



CONTENTS

Agenda item 23:	
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports 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: Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland (continued)	
Consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.801.....	187
Agenda item 23:	
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports 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: A/5800/Rev.1, chapters VII, IX, X and XIII-XXVI; A/6000/Rev.1, chapters IX-XXV	
General debate.....	189
Question of the date for hearing the petitioner from British Guiana.....	189
Hearing of the petitioner from British Guiana.....	190
Organization of work.....	192

Chairman: Mr. Majid RAHNEMA (Iran).

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports 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: Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland (continued) (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. VIII; A/5958, A/6000/Rev.1, chap. VII; A/C.4/L.801)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION  
A/C.4/L.801

1. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/L.801, said that he was gratified by the constitutional developments which had taken place in Basutoland and Bechuanaland during recent years, and as a result of which those Territories would attain independence in 1966. He regretted that the same did not apply to Swaziland, even though it was economically better off; he hoped that that was merely a postponement. He was, however, obliged to recognize that the deplorable economic conditions in the

three Territories had not improved and that the danger of their falling into South Africa's hands had only become more menacing. South Africa had already made great inroads into the political and economic life of the Territories, for it was known to have tried to influence the conduct of the elections and to be planning to incorporate the High Commission Territories in its Bantustan Administration.

2. Aware of that danger, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had explored ways and means of safeguarding the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the three Territories, and the Secretary-General had formulated a number of positive and constructive proposals with the same objective. He took the opportunity to express his appreciation of the excellent work done by the members of the Mission to Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, which had conducted an on-the-spot study of the Territories' economic needs, and he thanked the administering Power for having facilitated their task. On the basis of the Mission's conclusions the Secretary-General had proposed the establishment of a development fund, made up of voluntary contributions and designed to supplement the assistance provided under the regular United Nations programmes of technical assistance and had announced his intention of establishing a Technical Assistance office in each Territory (see A/5958, paras. 18-22).

3. The main purpose of draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 was to safeguard the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland. The sponsors, after expressing in the preamble their concern at the economic and social situation prevailing in the Territories and the imperative need for United Nations assistance, proposed in operative paragraph 7 the establishment of a development fund; in operative paragraph 8, the continuance of the economic, financial and technical assistance provided by the United Nations and the specialized agencies; and in operative paragraph 9, the appointment of resident representatives. Since the draft resolution reflected, on the whole, the views expressed in the Committee and was very moderate in wording, he hoped it would win the support of an overwhelming majority of members of the Committee, including the administering Power. Its success would ultimately depend, however, on what voluntary contributions Member States were prepared to make to the future development fund.

4. Mr. BHUIYA (Pakistan) expressed regret at the continued existence of colonial enclaves in some parts of the world. Having regard to the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 2 November 1964

(A/5800/Rev.1, chap. VIII, para. 365), the report submitted by the Secretary-General (A/5958) and the development of the situation in Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, his delegation considered that the three High Commission Territories should be granted independence without further delay and that all necessary steps should be taken to strengthen their economy. His delegation would therefore welcome the adoption of any resolution with that objective.

5. Mr. G. E. O. WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone) observed that, although in theory the three Territories were on the point of attaining their independence, in practice it was clear from the statements made by petitioners before the Special Committee that they would not really be granted political emancipation of the type envisaged in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). He therefore hoped that the administering Power would introduce universal suffrage without delay, so as to enable the population to express their wishes with regard to their future and to create, before independence, conditions that would prevent South Africa from seizing the Territories. The latter were so poor that the Fourth Committee might perhaps request that they should be given technical and financial assistance on a larger scale than originally planned, perhaps out of the savings anticipated from the consolidation of the United Nations Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance.

6. Mr. SANGHO (Mali) reminded the Committee that the African Heads of State and Government who had met at Cairo in July 1964 had requested the United Nations to guarantee the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland. It was gratifying that the Secretary-General had demonstrated the special importance he attached to that problem by sending a Mission to the Territories to study their economic needs. He was greatly concerned at the preponderant influence exercised by the South African Government, from which it was certainly no use to expect disinterested assistance, and he noted that the three Territories urgently needed substantial technical assistance from the United Nations.

7. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.801, which Mali was sponsoring jointly with a number of other countries, was designed to lead Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland rapidly to independence; to strengthen that political independence by introducing real economic independence, involving the development of production and the training of indigenous skilled personnel; and to free the three Territories from the economic ascendancy of the Republic of South Africa. The sponsors of the draft resolution welcomed the efforts made by the Secretary-General; they supported the recommendations set forth in his report and in the reports of the Special Committee, including the proposal for the establishment of a fund made up of voluntary contributions. Political independence would mean little if all the land remained in the hands of settlers and a few privileged individuals, and if the exodus of workers continued. All the land should be speedily returned to the indigenous inhabitants; the ways and means of doing so could if necessary be worked out with the assistance of United Nations experts. He thought that the Special Committee was in a

better position than the Second Committee to keep abreast of developments in the three Territories and, in particular, to consider the question of establishing a development aid fund; it would be for the Governments of the Territories, in close co-operation with the technical assistance services of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, to dispose of any difficulties which arose.

8. He noted with satisfaction the progress of the three Territories towards independence and acknowledged the efforts made by the administering Power to foster their economic development; nevertheless, more must be done to speed up economic growth and to develop education, particularly in order to ward off the threat of economic domination of the three Territories by South Africa.

9. He appealed to all members of the Committee to vote in favour of the draft resolution and urged all countries which were friends of Africa to make a substantial financial contribution to the fund proposed to develop the economy of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland.

10. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) reminded the Committee that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution adopted by the Special Committee in 1964 (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. VIII, para. 365) and that, to mark its appreciation of certain aspects of the Special Committee's work in connexion with the three Territories and of the work done by the Mission which had visited the Territories, it had voted in favour of the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 17 June 1965 (A/6000/Rev.1, chap. VII, para. 292). His delegation would also vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 as a whole, although it reserved its position on certain aspects of that text.

11. With regard to the sixth and eighth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, he was not convinced that the economic and social situation prevailing in the three Territories was worse than that in other areas, but in any case he did not think the administering Power was to blame. Again, his delegation did not subscribe to the statement that the administering Power had not taken effective and complete steps to implement General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV), 1817 (XVII) and 1954 (XVIII). On the contrary, the administering Power had been planning wisely, in particular for independence, and had made every effort to co-operate with the United Nations. His delegation also rejected the implications of operative paragraph 3. He sympathized with the thinking behind paragraph 4 and would welcome any initiative to rectify the anomalies and injustices of the existing land-tenure system, but he saw insuperable difficulties in the practical application of a provision drawn up in such rigid terms. As to operative paragraph 7, his country, which had great experience of development aid schemes, had grown wary of special funds reserved for special purposes and designed to secure preferential treatment for particular groups. Nevertheless, his delegation appreciated the humanitarian motives underlying the draft resolution and would be able to support the recommendation, especially since it had been improved since its submission to the Special Committee. That support should

not, however, be understood as constituting a pledge of a contribution by his Government.

12. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) observed that his country's name had been omitted in error from the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

13. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that, after consultation with the other sponsors of the draft resolution, she considered that it would be appropriate to amplify operative paragraph 9 by inserting the words "paragraph 22 of" between the words "as recommended in" and the words "the report".

14. Mr. RIMMERFORS (Sweden) said that, since his delegation had not yet received instructions from its Government, it would prefer the vote on the draft resolution to be postponed until the following day.

15. The CHAIRMAN agreed to postpone the vote until the following day provided that it was clearly understood that the debate on the question of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland was closed.

16. He announced that in addition to Morocco, whose name had been omitted from document A/C.4/L.801 by mistake, the following countries should be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Guinea, India, Lebanon, Mauritania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, United Arab Republic and Zambia.

### AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports 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: A/5800/Rev.1, chapters VII, IX, X and XIII-XXVI; A/6000/Rev.1, chapters IX-XXV (A/5959 and Corr.1; A/6084, A/6094; A/C.4/655)

#### GENERAL DEBATE

17. Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India), Rapporteur of the Special Committee, submitted to the Fourth Committee the Special Committee's reports on the Territories which it had decided to discuss together; the report for 1964 was contained in document A/5800/Rev.1, chapters VII, IX, X and XIII-XXVI; the report for 1965 in document A/6000/Rev.1, chapters IX-XXV.

18. After enumerating the Territories to be considered, he pointed out that, in accordance with the Committee's decision at its 1517th meeting, the question of the Cook Islands, which was included in chapter XV of document A/5800/Rev.1 and was the subject of chapter VIII of document A/6000/Rev.1, would be examined separately, in connexion with agenda item 24 (Report of the United Nations Representative for the Supervision of the Elections in the Cook Islands).

19. Moreover, as the Chairman had pointed out at the Committee's 1517th meeting, the chapters on the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. XIX; A/6000/Rev.1, chap. XVIII) were related to agenda item 13 (Reports of the Trusteeship Council).

20. Lastly, although the Special Committee's reports included chapters on Brunei, Hong Kong and British

Honduras, the Special Committee had not examined the situation in those Territories in 1964 or 1965 and consequently had no recommendations to submit concerning them.

### QUESTION OF THE DATE FOR HEARING THE PETITIONER FROM BRITISH GUIANA

21. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, at its 1548th meeting, the Committee had decided to grant to Mr. Cummings, the representative of the People's Progressive Party of British Guiana, the hearing he had requested (A/C.4/655), but to set a date for the hearing later on. Mr. Cummings was now in New York and was ready to make a statement if the Committee was willing to hear him.

22. Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela) saw no reason why the petitioner should not be heard immediately. However, in view of the Algerian representative's proposal at the previous meeting, he had thought that the requested hearing would be granted at a later date. Moreover it would perhaps be better to postpone the hearing of Mr. Cummings pending the outcome of the conference now in progress in London concerning the future of British Guiana.

23. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana) said that his delegation had no objection to an immediate hearing for the petitioner. The Committee could suspend judgement on his statement pending the outcome of the London conference. Moreover the petitioner might perhaps be able to furnish information which would help the Committee to grasp the full significance of the talks now taking place in London.

24. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it was customary for the Committee to hear petitioners before starting its full-scale debate on conditions in the Territories from which they came. The only reason why he had put the question of the hearing of Mr. Cummings to the Committee was that it had not yet decided on what date it would hear the petitioner.

25. Mr. AZIMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. NKAMA (Zambia) joined the Ghanaian representative in requesting that the petitioner should be heard at once.

26. Mr. BROWN (United Kingdom) reminded the Committee that, when the petitioner's request for a hearing had been examined, his delegation had stated the reasons why it considered it preferable not to hear him until the London conference was over. He therefore endorsed the Venezuelan representative's view.

27. However, if the Committee granted a hearing to Mr. Cummings immediately, the United Kingdom delegation, while regretting that decision, was prepared to accept it. It had, indeed, no objection to the Committee's hearing Mr. Cummings, but considered that the petitioner should be able to make his statement at the proper time, namely when the London talks were concluded.

28. He considered it important to remember that Mr. Cummings's party had been bidden and pressed to take part in the talks but had not agreed to do so.

29. Mr. LAIDI (Algeria) said that he too considered that the Committee should hear Mr. Cummings at once.

30. Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela) said that he wished to make his position entirely clear; although he thought that it would be preferable to hear the petitioner at a later date, he was not in any way opposed to a hearing being granted to him at the present meeting.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that since there were no strong objections the petitioner would be heard immediately.

#### HEARING OF THE PETITIONER FROM BRITISH GUIANA

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Felix A. Cummings, representative of the People's Progressive Party, took a place at the Committee table.*

32. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) thanked the members of the Committee for agreeing to hear him immediately.

33. The reason why he had asked for a hearing was that the recent split of the so-called coalition in British Guiana called for some clarification of the situation and a review of the events which had brought the split about. Moreover, the clarification which he proposed to provide would serve to correct certain erroneous and misleading statements of facts and opinions which had appeared in certain quarters of the United States Press.

34. It was no surprise to the leadership or members of the People's Progressive Party (PPP) that Mr. Burnham's People's National Congress (PNC) and Mr. d'Aguiar's United Force Party (UFP) had parted. What was surprising was that the PNC, which represented itself as the party of liberation, could have entered into an alliance with the UFP, whose real interests had at last been laid completely bare. For even now, when complete independence for Guiana was being discussed, it was the UFP which insisted that a representative of the colonialist Power should be made chief of the new State. The neo-colonialist character of that suggestion was but one instance of the posture into which the PNC had permitted itself to be seduced.

35. The PPP had already exposed, especially in statements made before the Special Committee, the constitutional irregularities by which the PNC itself had come to power, and the compromises in which it was involved were simply the corollary of those irregularities.

36. The Western Press had also spoken of racism. It was notable that it was especially in those countries where racial problems were most serious and abundant that such arguments were adduced to explain the situation in British Guiana. Thus, differences which the leadership of the PPP and the PNC would characterize as ideological or tactical were represented by certain interests as reflecting racial animosity between Afro-Guianese and Indo-Guianese. Unfortunately, through short-sighted political expediency, the PNC had on various occasions and by several acts given support to the impression of sentiments of enmity between the major ethnic groups in Guiana. The truth, however, was that racial antagonism existed only in the degree that it had been engineered

by the PNC, and even that antagonism had been grossly exaggerated by the neo-colonialist Press.

37. To illustrate his point, he emphasized that while there were some 300,000 Indo-Guianese and 200,000 Afro-Guianese, the PNC had won twenty-two out of fifty-three seats as against the PPP's twenty-four seats, from which it must be concluded, even bearing in mind the system of proportional representation, that some Indo-Guianese must have voted for the PNC for it to have obtained such a large minority.

38. As to the PPP's attitude towards ethnic differentiation, it was an unquestionable fact that the African majority in the Guianese population had been duly represented in Mr. Jagan's Government. Thus Mr. Jagan's Deputy Premier, Mr. Benn, was an African, and the Jagan Government's representative to the United Nations had been Mr. Cummings himself. In an article on 2 November 1965, The New York Times had noted the substantial progress made in British Guiana towards economic viability, political stability and racial harmony. There was nothing surprising in that, for the various ethnic groups in Guiana generally lived together in peace and concord except when foreign agents provocateurs engendered antagonisms among the Guianese. Incidentally, if pacification was so far advanced in Guiana, it might be wondered why political prisoners were still under detention. The PPP had never countenanced, nor would it ever countenance, racist animosities, for the building of the Guianese nation required the help of all its people, irrespective of differences of religion, culture, colour, or ethnic identification. The only criterion to be used was that of individual worth.

39. In that respect, although the United Kingdom professed agreement with the Committee's guiding principles, which had been recalled by the representative of India at the Committee's 1521st meeting, it should be noted that it had not suspended the Constitution in Southern Rhodesia although it had not hesitated to do so in Aden and Guiana. It could legitimately be asked whether the difference was not due to the fact that the Rhodesian settler Government was European, while the populations of Aden and Guiana were of African and Asian stock. Furthermore, the United Kingdom representative had made it clear at the 1368th plenary meeting of the General Assembly that his Government was prepared to lift the emergency measures in Aden when the violence ceased in the Territory. The coalition régime in Guiana, itself installed with the blessing of the imperialists, had declared that peace had been restored in the land since the PPP had been removed from power. If that was true, why was the principle expounded by the United Kingdom representative not applied in British Guiana, except to prevent the people's voice, which was calling for self-determination through its majority party, from being heard?

40. He stressed that the PPP would consider participation in the constitutional conference now being heard in London if the emergency regulations were lifted in British Guiana and if the political detainees were released.

41. He hoped that his statement would help to restore the truth as to the real situation in his country.

42. Mr. DONALDSON (Trinidad and Tobago) thanked the petitioner for the information he had furnished, which would help the Committee to evaluate the situation.

43. His delegation wondered whether the difference of opinion concerning the choice of the head of State was the only point at issue between the political parties taking part in the London conference, and whether agreement had been reached on the control of police and defence.

44. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) replied that the question of national defence had been raised by the UFP leader some time before the conference. The UFP leader was in fact insisting that the country's defence should remain the responsibility of the United Kingdom.

45. The question of the choice of the head of State had not been settled, and the United Kingdom Government had requested the participants in the London conference to leave the matter aside for the moment, considering it to be a minor question.

46. Mr. DONALDSON (Trinidad and Tobago) asked why the PPP was not taking part in the London conference.

47. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) quoted in reply a letter from Mr. Jagan to Mr. Greenwood, the United Kingdom Secretary of State for the Colonies, from which it was clear that the PPP would have been willing to attend that conference if the emergency measures had been lifted and the political prisoners freed. Those conditions had not been met, which was the main reason why the PPP was not participating in the London conference. The other difficulties were of only minor importance.

48. Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela) asked the petitioner what he had meant in stating that the present Government of British Guiana was illegal or illegitimate in view of the fact that, according to the Special Committee's report (A/6000/Rev.1, chap. IX), it was the result of free elections held under the supervision of a Commonwealth observer group.

49. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) said that when Mr. Jagan's Government had been elected in 1961, with the entry into force of the new Constitution, all domestic problems had come within the competence of the Government of British Guiana. Before the time-limit of four years had expired, the United Kingdom had intervened, suspending the Constitution, so that the PPP had had no part in organizing the last elections.

50. As regards the Commonwealth observers, he drew attention to the fact that one of the Indian representatives had submitted a minority report (see A/6000/Rev.1, chap. IX, para. 14) in which he had mentioned the atmosphere of fear and insecurity prevailing in the country; he had also pointed out that many members of the PNC had been able to vote by proxy, but had been unable to state whether PPP members had been able to do likewise.

51. When he had last been heard by the Special Committee, in September 1965, he had prepared a list of constitutional irregularities that had been

committed when the new Government came into power, but the Committee had not questioned him again on the subject.

52. Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela) said that he had noted with interest the petitioner's statement that there was no racial problem in British Guiana. In a separate memorandum, however, one of the Indian observers had remarked that he did not think any election, however well conducted, could be called fair when it led to division and racial conflict and created a sense of fear and insecurity.

53. The Venezuelan delegation inquired whether the PPP had taken part in the 1964 elections.

54. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) said that his party had indeed taken part in those elections, but under protest, and that it had made its position known.

55. Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela), referring again to the December 1964 elections, said that paragraphs 3 and 4 of the report of the Special Committee (A/6000/Rev.1, chap. IX) showed that the percentage of registered voters of Indian origin (45.5 per cent) and of African origin (39.3 per cent) corresponded to the percentages of votes obtained by the People's Progressive Party and the People's National Congress, so that it had been said of the elections that they had reflected the attitude of the various racial groups within the political framework in British Guiana. He asked Mr. Cummings's opinion on that point.

56. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) replied that it was incorrect to say that the Guianese political parties operated on a racial basis: the best proof of that was the fact that in the Georgetown area the PPP had won the votes of thousands of electors of African origin. The various ethnic groups of Guiana had always lived in peace and harmony and there was no doubt that the attempt to divide them for racial motives was inspired from the outside. The fact that the PPP had obtained over 109,332 votes, compared to 96,657 votes for the PNC, clearly showed the preference of the population of Guiana for a certain form of government.

57. Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela) thought it also showed that the people of Guiana accepted the proportional representation system, which was used in many other countries, including Venezuela.

58. Mr. AZIMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked Mr. Cummings to give him some particulars of the arrests made by Mr. Burnham's Government. He also wished to know exactly what the PPP's programme was.

59. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) replied that since the change of government many political figures had been detained without trial. Seventeen PPP party workers had been sent to concentration camps, among them the former Minister for Education, a Member of Parliament, who had been arrested on mere suspicion. As could be seen, parliamentary immunity had become meaningless in British Guiana.

60. As to the PPP's programme, the party called for immediate independence, but it must be true

independence and not subject to conditions and reservations imposed by colonialists or imperialists. Meanwhile, the PPP asked that the British Government should lift the state of emergency and liberate all prisoners, which was a necessary condition for the creation of a climate of peace and confidence favourable to fruitful consideration of matters affecting the Territory's future. It went without saying that no important decision could be taken without the participation of the PPP, the majority party which the Government was shamelessly ignoring.

61. Mr. DIABATE (Guinea) asked the petitioner what action his party expected the United Nations to take and requested further information concerning the talks now taking place in London.

62. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) said that the population of British Guiana had always believed in the United Nations, which had invariably extended a sincere and courteous welcome to petitioners from his country. Upon completion of its deliberations, he hoped that the Fourth Committee would adopt a resolution that fully reflected the legitimate aspirations of the people of the Territory.

63. With regard to the London talks, the PPP had broken with the coalition Government because Mr. d'Aguiar, leader of the United Force Party, had not accepted the principle that the first Governor-General of British Guiana must be a Guianese. In addition, Mr. d'Aguiar had maintained that the defence portfolio should be given to a person from overseas. Differences also existed on the question of the Territory's finances.

64. Mr. DE CASTRO (Philippines) asked which of the seven political parties of British Guiana, in addition to the People's Progressive Party, had refused to take part in the London talks.

65. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) replied that the Secretary of State for the Colonies had invited only the parties led by Mr. Burnham, Mr. Jagan and Mr. d'Aguiar, no doubt because the others had no parliamentary candidates.

66. Mr. NKAMA (Zambia) asked the petitioner whether the PPP encouraged co-operation among the different groups in the Territory and whether the population of British Guiana would be willing to accede to independence in the present circumstances.

67. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) said that the PPP had always insisted on harmonious and constructive co-operation among all groups and all parties. In 1963, for instance, when Mr. Jagan and Mr. Burnham had been invited to the United States by the Special Committee's Sub-Committee on British Guiana, Mr. Jagan had stated that he was

ready to offer the Vice-Premiership of the Government to the leader of the People's National Congress, in addition to four ministerial portfolios. As was known, Mr. Burnham had rejected that offer, probably at the instigation of external forces which considered such co-operation incompatible with their own interests. Racial discrimination did not exist in the Territory, as an African good offices mission had discovered.

68. With reference to the representative of Zambia's second question, the PPP considered that if independence were granted to British Guiana under the present conditions, it could not be a genuine form of independence allowing the Guianese to be the sovereign masters of their own nation and land.

69. Mrs. MENESES DE ALBIZU CAMPOS (Cuba) asked the petitioner what he thought of the administering Power's policy in British Guiana as compared with its policy in Southern Rhodesia, particularly with regard to the way in which it discharged its responsibilities.

70. Mr. CUMMINGS (People's Progressive Party) said that in view of the situation in the two Territories, he could only conclude that if the administering Power did not suspend the Constitution in Southern Rhodesia and send troops there, as it had done in British Guiana, the reason was that the minority Southern Rhodesian Government was a white Government, which it treated with a consideration that was denied to peoples of Asian and African stock.

71. The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Committee, thanked the petitioner for the information he had provided concerning the situation in British Guiana, which would be of great value to the Committee in its work.

*Mr. Cummings, representative of the People's Progressive Party, withdrew.*

72. Mr. BROWN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation reserved the right to comment in due course on the statement and replies of the petitioner.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

73. After an exchange of views in which Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela), Mr. AZIMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) and Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India), Rapporteur, took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take up at its next meeting the question of the procedure it would follow in considering the Territories which came within its competence, and the form in which it would submit its report to the General Assembly.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.