

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.109/SC.2/SR.39
25 May 1967

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF
INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

SUB-COMMITTEE I

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 10 May 1967, at 10.55 a.m.

CONTENTS

Mauritius, Seychelles and St. Helena: draft report of the Sub-Committee
Activities of foreign economic and other interest which are impeding the
implementation of the declaration in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa
and territories under Portuguese domination as well as in all other
territories under colonial domination

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Miss SINEGIORGIS	Ethiopia
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. JOUEJATI	Syria
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. CAWEN	Finland
	Mr. DIAKITE	Mali
	Mr. CHTOUROU	Tunisia
	Mr. USTINOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. FOUM	United Republic of Tanzania
	Mr. PEJIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Also present:</u>	Mr. SHAW	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. POLYAKOV	Secretary of the Sub-Committee

MAURITIUS, SEYCHELLES AND ST. HELENA: DRAFT REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

At the Chairman's invitation, Mr. Shaw, representative of the United Kingdom, took a place at the Sub-Committee table.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft report which had been circulated in the form of a conference room paper.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that although his delegation welcomed the United Kingdom representative's participation in the meeting, he felt that only members of the Sub-Committee should take part in the discussion of the draft report. He would like to know whether the United Kingdom representative intended to limit himself to replying to any questions that might be put to him or whether he would comment on the draft report itself.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom) said that while a decision in the matter lay of course with the Sub-Committee, he would like to recall that it was the usual practice in other subsidiary bodies of the Special Committee for representatives of the administering Powers concerned to participate in the discussion of reports.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was indeed customary for representatives of administering Powers to make comments on reports relating to the Territories they administered. However, the Sub-Committee was the master of its own procedure.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, in putting his question, he had taken into consideration the fact that during the discussion of the Sub-Committee's draft report on the three Territories the previous year the United Kingdom representative had made comments and had wished them to be reflected in the report but the Sub-Committee had decided not to include them.

The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, she would take it that the members agreed to hear the comments of the United Kingdom representative, on the understanding that the draft report would in no way be amended to reflect those comments. The Sub-Committee's discussion of the draft report would of course be described in the summary record of the meeting.

It was so decided.

Mr. CAWEN (Finland) said that some of the conclusions and recommendations in the draft report were not in accord with the views expressed by his delegation

(Mr. Cawen, Finland)

at the Sub-Committee's meeting on 13 April 1967. He would therefore like a statement to be included to the effect that his delegation could not support all the conclusions and recommendations of the report.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had studied the draft conclusions and recommendations and regretted to note that the full information supplied to the Sub-Committee on developments since the Territories in question had last been considered appeared to have been entirely disregarded. The draft report was an unrelieved catalogue of criticism, which did not even acknowledge the substantial advances that had been made in the Territories in the past few months, such as the establishment in St. Helena of a system of direct executive responsibilities for members of the Legislative Council, the impending introduction in the Seychelles of a new Council with an elected majority and the forthcoming elections there which for the first time would be based on the basis of universal adult suffrage.

His delegation did not propose to enter into detailed comment on the draft report at the present stage; it would reserve that for discussion in the Main Committee in the hope that some of the more obvious deficiencies would on further consideration have by then been remedied by the Sub-Committee. He would only observe that the draft recommendations, particularly where they touched on political and constitutional matters in the three Territories, were characterized by strange contradictions. One paragraph said that constitutional changes must be left to the peoples of the Territories themselves, while in another paragraph, his Government as the administering Power was enjoined to hold elections without delay irrespective of the wishes of the elected leaders of the people, even in the case of Mauritius, where they had been chosen by universal adult suffrage at the last general elections in 1963. Again, with curious inconsistency, it was the General Assembly apparently, and not the people of the Territory, which was to be asked to determine not only the timing but the form of decolonization in the Territories. Independence without any conditions or reservations was to be the general prescription whether the Territory in question was an isolated dependency like Tristan da Cunha with 198 inhabitants or Mauritius with a population of 750,000, and the wishes of the peoples of those Territories on such fundamental issues were apparently to be determined for them by the General Assembly.

(Mr. Shaw, United Kingdom)

The draft report also contained factual inaccuracies. For example, a paragraph of the conclusions suggested that his Government had denied any intention of using portions of the British Indian Ocean Territory for military purposes. On the contrary, his Government had announced publicly as long ago as November 1965 that the Territory might provide potential sites for defence purposes. That had never been denied or disguised. What his Government had denied was that it had any programme for creating bases in the Territory or that at the present time any decision had been taken to proceed with the construction or development of defence facilities.

Again, one paragraph of the conclusions reflected the time-enshrined misconception about the role of the Governor in United Kingdom dependencies. The inference seemed to be that in a Territory such as Mauritius, which enjoyed a high degree of internal self-government and was within measurable reach of final decolonization, the exercise by the Governor of the formal power of appointing the Premier and his Ministers was a significant symptom of lack of political progress. He would point out that in a great many independent countries the formal constitutional practice required the appointment of members of the executive organs of Government to be made by the Head of State. In that respect, Mauritius, like other United Kingdom dependencies, followed the pattern of the United Kingdom, where the appointment of Ministers was the prerogative of the Crown. But the exercise of those formal powers was as irrelevant to the realities of political responsibility and the exercise of executive power in a dependent Territory as it was in the case of an independent State Member of the United Nations.

Unless the draft report was substantially revised, his delegation would have no choice but to dissociate itself in the Special Committee from the Sub-Committee's report. His delegation did not claim that there was no room for legitimate differences of opinion on the rate of political advance in the Territories in question. Nor did it assert that views might not be honestly held as to the alleged shortcomings in the Territories' economic development. However, when it found that the response to its efforts to proceed towards a synthesis of views was to set aside the statements of the administering Power, to ignore the constructive and

/...

(Mr. Shaw, United Kingdom)

positive features of the situation in the Territories, to expunge any reference to other points of view and above all to disregard the progress achieved by the people of the Territories themselves, it was bound to wonder whether its participation served any practical purpose. Nevertheless his delegation continued to hope that upon further reflexion and in the spirit of objectivity which should govern all the deliberations of the Special Committee and its subsidiary bodies, members would seek to adopt a statement of conclusions and recommendations that was at once more valid, more accurate and more realistic.

Mr. USTINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation believed that the conclusions and recommendations did indeed reflect the situation in the Territories in question. The recommendations were aimed at accelerating the process of the granting of independence to the colonial countries and peoples concerned. The draft report accurately reflected the discussions in the Sub-Committee. His delegation endorsed the statement in paragraph 1 of the conclusions concerning the administering Power's undue delay in granting independence, but he felt that the paragraph could have been drafted in more emphatic terms. His delegation thought that paragraph 2 of the conclusions relating to the "British Indian Ocean Territory" should include a reference to General Assembly resolution 2232 (XXI), which was also very relevant.

The recommendations were completely consistent with the conclusions reached regarding the situation in the Territories and his delegation fully supported the draft report, which contained useful points that might help the people of the Territories in their progress towards self-determination and independence.

Mr. FOM (United Republic of Tanzania) suggested that, in order to ensure a freer exchange of views, the Sub-Committee should continue its meeting in closed session. If that was unacceptable, his delegation would propose a brief suspension in order to enable members to hold consultations.

Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom) said that the question of holding a closed meeting was of course for the Sub-Committee to decide but his delegation would prefer not to participate in a closed meeting.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he saw no reason why his proposal should be displeasing to the United Kingdom representative, whose threat to withdraw he regretted. He welcomed the United Kingdom representative's participation but thought that a more accurate report could be prepared if members could consult outside the framework of a formal meeting.

Mr. JOUEIATI (Syria), recalling that the Tanzanian representative had suggested a suspension of the meeting as an alternative, formally proposed that the meeting should be suspended briefly for purposes of consultation.

The meeting was suspended at 11.25 a.m. and resumed at 12 noon.

Mr. JOUEIATI (Syria) (Rapporteur) said that the following amendments to the draft report had been agreed on during the recess:

In section B (Conclusions), the order of paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 would be altered so that they became paragraphs 3, 4 and 2 respectively.

The second sentence of the new paragraph 3 (formerly paragraph 4) would be deleted and replaced by the following:

"The administering Power continues to exercise through the Governors vast powers, particularly in the constitutional and the legislative fields."

In the new paragraph 3 (formerly paragraph 2), the words "the British Indian Ocean Territory" would be placed between inverted commas; and the words "has shown disrespect ... of the General Assembly" would be replaced by the words "continues to violate the territorial integrity of these Non-Self-Governing Territories and defies resolutions 2066 (XX) and 2232 (XXI) of the General Assembly".

In the first sentence of the new paragraph 4 (formerly paragraph 3), the words "and that to this end, it is negotiating with the United States" would be replaced by the words "in collaboration with the Government of the United States of America".

In paragraph 5 of section C (Recommendations), the words "Seychelles and St. Helena without any conditions or reservations" would be replaced by the words "and to accelerate the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) regarding Seychelles and St. Helena".

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) proposed that the words "and independence" should be added after the word "self-determination" at the end of paragraph 6 of the recommendations.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, the report would be adopted by consensus, on the understanding that it would reflect the reservation expressed by the Finnish representative.

It was so decided.

ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA, SOUTH WEST AFRICA AND TERRITORIES UNDER PORTUGUESE DOMINATION AS WELL AS IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION

The CHAIRMAN announced that there were no speakers on her list for the above agenda item. If any members indicated to her during the next few days that they wished to make statements concerning the item, she would arrange a meeting of the Sub-Committee in the following week; otherwise, she would take it that the Sub-Committee preferred to postpone consideration of the item until its return from Africa.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.