationals of another country.

It may well be that others consider we do not do enough. The emergence of the United Nations black list is their way of advancing the battle lines. But let me be clear. The Government cannot support any proposal which would oblige us to place limitations on the movement of our sportsmen and women, or to interfere with individual liberties.

We have to accept that every country has the right to refuse entry to non-nationals whose presence is considered undesirable. That right cannot be denied. However, we will not accept the use of such powers simply to penalise sportsmen.

We cannot, therefore, approve of this initiative by the United Nations Centre Against Apartheid and we will not support it. Indeed, we condemn all such "sporting black lists", whatever the source. My hon. Friend is therefore right to be concerned about the implications for our sportsmen and the future of international sport.

The House may find it useful if I outline briefly the history of, and background to, this unfortunate black list. Certainly media coverage of its origins and publication has been characterised by confusion over the past few months. Much of this is due to the two earlier unofficial lists by SANROC.

The United Nations Special Committee Against Apartheid has existed in various forms since 1962. The United Kingdom has never been a member, but this is in no way unusual. The committee's membership has consisted almost exclusively of Eastern European and developing nations. Its decisions and recommendations—unlike resolutions of the Security Council—are not binding. The centre against apartheid, which published the black list, operates under one of several sub-committees.

Most of the information on which the list is based has been culled from newspaper reports—or, it seems, from

the efforts of SANROC. Britons feature prominently throughout. This might reflect the fact that SANROC is based here in London.

As my hon. Friend rightly said, the list includes the chairman of the Sports Council and one of its members. I am sorry if my hon. Friend was concerned about my answer to his earlier question about the Sports Council chairman. That was possibly due to a misunderstanding. I have full confidence in Dick Jeeps. I am certain that the fact that his name appears on the list will in no way affect his ability to carry out his duties.

As time rolls forward we can expect new additions to the black list. The secretary's report states that one of the committee's objects in publishing the list is to help secure the isolation of South African sport as a means towards the elimination of apartheid in South Africa.

The report recognises that the co-operation of Governments and sport bodies will be necessary. The Government's view is clear. We abhor apartheid. We are committed to the Commonwealth statement. We will not co-operate with the special committee or the centre against apartheid in the operation of the black list.

It is unfortunate that some Commonwealth countries have already taken action on the black list. The United Nations report notes that Guyana has operated such a policy since 1976. It was this policy rather than this black list which prompted the Jackman affair.

My hon. Friend has given us other examples of what being on the blacklist means to British sportsmen. However, the United Nations committee goes further. It seems to be calling on Governments and sports bodies to bar their own nationals from domestic competition if they feature on the United Nations list. In the case of professional sportsmen, this would mean that individuals could effectively be denied any opportunity to pursue their chosen career. I need not dwell upon the Government's response to that suggestion other than to condemn it. I hope that British and international sports organisations will similarly condemn this proposal.

At its simplest, therefore, the effect of this black list may well be to present individual sportsmen and women with a stark choice. They will have to decide between sacrificing their links with South Africa and sacrificing the possibility of competing in those countries that co-operate with the United Nations Centre Against Apartheid in the operation of the blacklist. In a sense, this would represent no more than an attempt to make individuals face up to the wider responsibilities that I mentioned earlier, but it would be nearer to blackmail than advice. I find the prospect profoundly disturbing and potentially very divisive.

If a significant number of Governments should decide to deny entry to sportsmen named on the United Nations list, the effect could be more damaging. It is not difficult to foresee the result being complete polarisation of international sport. There could be groups of countries that are only prepared or able to play among themselves, which would be a total disaster for the world of sport.

All involved—and those of us who are not directly involved but care—must ask ourselves whether the end justifies the means. I believe that I have made my views and those of the Government quite plain.

However, others, too, have a role. I am thinking particularly of the international sporting federations themselves and the other sporting organisations that sanction or approve tournaments or fixtures. I hope that they will strongly resist pressures from whatever source to

[Mr. Hector Monro]

make use of this or similar black lists in deciding the entries for their competitions. I sincerely hope that British sportsmen and governing bodies, and their counterparts overseas, will try to persuade the relevant organisations to resist these political pressures originating from the United Nations committee. If not, the prospects for international sport begin to look bleak. The Government will do what they can, but it is important to maintain the continued independence of sport and sporting organisations. Therefore there is a limit to what we can do.

My hon. Friend has drawn our attention to three visits to South Africa, the Sports Council's fact-finding report, his own recent visit there, the changed views of Bill Hicks, a respected member of the Sports Council. All report on the encouraging progress made in South Africa towards greater integration of sport.

The Government note the progress with satisfaction. We monitor the situation continuously, but it varies considerably between the different sports. Some have made greater progress towards integration than others.

Every step forward is helpful. We, therefore, welcome reports of the recent announcement by the South African Government that they intend to relax the Liquor Act, the Group Areas Act and related legislation as far as sport is concerned, but I understand that the legislative changes necessary have not yet been approved. None the less, the intention is welcome.

However, we are bound by the Gleneagles agreement. When the Government are persuaded that progress towards integration in sport in South Africa warrants it, we shall certainly seek a review of the Gleneagles agreement, but we are not yet persuaded that this time has arrived—

The Question having been proposed after Ten o'clock and the debate having continued for half an hour, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at twenty-seven minutes past Twelve o'clock.

Gleneagles Agreement

Motion made, and Question proposed. That this House do now adjourn.—[Mr. Thompson.]

6.12 pm

Mr. John Carlisle (Luton, West): It is a great honour to speak on the last day of term; indeed, in the last debate. I am pleased to see my hon. Friend the Under-Secretary of State for the Environment in his place to debate this extremely significant matter. I hope that he will relate what we say to our right hon. Friend the Prime Minister.

The significance of the debate is that it comes just two months before the Commonwealth Conference is due to take place in Melbourne, when undoubtedly the whole issue of the Gleneagles agreement will be high on the agenda. It also comes at a time of great relevance to the problems in New Zealand over the South African rugby tour. I say immediately that I fully support the actions of the Prime Minister, Mr. Robert Muldoon. He has been extremely brave in many of his decisions. Although he has kept well within the Gleneagles agreement. It is sad that in *The Times* the other day he was quoted as speaking of his own little country being rent asunder by the terrible actions of yobs and hooligans of the extreme Left.

As the House will know, the Gleneagles agreement was made by a Labour Government in 1977 and confirmed by a Conservative Prime Minister in 1979. It has never had the approval of the House, which is a cause of shame that should be highlighted. From my researches, I do not believe that it has been debated on the Floor of the House, certainly not since the Government came to power in May 1979.

The agreement has been interpreted in many and varied ways by those considering it from a legal angle, and not least by the notable lawyer Edward Grayson, who has discussed the matter at great length and in legal terms has driven a horse and carriage through it.

We must remember that the agreement itself at all times stands out against apartheid. I believe that all Members of the House and many in South Africa are absolutely against apartheid. The agreement seeks only to discourage and dissuade. It puts no imperative legal binding on any Government to stop their own international sportsmen from practising their arts wherever they choose.

Sadly the agreement has now become an easy political weapon for anyone wishing to mount a vendetta against South Africa. Indeed, it has given such people a respectability which they do not deserve. As the House will know, they have now involved the United Nations in a treaty and an agreement which is of absolutely no concern to them.

Great progress has been made in the integration of multiracial sport in South Africa. The House will recall that I have raised this matter on several occasions, and I do not intend today to go into the detail of that progress. Suffice it to say that the various fact-finding missions that have been to that country, including the International Cricket Conference, a delegation of French parliamentarians and indeed our own British Sports Council, led by Dickie Jeeps, and several individuals who have been there merely on holiday, have almost all reported that great progress has been made towards full intergration of virtually every sport in South Africa. Hard on the heels of that news, the South African Government have recently announced intended legislation to ease certain other laws.

[Mr. John Carlisle]

Regrettably, I believe that that progress has been ignored by the British Government, apart from one or two peremptory remarks noting that some small progress had been made. It is also sad to report that some Ministers who were concerned about this matter before coming to office in 1979 seemed then to put forward an attitude towards South Africa rather more friendly than their attitude today. It is also a great tragedy that, so far as I know, no Minister has visited South Africa since the Government came to office. Without that actual measurement of progress, a complete mockery is made of the Gleneagles agreement.

During this time, opponents of South Africa have been extremely vigilant. Only today I was privileged to visit the international games for the disabled at Stoke Mandeville, where earlier in the week a despicable demonstration took place against the South African athletes. I had a short discussion with Miss Joan Scruton, who is the secretary of the games. She related sadly that international sportsmen of all colours from the South Africa team—cripples, the unfortunates of society—were being got at by extreme anti-apartheid demonstrators.

In South Africa itself, the organisation SACOS, which is well known to my hon. Friend, has been carrying out a physical vendetta and intimidation against certain people. The funds upon which it relies are of doubtful origin. It is well known that the organisation has strong connections with Moscow and Eastern Europe. It has now put out an obnoxious black list to try to prevent sportsmen from playing where they are.

Without doubt, active Governments and even members of Commonwealth Governments are now using the agreement to get at sportsmen. Only today I heard that the Trinidad representatives at the disabled games had been prevented by their Government from taking part. The tragedy of New Zealand has prompted Prime Minister Robert Muldoon to talk about the "experienced organisers of the extreme Left" who are organising the demonstrations.

I regret that while Her Majesty's Government continue to support the Gleneagles agreement, they can only encourage those opponents of free sport, however unwittingly that is done.

We begin to wonder where we go from here, because we now have the black list. The English cricket tour to India is under threat because Geoffrey Boycott, one of our prominent players, is on the list. We wonder what will happen to the meeting of Commonwealth Finance Ministers and whether it will be held in the Bahamas. If that happens, I hope that Britain will refuse to attend. We wonder what will happen to the Commonwealth conference and whether those two allies—Australia and New Zealand—will come to blows. We wonder also whether relations between the United Kingdom and those two countries will be soured because of the agreement.

The Commonwealth Games are under threat because of the actions of Governments who, although within the Commonwealth, seem to be becoming almost enemies of Britain. The South African rugby team is due to go next to America, and I am pleased to report that it has received full co-operation from the United States authorities. For the first time for many years visas have been issued for the players to go there.

We must remember, in the context of the Commonwealth, the various civil liberties in South Africa

that are being objected to by the enemies of that country. There is significance in a letter in *The Times* today from Professor John Hutchinson, who outlines some of the civil liberties that are being flouted in certain Commonwealth countries. In India, for example, he talks about "constitution-bashing" by the Prime Minister. In Guyana, which is a name well known to sportsmen for what happened over the Jackman affair in the winter, he talks about the attitude there towards "awkward immigrants". We all know about the massacres that have occurred in Uganda. If those things are happening in other parts of the Commonwealth, why should South Africa be singled out for this vendetta and the various boycotts?

When the Commonwealth conference begins, and when the Gleneagles agreement is discussed, there will be a great temptation for the whole matter to be left alone, on the basis that because it is not legally watertight the matter can be left where it is and we can continue as we are. There will be those who will seek to strengthen the agreement and there will possibly be those who will seek to weaken it, although they will be in the minority.

I hope that my hon. Friend will pass this on to my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister. In my view, and in the view of many hon. Members, that agreement should be abolished. In Mr. Muldoon's words, "it is now dead". It has become an extremely easy weapon for the political extremists to use, and while it exists they will use it to full effect. It is extremely divisive and sets one country against another. There is not much Commonwealth spirit in that. It is also extremely discriminating against sport.

One wonders why sport should be singled out in this way. If the vendetta is to continue against South Africa, why is the business world not to be penalised? Would that have anything to do with the fact that investment by this country in South Africa is considered to be up to about £9,000 million? Would it have anything to do with the fact that about 250,000 jobs in this country could be dependent upon South Africa? The discrimination against sport is despicable.

I am pleased to report to the House that the right hon. Member for Birmingham, Small Heath (Mr. Howell) I have informed him that I would say this—was quoted in *The Guardian* of 22 March 1975 as saying that

"He was totally opposed to apartheid, but he did not believe that foreign governments should intervene. If business men could travel freely to South Africa, then there was no reason why sportsmen should not."

The right hon. Gentleman has continued an active campaign against South Africa and South African sportsmen. Even out there, while the vendetta continues, South Africa is supplying vast quantities of food to keep alive various countries around it. It also supplies manpower to those various countries.

It will need a bold decision by my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister if she considers scrapping the agreement. It may lead to the break-up of the Commonwealth, however sad that may be. It will lead to the loss of old friends, but it will mean the introduction of new ones. I believe that one day the blackmail and the bluff have to stop. One day the real truth must be told. South Africa's enemies will not stop until they achieve the overthrow of the white National Government, by whatever method they choose. By continuing to support the agreement the Government are giving credence to those aims. I implore

my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister, through my hon. Friend here today, to consider those facts with great urgency before a final decision is concluded.

6.25 pm

Mr. Nicholas Winterton (Macclesfield): I rise briefly to support the case that has been advanced by my hon. Friend the Member for Luton, West (Mr. Carlisle) in an articulate speech. He is widely respected in the country for the stand that he has taken on the subject, and he has highlighted a number of important issues.

The Gleneagles agreement should never have seen the light of day. It is undoubted blackmail, and the sooner it is laid to rest the better. If my hon. Friend is the Minister for sport, let him stand up for sportsmen because the vast majority of sportsmen in this country want to participate in sport throughout the world, and that includes South Africa. If, as we are advised by the intellectuals in the media and elsewhere, reason, debate and discussion is the way to make progress in the world, surely it is only right that that should be carried into sport so that sportsmen from the Western countries such as the United States, France, Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom can go to South Africa and show the South Africans how sport across colours, creeds, and different countries can work.

My hon. Friend knows that great progress has been made in South Africa already. As my hon. Friend the Member for Luton, West said, Dickie Jeeps, who chaired a visiting delegation to South Africa showed in a detailed report that sport in South Africa was rapidly being fully and properly integrated. We have seen on our television screens the chaos—

The Under-Secretary of State for the Environment (Mr. Hector Monro): I hope that my hon. Friend will leave me time to reply.

Mr. Winterton: This debate can go on until 7 o'clock approximately.

Mr. Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bernard Weatherill): Order: The Adjournment motion was moved again, and this debate can last for half an hour.

Mr. Winterton: I shall give my hon. Friend plenty of time to reply.

We have seen some disgraceful scenes in New Zealand where a handful of protestors were allowed to rip down fences around a rugby ground to prevent 20,000 rugby supporters and enthusiasts from watching a game of rugby football. It is appalling that the police did not take action. There are occasions when I am tempted to say that we should let the police turn a blind eye and allow the supporters of rugby to get at these people—these trendy, long-haired layabouts and louts, these trendy extraordinarily Marxist-Christian clerics who seem to encourage the breakdown of society as we know it for reasons known only to themselves.

The scrapping of the Gleneagles agreement will speed up the total integration of sport in South Africa, and the more that the South Africans can travel throughout the world, playing their games, the sooner they will bring changes to their country. Those are the changes that many of us want to see.

But is it not appalling that at Stoke Mandeville, where handicapped people are working together in the world for disabled persons games a protest took place and the South

African team was put in a difficult position by the anti-apartheid movement. The team was greatly embarrassed especially as it contained at least seven blacks from South Africa.

I hope that my hon. Friend will make a meaningful response to the debate and will say that the Gleneagles agreement will not be renegotiated at the Commonwealth conference. The sooner it is laid to rest, the better.

6.29 pm

The Under-Secretary of State for the Environment (Mr. Hector Monro): I am only sorry that my hon. Friend the Member for Macclesfield (Mr. Winterton) has left me so little time in which to respond as he asks.

I cannot but admire the persistence of my hon. Friend the Member for Luton, West (Mr. Carlisle) for again bringing the subject of sporting links with South Africa before the House, because he managed to have a debate last month on the same subject.

My hon. Friend has questioned the Gleneagles agreement. The date of the agreement is significant. Commonwealth Heads of Government issued their agreed statement in 1977, the year after that in which over 20 countries, most of them Commonwealth members, had boycotted the Olympic Games in Montreal. A similar threat hung over the following year's Commonwealth Games in Edmonton. But the Commonwealth was only following a lead already given by sportsmen themselves.

For example, as early as 1970 South Africa had been expelled from the International Olympic Committee and the International Cricket Council, and in 1976 from the International Amateur Athletics Federation and FIFA. This was nothing to do with the Commonwealth or with Gleneagles, so sport took its own action before the Gleneagles agreement came into discussion.

Gleneagles was thus a policy statement which acknowledged and sought to reduce the confusion of what sportsmen themselves were already doing.

The "Gleneagles agreement" is a misnomer. It is not a formal agreement. It is simply a joint statement of policy by Commonwealth Heads of Government. The authority of Parliament was not sought at the time, and has not been sought since—because no such authority is necessary. Gleneagles, however, received wide publicity at the time, and it was open to any Member to raise it in the House, as can be done with more formal treaties and agreements. In fact, it has been raised on several occasions, including the present. The government have repeatedly confirmed their acceptance and support for Gleneagles, which calls on Governments to discourage sporting contact with South Africa.

As with any policy statement, different interpretations are possible. I have considerable sympathy for the New Zealand Government in their present difficulties over the Springboks' tour of their country. They have made clear their opposition to the tour, but the New Zealand Rugby Football Union has chosen to ignore their advice. Mr. Robert Muldoon has amply fulfilled his obligations under Gleneagles to discourage the tour.

One of the tragedies of the Springboks current tour of New Zealand is the effect that it is likely to have on world sport. Never was there a greater need for quiet diplomacy than now, but instead of this, we have confrontation in New Zealand and banner headlines.

As we have already seen, the meeting of Commonwealth Finance Ministers next month has been

[Mr. Hector Monro]

switched from Auckland to the Bahamas. The Commonwealth Games in Brisbane due to take place in October 1982 are under serious threat. Should the Springboks team fly to the United States of America after their New Zealand tour to play three games as planned, then the 1984 Olympic Games in Los Angeles also come under threat.

Mr. Nicholas Winterton: Blackmail again.

Mr. Monro: As a rugby man myself, I am deeply sorry that it is rugby which is spearheading this confrontation in international sport. It is too easy for rugby leaders to claim that politics is none of their business, but it is naive to believe that sport and politics do not mix, especially where South African sport is concerned.

Individual sports must take a broad view and not look only at their own self-interest. A rugby tour such as the present one can have repercussions for the whole of sport.

The Springboks New Zealand tour has focused attention on Gleneagles only two months before the Commonwealth heads of Government meet in Melbourne. My hon. Friend has suggested that the Commonwealth itself might be at risk, but the Commonwealth has an amazing resilience. I hope and expect that the present difficulties will be solved in the spirit of compromise and good sense, as other problems have been in the past. Indeed, Gleneagles itself is a good example of the Commonwealth process at work.

We must expect some pressure at Melbourne for the strengthening of Gleneagles, but I am confident that the Prime Minister and her colleagues will find a way of resolving this difficult problem.

I should certainly like to comment for a moment or two on the International Stoke Mandeville Games for the Disabled, which both of my hon. Friends have mentioned, and rightly so. My hon. Friend the Member for Luton, West has expressed his dismay at the recent attempt by the anti-apartheid movement to disrupt these games. I most certainly associate myself with his dismay.

Let us look at what is happening at Stoke Mandeville. These games, which end on Sunday, have disabled athletes of various races from South Africa among the competitors. We knew of their participation in advance, but decided, exceptionally, that this friendly sporting gathering did not warrant our taking any action under Gleneagles to discourage the event.

We are totally opposed to apartheid but are also deeply concerned for the disabled, who have a heavy enough burden to bear in their everyday lives. It would be wholly inappropriate in our view to draw them into the political arena because of the South African presence.

Indeed, South African disabled athletes have competed at these annual games for many years without hinderance or complaint from anti-apartheid groups or from the previous Administration. That this is the International Year of Disabled People only adds to my conviction that we were right not to intervene. In my view, last Sunday's demonstration at Stoke Mandeville was repugnant.

The press has reported that attempts will be made to add the name of Miss Joan Scruton to the United Nations blacklist. She has been closely associated with these games for many years and plays a key role in the promotion and development of sport for the disabled. I can only add my own view that it would be a tragedy if her splendid work was inhibited in any way.

In my closing remarks, I should like to look at what has happened during recent years in South African sport. Changes have undoubtedly taken place in many sports towards integration, although greater advances have been made in some sports than in others. Both my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister and I have acknowledged at Question time that progress is being made.

Only recently the South African Government announced their intention of amending some of their apartheid laws as they affect sport.

I understand that the changes proposed, based closely on the report of the South African Human Sciences Research Council last year, would affect the Group Areas Act, the Liquor Act and the Black (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act. They have also undertaken to review the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act.

These proposals, which would have a fundamental impact on the playing of sport, could also, just as importantly, have an impact on the "off the field" activities which we in this country take for granted as a normal part of the sporting scene. They are as important as playing the game itself.

I would only add a word of caution. We cannot expect changes to take place overnight. Legislation itself takes time. Its acceptance by the people will probably take longer. However, clearly these moves are to be welcomed. Who can doubt that the isolation of South Africa in the world of sport has contributed significantly towards this process and the speed at which it has been attained?

The Government reaffirm their adherence to the Gleneagles agreement, but we hope that the progress in South Africa will continue so that eventually sporting links can be re-established. That must be the aim of all free and freedom-loving nations and particularly those that want to play sport, one with another.

Question put and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty-two minutes to Seven o'clock till Monday 19 October, pursuant to the Resolution of the House of 23 July.

File
BF 16/9/81

886

10 September 1981

Mr. John Carlisle, MP, has requested an appointment with the Prime Minister to discuss sporting contact with South Africa. This meeting will take place next Thursday, 17 September. I would be grateful if you could send us an up-to-date brief, to reach us by close of play on Wednesday 16 September.

CS

W. L. Smith, Esq.,
Department of the Environment.

From: John Carlisle M.P.



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Home Telephone
Number: 0462 812268

Ian Gow, Esq., M.P.,
The Prime Minister's Office,
10, Downing Street,
London SW1.

7th September 1981

Prime Minister
I suppose we have to? ef. 8/9
Yes - we always see our own M.P.

Dear Mr. Gow,

You may recall some time ago that I requested an interview with the Prime Minister to discuss sporting contact with South Africa before my visit to that country. As you know, since that time much water has gone under the bridge and I should welcome the opportunity of a very short meeting with the Prime Minister before she leaves for the Commonwealth Conference.

At present, I intend to be in Melbourne at the time of the Conference with Mr. Tommie Campbell, who is the Chairman of the "Freedom in Sport" international organisation, recently formed to promote sporting interests free from political interference. If we could both see the Prime Minister for a few minutes before our visit to Melbourne, I am sure we could provide her with information that will assist in the various discussions over Gleneagles. Let me emphasise that my intention is to support the Government in its stand against apartheid in sport and in no way will we "rock the boat".

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

CE Roberts for John Carlisle

(Dictated by Mr. Carlisle and signed in his absence.)