



/JA COLLECTION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 7th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 110: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

REQUEST FOR HEARING

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/40/SR.7
23 October 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 110: ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/40/23 (Part IV); A/AC.109/803, 805, 810-812, 815, 817, 819, 825 and 826)

1. Mr. DEDE (Nigeria) observed that colonialism and racism of the most vicious kind were still endemic in southern Africa. Perhaps nowhere in the world were the debilitating effects of colonial domination and exploitation felt daily as in Namibia and South Africa.
2. Years of concerted efforts to find a peaceful solution to the thorny question of Namibian independence had culminated in Security Council resolution 435 (1978); yet the bantustanization of Namibia had continued with the active encouragement, if not collaboration, of South Africa's Western allies. The so-called Contact Group, composed of the very countries whose transnational corporations were involved in plundering the natural resources of Namibia, had done nothing for the past eight years but watch South Africa consolidate its illegal occupation, and had only occasionally voiced disapproval at South Africa's arrogant violation of the territorial integrity of the front-line States, even while tacitly approving that policy.
3. There was ample evidence that the activities of the Western transnational corporations had indeed impeded the independence of Namibia. The plunder of Namibia's natural resources directly violated the rights of its people as well as the principles of the United Nations Charter and all relevant resolutions and declarations, particularly Decree No. 1. Another stumbling block to the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and independence was the militarization of the Territory by the apartheid régime. The time had come for the United Nations to work for the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The national independence of Namibia could not be sacrificed on the altar of extraneous ideological and economic interests.
4. The world had watched in utter dismay as the racist minority régime, through brutal police and military actions, had murdered over 800 South African blacks during the past 14 months, even as it continued to wage an undeclared war against all the front-line States. The seeming helplessness on the part of the United Nations, despite the universal condemnation of such State terrorism, had been due largely to the unwillingness of some permanent Members of the Security Council to recognize apartheid as a threat to international peace and security.
5. His delegation commended the many courageous initiatives that were being taken by some countries, local authorities and institutions to impose economic and other

/...

(Mr. Dede, Nigeria)

sanctions against the racist régime. In order to avert a racial conflagration engulfing the whole of southern Africa, the Security Council should move to impose mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. That decisive step would lead to the total eradication of the apartheid system and the emergence of a truly multiracial society in South Africa.

6. Mr. MERCADO FLORES (Mexico) observed that there were still colonial Territories in practically all continents and many of them in the Caribbean region. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples should provide new incentive for solving a series of problems associated with colonialism.

7. Exploitation and colonial domination went hand in hand and, by the same token, the independence of the colonial Territories required an adequate political, economic, social and cultural framework. Not only could foreign economic interests constitute a major obstacle to the independence of Non-Self-Governing Territories by their support for the colonial authorities and their sapping of local efforts at production and administration, but they also seriously jeopardized the future of colonial peoples once they became independent. It should be the concern of the international community to ensure economic and cultural independence along with legal and political independence.

8. The case of Namibia undoubtedly required a special approach because of the illegal nature of the occupation of the Territory and the inhuman character of the apartheid policy practised by the occupying régime, and also because of the direct United Nations responsibility for Namibia.

9. The activities of foreign economic and other interests in Namibia and the policies of certain Western Powers in their support, besides being illegal and causing the plunder of the Territory's natural resources, constituted a serious obstacle to its independence. Such activities also fed the aggressiveness, intransigence and disdain of the South African régime towards the the international community and towards international law, and they represented a serious threat to security in the region.

10. Mexico, as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, reaffirmed its commitment to the cause of the Namibian people and their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization. It supported measures such as the arms and oil embargoes or voluntary sanctions to increase pressure on the South African régime, as long as the Security Council, blocked by some of its permanent members, failed to adopt a decision on mandatory sanctions. Mexico also reaffirmed its full support for the Council for Namibia, particularly its recent decision to initiate legal proceedings in local courts against the companies operating illegally in Namibia, as an effective means of implementing Decree No. 1.

11. His delegation was becoming increasingly concerned over military activities and the installation of military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Mexico's position in favour of disarmament made it opposed to any attempt to utilize or test nuclear weapons in the Territories.

/...

12. Mr. KHAMMAVONG (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that since the adoption of the Declaration on decolonization 25 years earlier, the national liberation movements of the colonial peoples, with the aid of all progressive forces, had been very successful in freeing millions from the yoke of colonialism. The newly independent States were, however, still struggling for economic decolonization under very difficult conditions since the imperialists were continuing the blind pillage of their natural resources.

13. In southern Africa, the negative effects of foreign economic activities were most striking in Namibia. Document A/AC.109/826 showed that, in terms of economic ties, Namibia was almost totally dependent upon South Africa; and that structural inequalities in the earning capacity of blacks and whites were also alarming, as was the disproportionate access of blacks and whites to public and social services. The foreign monopolies had no interest in advancing Namibia's industrial capacity and, in fact, made investments only to exploit the Territory's natural resources. Their activities were one of the main impediments to the Namibia's decolonization. His delegation fully supported recent statements by the non-aligned countries strongly denouncing the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia.

14. The focus on foreign economic interests should not obscure the existence of military and other interests which were also impeding accession to independence. It was clear that the Pretoria authorities were, with the unconditional and wide-ranging co-operation of the Western Powers, intensifying their military action against the Namibian people and against SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. The Territory was, moreover, being used as a staging ground for acts of subversion and aggression against the front-line States, most recently against Botswana and Angola. That policy of escalating aggression seriously endangered international peace and security and depended entirely upon active Western support. His delegation supported General Assembly resolution 39/50 strongly urging the international community to increase support to the front-line States.

15. Colonialism was also unfortunately alive in the small Territories, where the administering Powers not only were not handing power over to the people but in some cases were seeking to perpetuate their domination by claiming that the people did not want to change their colonial situation. It would be naive and dangerous to believe further that the military bases set up in a number of the small Territories were beneficial because they provided employment for the local population, an absurd argument cynically advanced by the colonialists. The goal of their military activities and bases was to maintain their military control in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania, and the bases were used to suppress national liberation movements, intimidate independent countries and interfere in their internal affairs. Under such circumstances, it was difficult for peoples living in dependent Territories to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Neither geographical location nor size, however, could be an obstacle to their decolonization.

(Mr. Khammavong, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

16. The Western imperialists responsible for the current predicament of the former colonies must make reparations for the damage done to the social and economic development of the new States.

17. The Lao People's Democratic Republic firmly supported the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa and supported the General Assembly's position that military bases and installations in Non-Self-Governing Territories must be dismantled.

18. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that efforts to remove the vestiges of colonialism were being hampered by foreign economic and other interests which persistently violated the right of peoples in dependent Territories to self-determination and control over their own resources, despite the protests of the international community. That was possible because the United States and certain NATO countries saw decolonization as inimical to their long-term political, economic and military interests, especially in southern Africa, where their increased economic co-operation with the apartheid régime was well documented, as was the brutal exploitation of Namibia by their profit-mad transnational corporations.

19. Equally well documented was the deteriorating situation of the small colonial Territories, owing to their economic exploitation by foreign monopolies, which prevented them from achieving self-determination. The claims of the administering Powers that special conditions applied in such Territories because they were small, underpopulated or geographically isolated were merely pretexts to keep them in a state of colonial dependence.

20. His country condemned the continued plundering of dependent Territories by Western monopolies. It supported demands for disinvestment from and an immediate end to all economic co-operation with South Africa and called upon the international community to take urgent measures to remove the remaining obstacles to decolonization.

21. Many former colonies were kept in a state of colonial dependence through the economic shackles of their inherited economic structure and the neo-colonialist practices of imperialism, such as protectionism, unfair trade, exploitation by transnational corporations, the overvalued dollar, tightened credit and efforts to involve newly independent States in the costly arms race. The victims of those policies were perfectly justified in demanding compensation in the form of the increased transfer of resources to them from those responsible. The imperialist Powers did not shrink from spreading dissension and disunity among the newly independent countries in order to prevent them from implementing the progressive policies that would promote their economic decolonization. His country supported demands for economic decolonization through a restructuring of international economic relations on a democratic basis and the establishment of a new international economic order. It also supported the adoption of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, including economic ones, against the racist régime in South

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

Africa. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples should be observed by the adoption of significant political decisions designed to ensure the final eradication of colonialism in all its forms.

22. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) said that foreign economic interests were not necessarily exploitative and that the case of Namibia could not be applied indiscriminately to other territories. Private foreign investments and economic interests had stimulated growth and prosperity in his own country without impeding its right to self-determination and could do even more for Non-Self-Governing Territories, where they were an essential source of foreign exchange earnings, managerial skills, technical know-how and access to world markets. Only ideological prejudice could blind one to the reasons why his country encouraged in its dependent Territories the same economic policies that it pursued successfully at home. His country's dependencies were small, underpopulated and devoid of natural resources, with very little to pillage or deplete, and their limited economic potential was best developed through capital-intensive economic pursuits which made the best use of limited manpower. It was therefore perfectly natural that his country's dependencies concentrated on the services sector. Bermuda, the Cayman Islands and Montserrat were excellent and well-documented examples of economic and social success which owed much precisely to foreign economic interests. The Committee must recognize the fact that foreign economic enterprises in dependent Territories had, with occasional exceptions, contributed to the establishment of sound economic infrastructures instead of passing resolutions based on ideological blueprints rather than on serious examination of the needs of people in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

23. The United Nations must, in particular, take a more objective look at the question of Namibia and consider whether the economic benefits of foreign investment there were outweighed by political disadvantages. According to the Special Committee on decolonization, South African and other foreign economic interests had, for example, depleted Namibia's inshore fisheries but ignored the larger, more valuable and more significant stocks of pelagic fish in the rich offshore waters. Yet FAO experts, in a paper which had, strangely enough, never been published, described how not only the inshore Namibian fisheries, but also the offshore fisheries, had suffered grave damage through overexploitation because of the rapid general build-up in many countries of modern stern trawler fleets, notably in the USSR and other Eastern European countries. In that case, which foreign economic interests were taking those fish and doing such harm to what the Special Committee on decolonization had rightly described as Namibia's most important industry and one of the principal economic resources of the future independent State of Namibia? Were the Namibian people being paid for the fish which the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries were taking? Did those fishing operations provide employment for a single Namibian? The answer from FAO was in the negative. He therefore proposed that the highly relevant report prepared by the FAO experts together with the Commissioner for Namibia should be circulated as a United Nations document; that all future papers about the involvement of foreign economic interests in the Namibian economy should deal

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

comprehensively and objectively with the fisheries sector and cover offshore as well as inshore fisheries; and that those countries which were currently overexploiting Namibia's fish stocks should be encouraged by the Committee to reduce their annual catch immediately. The same problem of depletion of fish stocks also threatened the waters around the Falkland Islands, and he hoped that all interested countries would join his in assisting FAO in its efforts to conserve a national resource of interest to the whole international community.

24. As for the matter of military activities, the Committee on decolonization had taken as its main example Bermuda, where military facilities had the support of both the Government and the Opposition. Those military installations had never been a source of contention and there had never been any pressure for them to be withdrawn. The instances in which foreign military occupation indeed impeded the exercise of the right of self-determination had nothing to do with Non-Self-Governing Territories as defined in the United Nations and were the subject of debate elsewhere.

25. Mr. BRAVO (Angola) said that the transnational corporations continued to play a vital role in the South African and Namibian economies. The activities of the foreign economic interests, which ran counter to United Nations resolutions and Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, only served to strengthen the dominant position of the white minority and perpetuate the illegal occupation of Namibia. The activities of the transnational corporations in the military and nuclear field in Namibia, in defiance of Security Council resolution 418 (1977), and the increasing use of military force by the Pretoria régime were cause for profound concern for his country and the entire international community.

26. For the past 20 years the racist régime had pursued a policy of massive militarization. South Africa had emerged as a regional military Power capable of imposing by force its will on the independent countries of southern Africa. The increase in the number of acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola demonstrated the danger which the strategic alliance between South Africa, its Western allies and Israel posed for the peace and security of the region. His delegation reiterated its strong condemnation of South Africa's policy of confrontation and demanded once again the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from the territory of Angola. Lastly, he stressed that strict respect for the Charter of the United Nations, particularly Article 25, would be a major contribution to the implementation of the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

27. Mr. PIMENTEL (Dominican Republic) said that the United Nations would achieve the purposes for which it was founded only if all its Members observed the principles of the Charter. The Dominican Republic reiterated its steadfast support for the Charter principle of respect for the self-determination of peoples, and it condemned attacks of any kind upon State sovereignty. His country had a particular stake in preventing the violation of those principles.

/...

(Mr. Pimentel, Dominican Republic)

28. His delegation intended to work with all others genuinely opposed to any kind of colonialism and any form of discrimination. He condemned the brutal policy of apartheid, which was barring the majority of South Africans from fully participating in their society; and called for the release of Nelson Mandela and all other freedom fighters imprisoned in South Africa. It firmly endorsed the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia for self-determination and independence and believed that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) offered the only basis for a peaceful settlement of that conflict. It also urged Argentina and the United Kingdom to continue trying to reach a speedy solution to the conflict in the Malvinas Islands.

29. Disputes must be settled peacefully, and States must not shift their own responsibilities in that regard to the United Nations.

30. Mr. ABDORAHMAN (Democratic Yemen) said that, since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the world had gone through a radical change, and new factors that had had a decisive influence on the course of history had made their appearance. Among them was the emergence of many newly independent countries and their active participation in the struggle for the restructuring of international relations on a new, more democratic basis. Despite the enormous progress made in decolonization, some States had not renounced their colonialist policies aimed at limiting the independence of the developing countries and forcibly keeping them under foreign domination.

31. The situation in Namibia was a clear indication that colonialist circles were seeking to perpetuate their domination over the Namibian people by force of arms. For many years, the racist South African Government had been using its powerful military machine to prevent the people of Namibia from exercising their inalienable right to independence and self-determination. The peoples of the world were well aware of the Pretoria régime's defiance of the will of the international community and its insistence on continuing to occupy Namibia and to exploit its resources.

32. The policy of so-called "constructive engagement" enabled the international monopolies and their various interests to continue plundering the natural resources of Namibia. The involvement of the transnational corporations in Namibia and South Africa had enabled the racist régime to enhance its economic capacity and its ability to oppress the majority and hinder Namibia's independence.

33. The granting of credits and loans, other forms of international assistance and the exploitation of minerals in South Africa and Namibia were all closely linked with the increasing military capability, particularly in the nuclear field, of the racist régimes of Pretoria and Israel. Their co-operation in the nuclear field, with the assistance of certain Western States and particularly of the United States of America, was a direct threat to international peace and security.

34. Despite the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and the adoption of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, the transnational corporations continued to plunder the resources of the Territory

(Mr. Abdorahman, Democratic Yemen)

and to repatriate the greater part of their profits. In doing so, they encouraged South Africa and its allies and strengthened the racist and expansionist tendencies of the Pretoria régime. Pretoria and Israel were the constant defenders of the vital interests of the monopolies and, for that reason, received billions of dollars from them. That added to the difficulties of the developing countries, since, in defence of their independence, they were obliged to spend a large part of their resources on enhancing their capacity to stand up to the threat of aggression. Colonialist and neo-colonialist policies bore full responsibility for the appalling economic backwardness of the colonial Territories and the newly liberated countries.

35. His country shared the concern expressed by many others at the establishment of military bases in the Pacific and Indian Oceans and in Territories under colonial administration. The colonialist States sought, by means of military force, to safeguard the interests of the international monopolies by imposing their hegemony on numerous independent countries and keeping them within the colonialist sphere of influence. His country therefore supported the efforts of the United Nations to eliminate the foreign military presence in such Territories.

36. Democratic Yemen was confident that the national will of peoples and their aspirations for a peaceful and independent life, in Central America, South Africa, Namibia, Palestine and Western Sahara, could not be suppressed no matter how great the colonial tyranny might be.

37. Mrs. KING-ROUSSEAU (Trinidad and Tobago) said that, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples the international community should carry out a comprehensive review of all factors impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The Committee must remain vigilant in assessing the situation in the remaining Trust Territories because the domination and exploitation of colonial peoples constituted a denial of fundamental human rights and an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation.

38. The apartheid régime continued to exploit the human and natural resources of Namibia in order to further its economic and military interests, in total defiance of United Nations resolutions and decisions. In spite of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the transnational corporations continued to plunder the natural wealth of Namibia and thus sustain the system of apartheid, both in that Territory and in South Africa. It was encouraging that the idea of imposing economic sanctions against South Africa was gaining acceptance. In view of the increasing militarization of the illegally occupied Territory, it was time to impose comprehensive and mandatory economic and military sanctions against the Pretoria régime. Lastly, it was hoped that all delegations would support the draft decision of the Special Committee on decolonization in document A/40/23 (Part IV).

39. Miss ANYOTI (Uganda) said that Namibia was the last bastion of colonialism. In defiance of United Nations resolutions and Decree No. 1, the racist régime of Pretoria, in collaboration with the transnational corporations of certain Western

/...

(Miss Anyoti, Uganda)

countries, continued to plunder on a massive scale the natural resources of that Territory. Pretoria and the transnational corporations, therefore, had a direct interest in prolonging the illegal occupation of Namibia and its dependence on South Africa.

40. The foreign economic interests had also helped South Africa build up its massive military machine, which was used to strengthen Pretoria's hold over Namibia and carry out acts of aggression against the front-line States. With the help of the foreign economic interests, South Africa had acquired a nuclear capability which represented a grave danger to peace and security in the region and was an obstacle to efforts to establish a denuclearized zone in Africa and turn the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

41. The problems in southern Africa could be solved only through the complete elimination of colonialism and the apartheid system in South Africa. Her delegation strongly condemned the continued economic and military collaboration of certain Western countries with South Africa, which only served to strengthen the system of apartheid and prolong the occupation of Namibia. The Committee should demand the full implementation of all United Nations resolutions concerning Namibia, particularly Security Council resolution 418 (1977). Lastly, Uganda called upon the administering Powers to implement fully the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and expressed its full support for the draft decision contained in the report of the Special Committee on decolonization (A/40/23 (Part IV)).

42. Mr. SKOFENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the military activities of the administering Powers ran counter to the interests of the peoples under their administration and violated their inalienable rights, particularly the right to self-determination. The use of armed force to suppress national liberation movements was the most widespread method used by colonial Powers to maintain their position of dominance. In an attempt to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia, South Africa continued to build up its military presence in that Territory by increasing the size of its armed forces there, recruiting mercenaries and forcibly conscripting Namibians into military service. The military buildup in the Walvis Bay area demonstrated South Africa's determination to carry out the illegal annexation of that part of the territory of Namibia.

43. In escalating its war against the peoples of Namibia and South Africa, Pretoria constantly sought to destabilize independent African States. Namibian territory was used as a springboard for armed aggression against Angola and Botswana. The imperialist States and transnational corporations which supported South Africa financially enabled the racist régime to continue its aggressive policies. The United States and some of its NATO partners which considered South Africa a strategic ally stubbornly shielded Pretoria from effective international sanctions.

44. South Africa's nuclear potential represented a direct threat to international peace and security. Certain Western States, particularly the United States, and

(Mr. Skofenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Israel collaborated with South Africa in the nuclear field and helped Pretoria to carry out its nuclear programme. Pretoria was attempting to manufacture chemical and bacteriological weapons and had used nerve gas in carrying out acts of aggression against Angola.

45. His delegation fully supported the demands for the immediate cessation of collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa in all fields, particularly the military and nuclear fields, and firmly advocated the unswerving implementation by all States of sanctions against South Africa, including an arms embargo. The Ukrainian SSR supported the demands of the African States for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

46. The military activities of the imperialist States and militarist circles in the Non-Self-Governing Territories took different forms. The most modern military equipment was being introduced into the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The United States was constructing a strategic laboratory for its "Star Wars" programme in the Marshall Islands. The best land was used for the construction of military bases, airfields and storage depots for nuclear and chemical weapons. Numerous islands in that area had either been destroyed or contaminated through nuclear tests.

47. The United States and its NATO allies were carrying out joint measures to establish a powerful military beach-head in the Chagos archipelago, which included launching facilities for nuclear rockets on the island of Diego Garcia. Foreign military Powers were violating the rights of the local populations on the islands of Guam, Bermuda, the United States Virgin Islands and other Territories. The presence of those military bases and installations constituted a serious threat to peace and security and prevented the implementation of the right of the inhabitants to self-determination and independence. The NATO programme to turn the Falklands Islands (Malvinas) into a military outpost was fully in keeping with that organization's strategic plans.

48. His delegation strongly condemned the military activities of the Western Powers in the Non-Self-Governing Territories under their administration. The implementation by the peoples of those Territories of their right to sovereignty and independence could be brought about only through the withdrawal of all foreign troops.

REQUEST FOR HEARING

49. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received an additional communication containing a request for a hearing relating to agenda item 18. He suggested that, in accordance with the usual practice, the communication should be circulated as a Committee document for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

50. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.