

Director of Establishments.

The Financial Secretary discussed with me to-day the draft letter to the Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Aviation, about outward baggage examination and the title of the Waterguard.

On the latter point, he appreciated the difficulties about finding a different name for the Waterguard Service and did not press that. He said however that, as he understood it, what is really bothering the Ministry of Aviation is that they say airlines, particularly foreign airlines, find it puzzling and somewhat irritating to receive Customs documents connected with air traffic that contain the word "Waterguard". He thought this applied particularly to

- (a) various rubber stamps used on official documents;
- (b) the title "Waterguard Superintendent" typed below the signature on letters.

I undertook, on your behalf, that we would look at these particular matters and consider how far the word "Waterguard" could be removed, or replaced by "Customs and Excise" or something of that nature, without creating difficulties or confusion for us. (For instance, I suppose the title "Waterguard Superintendent" might for correspondence purposes at airports be shortened to "Superintendent" without causing any confusion, since the title "Superintendent" is not used in the Outdoor Service.)

... I attach a copy of the ^{relevant draft from the} draft letter to Mr. Stonehouse, amended to meet the Financial Secretary's points. Will you let me know, please, if you have any objections to the draft?

16th February, 1966.

Mr. Kennedy, Section 1

c.c. I.C.W.

Mr. Dobson

Mr. Forster

At present the title "Waterguard" is under fire from outside the Department, as being an inaccurate description of the Service. There is, however, no obviously acceptable alternative.

Would you please do the following piece of research: find out the title given, in as many other countries as possible (whether or not English-speaking), to the Service which is their equivalent of our Waterguard. The Intelligence Branch (Foreign Section) may be able to help with sources of information e.g. some countries publish the equivalent of our Board's report, and send us copies.

(A. M. FRASER)

17th February 1966

Librarian

c.c. I.G.W.

Mr. Dobson

At present the title "Waterguard" is under fire from outside the Department, as being an inaccurate description of the Service. There is, however no obviously acceptable alternative.

I should be grateful if you could let me know, as background information, of any other names which have been given to this Service in the course of its history.

(A. M. FRASER)

17th February 1966

Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Innes asked me to let you have these papers back for further action, please. The C.P.S. is sending over to the Financial Secretary's office the revised draft letter to Mr. Stonehouse, containing the revised passage hereunder.

I have no idea what the rubber stamp problem amounts to, but the Financial Secretary seemed to have been told that there are various "Waterguard" stamps that we use on forms, etc., as well as the use of the word on letters.

JF 18/2/66

(Cov.)

The proposal is that at London Airport, & there alone, the W.C. Supt. shd call himself "Superintendent, Preventive Service."

Wld. there be any great difficulty about this from your point of view?

Dr. F.
18/2

At the Home Affairs Committee Meeting on 17th December, when we discussed the Customs treatment of incoming passengers, I promised to write to you about the possibility of dispensing with Customs examination of outgoing flights. I have delayed doing so because the Customs had had representations from the airlines on this subject and have been looking into the whole matter with some care.

The Customs examination of out-going passengers is done primarily to check that currency regulations are being observed; export licensing restrictions also come into the picture, but in practice the risks in this field are less.

Checks in the last month or two, of passengers leaving the country both for holidays and for business reasons, have shown that many passengers nowadays are unaware of the ceiling of £25 in sterling notes which may be taken out of the country. For example: (a) about 10 per cent. of outbound travellers were seen by the Customs in December at London Airport and 300 people were found to be carrying sterling in excess of the allowance (£15,000 excess in all); (b) on one charter flight out of Manchester 30 per cent. of passengers had a total of £1,200 in excess of the allowance; (c) at Liverpool thirty people boarding a vessel for a six months' cruise were carrying £1,300 in sterling notes more than they should have been (and most passengers on this vessel were also carrying their full twelve months' quota of travellers' cheques). Other lesser amounts have been found on a number of other occasions. I must confess I am rather disquieted by these figures, and I am arranging for consideration to be given to the possibility of further publicity about the £25 limit and the penalties for disregarding it. In any event, however, it seems that there is a clear need for policing.

The task of controlling outward passengers is somewhat unwelcome to the Customs themselves, as it does not easily fit in with their other responsibilities, but they try to ensure that the control operates with as little inconvenience as possible to the airlines and to the majority of travellers who have no wish to contravene the law. The present system,

which was introduced with the full agreement of the airlines some years ago, is that the Customs free time to time select a complete flight for outward examination and want to see all the passengers for that flight with both their hand baggage and their hold baggage. It has, I understand, become increasingly inconvenient for the airlines to keep passengers and their hold baggage together until the point of Customs examination; and the Customs accept that in fact the greatest risks in respect of currency attach to hand baggage. They are therefore now discussing the matter with the airlines and suggesting a revised system which will concentrate almost entirely on hand baggage, with only a very exceptional and occasional check on hold baggage. So long as exchange control and export licensing have to be retained, I am afraid there can be no question of removing the control altogether; but I hope the modifications the Customs are suggesting will substantially reduce inconvenience and be acceptable to all concerned.

You also raised the question whether a more appropriate name than "Waterguard" could be found for a Service of which many members are stationed at airports. I agree that as a description of the functions of the Service "Waterguard" is out-of-date, and indeed has been so since airports first came within its field of activities. To the public at large, these men are "the Customs" and a change in their designation would probably attract as little public notice as the present designation does. However, the title "Customs Officer" cannot be given to them officially, as it is already the official title of the separate, non-uniformed grade that does the main bulk of the work of assessing and collecting Customs duties in the field of trade.

I think the point you particularly had in mind was that airlines, particularly foreign airlines, find it somewhat perplexing that the word "Waterguard" appears on various official documents they receive. This is a more limited problem, which it may well be possible to solve; and I am arranging for the Customs to review the various documentary uses of the word and consider how far it can be removed or replaced by something more appropriate. I will let you know the outcome.

Mr. Fraser,
Division 2.

Amst. 2/3

The title "Waterguard" means much to us; we take pride in ourselves as "the Waterguard". I can see quite clearly the apparent anomaly in the name at airports and on the Land Boundary but I was not aware that there is any real confusion. I have often been asked about it and, once explained, our retention of it and affection for it has always been appreciated. Search is going on now to see whether there is any alternative attractive and apt enough to replace Waterguard, which of course has the great convenience of describing the Branch, the officers and the higher grades, all with just one word.

Meantime we have to look into the suggested partial change at London Airports. I don't think this is at all impossible. Notepaper and stamps could be altered easily enough but I cannot say how much farther it would have to go, e.g. how would Morrison be titled for Airport meetings and in Airport publications of one kind or another? I would have thought that by now the name Waterguard is accepted in the Airport Administration without question.

I suggest the papers be sent out to the Airport for local information and views on what is involved.

Edw.

2nd March 1966.



H.M. CUSTOMS AND EXCISE
KING'S BEAM HOUSE, MARK LANE
LONDON E.C.3
MANSION HOUSE 1515

2. iii. 66.

Dear Morrison,

I should be grateful if you wd. let me have your views on the implementation of the proposal in the attached pps. - i.e. avoiding the use of the word Waterguard at LAP.

You will be aware of some of the background to this from the recent discussion at the Superintendents Conference.

Yours,

Am. J. Ash.

FILE No. 19

Mr. Fraser,
Division 2.

There is really very little confusion among members of the business community here arising from the use of the word Waterguard. While the matter is often raised in conversation people realise exactly what the Branch title means and appreciate our traditional retention of it. There may be, however, a few who feel that the use of the term implies that civil aviation is an offshoot of the sea transport industry and for this reason find the word emotionally irritating.

There would be no great difficulty in eliminating the word from London Airports (Heathrow and Gatwick) usage. Notepaper and rubber stamps could quickly be altered. Brass seals, some of which carry the word, are not extensively used and could gradually be replaced. The lead plumb seals do not bear the word.

Government Departments, Public Corporations, airlines and those firms with whom we regularly correspond could be advised of the change by circular. The airport directory and telephone directory could quickly be amended. Nameplates on doors could be replaced. At airport meetings the Superintendent could be designated either Customs Superintendent or Superintendent Preventive Services but the Branch would need to have a title in such publications as the airport directory.

To change at London Airports alone would not solve the problem however. On April 1st the British Airports Authority will assume main control of Prestwick and Stanstead as well as of Heathrow and Gatwick. The two first named are in Glasgow and Harwich Divisions respectively and I could see real confusion arising if the Branch and its Superintendents were titled differently at airports administered by the same Authority.

It would seem that the change will have to be made nationally and the entire Branch title altered. While use of the word Preventive in the title would not be conducive to fostering good relations with the travelling public, it is true to say that only those who correspond with us would be aware of the name. We would continue to be known generally as "the Customs". I am unable to suggest another comprehensive alternative to Waterguard at the moment.

G. E. B. Morrison
G. E. B. Morrison,
Waterguard Superintendent,
London Airports.

C. & E. 584

Sec. F. 283
(March, 1958)



Mr. Fraser, Division 2

c.c. I.G.W.
Mr. Dobson
Mr. Forster

With reference to your minute of 17th February, 1966, regarding the title of the Waterguard Service.

Few countries seem to have a service exactly equivalent to our own. Generally speaking, the primary duty of their anti - smuggling service is to drive incoming goods and individuals into the revenue net where duty will be collected by an officer of (what would in this country be) the Outdoor Service. Their anti - smuggling personnel tend to be less involved in collection of revenue through examination of passengers' baggage. The nearest equivalent services that I can find in each country are described below.

<u>AUSTRIA</u>	<u>CUSTOMS GUARD</u>
<u>BELGIUM</u>	<u>CUSTOMS + BRIGADE</u>
<u>FRANCE</u>	<u>BRIGADE SERVICE</u>
<u>GERMANY</u>	Apparently no separate nomenclature. Duties performed, under (U.K. terminology) the Collector's <u>COMMISSIONER</u> Office by the EXCISE / <u>OF FRONTIER DISTRICT SURVEILLANCE</u> .
<u>GREECE</u>	<u>BRIGADE SERVICE</u> Also an independent service for the prevention of smuggling by sea, working directly to the Ministry of Finance, viz. XXXX <u>SEA POLICE (FINANIE)</u>
<u>IRELAND</u>	<u>PREVENTIVE STAFF</u>
<u>ITALY</u>	<u>FINANCE GUARD CORPS</u>
<u>LUXEMBURG</u>	<u>FRONTIER WATCH</u>
<u>HOLLAND</u>	Apparently no separate nomenclature. <u>GUARD Stations</u> are an integral part of the Inspectorate of Import Duties and Excise.
<u>NORWAY</u>	Duties performed by normal Customs staff, except that there is a special post of <u>COAST GUARD INSPECTOR</u> in Oslo - fjord.
<u>PORTUGAL</u>	<u>FISCAL GUARD</u> - land duties only. Maritime duties performed by normal Customs staff.

Mr. Fraser, Division 2

My submission of 9th March re. title of the Waterguard Service refers. I have today been belatedly advised of the following title, which is additional to those listed in my a/m submission.

NEW ZEALAND

BOARDING INSPECTORS' BRANCH

(The Boarding Inspector is equivalent to the U.K. C.P.O.)

This has not been copied to the recipients of your original minute.

*Kennedy S1
11/3/66.*



FROM THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY

PARLIAMENTARY OFFICE	
TO	<i>Col E</i>
FROM	
CC	

MINISTRY OF AVIATION
HORSE GUARDS AVENUE
LONDON S.W. 1

16th March, 1966.

Dear Niell,

Thank you for your letter of 22nd February and for the considerable trouble you have taken in dealing with our comments on outward Customs examination.

I, of course, accept your point that Customs must check the observation of currency and export licensing regulations. From what you say it looks as though most people who take out too much sterling do so in ignorance of the law, so further publicity about the law will reduce the work falling on Customs and make life easier for passengers, airlines and ourselves.

If Customs can limit outward examination to hand baggage this will also help everyone.

I see your problem in connection with the name "Waterguard". Would it not be possible to call them "Customs Examination Officers" as opposed to "Customs Officers", who as you say are in another branch?

Yours sincerely
John

JOHN STONEHOUSE

1. I.S.W. Do you wish to add?
2. D. of E.

If one had to retitle the entire Waterguard Service, the most obvious name would be Preventive Service. This has some support in the earlier history of the Service, and also, of course, fits in with the present titles of the three uniformed grades. A number of other English-speaking countries (Ireland, Canada, Australia, Trinidad, India) have similar names for their equivalents of the Waterguard. Against such a change would be the unfortunate overtones of the word "Preventive": it would probably not enhance the service image in the eyes of the public or of potential recruits.

Mr. Morrison's minute above shows that there would be no particular practical difficulty about implementing a changeover to such a title as "Superintendent, Preventive Service" at London Airports. He makes the point, however, that there might be confusion at other airports if the change were limited to London. We could no doubt meet any pressure on this by pointing out that e.g. the Waterguard Superintendents, Glasgow and Harwich, are not concerned solely with Prestwick and Stanstead and that there is therefore little anomalous about their title. Probably the British Airports Authority would quickly become accustomed to the differing nomenclatures - just as people have become accustomed to the use of the word Waterguard at airports.

I have no enthusiasm for either the general or the isolated change. It may be that this issue is a bee in the bonnet of someone at Ministry of Aviation, and that once the British Airports Authority takes over at the beginning of next month, the subject would be allowed to rest. The Financial Secretary has, however, undertaken to pass on the outcome of our deliberations. If we have to make a positive move, I suggest that we put forward the limited proposal, while pointing out that we must recognize that the title 'Preventive Service' may tend to spread and that this would be unwelcome.

If you agree with this course, I shall prepare a draft.



(A. W. FRASER)
22nd March 1966

Naturally I would prefer that we leave well alone but if we have to do something in the Airports Division why not simply drop "Waterguard" from notepaper and rubber stamps, the points about which the Financial Secretary was most concerned? Cont. 23rd 66

Chairman

My original view was that the only realistic alternative to Waterguard was the present one, viz. Preventive Service, and that this would not be suitable for general use because of the over-tones attached to "Preventive" as part of the title of an arm of Government. ~~obscure~~. I have now come to the conviction that my objection was misconceived, in that those over-tones are silenced by the word "Service", and I think "Customs Preventive Service" would be an acceptable title for public use. Other possibilities on these lines would be "Customs Protective Service" or "Customs Defensive Service", but I think "Preventive" has it as the adjective in possession, as it were.

Departmentally we should of course drop the word "Customs" from the title, and the three lower ranks would retain, as now, their titles A.P.O., P.O., and C.P.O. In the higher ranks, the Waterguard Superintendent would become internally the Preventive Service Superintendent and externally, since that title with Customs prefacing it would be too much of a mouthful, the abbreviation Customs P.S. Superintendent could be used. And so for other ranks.

It must I think be said in favour of the change that a wrong image is projected if the Department is seen to cling to traditional designations which have become inappropriate, and we cannot seriously contest the fact that at airports the title Waterguard is anachronistic. (The historical notes in these papers show that in the late 18th and the 19th centuries there was readiness to change titles of considerable antiquity.)

In the context of the Channel Tunnel, too, the title Waterguard would have a very strange ring.

On balance then, while I appreciate the attachment of the Inspector-General and the members of the Service to the old title, I feel that we shall eventually be driven to drop it and now is as good a time as any.



30th March, 1966.

Director of Establishments

I have little doubt that in logic your minute of 30th March is sound in proposing that the Waterguard title should give place to the Preventive Service. I doubt not too that this will come. But I think we would be prudent to allow the change to evolve over time rather than to impose it immediately and as a consequence of our "little local difficulty" at Heathrow. I would therefore prefer that Mr. Morrison should change to become either Superintendent without ascription or Superintendent Preventive Service as might be preferred. Prestwick and Stanstead can continue to be run quite reasonably by the Waterguard Superintendents of Glasgow and Harwich.

The process of evolution could be encouraged if amongst ourselves we used the "Preventive Service" more frequently than the "Waterguard".



4th April, 1966.

Mr. Fraser

*To note and date accordingly
by the Director when appointed.*



Mr Smith

Archivist + Curator

R 429

These protests may well be of
interest to the library. Reorganisation
has resulted in a departmental identity
and thus removed the needs for
-autonomy and the term 'Walden'.

The concept of John Stonehouse
has been overtaken by events.

J. A. B. K

ODA

28th April 81

Chief Inspector.

Although, I understand, you are aware informally of the considerations herein, the papers have not so far been formally referred to you. Before any further steps are taken, I should be glad to have your observations.

R. J. Dawson

Ext. Dwd 2. 13/1/76

Mr. Fraser.

Title of Waterguard

1. The Chairman has said that Mr. Morrison, at London Airport should become either "Superintendent" or "Superintendent Preventive Service".
2. Mr. Morrison and Mr. Davis, the Collector, think that "Superintendent" could lead to local misunderstanding as to the position in relation to the Collectorate. Morrison does not like "Preventive Service" and would like to retain "Waterguard". (He points out that all airline operators talk about the "shipment" of goods).
3. The Chief Inspector, in the file, would prefer "Superintendent, Preventive Service" as this does not tend to weaken the title of the Collector, who has over-all airport control. "Superintendent" by itself might, he suggests, widen the current impression that the Waterguard is the Customs.



(B. T. DOBSON)

13.5.66.

Dis/6

1. Mr. Woolfe.

See note title of file under "Waterford - General"
and show when considerable took place i.e. 1966.

2. Put away

Rev 3
 2/1
 8/6/67

Mr. Lloyd.

In the attached correspondence with the former Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Aviation, the Financial Secretary undertook that we would review the various documentary uses of the title "Waterguard" at airports, to see how far it might be removed or replaced by something more appropriate.

The members of this Service take pride in their traditional title, and would be reluctant to see it go, particularly as the most appropriate alternative description - Preventive Service - may not have the right kind of overtones. We do not favour any general change in the title.

The use of the word 'Waterguard' gives rise to very little confusion among members of the business community at airports, although there may be some who feel that it implies that civil aviation is an offshoot of the sea transport industry and for that reason find the word emotionally irritating. (It is ~~not~~ to point out, however, that all airline operators are guilty of a similar semantic extension in using words like 'shipment' in relation to air traffic). There would be no great practical difficulty about eliminating the word Waterguard from London Airports (Heathrow and Gatwick) usage - e.g. by replacing seals and stamps carrying the word, and amending the airport directory and telephone directory, nameplates on doors and signatures to letters. The head of this service at London Airports would then become 'Superintendent, Preventive Service' instead of 'Waterguard Superintendent'. ('Superintendent' by itself would not suffice, since it would ~~cause~~ cause doubt about the status of the 'Collector of Customs and Excise' who has overall Customs control at the airport).

We suggest that to meet the Ministry of Aviation's point, this change should be made at London airports. The Waterguard Superintendents for other airports, unlike the Superintendent for London Airports, are by no means concerned solely with airports and so there is little anomalous about their title. (For example, Prestwick and Stanstead come under the jurisdiction of the Waterguard Superintendent of Glasgow and Harwich, respectively). We do not suggest any change there.

If this solution meets with the Financial Secretary's approval, we shall draft a letter which might go to the present Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Aviation.

be liable to create

And

7/6

Mr. James *Mr. Fraser* *20/6/66*

I think, particularly given the time that has elapsed since the previous letter, we can let this rest. Anyhow the Commission is no longer at the...

[Handwritten initials]