

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/AC.109/102  
30 October 1964

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

LETTER DATED 20 OCTOBER 1964 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE  
OF THE UNITED KINGDOM ADDRESSED TO THE CHAIRMAN OF  
THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Note by the Secretariat: The following text is circulated  
in accordance with a decision taken by the Committee at its  
297th meeting on 29 October 1964

I have the honour to refer to the decision by the Special Committee at its 234th meeting, in approving paragraph 9 (a) of the seventh report of the Working Group (A/AC.109/L.104), to hear statements by administering Powers on territories for which they are responsible in plenary meetings of the Special Committee rather than in the Sub-Committees. In subsequent discussion of this decision, the Special Committee agreed that administering Powers' statements might be made where convenient in the Sub-Committees, but the view was expressed that wherever possible such statements should be made in plenary meetings.

In the event it has proved to be appropriate for a number of statements by the United Kingdom delegation on territories for which the United Kingdom Government is responsible to be made in Sub-Committees rather than in the Special Committee. Since this has precluded some members of the Special Committee from hearing these statements, and in view of the fact that verbatim records of the statements are not available to members of the Special Committee, my delegation feel that it might be helpful to the Committee if verbatim texts of these statements were made available for the Committee's discussions of the reports

A/AC.109/102  
English  
Page 2

by the Sub-Committees. Accordingly, I have the honour to enclose copies of the main statements made by my delegation in the Sub-Committees, and to ask you to arrange for their circulation, together with this letter, as official documents of the Special Committee.

(Signed) C.E. KING

ANNEX

STATEMENTS MADE BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM  
IN SUB-COMMITTEES I, II, AND III OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Contents

			<u>Page</u>
Sub-Committee I:	Mauritius, Seychelles and St. Helena	6 May 1964	2
Sub-Committee II:	British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Pitcairn and the New Hebrides	24 September 1964	15
Sub-Committee III:	Barbados and the Windward and Leeward Islands	29 April 1964	26
	Barbados and the Windward and Leeward Islands	15 May 1964	
	Falkland Islands	8 September 1964	
	Falkland Islands	16 September 1964	
	Bahamas, Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands	25 September 1964	

STATEMENT MADE IN SUB-COMMITTEE 1 ON 6 MAY 1964 CONCERNING  
MAURITIUS, SEYCHELLES AND ST. HELENA

My delegation has listened with great interest to the statements made in the course of this discussion on the territories of Mauritius, Seychelles and St. Helena. I am sorry that I was unable myself to be present during the discussions, but I think that members of the Sub-Committee will agree that it is difficult, under the new arrangements, for one person to follow all that is happening in the three sub-committees, especially when their sessions are simultaneous. I am reminded of a remark by my small son, who was recently taken by friends to the circus. When asked how he had enjoyed the show, he replied that it was very good, but there had been three separate rings all in action at the same time and that he had found this rather confusing. At first, he said, he tried to divide his attention equally among the three rings only to find that this resulted in his not getting a very clear idea of what was going on in any of them. So he ended up by concentrating his attention on one of the rings, with occasional quick looks at the others in case something of unusual interest should occur in them. This seems to me to have been a sensible decision.

However, Mr. Chairman, although I did not hear the statements made in the course of this discussion, I have been able to read the summary records. I should like to say that I have read with particular interest the record of the statement by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union on 28 April. I confess that I almost always enjoy the contributions made by the Soviet delegation to the Committee's debates on colonial affairs. The reason is, I think, that these statements have a kind of liberating effect; they seem to lift the discussion out of the factual and practical framework in which my own delegation has endeavoured to place it, and which I must admit tends to make our statements rather dull and prosaic, and to lead it into a more exciting world in which the facts are no longer allowed to exert a restrictive influence on the free flow of ideas. I am reminded of the illustrated postcards one used to buy at tourist resorts many years ago, in the days when the science of pictorial reproduction had not reached its present level of efficiency. There was a choice between plain postcards and coloured ones depicting local beauty spots, buildings of historical interest and

so on. The coloured ones were more interesting and picturesque than the plain ones, but on examination one realized that they were less closely related to reality.

In the view of my delegation, there are two reasons for this. In the first place, the Russians, unlike the British, are not a seafaring race. We are all familiar with the stirring accounts of how the Russian State from small beginnings extended its rule until it embraced a mighty empire extending across the continent of Asia, and of the great battles fought to accomplish this; but these exploits were across the land, and not across the sea.

The influence of these historical facts is evident when we consider the statements by the Soviet representative in this Committee. When he is dealing with mainland territories, particularly in Africa, he has a certain confidence, a certain sureness of touch, but when he moves into the realm of small islands, he is, as we say in England, "all at sea". We have already noticed this when the Committee was discussing Malta and Fiji; and we now have it demonstrated once again in the case of the territories of Mauritius, Seychelles and St. Helena.

The second reason is that the Soviet delegate is using a faulty compass. The first point on his compass is that all small islands were originally inhabited by an indigenous people, quietly pursuing their peaceful way of life and exploiting their natural resources for their own good, when brutal colonizers arrived from overseas and shattered this idyllic existence.

The second point on the Soviet compass is that the colonial Power then proceeds to rule this hapless people by means of a tyrannical Governor with all the powers of a Czar (the Soviet representative will be more of an authority on tyrannical governments than myself), while local ministers and legislatures are mere puppets.

The third point on his compass is that all these islands are sunk in poverty, ignorance and despair and are used as vast plantations to grow produce for the metropolitan country (which takes it free or buys it at well below the world market price).

The fourth and final point on his compass is that each of these islands is retained for one purpose only, namely as a military base which is directed at whichever peace-loving country happens to be nearest to it (in the case of Tristan da Cunha, this would presumably be South Africa).

It is quite clear how, using such a compass, the Soviet delegate quickly loses his bearings and I propose now to help him recover them.

His first point is that European settlers descended on Mauritius, Seychelles and St. Helena and deprived the indigenous inhabitants of their independence, which should now be restored to them. I am afraid that in the case of Mauritius, the situation is even worse than the Soviet delegate realizes: the original inhabitants were all liquidated, if I may use the expression, within a few years of the arrival of the first explorers. They were birds of the species Dodo, which is extinct, and thus unable to press its claim to be granted independence on the basis of one bird, one vote. The first, or perhaps one might say, aboriginal human inhabitants of Mauritius were from France.

After the French inhabitants had lived on the island for over a century, the first immigrants came from the Indian sub-continent, and now outnumber the other communities by 2 to 1. I assume that in accordance with the Soviet thesis, these Indian immigrants must be the settlers who have taken over the island from the original French inhabitants; but I am not sure whether the Soviet delegate is proposing that the political rights which they enjoy should be taken from them and restored to the descendants of the original French inhabitants so far as they can be traced. So far as the British Government is concerned, we make absolutely no distinction at all between the different races in Mauritius and are concerned only to ensure that all persons enjoy complete freedom and the equality of political opportunity. I shall return to this point later.

As for the Seychelles, my researches are not complete but I believe that the original inhabitants were giant tortoises.

Fortunately, these are not completely extinct but they have shown no interest in political advance. The first human inhabitants of the Seychelles were also from France.

Finally, with regard to St. Helena, the first explorers record the presence of pheasants, partridges and other birds including the wide-awake or hack-backed tern but, alas, no indigenous inhabitants. In this case, the original human inhabitants came from England.

So much for the original inhabitants part of the Soviet mythology.

The second point on the Soviet compass is that these small islands are ruled by tyrannical governors, although the administering Power may, to deceive the

outside world, create executive or legislative councils with advisory powers, but no real authority. Now my delegation admits from the outset that British constitutional practice, based on many centuries of evolution, is difficult to understand, particularly by a delegation from a country which does not have a similar historical background. Nevertheless, the idea that all British governors are tyrannical rulers, presumably until the moment of independence, is rather contradicted by the remarkable regularity with which former British colonies ask their last Governor to remain on, after independence, as the first Governor-General of the independent State.

However, with regard to the islands we are now discussing, the fact is that the Governor does have certain powers. This is a statement of the obvious, because these territories are not independent, but are under British administration, and Britain is responsible for their external affairs and defence. There is no dispute about this, and I am not sure what the Soviet delegate is trying to prove. However, the hard fact is that the Governor's powers over 95 per cent of the matters of day-to-day government and administration in Mauritius are exercised only after consultation with, and in accordance with the advice of, the Council and Ministers. Section 59 of the Mauritius Constitution states that, with certain very limited and specific exceptions, the Governor shall not merely seek the advice of the Council of Ministers in the formulation of policy and in the exercise of all powers conferred on him by the Constitution, but shall act in accordance with that advice.

I have just mentioned that there are certain specific exceptions and these stem from Britain's ultimate responsibility for the international relations, defence and good administration of Mauritius; and the Soviet delegate would doubtless be the first to protest if we denied that we had such a responsibility. But these are the exceptions and, as I have said before, they do not in practice inhibit the Council and Ministers from exercising full control over virtually the whole range of government business.

The Soviet delegate also implied that the Governor was an arbitrary lawmaker, and that the Legislative Assembly was merely advisory. Here again this betrays a misunderstanding of the basis of British constitutional practice. In England, no act of Parliament can have the force of law until Her Majesty the Queen gives her assent. Similarly, in Mauritius, the Legislative Assembly passes Bills which

become law when the Governor and Her Majesty have given their assent. This is the formal position. But for all practical purposes they are the Legislative Assembly's laws; and they are certainly not diktats handed down by the Governor.

The Soviet delegate thought he had detected some flaw in the electoral arrangements in Mauritius. He said, if I understood him correctly, that there was no universal adult suffrage, because only persons who paid tax were eligible to vote, and thus many of the workers are deprived of the right to vote. This, Mr. Chairman, if you will forgive the phrase, is nonsense.

Sections 37 and 38 of the Mauritius Constitution make it quite clear that any person who is a British subject of the age of 21 years or upwards, and has resided in Mauritius for at least two years before the date set for the registration of electors, shall be entitled to vote unless he has been sentenced to a substantial term in prison or is of unsound mind or has been guilty of an election offence. Moreover - and this, I think, distinguishes the voter in Mauritius from his opposite number in certain countries I could name - he has a choice of parties for which to vote, and the ballot is absolutely secret. There is absolutely no income or property qualification involved at all.

The Soviet delegate found something sinister in the fact that there are nominated members in the Mauritius Legislative Assembly. In fact, provision for those nominated members was included in the Constitution as a result of the recommendations of the 1958 Constitutional Convention, and their number was increased after consultations which took place at the 1961 Conference. The object of their inclusion is to ensure that the main communities in Mauritius are represented in the Legislature broadly in proportion to their percentage in the population. The Governor has in fact nominated only twelve members, and he consulted the leaders of the political parties before doing so. He is moreover bound under the Constitution not to use the power of nomination in such a way as to frustrate the election results.

Before leaving the political situation in Mauritius, I must say that the Soviet representative appears completely to have missed the point of the constitutional changes which were introduced this year. The major change is not the fact that the titles of certain individuals or organs have been altered, but that Mauritius now has an all-party Government in which representatives of all the



main parties and communities are participating in order to work together for the economic, political and social development of their country. This is a remarkable and praiseworthy achievement in a multiracial territory, and one which should not be sneered at or ignored.

The leaders of all the parties have also agreed, just two months ago, to tackle the numerous important problems facing Mauritius in a spirit of harmony, and not to raise the question of further constitutional advance until two years after the elections, i.e. October 1965. If the Soviet delegate really cares at all for the welfare of the inhabitants of Mauritius, he might pay more attention to their wishes and not talk so glibly about further changes which might well disrupt the harmonious political atmosphere now prevailing in the territory.

I have devoted some time to Mauritius because it is by far the largest territory of the three we are discussing and is politically more advanced. Seychelles and St. Helena have, as I said in my original statement, less elaborate constitutional arrangements, which nevertheless meet the basic requirements of efficient administration and popular representation.

We are here talking about very small and isolated communities, consisting of 43,000 and 4,700 persons respectively; and the plain fact is that it suits the inhabitants of these islands to have a simple and almost informal constitution, where the Governor and his three or four senior officials on the one hand, and a group of elected representatives of the people on the other, sit around a table in Executive Council and discuss freely and frankly the day-to-day business of government and plans for future economic and social development. They also meet rather more formally, and with rather wider representation, in the Legislative Council to enact laws for the government of their territory. This is the arrangement they have found suits them best and this is what they want. Both territories have just had elections, and there is absolutely no sign of any desire on the part of the political parties or individual candidates to make any radical changes in the present arrangements. Certainly no constitution is perfect, and changes will no doubt be made in the Constitutions of Seychelles and St. Helena when this is considered desirable, but no proposals for any such changes have been put forward by the inhabitants of these territories at the present time.

Personally, I can imagine few arrangements more democratic than that whereby the elected representatives of the people can put their views directly to the leading officials of the Government as is done at present. I therefore think that the Soviet delegate is caught in a web of his own weaving when he tries to criticize the Constitutions of these territories.

The third point on the Soviet compass is that these islands are living in poverty and misery while their resources are being ruthlessly exploited for the benefit of foreign countries. Let us examine this myth in the case of Mauritius. It is no secret that the cultivation of sugar plays a preponderant part in the island's economy; but I wonder if the Soviet delegate has even paused to think that there may be particular reasons for this, quite distinct from some abstract colonialist theory being worked out in London (unless he believes that Britain plan to have their tea grown in Ceylon, while getting the sugar from Mauritius and the milk from the Channel Islands - Britain supplies its own water).

Fortunately, an excellent and informative report on the sugar industry in Mauritius was published some months ago, prepared by a Commission headed by the well-known Socialist (I repeat Socialist) economist, Dr. Thomas Balogh. Anyone who knows Dr. Balogh will know that he is no friend of capitalists, colonialists or foreign monopolies, and his conclusions are therefore particularly interesting in the present context. What does Dr. Balogh say about the reasons for the sugar industry in Mauritius? He says: "It is not a matter of chance that so large a proportion of the resources of the country have always been devoted to sugar production. This is the logical outcome of the fact that sugar cane is among the plants most resistant to the high winds which occasionally visit the island. Moreover, the damage can be repaired annually and the growers work in the hope and expectation that they will be spared another year's visitation. The destruction of tree-crops on the contrary, might have catastrophic consequences over a number of years."

In other words, bearing in mind that Mauritius is frequently hit by cyclones, sugar is the inevitable crop not from the point of view of the United Kingdom but from the point of view of Mauritius.

Who grows the sugar in Mauritius? Dr. Balogh gave us the figures: in 1961, the division of cane land between millers and planters was roughly 50/50. Who owns the factories which produce the sugar from the cane? Of the twenty-three factories, all but two are owned by Mauritian companies; this does not look like exploitation by the United Kingdom. Do these sugar millers make excessive profits? Dr. Balogh says "it would seem quite fair to say that the millers' earnings over the last few years do not appear to be unreasonably high". Do the companies make an adequate contribution to the revenue of Mauritius? The rate of Government tax on undistributed profits is 40 per cent, while distributed profits are taxed as personal income at rates rising to 70 per cent. In addition, since 1961 there has been a 5 per cent export duty in addition. I do not think anyone can argue from these figures that the Mauritius Government is not receiving a fair share of the profits.

What about arrangements for selling the sugar? Surely this is where the big planters oppress the small planters or where the administering Power oppresses both? Far from it. Dr. Balogh says "during the whole course of the inquiry, none of the parties has complained about the efficiency of the Sugar Syndicate's selling organization. There has never been any suggestion that it performed its duties otherwise than exceedingly well. We fully share this view". The Soviet delegate also implied that Britain was getting this sugar at a cut rate; in this he may be thinking of his own Government's behaviour when it purchased sugar from Cuba in 1960 at less than 7 cents a kilogram and sold it for \$2.25 a kilo, representing a clear profit of over 1000 per cent. However, Dr. Balogh makes it quite clear that Mauritius benefited from "its preferential market, for which an exceedingly favourable price had been guaranteed by the British Government".

Surely, the Soviet delegate will say, this industry ought to be nationalized; what does Dr. Balogh say about this? He says "we are convinced, that at this juncture a common ownership of the industry would spell disaster and strike a death blow at the chances of ordinary economic development and the maintenance let alone the improvement of the standard of living of the population".

This is not to say that everything in the sugar industry is perfect (I doubt whether the agricultural industry will ever be perfect in any country, as the Soviet delegate will be only too well aware). The Balogh Commission makes a number

of recommendations to ensure a higher standard of living for the small planters and to encourage the diversification of agriculture and greater industrialization. I gave a full account of the measures that are being taken in these respects in my opening statement in the main committee, and I do not propose to repeat them now. My sole purpose now is to show that the picture painted by the Soviet delegate of the sugar industry in Mauritius bears no relation to the facts.

The Soviet delegate also gave a distorted picture of the economic position in the Seychelles and St. Helena; he alleged that the Seychelles Copra Association exploited the small copra producers, while in the St. Helena the flax industry was controlled by a private company in Lancashire and two traders. In fact, membership of the Seychelles Copra Association is open to all producers whose properties yield over 1,200 coco-nuts annually. It is thus widely representative and its present membership is 118; and these members elect an executive committee of twelve annually. No foreign control here.

As for St. Helena, there is no Lancashire interest or control in the local flax industry whatsoever. There are two flax millers; one is a family business, entirely owned by islanders while the other is a public company 55 per cent of whose capital is owned by the United Kingdom investors and 45 per cent by local islanders and descendants of the islanders who originally started the concern. In any case, I made it clear in my statement in the main Committee that the flax industry in St. Helena is hardly a very suitable subject for colonialist exploitation, as the St. Helena Government has had to subsidize this industry in order to keep the mills in operation.

I do not propose to dwell at length on the long catalogue of allegations about social and educational difficulties on these islands as I do not believe that they are germane to the main work of this Committee. I should, however, like to make three points. First, there is no racial discrimination of any kind in any of these three territories. Even the Soviet delegate could find no trace of it in Seychelles or St. Helena, but he did make vague allegations about Mauritius. I can assure this Committee that there is no differentiation in treatment on racial grounds in Mauritius, and relations between the different races in social and commercial life are good and close. There is complete

integration in schools and other institutions. Furthermore, chapter one of the Mauritius Constitution is devoted to the protection of fundamental rights and individual freedoms, and section thirteen of this chapter states that no law shall make any provision that is discriminatory either of itself or in its effect. In the circumstances of a multiracial territory like Mauritius, the Soviet allegations of racial discrimination are both mischievous and deplorable and my delegation rejects them categorically.

The Soviet delegate claimed that the administering Power had neglected the economic and social development of the Seychelles. I devoted a considerable part of my statement in the main Committee to the important development programmes being carried out in this territory, which of course post-date the Rowe Report from which the Soviet delegate quoted. Since that report, \$2.8 million have been made available to the Seychelles for the five year period which ended in April 1964, and an additional \$1.4 million have been allocated for the two year period ending March 1966. All this money has been directed to raising living standards, and when the annual subvention to the ordinary administrative budget is also taken into account, it is clear that British aid to the Seychelles has been very substantial.

With regard to allegations of malnutrition, the World Health Organization report on the Seychelles in 1956/57 stated severe malnutrition was not a problem, and that the diet of the inhabitants was not to any great extent deficient in important food factors. Since that report, the school-feeding programme has been developed, and improved water supplies are included in the current development plans.

There has been substantial improvement in educational facilities in the last few years; the total number of children at school in December 1963 was over 8,300 out of an estimated figure of 10,300 for the five to seventeen age group. Among the recent schools completed are a new primary school and a new secondary school for boys in Victoria, and a new Anglican school at Bel Ombre. School building is in progress at Cascade and Baie Lazarre.

The Soviet delegate chose to quote statements, now several years old, in an attempt to justify his claim that St. Helena was sunk in poverty. Now no one imagines that life in a small, remote and rather barren island with very few natural resources is easy, but conditions are improving year by year. In

particular, there has been a substantial improvement over the last five years, mainly due to considerable increase in basic wage levels. It is always difficult to measure comparative prosperity, but deposits in the local savings bank are one indicator, and the number of accounts has increased by about 50 per cent in the last six years, and the sums deposited by a similar amount. Indeed, unemployment in the strict sense does not exist since all men unable to find other unemployment are offered work three days a week in the Public Works Department. Since the WHO Experts review in 1958, malnutrition has been ended by energetic measures on the part of the Government, including the increase in wages to which I have already referred, and the Government subsidy of essential food-stuffs. There is incidentally no illiteracy in St. Helena; education has been free and compulsory for over sixty years.

Some reference was made by the Soviet delegate to the infant mortality rate of 33.6 per thousand in St. Helena. It may be of interest to the Soviet delegate that according to the United Nations Statistical Yearbook for 1961, there are several independent countries with a considerably higher infant mortality rate, not merely in Africa, Asia and Latin America, but also in Europe including Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and the Soviet Union itself. Does the Soviet delegate still wish to maintain that a high infant mortality rate is a hall-mark of colonial rule?

The fourth point of the compass on which the Soviet delegate relies is the presence of military bases. This is an absolutely fundamental and essential point in the Soviet philosophy, so important in fact, that if bases did not exist, then Marxist dogma requires that they should be invented; and I must say that in the present instance the Soviet delegate has displayed as much ingenuity as the author of the tall stories of Baron Munchausen, and as much regard for credibility as Hans Christian Andersen.

Perhaps it would help the Committee if I stated from the outset that there are no military bases in any of the three territories we are at present discussing; none at all. In Mauritius there is a small naval wireless station - I repeat, a wireless station, not a base or a port - which is manned by a small number of naval

personnel. There is no secret about the existence of this radio station nor is there anything sinister about it. To speak about it as a dagger poised to strike Africa and Asia, and similar flights of fancy, is ridiculous. Construction of this radio station began five years ago after the Executive Council of Mauritius (whose members included Dr. Ramgoolan and other elected Ministers) agreed to make the necessary land available. Local Mauritius Ministers therefore have no objection to the presence of this radio station in their territory, and relations between the naval personnel and the inhabitants of the island are good.

So far as the Seychelles are concerned, there is no military installation of any kind belonging to any Government. There is however a United States Satellite Tracking Station similar to those established in various parts of the world in many cases in independent countries, in connexion with the American Space Programme designed to further the peaceful uses of outer space. The Executive Council of the Seychelles had no objection to the establishment of this tracking station and negotiations are now being conducted in connexion with the administrative arrangements regarding its maintenance.

Finally, we come to St. Helena whence the last British troops left in 1946, at the end of the war. There has really been no military interest in St. Helena since the time of Napoleon.

However, the Soviet delegate did make a reference to the dependencies of St. Helena. In the first place he made a vague reference to the establishment of a base on Tristan da Cunha. Well, Mr. Chairman, the British Government has been accused of creating explosive, one might even say volcanic situations, by maintaining bases abroad, but it has never before been accused of wishing to establish a base actually on an active volcano; much though the Soviet delegate might like to see the British Government establish a base in such a hot spot.

So far as the other dependency of St. Helena is concerned, there appears to be some confusion with regard to its correct name. According to the provisional verbatim record the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union in his statement to the main Committee on 2 April referred to the "Assumption Islands", and my delegation presumed that the campaign to eradicate religious belief in the Soviet Union had been successful to such a point that it was no longer possible

to differentiate between the Assumption and the Ascension. However, I am very pleased to see from the summary record of this Sub-Committee's meeting of 28 April that this campaign has not been as successful as I had suspected, and that in fact the Soviet delegate used the correct title, namely Ascension Island. Now Ascension Island is not geographically part of St. Helena, and it has no indigenous population at all. For many years, the only persons living on the Island were the staff of the Cable and Wireless Station (not a military installation), and the Manager of this Station was customarily appointed resident magistrate. There is therefore no question of any indigenous inhabitants being exploited or oppressed, as there are none. In recent years, by agreement with the British Government, the United States Authorities have facilities on Ascension Island, and at present maintain a satellite tracking station on the island together with an associated air strip. The existence of these facilities on an otherwise virtually uninhabited island, which is an undisputed British possession, is clearly of no relevance to the work of this Committee.



STATEMENT MADE IN SUB-COMMITTEE II ON 24 SEPTEMBER 1964  
CONCERNING BRITISH SOLOMON ISLANDS PROTECTORATE, GILBERT  
AND ELLICE ISLANDS, PITCAIRN AND THE NEW HEBRIDES

In this statement I propose to deal with four territories in the Pacific for which the United Kingdom is fully or partially responsible: the British Solomon Islands Protectorate, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, the Pitcairn Islands and the Anglo-French Condominium of the New Hebrides. Since I shall be discussing the affairs of four distinct territories in a single statement, I hope the Committee will forgive me if I speak at some length.

Apart from Pitcairn, whose administration is the responsibility of the Governor of Fiji, these territories come within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, a post which was created in 1877. The High Commissioner has his headquarters in Honiara in the Solomon Islands. The Solomon Islands are a string of islands running roughly south-east from New Guinea, with the New Hebrides beyond their south-east tip. The Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony lies about 800 miles to the north-east of the Solomons and also runs roughly from north-west, south of the Marshall Islands, towards the south-east in the direction of Samoa. Pitcairn is nearly four and a half thousand miles east of Vila, the capital of the New Hebrides.

The British Solomon Islands Protectorate consists of a double chain of islands spread over a quarter of a million square miles of the south-west Pacific Ocean, north-east of Australia. The total land area is about 11,500 square miles and the population is about 130,000. Almost all are Melanesians; there are about 5,000 Polynesians. Honiara, the capital, on the island of Guadalcanal, is the only township and about 3,000 people live there. The main islands are very rugged, and vary between 90 and 120 miles in length and 20 to 30 miles in width. The largest is about 2,000 square miles in area. Most of the large islands have a mountain spine along their length, with a steep drop to the sea on one side and a series of foothills on the other. Guadalcanal, the largest island, has a mountain of 7,600 feet and this is also the only island with extensive coastal plains. Most of the islands are of rock overlaid in parts with spectacular terraces of coral reef. The coral and lagoons make many of the islands dramatically attractive, and there are many sheltered anchorages along the coastlines of the

bigger islands. There is dense rain forest on many of the islands but on Guadalcanal there are long tracts of rough grass with mangrove swamps along the coasts.

The islands were discovered in the middle of the 16th century by the Spanish explorer Mendana, who named them the Islands of Solomon in the hope of lending support to his claims that they were a rich source of gold. They were rediscovered 200 years later and thenceforth were frequently visited by explorers and sailors from the outside world. Overseas plantations in the Pacific and elsewhere began to treat the islands as a source of labour, and their recruiting methods gave rise to increasing violence. It was to put an end to this that Britain declared a protectorate over the southern area of the islands in 1893; other islands were added in the following seven years.

The geographical circumstances of the islands have hindered the free intercourse of the people and, although they are mostly of one race, they have a multitude of customs and languages. In most cases their horizon does not extend much beyond the village and often there is not even a sense of belonging to a community embracing a whole island, still less the group of islands that form the Protectorate. What is needed is to build up a consciousness of the Protectorate as an entirety, so that the people come to think of themselves as one community, ready to bear the responsibility of deciding its own future in the world. Britain's effort is devoted to meeting this challenge in a number of ways, fundamentally by developing educational facilities and communications and by encouraging the people to play an increasing part in government both at the central and local level.

The Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony comprises thirty-seven islands, with a total land area of about 369 miles, spread over more than 2 million square miles of the South West Pacific Ocean. Thus the combined areas of Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Ghana, Tanganyika, Uganda and Kenya, all put together, add up to about half of the area of ocean over which these islands are scattered. In addition to the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, the Colony includes the Phoenix Islands, the Northern Line Islands and Ocean Island. The islands are atolls of coral reef, most of them enclosing a lagoon with on one side long narrow stretches of land varying from a few hundred yards to about ten miles in length and a few hundred yards to nearly

a mile in width; the other side there are usually breaks in the reef which form entrances to the lagoons. The vegetation is poor and there are few plants or trees of importance apart from the coco-nut. There are no indigenous fauna apart from birds, but fish in the surrounding seas are very plentiful and these are basic to the islanders' diet. The people of the islands live mainly in villages of ten to 150 dwellings with populations ranging from fifty to 700. Subsistence cultivation and fishing are carried out mainly at the family level, and most families have their own canoes. The islanders are extremely skilful fishermen and sailors. Ocean Island is not a coral atoll like the others, but is an atoll raised by volcanic action about 200 feet above its original level. The importance of Ocean Island to the territory is crucial, for it is from this island that the phosphate of lime is extracted.

The Gilbert Islands were probably first discovered by the outside world shortly before Mendana's exploration of the Solomon Islands, in the 16th century. Further and more thorough discovery of the Gilbert and Ellice group did not take place until the latter part of the 18th century and the first quarter of the 19th century. Initially, most contacts which took place between the islands and outsiders were with the whalers, since the waters of the Gilbert Islands were important sperm whaling ground. The first European to live in the Gilbert Islands landed about 1837, and trade and other contacts began to grow from the middle of the 19th century. The islands were included in the area of jurisdiction of the High Commissioner from 1877; before this time the captains of British ships had been given limited authority to look after the interests of British subjects in the area. A Protectorate was declared in one of the Gilbert Islands in 1892, and was later extended to the rest of the Gilbert Islands and to the Ellice Islands. Small local governments were set up, guided by a small number of European officers, and an era of relative peace and prosperity began. In 1915 after consultations with and at the declared wish of the so-called native governments of the islands, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands became a Colony with effect from January 1916. There is a population of about 50,000, mostly on the Gilbert and Ellice Islands which constitute about half the total area of the territory. About four fifths of the people, including most of the Gilbert Islanders, are Micronesians and the rest, including most of the Ellice Islanders, are Polynesians.

The Pitcairn Islands are small volcanic islands midway between South America and New Zealand. Only Pitcairn Island itself is inhabited; it has an area of about 2 square miles. Its cliffs rise sheer from the sea and the land reaches 1,000 feet above sea level in the interior. The soil is fertile and there is lush vegetation with sub-tropical and tropical trees and plants. The population in March was eighty-six seventy-eight of them Pitcairners. The inhabitants are descended from mutineers from the British ship "Bounty", who landed in 1790 on the Island with women from Tahiti. Many of the islanders still bear the surnames of the original mutineers against Captain Bligh, including the descendants of Fletcher Christian. In 1937 the population was 227 and since 1946 it has only once been more than 150. For a generation there has been some emigration to New Zealand, which permits free entry for Pitcairners and where the islanders, who are hard-working and reliable people, easily find work. Many of the younger people have emigrated and the island has been left with an unbalanced population of the very young and the comparatively old.

The New Hebrides are a chain of about seventy islands, mostly small, and the larger islands mountainous, but generally with narrow cultivable coastal strips. There is a land area of about 5,700 square miles. The islands have a population of about 60,000 of whom about 5,000 are British and French citizens.

The New Hebrides were discovered in 1606 and visited in the latter half of the eighteenth century by explorers from the outside world. Trade and other contacts began to grow up during the nineteenth century and in 1887 Britain and France set up a Joint Naval Commission to protect the interests of their own nationals. The islands now form a condominium jointly administered by the British and French Governments. The condominium was established in 1906 and the administration of the territory is regulated by the Anglo-French Protocol of 1914.

I now turn to the social and economic affairs of the territories. The mainstay of the economy of the Solomon Islands is the export of copra, but cocoa and timber are being developed and mineral resources are being investigated. A Development Plan has been drawn up for the period 1963-1966 in continuation of similar plans since 1955. It envisages a total expenditure of about \$7 million of which nearly \$5 million will be met from British aid funds. The Plan provides for the building of more schools, hospitals and roads; the training of

Solomon Islanders, schemes for agricultural and mineral development, and research. The Protectorate Government is unable to meet the full cost each year for maintaining the normal administrative services from internal resources and the British Government support these services by a grant-in-aid which in the current year is about \$1.4 million.

The Gilbert and Ellice Islands' economy depends upon the revenue from the exports of copra and phosphate rock. The phosphate deposits are found only on Ocean Island, which has no indigenous inhabitants. The deposits are a wasting asset and it is expected that they will be exhausted in fifteen to twenty-five years time.

The Colony's current development plan for the period 1 January 1964 to 31 March 1966, provides for the continuation and expansion of development begun under previous development plans. Total expenditure envisaged in the current plan is expected to be of the order of \$1.338 million of which nearly half will be devoted to the improvement of the medical and health services; about 30 per cent to economic projects such as the improvement of the coco-nut industry and 10 per cent for the improvement of inter-island sea communications and the completion of the rehabilitations of war-time air fields in readiness for the introduction of an air service linking the Gilbert and Ellice Islands with Fiji. The development plan seeks to prepare for the time when the phosphate deposits are exhausted by developing the coco-nut and fishing industries, sponsoring overseas settlement, reducing recurrent costs by capital development, building up the local civil service so as to reduce the need for outside help, and improving social services and training so as to fit the people for overseas employment.

The scope for economic development is inevitably limited by the islands' lack of resources and isolation. The British Government are providing over half of the funds required for the current development programme.

I will now say a few words about the economic and social position on Pitcairn. Regular sea communication with the outside world is limited to unscheduled stops by cargo vessels and passenger liners out of Panama, the west coast of the Americas and New Zealand. Rare calls are made by yachts and research and naval vessels and the islanders themselves make occasional visits to Henderson Island by launch and tow in the period November to February to collect timber.

Pitcairn's economy rests on subsistence farming and the sale of stamps and handicrafts, supplemented by the interest from investments.

Since 1958 grants totalling \$67,000 have been made from British Colonial Development and Welfare funds. This aid is being used for the improvement of radio communications, agriculture and harbour facilities; the supply of mechanical equipment; and sending pupils to receive secondary education overseas. Further funds will be made available if the need arises.

Primary education is provided at the island school. Attendance is compulsory for children between five and fifteen years of age.

I now turn to the New Hebrides. As I have already said, the New Hebrides form a condominium jointly administered by Britain and France under the Anglo-French Protocol of 1914. Certain amendments have been and are being made to the Protocol and many of its provisions are regarded as obsolete. One of the important amendments now in train will have the effect of repealing the articles dealing with the recruitment, engagement and employment of native labour (articles 31 to 56) and their replacement by a provision permitting the introduction of a new labour code more in keeping with modern international labour standards. The Government of the condominium of the New Hebrides is known as the Joint Administration. The joint and equal Heads of the Administration are the British and French High Commissioners acting through their local representatives, the British and French Resident Commissioners, to whom they delegate their powers and to whom they give directions. The British High Commissioner is the High Commissioner for the Western Pacific.

The Joint Administration consists of the British National Service, the French National Service, and certain joint of "condominium" services. The Joint Services include such government departments as the Treasury (which deals also with customs and inland revenue), Public Works and Transport, Posts and Telephones, Radio, Lands, Survey, Mines, Agriculture, Meteorology and Local Councils. These services are financed mainly from local taxation. Other services, almost entirely the non-economic social services of health and education, are provided for by the National Services, the revenues for which are derived mainly from Britain and France.

There is an Advisory Council for the New Hebrides. It is presided over by the British and French Resident Commissioners and has four official and twenty unofficial members (five British, five French, and ten New Hebrideans). Eight of the unofficial members are elected and the rest are nominated. Of the elected members, two French and two British are elected by the local Chamber of Commerce and four New Hebrideans by the local Councils. The Council meets once or twice a year and debates such matters as the annual budget.

There are a number of local councils throughout the islands. They deal with most matters of local importance, such as village amenities. At Vila, the administrative capital with 4,000 inhabitants, there is a Town Planning Commission which, as Vila grows into an urban centre, may be expected to develop into a Township Board with the usual local government powers.

The system of justice in the New Hebrides is complex. There are both condominium and national courts. The condominium courts comprise the Joint Court, the Courts of First Instance and the Native Courts. The Joint Court is the chief court. It hears appeals from the Courts of First Instance and, in civil cases involving sums beyond a certain level, from the Native Courts; it reviews other cases from the Native Courts. One of the two administrative officers of the district concerned sits in the Native Courts with local assessors. The Administrative officers are obliged to consult the local assessors. The Native Courts have jurisdiction throughout their districts over offences against New Hebridean regulations and customs. British and French nationals each have their own legal machinery to administer their own national law. The jurisdiction of the national courts, however, extends only to those cases which are not reserved for the Joint Court.

The territory's economy is in the early stages of development. Copra is the most valuable export but frozen fish and cocoa are also important. Some coffee and manganese are also exported. The soil is generally fertile and the islands may have some mineral potential. The economic problems lie in the difficulty of finding markets and of producing goods of sufficiently high quality to be competitive with the many other sources of supply of tropical produce. Educational standards are low. The population is small and scattered and with the existence of a multitude of languages and dialects there is little social cohesion.

The arrangements for condominium administration are complex, but the aim of the British and French Governments in administering the New Hebrides is simple and straightforward. That aim is to bring the people of the New Hebrides to the point where they may decide their ultimate political status. Progress is being made to this end and the latest changes in the constitution of the Advisory Council, providing its elected basis, were made last December. The French and British Governments are co-operating in carrying this process forward.

Finally, I propose to describe briefly the political and constitutional positions in the Solomon and Gilbert and Ellice Islands and Pitcairn. Reference has already been made to the fact that the British Solomon Islands Protectorate is one of the territories administered by the High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, whose headquarters are at Honiara. The present constitution which dates from October 1960, provides for the administration of the territory by the High Commissioner aided by an Executive Council and a Legislative Council.

In the exercise of his executive powers the High Commissioner relies on the advice of the Executive Council. The Council consists of the principal officials (namely, the Chief Secretary, the Attorney General and the Financial Secretary), one other official and four non-official members appointed by the High Commissioner.

Legislation is normally made by the High Commissioner with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council over which the High Commissioner presides. The Council consists of the three principal officials as ex-officio members, eight official members and ten non-official members. The official and non-official members are appointed by the High Commissioner.

"In nearly all areas of the Protectorate there have been local government councils for some years. In 1962, the Protectorate Government published proposals for modernising and improving the system and for expanding the powers and functions of the councils. The necessary legislation has been passed and will shortly become effective. All areas of the Protectorate and persons regardless of race or nationality will then be subject to the authority of the Councils. Members of the Councils will be elected by universal adult suffrage.

In October 1963, the Protectorate Government published proposals for the holding of elections to return a majority of the non-official members of the Legislative Council. These proposals have been examined by a Special Select Committee of the Legislative Council, which undertook widespread consultations with representative opinion throughout the territory. Its



recommendations were unanimously approved by the Legislative Council at its meeting last June. Under these new proposals there will be two non-official members of the Council nominated by the High Commissioner and eight elected to represent single Member Constituencies in the islands. The Member for Honiara will be elected by secret ballot under universal adult suffrage. The other seven will be elected indirectly by the elected members of the Local Councils of their constituencies. The Select Committee recognized with regard that in the case of these seven members direct elections were not practicable at this stage. It is hoped that it will be possible to hold the first meeting of the reconstituted Legislative Council next spring, after elections which are planned for April 1965."

As I have said, a sense of nationality has not yet appeared generally among the people of the Protectorate: it is being nurtured. My Government is discharging its responsibility to develop self-government and when the Islanders reach the stage of considering their ultimate political status, the British Government will be ready to consider any proposals that the people of the Protectorate may wish to put forward.

The High Commissioner for the Western Pacific is also responsible for the administration of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, where he is represented by a Resident Commissioner who resides in Tarawa, the capital.

The present constitution was introduced in 1963. It provides for an Executive Council, presided over by the Resident Commissioner with the Assistant Resident Commissioner as an ex officio member, three official and four non-official members. There is also an Advisory Council of which the Resident Commissioner is President. The Advisory Council has eleven non-official members and five official members appointed by the Resident Commissioner. The Council meets twice a year and gives advice on all matters relating to the administration of the territory.

The High Commissioner and the Resident Commissioner are both empowered to make laws for the peace, good government and order of the territory with due regard being paid to local customs. The Resident Commissioner is required to consult with the Executive Council in the exercise of these powers. In cases where a proposed law might affect the lives of the local population the Island Councils are also consulted.

The twenty-six Governments, which are established on most of the inhabited islands are the basic units of administration. The Head of each is the Island Magistrate, who is the representative of the Central Government on the islands, Chairman of the Island Councils and Magistrate of the native court. The Island Councils consist of elected members, nominated members and ex officio members. The elected members are elected by universal adult suffrage of all islanders over the age of thirty and there is a majority of elected members in all the Island Councils. In addition to appointing certain officers of the Island Governments, such as village police, warders and boat captains, the Island Councils have power to make local regulations covering a wide range of subjects and provide services for the general health, security and well being of each island. The Councils have full financial responsibility and make their own estimates of revenue and expenditure; in most cases they pay for various island services out of local revenue, but in cases where they are not financially self-supporting they receive a subvention from Central Government funds. All the Island Governments officials are Gilbertese or Ellice Islanders.

The political and economic life of the Colony is dominated by the vast distance between its component islands. The distance between the northern-most Gilbert Island and the southern-most Ellice Islands is over 1,200 miles and the distance between Ocean Island in the west and Christmas Island in the east is nearly 2,500 miles. Participation by the Islanders in the central administration of the territory has in the past been rendered extremely difficult by these vast distances, and, despite recent improvements in communications, remains so. Such feeling of unity as exists is recent, deriving from the British administration covering the whole territory, and this sense of unity needs careful fostering. Britain is always ready to consider proposals for constitutional change advanced by the Islanders, but at present it is their wish to remain in continuing association with Britain. They have indeed recently expressed concern lest this association might end and leave them in the future without adequate means of support.

Lastly, Pitcairn. The Governor of Fiji is responsible for the administration of the Pitcairn Islands. There is an Island Council consisting of the Chief Magistrate, two Assessors and the Secretary. These officers are local inhabitants

elected by the adult population. The Chief Magistrate is elected triennially and the other officers annually. The Islanders manage their own internal affairs with the aid, when necessary, of expert help and advice from Fiji. There is a remarkable degree of practical autonomy for the island. The last time a Governor of Fiji paid a visit to Pitcairn was in 1958, although a senior official of the Governor's staff paid a visit early this year to look into the population problem, to which I have already referred and which has become serious in the last few months. His report is being examined by the Governor. This tiny community cannot stand alone in the world and does not wish to. The islanders wish to maintain their connection with Britain.

STATEMENT MADE IN SUB-COMMITTEE III ON 29 APRIL 1964  
CONCERNING BARBADOS AND THE WINDWARD AND LEEWARD ISLANDS

The United Kingdom Government is responsible for the administration of nine territories in the East Caribbean. These are: Antigua, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, Montserrat and the British Virgin Islands (which comprise the Leeward Islands); Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent (which comprise the Windward Islands); and Barbados. These islands, which are for the most part hilly and of volcanic origin, form a chain stretching over 600 miles from the Virgin Islands in the north to Grenada in the south, and are well known for their pleasant climate and great natural beauty. They range in size from Dominica, whose area is 290 square miles, to Montserrat with an area of only 32 square miles; and in population from Barbados which has nearly 250,000 inhabitants, to the Virgin Islands with about 7,500 inhabitants. The total population of all nine territories is nearly 700,000, which gives a population density of some 600 persons per square mile.

The Windward and Leewards were discovered by Christopher Columbus in the course of his voyages to the West Indies in 1493 and 1498, and several were named by him. European settlement began in the seventeenth century, and during the eighteenth century the area was the scene of conflict between France and Britain, during which most of the islands changed hands several times although Antigua, Barbados and the Virgin Islands remained British throughout. British possession of the remaining islands was confirmed by the Treaty of Versailles in 1783, except for St. Lucia which was not finally ceded until the Treaty of Paris in 1814.

The British Virgin Islands are the most northerly territory. Their area is 59 square miles and they consist of a main island (Tortola) and some forty smaller islands, with a total population of 7,500, 80 per cent of whom live on Tortola. One hundred and forty miles south-east of the Virgin Islands lies the territory of St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, which comprises of three islands so named and the smaller island of Sombrero. The total area of the territory is 138 square miles and its population numbers 60,000. The main island in the group, St. Kitts, comprises nearly half the total area and two-thirds of the population.

The territory of Antigua lies to the east of St. Kitts. It consists of the island of Antigua together with its two dependencies of Barbuda and Redonda, with a total area of 170 square miles and a population of 55,000.

Montserrat is the most southerly of the Leewards and lies twenty-seven miles south-west of Antigua. It is the smallest of these islands with a land area of 32 square miles. Its population numbers 12,000. Further to the south lies Dominica, the most northerly of the Windwards and the largest of the lesser Antilles, with an area of 290 square miles and a population of 60,000. St. Lucia has an area of 238 square miles and a population of 86,000. St. Vincent has an area of 150 square miles (including a chain of small islands known as the St. Vincent Grenadines) with a population of 80,000, and Grenada, the most southerly of the Windward Islands, has an area of 133 square miles (including Carricaou and the remaining Grenadines) with a population of 90,000).

Lying apart from the Windward Islands, some 100 miles to the east of St. Vincent, is the island of Barbados, which has an area of 166 square miles and a population of nearly 250,000.

During three centuries these islands, although widely separated by water, and normally parochial in outlook, have shared common patterns of life. Because so many of the inhabitants are of mixed ancestry and have a tradition of inter-territorial migration, it is impossible to describe a West Indian in terms of specific racial characteristics. Thus they have fortunately escaped the sort of troubles over racial discrimination and minority groups which have disrupted societies elsewhere.

The economies of the islands have always been basically agricultural. Sugar production has played an important role in almost all the islands; it is still overwhelmingly important in Barbados, St. Kitts and in Antigua, where however tourism is rapidly replacing sugar as the most important industry. Cotton is exported from St. Kitts-Nevis and Montserrat, and to a lesser extent from Grenada, Antigua and St. Vincent.

A striking feature of the economies of the Windward Islands in recent years has been the very rapid increase in banana production, particularly in St. Lucia and Dominica where bananas now account for 70 per cent of total exports (the Windward Islands now supply over a third of the United Kingdom market for this fruit). Other exports include cocoa, nutmegs and mace mainly from Grenada, citrus

including lime juice and lime oil mainly from Dominica, livestock from Montserrat and the British Virgin Islands, and copra and coco-nuts mainly from St. Lucia and St. Vincent. St. Vincent is also noted for its arrowroot and in-shore fishing, and St. Kitts produces salt. The tourist industry, at present concentrated largely in Barbados and Antigua, is making an increasing contribution to the economies of some other islands, particularly Grenada.

Generally speaking, in all the islands the main problem - as in most tropical countries - is to find new resources to exploit, and to develop and diversify the economy, in order to provide sufficient employment for the rising population. Employment opportunities tend to be limited by various factors, including lack of resources and the smallness of the local markets. Many of these facts are a reflection of the small scale of the economies of the islands. Individually, most of the islands appear to have little hope of becoming viable in the foreseeable future; and their best hope for progress in this field would seem to lie in co-ordinated development on a regional basis.

The United Kingdom has given extensive financial assistance to the territories in this region. Since 1945, economic aid to Barbados and the Windward and Leeward Islands in the form of gifts and loans has amounted to about \$84 million. All the territories except for Antigua and Barbados are receiving grants-in-aid of recurrent expenditure from the British Government, to the extent of about \$2.8 million per annum. In addition, the territories are receiving on an average between \$5.5 million and \$8.5 million a year for development purposes. The United Kingdom Commonwealth Development Corporation has, among its other activities, invested in electricity development in Grenada, St. Vincent and Dominica.

Assistance has also been given by the Canadian Government, which has provided two ships for inter-island transport and a deep-water harbour for St. Vincent; and by the United States Government, which has given over \$2.7 million in aid for road building, technical education and other projects.

Ordinary forms of financial aid, in the shape of assistance towards administrative expenditure and development grants, are of great importance, but they need to be accompanied by a continuance of the present favourable trading arrangements for basic products. The chief safeguard for the economic progress

of the islands lies in the maintenance of special trading agreements, such as the operation of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement and the preferential arrangement for West Indian bananas in the United Kingdom market, and the local Governments set great store by these agreements.

I turn now to the question of constitutional development in these territories, and I shall deal first with Barbados. Full internal self-government was introduced in Barbados in October 1961. The Governor's powers are exercised virtually in the same way as by a "constitutional monarch", who by convention must always act upon the advice of his Ministers. He is not a member of the Cabinet, and his right to refuse assent to laws is restricted to those about government stock, international treaty obligations and the Royal Prerogative. He appoints as Premier the member of the House of Assembly best able to command a majority. In proroguing and dissolving the House of Assembly, he acts in accordance with the conventions which the Queen observes in similar circumstances in the United Kingdom.

The main executive organ of the Island is the Cabinet which is collectively responsible to the Legislature of Barbados for the direction and control of the Government. The Cabinet consists of the Premier and five Ministers drawn from the elected members of the House of Assembly plus one Minister (without portfolio) drawn from the Legislative Council.

The Constitution provides for two other executive organs. The Privy Council consists of the Attorney-General and other members appointed by the Governor in his discretion. It advises the Governor on the commutation of death sentences and on appeals by civil servants against disciplinary proceedings. The Executive Committee consists of the members of the Cabinet plus the Governor and the Attorney-General. Since the establishment of cabinet government in 1958, the role of this Committee has been much reduced.

The Legislature is bicameral. The Upper House has power to review legislation passed by the Lower House. Hitherto it has been known as the Legislative Council and its members (usually about fifteen) are appointed normally for five-year terms by the Governor after consultation with the leaders of the political parties. However, it will be replaced on 5 May by a Senate consisting of twenty-one members appointed by the Governor (twelve on the advice of the Premier, two on the advice of the Leader of the Opposition and seven to represent

religious, economic, social or other interests in Barbados). The life of the Senate will be coterminous with that of the House of Assembly.

The House of Assembly (the Lower House) has 24 members elected by universal adult suffrage from 12 constituencies. Elections are held at intervals of five years or less. The voting age has recently been reduced to eighteen. At the last general election, held in December 1961, the Democratic Labour Party won 14 seats, the Barbados Labour Party 5 seats, the Barbados National Party 4 seats and an independent one seat. Since the election, two members of the Labour Party have become independents. The present composition of the House therefore is: Democratic Labour Party 14 seats, Barbados National Party 4, Barbados Labour Party 3 and Independents 3.

The constitutional arrangements for the Leeward and Windward Islands, with the exception of Montserrat and the British Virgin Islands, are broadly similar, and I shall describe them together.

Under the present constitutions the Administrators in Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts, St. Lucia and St. Vincent are appointed by Her Majesty and have the status of Queen's Representative. They are constitutionally required to act on the advice of their Ministers except in certain specific and limited cases.

The Executive Council of each territory is responsible for the general control and direction of the Government. It is presided over by the Administrator, and there is one ex officio member (the principal law officer) and five non-official members (the Chief Minister, three other Ministers and a Minister without portfolio). All the Ministers are appointed from among the elected members of the Legislative Council (except the Minister without portfolio who is selected from either the elected or nominated members). The Administrator is required to appoint as Chief Minister the member of the Legislative Council who in his judgement is most likely to command a majority in the Legislative Council. The other non-official members are appointed by the Administrator on the advice of the Chief Minister. Ministers are assigned responsibility for any Government business (including financial matters) except criminal proceedings, internal security, the audit of public accounts and the public service.

The Legislative Council in Antigua, Dominica, Grenada and St. Lucia has ten members elected by universal adult suffrage; in Dominica there are eleven elected members, and in St. Vincent nine. In addition, each Council has ex officio member



(the principal law officer) and two nominated members appointed by the Administrator in his discretion. The Legislative Council is presided over by a Speaker, elected by the Council either from within or outside its own membership, and having only a casting vote. There is also a Deputy Speaker elected from within the Council.

The constitutional arrangements in Montserrat and the British Virgin Islands are broadly similar to those I have just described, but there are some differences, mainly due to their small populations (12,000 and 7,500 respectively). For example, the Executive Council of Montserrat has two ex officio members (the Crown Attorney and the Financial Secretary) and four non-official members (the Chief Minister and three other Ministers), while the Executive Council of the Virgin Islands has two ex officio members (the Crown Attorney and the Government Secretary) and three non-official members.

The Legislative Council of Montserrat and the Virgin Islands each have ten members; in Montserrat there are seven elected members, two ex officio members and one nominated member, while in the Virgin Islands there are six elected members, two nominated official members and two nominated non-official members. The Administrator presides over the Council in each case.

It has long been clear to my Government that these small islands in the Caribbean stood little chance of obtaining economic self-sufficiency or international status as individual States, nor could they remain colonies of the United Kingdom indefinitely. Over the years, considerable efforts have been made, so far without success, to establish a federation in the West Indies and I should now like to give an outline of these efforts as without some consideration of them no sound understanding of the problems facing these territories is possible.

Various groupings of the islands were formed for the sake of administrative efficiency and economy in the nineteenth century. For example, for nearly fifty years Barbados, Grenada, St. Vincent and St. Lucia were administered by a single Governor, but this arrangement failed to win local support, and in 1885 the three smaller territories were given their own Governor under the title of Governor of the Windward Islands, each territory retaining its own legislative and executive organs. In 1871 an attempt at a somewhat closer union was made when Antigua, Montserrat, St. Kitts, the Virgin Islands and Dominica were combined into a single federal colony of the Leeward Islands, with its own central Legislative Council and

Executive Council. (Dominica later transferred to the Windward Islands colony). Subsequent moves to join the Leewards and the Windwards with each other or with other British territories in the Caribbean were unsuccessful.

In March 1945 the United Kingdom Government stated that the aim of British policy in the Caribbean area was the development of a federation at such time as the balance of opinion in the various territories was in favour of such a change; and on the proposal of the British Government, the idea of a political federation was debated in the Legislatures of all the territories of the region, including not only the nine territories which are the subject of my present statement, but also British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica and Trinidad.

In September 1947, a Conference on Closer Association was held in Jamaica. All delegates (except those from British Guiana) accepted the principle of federation and a committee was set up to work out the draft federal constitution. This committee consisted of seventeen West Indians selected by their respective legislatures and its recommendations for a federal constitution were accepted by the legislatures of all territories concerned except for British Guiana, British Honduras and the British Virgin Islands. Since that time these three territories have stood apart from the project of federation.

A conference of the remaining ten Governments was held in London in 1953 and agreed upon a Plan for a British Caribbean Federation based on the proposals of the Committee and by February 1955 this Plan had been debated and adopted by all Legislatures concerned. The next conference, held in 1956, formally agreed that the participating territories would be "bound together in federation", and a Standing Federation Committee was set up to consider the detailed drafting of the constitution and make the necessary administrative arrangements for the establishment of the Federal Government. In 1957, it was decided that the capital of the new Federation should be in Trinidad and that the Federation should be named The West Indies. It came into being in January 1958.

After the establishment of the Federation, a basic difference of opinion became apparent about the extent and nature of the powers to be given to the Federal Government. An inter-governmental conference was held in London in 1961 to consider the three main issues of contention, namely freedom of movement,

control over income tax and industrial development and methods of raising federal revenue; and although broad agreement was reached on certain conclusions, several of the participants recorded dissent on particular items and the conclusions of the conference as a whole were ad referendum to local Legislatures. However, the British Government agreed, subject to the decisions reached by the various Legislatures and peoples, to take the necessary steps to grant The West Indies independence on 31 May 1962.

Meanwhile, the Jamaican Government had announced in May 1960 that its electorate would be given an opportunity by way of a referendum to decide whether Jamaica should continue to participate in the Federation of the West Indies. The referendum was held in September 1961 and a majority voted against Jamaica remaining within the Federation. As a result, the British and Jamaican Governments agreed that Jamaica should proceed to independence on its own. Subsequently, in January 1962, the Government of Trinidad decided that it would not participate in any new Federation of the East Caribbean which might be formed, but should proceed forthwith to independence. As a result, Jamaica and Trinidad proceeded to separate independence in August 1962, and are now Members of this United Nations Organization.

Early in 1962, after Jamaica and Trinidad had decided to seek separate independence, the Premier of Barbados and the Chief Ministers of Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts, St. Lucia and St. Vincent declared their wish to form a new federation, and submitted outline proposals to the British Government with a request that an early conference should be convened. The proposals envisaged the establishment of a new "West Indies" federation, as an independent State within the Commonwealth, with its capital in Barbados. The British Government considered these proposals and in April 1962 the British Colonial Secretary told Parliament that the federation of Barbados and the Leeward and Windward Islands "appears to offer the best solution to the problems of the area provided that the Constitution is such as to provide adequate powers to the Federal Government and to offer a reasonable prospect of economic and financial stability".

A month later, at a Conference in London agreement was reached with the Governments of the eight territories on the general lines which the new federation

should take. An outline plan of the constitution was drawn up and published for the consideration of the Governments, legislatures and peoples concerned. It provided for a federation with stronger powers in the centre than the former federation, and which would enjoy full internal self-government from the outset, the question of independence being left for further consideration later. Enquiries were put in hand into the fiscal, economic, civil service and customs union aspects, and it was agreed to convene a further Conference, at which Opposition Parties would also be represented, to reach final decisions in detail. Meanwhile, the Premier of Barbados and the Chief Ministers agreed to constitute themselves as a Regional Council of Ministers under the chairmanship of the Governor of Barbados, to facilitate dealing with matters of regional interest and, in particular, of preparations for federation.

Late in 1962, following elections and the formation of a new Government, Grenada ceased to participate in preparations for federation and started negotiations with Trinidad for association in a unitary State. These negotiations have not reached a final conclusion. In December 1962, a joint statement was issued in Barbados by the British Colonial Secretary and leading Ministers of the remaining seven territories, reaffirming their conviction that federation offered the best prospect for economic and political progress (irrespective of whether Grenada decided to participate) and announcing that preparatory talks would be held in Barbados before a final conference in June 1963.

These preparatory talks, which were held in Barbados in May 1963, revealed a significant divergence of opinion between the Governments concerned. Some of the differences arose from further reflection upon the original proposals, while others arose from a first consideration of the expert studies, which had recently become available, of the administrative, fiscal and economic aspects of the problem. Then, at the final session of the conference, the Ministers tabled a statement suggesting a new procedure for establishing a Federation which would be independent from the start. This statement had been agreed among the seven Ministers subject to reservations by three of them. Since the suggestions in the statement involved radical changes in the proposals previously considered, and since time would clearly be needed to study them, it was agreed that the constitutional conference in London for which they had been preparing would have to be postponed until later in the year.

Since that time, the British Government and the Governments of the territories have exchanged views on various aspects of the problem. They have also been giving careful study to the Fiscal and Civil Service Commission reports and to the economic survey and the report on customs union.

A variety of difficulties still exist, including differences between the territories regarding the degree of financial support to be provided by the British Government. To enable discussions to be pursued, on 24 March the British Government invited the West Indian Ministers to London in April to consider the matter further in the hope that these difficulties could be resolved.

The Regional Council of Ministers considered this invitation at their meeting held in Barbados from 15-18 April, and the Ministers decided that they would not be in a position to suggest a date for a conference in London until they had held a further meeting among themselves. This is where the matter rests at present.

Thus the future of the nine territories we are now discussing has not yet been finally determined. Grenada and the British Virgin Islands have decided that they do not wish to participate in the Federation with the other British territories in the region; Grenada is exploring the possibility of union with Trinidad and the British Virgin Islands are content for the time being to continue their present relationship with Britain. For the remaining seven territories, the view of the British Government is that the Federation still offers the best prospect for their future constitutional and economic development. However, there are still difficulties in the way which have to be resolved. The Governments of the various islands remain reluctant to concede power to a federal centre; and there is as yet no sense of West Indian nationhood as such. The dependence of the individual territories on United Kingdom aid, even for the cost of day to day administration, is very great and the islands appear reluctant to contemplate finally committing themselves to federation unless the considerable sums of aid are greatly increased and guaranteed for a period as long as ten years ahead. The British Government, for its part, recognizes that the Federation of these territories would stand in need of external assistance for its establishment, and hopes that through patient negotiation a successful formula can be found to overcome all the obstacles so that these territories can achieve independence as well as a united and stable federation.

STATEMENT MADE IN SUB-COMMITTEE III ON 15 MAY 1964 CONCERNING  
BARBADOS AND THE WINDWARD AND LEEWARD ISLANDS

My delegation has followed with interest the debate on the nine territories under British administration in the East Caribbean currently under discussion. My delegation has been impressed by the fact that members of the Sub-Committee have, for the most part, taken a realistic and objective view of the situation and have endeavoured to make their comments constructive. I refer in particular to the statements by the distinguished representatives of Italy, Ivory Coast, Madagascar and Iran. I should, however, like to make one or two comments in relation to points which have arisen in the course of the debate.

Some distinguished representatives referred to the need for more economic and social development in the British Virgin Islands. The United Kingdom each year gives considerable financial assistance to this territory in respect of ordinary expenditure; this amounted to over \$500,000 in 1963. (Throughout this statement I shall give figures in US dollars.) In addition to this grant of aid of administration, funds have been made available from the United Kingdom for development projects in the economic and social field and a further sum of just under \$500,000 was made available to the Territory for the five-year period ending 31 March 1964. An expert enquiry into the economic potential, fiscal structure and capital requirements of the Territory was undertaken in 1961 by Dr. O'Loughlin, of the University of the West Indies. Her report was published in 1962 and a local development Advisory Committee was set up in the following year, which allocated priorities in the light of the report and produced a three-year development plan. Under the 1963 Commonwealth Development Act, a total of \$694,400 will be available for the Virgin Islands in the period 1963/66, permitting an average annual expenditure of \$231,500 which is practically double the amount available for the preceding five-year period. The revised development plan concentrates on improvement of the Territory's infrastructure including roads, electricity, water supplies and water front reclamation, the balance being devoted to social service projects.

The distinguished representative of the Ivory Coast referred particularly to educational conditions. All education is free and compulsory up to fifteen years of age and the challenge to raise educational standards contained in the report of the Committee which reviewed the education system in 1958 has been met with vigour

by all concerned. Government expenditure on education in 1962 amounted to more than 15 per cent of total expenditure, and a new post of Superintendent of Education is being created to make possible more regular inspection of schools and a corresponding improvement in standards.

A number of distinguished representatives suggested that the local inhabitants should be given a greater role in the administrative legislative and executive organs in these territories. My delegation wishes to emphasize that the extent of participation by local inhabitants in these organs is already very great. I referred in my previous statement to this Sub-Committee to the fact that elections under universal adult suffrage were held in all territories, and I noted the extent to which responsibility for the affairs of these Islands was in the hands of elected ministers answerable to their legislative councils.

But, in addition to this, three of the Administrators of the territories are West Indians, as well as five of the Chief Secretaries (or their equivalent), all the Attorneys General, and many heads of such technical departments as Agriculture, Electricity, Labour and Public Works. Indeed, an overwhelming majority of the officials of these territories are West Indians.

Having dealt with these more detailed points, I should now like to turn to the fundamental problem facing the peoples of these territories and the British Government, with particular reference to the enquiry addressed to my delegation by the distinguished representative of Iran, namely whether the basic obstacle to the establishment of a federation, and the attainment of independence by these territories, was lack of financial assistance from the administering Power.

The deliberations of the Sub-Committee have brought out in sharp relief the nature of our problem in the East Caribbean. On the one hand there is the wish of the Island Governments, to which we are willing to accede, that they should proceed to early independence. On the other hand, there is the need to ensure, so far as lies within our power, that when they have their independence they will be able to stand on their own feet.

It was at the request of the Governments of the eight territories that we have been considering with them the establishment of a federation and independence. Not for one moment did it occur to the British Government that here was a chance to cast these islands off, and leave them to their own devices. At the Conference in London in May 1962, the British Government and the Governments of

these territories reached agreement on the scheme of federation which they would recommend. In the course of that Conference, the British Government went on record as recognizing that such a federation would stand in need of external assistance for a period after it was established, both on capital and on current account. The British Government stated their willingness to help within the limits of the resources which they were able to make available.

Reference has been made to an estimate by the Trinidad Government that the West Indies needed development grants of \$183 million in the ten-year period 1959-60 to 1968-69, i.e. at a rate of \$18.3 million a year. There is room for argument about whether assistance should take the form of grants or loans. For the record, the total financial assistance provided from the British Treasury to the former federation and its constituent units in the first three years of that period exceeded \$60 million, i.e. a rate of \$20 million a year. This figure takes no account of British contributions to those institutions which have provided multilateral aid for the area; or of the contribution to development provided by loans raised on the London market totalling \$9.4 million; or of the very considerable indirect subsidies to the area (worth on the average over \$25.5 million a year over the period) provided under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement; or the specially guaranteed markets Britain provides for other agricultural products.

It is not correct to suggest that the only obstacle which prevented these territories from forming a federation and achieving political independence was lack of assurances about economic aid. Economically they are already more prosperous, and have a higher income per inhabitant, than some of the independent countries represented in the United Nations. Economically they could sustain independence as well as many other countries without relapsing into chaos and starvation. The real barriers that have been holding them back are political. They have recognized for themselves that they will be stronger in federation than as seven individuals, but federal constitutions are never easy to devise. A proper balance between the powers of the centre and of the unit is always difficult to achieve. Yet if it is not achieved, the resulting strains and stresses may weaken the whole structure, or even result in a dissolution, as has happened once already in this area - an experience nobody is anxious to repeat. The British Government would be failing in its duty if it did not seek to ensure that any



federation which may be established had the best possible chance, not only of survival, but of a healthy development.

It is no easy matter for the Island Governments themselves. It is naturally taking time to work out the details of the federal scheme, and it is not surprising that examination of the details should have prompted the seven Governments to re-examine some of the elements in the scheme they had previously agreed upon. The British Government are not pressing for hasty agreements which might be regretted. But agreements already reached cannot be discarded without an opportunity for full discussion, which we have invited.

The British Government are as anxious as the Island Governments are to ensure that the federation which they seek, and the independence which they claim, should be achieved in conditions which will not result in any setback to their economic or political development. It has been suggested that these problems would simply disappear if the territories could be promised grants of what they regard as the requisite size over the requisite period. However, the problem is not as simple as that. To be independent and support a level of living not by any means amongst the lowest in the world, together with a rapidly increasing population, a territory must have resources capable of development. To provide the infrastructure is not much good unless there is the wherewithal to maintain it, and we believe that this can in the end only materialize as a result of development in the private sector. It is true that a good infrastructure can be conducive to this sort of development where there are resources to develop. But the resources of these islands are, unfortunately, limited.

In those islands which have a tourist potential, this sort of investment will give a comparatively rapid return, in the absence of which the Governments concerned would be likely to run into difficulties over their recurrent expenditure. In some islands, there may be prospects of industrial development, but on the whole the smallness of local markets, even taking the whole area of the proposed federation into account, and the lack of ancillary services, set limits to this. In those islands which will probably continue to be mainly dependent on agriculture, however, the necessary increases in output may take years to achieve (and in some they may never be large enough to support a population growing at present rates). In fact, until considerable increases are effected in the productivity of peasant agriculture, it is difficult to see

how any great increase in income can be achieved from large-scale public investment, while the problem of mounting recurrent expenditure by Governments will increase. There are many obstacles to the improvement of productivity of peasant farming, including land tenure systems, size of farms, insufficient use of fertilizers, lack of cheap credit, etc.

Financial assistance can certainly do much to enable a Government to tackle such problems, but co-operation, dynamism and the ability to recruit the necessary experts are also important. In fact, one of the bottlenecks to development in these types of economy tends to be the lack of skill and expert personnel in all spheres of activity. Training can do something to remedy this, but a small country will always experience these difficulties to a degree, simply as a result of its smallness. This is merely one of the many diseconomies of small scale which makes development in these islands a long and far from easy process.

All the territories concerned now have development plans or are in process of revising them. The co-ordination of these plans is a function which a Federal government could most usefully undertake. But there is still a large number of questions to be discussed and settled before they and we can see clearly what the capacity of the islands, organized in a federation, will be to undertake expanded development plans. Once that is known, we shall be willing to consider with the federating Governments what external assistance they need, and how great a contribution we can make towards meeting that need. There are no grounds for doubting our stated willingness to assist, or for hesitation in planning for federation and independence on the basis of the assurances of continued assistance so readily given.

I informed this Sub-Committee in my statement on 29 April that the British Government has invited the West Indian Ministers to London for discussions of outstanding problems. The Regional Council of Ministers considered this invitation at their meeting held in Barbados last month and decided that they would hold a further meeting among themselves before suggesting a date for the London Conference. It is our hope that these discussions will point the way forward to the establishment of a federation and the attainment of independence.

STATEMENT MADE IN SUB-COMMITTEE III ON 8 SEPTEMBER 1964  
CONCERNING FALKLAND ISLANDS

The Falkland Islands consist of two large and about 200 small islands with a total area of around 4,700 square miles lying in the South Atlantic about 400 miles northeast of Cape Horn. The territory's Dependencies are South Georgia the South Sandwich Islands, and a number of rocks. Recent geological research and studies of the fossil forms of the Falkland Islands suggest that over the centuries the group may have moved from an original position off South-Eastern Africa, and that the Falklands were once part of what is now Natal and Eastern Cape Province in the Republic of South Africa. I leave the Sub-Committee to draw whatever conclusions it wishes from this, but I emphasize that the islands have moved, if the theory is true, from South-East Africa, not South-West. The population of the Falkland Islands, excluding the Dependencies, was 2,172 in 1962, the date of the last census. Of these 1,733, that is almost exactly 80 per cent, were born in the territory, 338 were born in the United Kingdom and nine in Argentina. Almost all the people are settlers or descendants of settlers from Britain. In terms of nationality, all but thirty-six of the population were British citizens; and of these thirty-six, fifteen were Chileans and three Argentinians. The only town is Stanley, the capital, with a population of about 1,000 and the largest settlement outside Stanley comprises only about 100 people. The population of the Dependencies fluctuates with the whaling season; in the summer it is about 500 and in the winter about half that number.

The economy of the Falkland Islands depends on the wool industry and the prosperity of the Island is therefore largely dependent on the world price of wool, which has declined since the time of the Korean War although it has risen slightly in recent years. As there are no national income or product figures for the territory, probably the best indication of its prosperity is the rising trend of the figures for the export of wool by volume. In 1938 the figure was 3,618,000 lbs. Since 1959 the figures have risen steadily from 4,546,000 lbs. to 5,061,000 apart from a slight drop in 1962. A further indication of the level of prosperity of the territory is revealed by the number of motor vehicles per head; this now

exceeds that of the United Kingdom. The Falkland Islands' Government places great emphasis on the improvement of pastures and action is now being taken to put into effect the recommendations of an expert in hill farming in Scotland who visited the Islands in 1960/61 to advise on pasture improvement and the sheep industry generally. The development of secondary industries is inhibited mainly by the smallness of the market and by the demands of the sheep farming industry on labour and enterprise - there is what the economists disapprovingly call over-full employment in the Islands. The Government of the territory has over the past fifteen years undertaken considerable development work to which the British Government has contributed nearly \$700,000 from Colonial Development and Welfare funds. This sum includes about \$224,000 for the improvement of the Stanley roads, \$145,000 for water supplies, \$39,000 for a vessel for communication between the Islands, \$36,000 for a power station, \$39,000 for a new Town Hall for Stanley and \$98,000 for hospital improvements. A further \$140,000 has recently been made available for the three years 1963/66 which is to be spent mainly on school buildings. It is broadly true to say that there is no real poverty in the Islands and that the standard of living is slightly higher than that in Britain.

I now turn to the constitutional position. The present constitution, which dates from 1951, provides for a Legislative Council which is empowered to pass laws for the peace, order and good government of the territory. The Council is presided over by the Governor and consists of three officials, four members elected by universal adult suffrage, and four members nominated by the Governor, two of them non-official members. There is thus a majority of non-official members, and although two of the six non-official members are nominated by the Governor they are in no sense government men. The Legislative Council must meet at least once a year and usually has several sessions, including the budget session. The non-official members play an important part in the government of the territory. For example the Standing Finance Committee of the Legislative Council comprises only the elected and non-official members and this committee may approve or object to any item of proposed governmental expenditure.

The Governor, who is the Queen's representative and Head of the Administration, is advised by an Executive Council. The Executive Council takes decisions on all

matters affecting the internal government of the territory. It consists of three officials and five other members nominated by the Governor. By an arrangement recently introduced the six non-official members of the Legislative Council are invited to recommend the appointment of two of the non-official members of the Executive Council. The Governor may act against the advice of the Executive Council only in certain circumstances, such as where the Royal prerogative is involved, but the number of such occasions is rare, if indeed it has ever happened.

There are no political parties, although there is a trade union (the Falkland Islands Labour Federation) and a Sheepowners' Federation.

There is a Town Council in Stanley which consists of six elected members and three members nominated by the Governor. Elections are held biennially, three of the six elected members retiring every two years. The Council is responsible for the usual local government services. Appointments to the public service are made by the Governor, assisted, when necessary, by members of the Executive Council. Of 158 Government posts now filled, 108 are occupied by Falkland Islanders. The entire staff of the key departments of the Secretariat and the Treasury, with the exception of the Colonial Secretary, are Falkland Islanders. There is no difference in the conditions of service of expatriates and Falkland Islanders in permanent and pensionable Government posts. They enjoy the same rates of pay and similar leave conditions.

After the recent general elections in the Colony, the members of the Executive and Legislative Councils discussed constitutional changes with the Governor, and agreed on proposals for changes in the composition of both Councils. These proposals were then put to the British Government. The proposals are that the non-elected membership of the Legislative Council should be reduced by omitting one of the three ex-officio members and the two nominated members. The Council would then consist of the Governor, the Colonial Secretary and the Colonial Treasurer, two nominated independent members and four elected members. In the Executive Council one of three official members would be omitted and the unofficials would consist of two appointed members and two elected members of the Legislative Council chosen by a ballot of the elected and independent members of Legislative Council. The object of these changes is to increase the influence of the elected members in

the two Councils, giving equal numbers of elected and non-elected members in the Legislative Council, where at present there is an unofficial but not an elected majority, and formalizing the the introduction of the principle of election in the appointment of members of the Executive Council. These proposals have been accepted by the British Government and will be brought into effect as soon as the necessary constitutional instruments are prepared.

It is for the Islanders to determine what their ultimate constitutional status should be and the British Government are always ready to consider any proposals for constitutional change that the Islanders may advance. For the present the Islanders have made it clear that they do not want independence. Members of the Sub-Committee and of the Special Committee will have seen the message from the elected members of the Falkland Islands Legislative Council to the Chairman of the Committee of Twenty-Four dated 3 August in the following terms:

"We, the elected members of the Legislative Council of the Falkland Islands, understand that the Special Committee proposes to discuss the Falkland Islands in September. We accordingly wish to make known to members of the Special Committee the wishes of the people of this colony. We are proud to be citizens of this British Colony which was settled and developed by people from the United Kingdom. We wish to retain and strengthen our link with the United Kingdom and to state in the strongest possible terms that any constitutional association with a foreign power would be completely repugnant to us. The unofficial nominated members of both the Executive and the Legislative Council wish to be associated in the fullest possible degree with this statement of ours and respectfully request you to arrange for this telegram to be circulated to all members of the Special Committee."\*

In the light of this unequivocal statement of the wishes of the people of the Falkland Islands, made by their own elected representatives, there can be no doubt about the desires of the people of the territory. My delegation urges distinguished delegates not to lose sight of this fundamental point, because it may well be that efforts will be made to distract attention from it.

---

\* The elected members of the Legislative Council unanimously adopted a declaration in similar terms on 2 April this year. The unofficial nominated members of the Executive and Legislative Councils associated themselves with the declaration which was formally conveyed at the elected members' request to the British Government.

My Government's position in regard to the Falkland Islands is thus fully consistent with the principle of self-determination. I wish to reaffirm the statement in the letters from the head of my delegation addressed to the Chairman of the Special Committee and to the Chairman of this Sub-Committee, and circulated as document A/AC.109/81, that my Government have no doubt as to their sovereignty over the territory of the Falkland Islands.

In the opinion of my delegation, the request by the distinguished representative of Argentina to participate in the work of this Sub-Committee constitutes, especially in view of the wording employed in the request, an intervention in the affairs of this territory in which Argentina is not properly concerned. The claim advanced by the Government of Argentina to sovereignty over the Falkland Islands is in effect a bid to annex those Islands in defiance of the clearly expressed wishes and interests of the people of the territory, wishes and interests which according to the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the granting of independence to non-self-governing territories and peoples should be paramount. In the view of my Government, the Special Committee and this Sub-Committee are not competent to attempt to consider or discuss territorial claims; indeed, my delegation are convinced that quite apart from the issue of competence, the Committee would be most ill advised to try to deal with this difficult and inevitably time-consuming question of sovereignty, which does not arise out of the resolutions establishing the Special Committee or out of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial peoples. It may be suggested, as it has been suggested in the past, that operative paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 (XV) constitutes a mandate to the Committee to consider questions of sovereignty; but in my delegation's view this reading of paragraph 6 is not borne out either by the wording of the paragraph itself, which clearly refers to possible attempts at disruption in the future and not to issues of sovereignty dating back to distant history, or by the remainder of the Declaration which indeed is very specific in stating that "all peoples" - and I repeat the crucial words, "all peoples" - "have the right to self-determination". It seems to my delegation, and I think it will be agreed by any fair-minded person who reads the terms of the Declaration without preconceived ideas, that paragraph 6 cannot possibly be construed as imposing a

limitation of such importance on the universal application of the principle of self-determination, which is indeed guaranteed under the Charter itself.

While therefore the United Kingdom Government cannot agree to participate in discussions of sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, either in this Sub-Committee and Committee or indeed in bilateral talks with the Argentina Government, I am authorized to say that my Government are always willing to discuss with the Government of Argentina ways in which we, they and the Falkland Islanders can avoid damage to the good relations between us from the dispute which unhappily exists; and my Government have so informed the Government of Argentina.



STATEMENT MADE IN SUB-COMMITTEE III ON 16 SEPTEMBER 1964  
CONCERNING THE FALKLAND ISLANDS

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons which I explained very fully in my statement to this Sub-Committee on 8 September, my delegation cannot recognize the competence of this Sub-Committee to consider the question of sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, the question to which most of the statement by the distinguished representative of Argentina on 9 September was devoted. However, the Argentine statement included a number of misconceptions about conditions in the Falkland Islands, and I shall be grateful if the Sub-Committee would spare me a short time to correct some of these inaccuracies.

First the distinguished representative of Argentina suggested that the status of the Falkland Islands as a British colony is an anachronism in the modern world. Mr. Chairman, my Government have made it clear that it is for the Falkland Islanders themselves to choose their constitutional future and it is the Islanders themselves who wish to retain the British connexion. I leave it to this Sub-Committee to decide whether the attitude of my Government, or the attitude of the Argentine Government which wishes to annex this small territory against the wishes of its inhabitants, is more in accordance with the enlightened thinking of modern days.

The Argentine representative referred to what he called the "stagnant" population of the Islands as evidence that they have relatively poor social and economic standards, and suggested that they would enjoy greater prosperity if linked with Argentina. Mr. Chairman, I wish to protest against this use of the word "stagnant". It is true that the population has increased very little during this century; it was 2,043 in 1901 and 2,172 in 1962, the date of the last census. But a stable population need not be a stagnant one; on the contrary, the Falkland Islanders are very much alive and full of energy, with a prosperous and thriving economy. The Argentine statement quoted some arrival and departure figures for the Islands as if these had great significance. For the record, the correct figures are: 1960, 224 arrived, 292 left; 1961, 276 arrived 326 left; 1962, 368 arrived, 411 left. These are not, however, emigration and immigration figures. They are accounted for largely by people coming and going on holiday, leave and business. The small population decline of recent years has been attributable mainly to the natural attraction of more varied employment opportunities outside

the Islands, and the consequent tendency to emigration has partially offset the natural population increase. The picture drawn by the Argentine representative of this community as the only shrinking family in America is wholly misleading. The birthrate in Argentina itself has been declining ever since 1956. As for comparisons between the prosperity now enjoyed by the Falkland Islanders and that which they could expect if joined to Argentina, I made it clear in my statement on 8 September that the Islands are prosperous, and indeed by most measurements enjoy a rather higher standard of living than the United Kingdom. One indicator of their general social well being is the infant mortality rate, which according to the latest United Nations demographic Year Book was 20.4 per thousand live births in the Falkland Islands in 1962 compared with a figure of 62.1 in Argentina. The Falkland Islands rate of infant mortality has been the lowest of all the countries in South America for which figures are available in every year since 1956; in almost every year the Argentine rate has been twice or three times as high as that in the Falklands. Comparable statistics are hard to come by, but from the available facts and figures that there are, as an index of prosperity and general well being, I will mention the average size of dwellings. According to the United Nations Statistical Year Book for 1963, the average number of rooms in houses in Argentina is 2.4; in Britain it is 4.6 rooms, in the United States of America 4.9, and in the Falkland Islands it is 7.9. 53.3 per cent of all dwellings in the Falkland Islands have seven or more rooms, compared with 2.7 per cent in Argentina. In Argentina, 62.7 per cent of dwellings have only one or two rooms, compared with 2.2 per cent in the Falkland Islands. I do not therefore know on what evidence the Argentine representative bases his suggestion that the Falkland Islands would be better off as part of Argentina. They seem to be doing rather well as they are.

The distinguished representative of Argentina described the population of the Falkland Islands as a purely temporary and fluctuating one, presumably in support of his suggestion that the principle of self-determination ought not to be applied to this territory. Mr. Chairman, the facts are as follows: 80 per cent of the resident population of the Islands in 1962 had been born in those Islands. Of the present population, 1,629 out of just over 2,000 can trace their roots to persons settled in the Islands before 1900. Over 1,000 can probably trace their origins back to roots in the Falkland Islands before 1850. The demand for skilled

craftsmen and other labour from overseas accounts for some of the yearly arrival figures and the emigration trends to which I have already referred account for tendencies for yearly departures to exceed arrivals. Neither the importation of skilled craftsmen and other labour, nor these unremarkable emigration trends, affects the great bulk of the population, which as I have shown is permanently settled and has been so settled for many years.

My distinguished colleague from Italy spoke of these Islands as the population's "second home". But these people have no other home; these Islands are their first and only home. This is no artificial community maintained by deliberate decision of the United Kingdom Government: the islanders form a stable and settled community descended in most cases (as I have shown) from the original settlers and their children. The fact that they are largely of British descent by origin does not mean that they can be wished away; it does not mean that the principle of self-determination cannot be applied to them. The distinguished representative of Italy suggested that the problem is that of a colonial territory rather than of a colonial people. But how can we talk about the territory and forget the men, women and children who have made their homes there? How can this Committee, which has dedicated itself to the service of colonial peoples everywhere in the world, put rocks and sheep before human beings? My delegation has been unable to find anything in the Charter or in the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples to suggest that the principle of self-determination shall not be applied to communities of British descent, or to communities from which there is any emigration, or into which there is an inflow of persons from overseas with skills that are needed in the territory.

The Argentine representative referred in rather disparaging terms to the important role of the Falkland Islands Company in the economic life of the Falkland Islands. It is true that this company has a most important part to play in the Falkland Islands, and indeed it was very largely the enterprise of the company which originally developed the Islands. The system of taxation in the Falkland Islands, which has recently involved raising the level of company income tax and the introduction of a profits tax, ensures that the Falkland Islands community itself receives a fair share of the proceeds of operations of the company. In addition, the Islands of course benefit from wages and salaries and other expenditure by the company. This is a tiny community by international standards,

and it is quite unrealistic to imagine that it could support a complex competitive economy of the kind apparently envisaged by the Argentine representative when he talks of a monopoly in the Falkland Islands. The efficiency and scale of the Falkland Islands Company's operations enable it to make a much greater contribution to the territory's prosperity than a wool industry composed of numerous small farms could possibly expect to do.

Reference was made in the Argentine statement to the fact that Montevideo is the only outlet from the Islands, and it was hinted that this limitation on the contacts of the islanders with the outside world should be laid at the door of their British connexions. Mr. Chairman, this is not so. There are regular voyages between the Falklands and Britain as well as the regular voyages to Montevideo by the mail vessel R.M.S. Darwin. As for contacts between the Islands and Argentina, Britain has never had any wish to put barriers in the way of contact or trade between the Falkland Islands and Argentina: the regrettable fact that such barriers do exist is to be ascribed to the policies of the Argentine Government. Merchant ships wishing to enter Argentine ports cannot do so if their last call was at the Falkland Islands, since there are no Argentine authorities to clear papers. Falkland Islanders cannot visit Argentina because they are treated there as if they were Argentine nationals, liable to Argentine taxes and military service. If the Argentine Government wishes to establish good relations with this little community so near its own shores, there are immediate and obvious measures which it could take to enable the Falkland Islanders to develop closer and better relations with them.

The Argentine representative based part of his argument on the fact that the Falkland Islands are situated on the continental shelf of Argentina, and spoke as if under international law and the Geneva Convention of 1958 this gave Argentina some kind of claim to sovereignty over the Islands. In fact, the Argentine Government has not yet ratified the Continental Shelf Convention although it appears from the remarks of the distinguished representative of Argentina to which I have just referred that his Government recognizes the Convention as definitive in international law. If so, it is to be regretted that the Argentine Government has failed to follow the principles of the Convention in almost every respect in drafting a law relating to the continental shelf. This Convention is now in force,

and the British Government has ratified it. Far from affording any basis for claiming that islands on the continental shelf belong to the State which enjoys certain rights over the shelf, the Convention goes so far as to make special mention of the fact that islands have their own continental shelf. The Convention confers on the coastal State sovereign rights only for the limited purpose of exploring and exploiting the natural resources of the shelf. It confers no right to full sovereignty over areas of the continental shelf, nor to the exercise of any rights apart from those connected with exploration and exploitation. The distinguished representative of Argentina did not refer to the principle established by article 6 of the Convention that States opposite one another on the same continental shelf shall determine boundaries between them on the shelf by agreement. In the absence of agreement, the Convention provides that unless another boundary line is justified by special circumstances, the boundary is to be the median. British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands confers upon Britain the rights described by the Convention over the continental shelf adjacent to the Falkland Islands, and my Government fully reserves these rights. Britain would of course be willing to determine appropriate boundaries on the continental shelf between Argentina and the Falkland Islands in accordance with the principles of the Convention.

I should now like to say a few words about the statement on 10 September by yourself, Mr. Chairman, in your capacity as the representative of Uruguay.

My delegation is glad to pay tribute to the great legal wisdom and knowledge which informed your delegation's statement, Mr. Chairman. I also wish to acknowledge with gratitude the friendly and constructive spirit in which your delegation's statement was conceived. However, I am sorry to say that my delegation cannot altogether agree with the interpretation which your statement appeared to place upon paragraph 6 of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. Whatever the history and background of the evolution of legal principles on the American continent, the meaning and interpretation of paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 (XV) must stand on its own; in my delegation's opinion, it cannot be a requirement for understanding a General Assembly resolution that one should be an expert in inter-American legal history. Words must be assumed to mean what they say, in General Assembly resolutions if not in documents of a more legal character. Mr. Chairman, if I understood your

learned exposition correctly, your contention was that paragraph 6 of this resolution gave international validation to an established principle of American law under which no country should accord recognition of sovereignty over territory acquired illegally or by the use of force. Leaving aside for a moment the question whether British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands was in fact so acquired, it seems plain to my delegation that paragraph 6 in fact says nothing of the kind. Let me read the text of the paragraph to the Sub-Committee:

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

Mr. Chairman, if words mean what they say, this paragraph is an injunction addressed to all countries to take no actions in the future - I stress "in the future" because the word used in the resolution is "attempt" - whose consequences would be to split existing territories or States or which would infringe their sovereignty in a manner inconsistent with the United Nations Charter, and in particular with Article 2 of the Charter. There is no justification for regarding this paragraph of resolution 1514 as constituting a limitation on the principle of self-determination assured by paragraph 2 of the same resolution and by Article 1, paragraph 2 of the Charter. Indeed, if it had been the intention of the General Assembly to indicate by paragraph 6 that, in cases where the principle of territorial integrity and sovereignty conflicted with the principle of self-determination, the principles of territorial integrity and sovereignty should have precedence, then it must be obvious that a completely different wording would have been used both in paragraph 6 and especially in paragraph 2 of the resolution. If such a wording had been used, placing such an important and far-reaching limitation on the principle of self-determination, I venture to suggest that the resolution might well not have commended itself to a majority of Members of the United Nations in 1960 or at any other time.

We welcome your recognition, Mr. Chairman, that neither this Sub-Committee nor the main Committee is competent to judge the merits of disputes over sovereignty. Your statement confirms us in the view that, apart from any other considerations, this is not the place in which to argue legal issues of this kind and that it is pointless and improper to attempt to do so. Your exposition of certain legal matters shows the deep waters into which pursuit of legal arguments as to

sovereignty can lead the Sub-Committee. We consider that the rules of international law relating to title to territory apply universally, without special rules for certain areas. Furthermore to talk in terms of the effects of acquiring territory by force or illegally simply begs the question as to the lawfulness of the acquisition of title: we for our part are entirely satisfied that our title was acquired lawfully.

The Argentine representative has given a lengthy and detailed statement of the history and legal aspects of his Government's claim to the Falklands. I do not wish to debate now precisely what occurred in the distant past in the Falklands but we firmly believe that British activities in those early days were sufficient to give us a good title by occupation: in addition British sovereignty over the Islands is established by open, continuous, effective and peaceful occupation for nearly a century and a half so as to give us a clear prescriptive title. So far from the Argentine Government's having protested "unceasingly" there have been very long periods, in one case amounting to thirty-five years (1849-1884), and another for twenty years (1888-1908), during which they remained silent.

The islanders are overwhelmingly British in origin. As I have already shown, the population is predominantly stable and permanent and the suggestion that it is temporary and floating is quite untrue.

The islanders have no connexions with Argentina nor do they wish for any other than the normal friendly relations which should obtain between neighbouring countries. They have made this abundantly clear in the elected representatives' declaration of last April and in their messages to the Committee. The plain fact is that these Islands have an established population of British origin dating back over about a century and a half of unbroken British administration and the wishes of their inhabitants cannot be set aside.

It has been suggested by several speakers, including yourself, Mr. Chairman, and the distinguished representatives of Italy and the Ivory Coast, that the Sub-Committee should appeal to Britain and Argentina to hold discussions of the problem and thus find a peaceful solution. My delegation of course appreciates and respects the spirit in which this suggestion is made. The reservation which I must express on the question of possible discussions between my Government and the Government of Argentina is made necessary not by any intransigence or unwillingness on the part of

my Government to settle problems by peaceful means, but by the inescapable facts of the situation. My Government has in its care the security and interests of a community of people who cannot be negotiated or compromised out of existence. These people have rights, and they look to my Government for the protection of those rights. My Government cannot disregard its obligations to the people of this territory simply in order to be able to respond to well-intentioned appeals to it to negotiate. When therefore it is suggested that a solution to the problem lies in negotiations between the parties directly concerned, I hope the Sub-Committee will remember that the party most directly concerned of all is the people of the Islands themselves, and that the British Government's first and paramount obligation is to them. The question of their own future and of sovereignty over the Islands is not therefore a matter on which my Government can or will negotiate with Argentina, or on which, in justice to the islanders, there can be any compromise. This does not of course mean that in my Government's view there is no role at all for fruitful discussions on this subject between my Government and that of Argentina, perhaps with the participation of representatives of the Falkland Islanders themselves. At the conclusion of my delegation's statement on 8 September, I said that although the British Government could not agree to participate in discussions of sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, either in this Sub-Committee or with the Argentine Government, nevertheless the British Government were always willing to discuss with the Government of Argentina ways in which that Government, the Falkland Islanders and the British Government could avoid allowing the dispute over the Falkland Islands to cause damage to good relations between us. I also said that this willingness on the part of my Government had been communicated to the Government of Argentina. Once again, I reaffirm that my Government, which has no doubts as to its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, stands by the principle of self-determination for these Islands, and I hope that the Sub-Committee will do nothing that could be construed as limiting or weakening that principle. As I have said, it is for the Falkland Islanders themselves to determine what their ultimate status should be, and my Government is ready to consider any proposals for changes in their constitutional status that the islanders themselves may advance. In this conflict between, on the one hand, an attempt to annex a peaceful and prosperous community against its wishes, and on the other hand, the principle of self-determination as enshrined in the Charter, there should in my delegation's view be no question about the proper choice for this Sub-Committee.



STATEMENT MADE IN SUB-COMMITTEE III ON 25 SEPTEMBER 1964  
CONCERNING BAHAMAS, BERMUDA, THE TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS  
AND THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

Mr. Chairman, the Bahamas and Bermuda have certain features in common, historically and in the present. So, in very different ways, have the Turks and Caicos and the Cayman Islands. I will therefore describe the Bahamas and Bermuda first and then turn to the other group of islands.

The Bahamas consist of an archipelago of fourteen large islands and many small cays and rocks, mostly uninhabited, making a total of 3,000 islands. The group extends for over 500 miles and has a total land area of about 4,400 square miles. Grand Bahama, to the north of the group, lies about sixty miles east of Florida, and Great Inagua, to the south, is about fifty miles from Cuba and Haiti. The islands are generally long, narrow and low-lying. The soil is mostly shallow with rock beneath; on the whole it is unsuitable for large-scale farming. Conditions are sub-tropical and both temperate and tropical trees grow literally side by side. All the islands were probably once thickly wooded, but little forest now remains except on Abaco, Andros and Grand Bahama where there are extensive pine forests.

New Providence, though not one of the larger islands, is the most important, as it contains the capital and chief port, Nassau. The other islands are known as Out Islands.

The combination of white coral sands, lagoons, reefs, sub-tropical vegetation, and brilliant sea colours gives the Bahamas a scenic beauty which, with their mild climate and sheltered waters, forms the basis of the tourist industry on which the colony's prosperity largely rests.

The colony has a population of about 110,000. About 80 per cent of the people are of African descent, 10 per cent European and the rest of mixed descent. About half of the people live on New Providence, and the Out Islands are very sparsely populated.

One of the islands composing the colony was the first land discovered by Columbus on his voyage in 1492. At that time the islands were inhabited by Arawaks, an Amerindian people, but slave raids by the Spaniards some years later left them practically uninhabited. In the seventeenth century, following grants of proprietorship by the British Government, the islands were colonized by British

settlers: a settlement was organized and a regular system of government was instituted by the settlers. This included a Parliament, with an elective Lower House. In 1670, the British Crown granted the islands to six of the Lords Proprietors of Carolina, but after attacks by the Spanish and French which nearly annihilated the settlement, the islands became a regular rendezvous for pirates, and in 1717 the British Crown resumed the civil and military government of the islands. Since then there has been a continuous line of Governors representing the Crown. In 1782, the islands were taken by the Spanish but were retaken by a British force, and British possession of the colony was confirmed by the Treaty of Versailles in 1783. In 1787 the Lords Proprietors surrendered their proprietary rights to the Crown.

Geographers describe Bermuda as an isolated group of about 300 small islands in the Western Atlantic some 675 miles from where we are now sitting. To the visitor, however, there seems to be one main island some twenty-two miles long (which consists, in fact, of seven islands linked by bridges and causeways). The total effective land area is a little under twenty-one square miles.

Bermuda was probably discovered in 1503 by a Spanish mariner, Juan de Bermudez, but the islands were still entirely uninhabited in 1609, when the English Virginia Company's expedition was shipwrecked there. Survivors brought home such glowing accounts of the islands (it was probably one of their reports which suggested the island setting for Shakespeare's "The Tempest") that a separate expedition was soon afterwards despatched to Bermuda. This expedition was successful and the settlement was maintained by the Bermuda Company until, in 1684, Bermuda became a possession of the British Crown.

Bermuda today is a thriving tourist resort, with a population of some 45,000. Americans visit Bermuda in ever-growing numbers; visitors also come from Britain, Canada and the West Indies. The result is a high national income, a high standard of living for all, high population densities and full employment. The number of visitors rose from 71,000 in 1950 to 193,000 in 1962. The expansion has been steady and continuous, and there is every reason to suppose that it will go on. Other sources of income and employment include banking and financial institutions, and the activities associated with the registration of many international companies in Bermuda (which has no income tax) and with the operation of the free port and

some minor industrial and agricultural activities. Although Bermuda's domestic exports represent less than one-tenth of her average retained imports, it is her earnings from invisibles (and a net inflow of capital on private account) which makes this level of imports possible. Bermuda's balance of payments position is strong and her overseas reserves substantial in relation to the size of the economy.

Bermuda is fiscally self-supporting. Revenue and expenditure in 1962 each amounted to about \$15.4 million. In recent years school and hospital accommodations has been considerably increased; there has been universal compulsory education since 1949, and there is a high level of health services. Over one-fifth of the Bermuda Government's expenditure in 1962 was devoted to these two social services, much of it being spent on a substantial building programme. Bermuda has, however, been fortunate enough to be able to finance its very considerable development expenditure in recent years entirely from revenue. The development of the hotel industry, which is fundamental to the whole economic structure, has been in private hands.

I now turn to the economic and social development of the Bahamas. As in Bermuda, the tourist industry is the basis of the colony's prosperity and chief source of revenue. Most of the visitors come from North America. Plans for tourist development in the Out Islands, as well as in New Providence, are on the increase. The expansion of hotel accommodation is encouraged by tax and other concessions. Visitors to the Bahamas topped the half million mark in 1963 (a 23 per cent increase over the previous year) and it is predicted that this figure may be increased to a million by 1970. The building boom continued in 1963. Permits worth over \$16.8 million were issued in 1963, \$2.8 million more than in the previous year.

The chief crops are peas, vegetables, and fruit for sale in the local markets. There are four canning plants which are engaged principally in canning tomatoes and pineapples for export. Forest industry and fishery products provide the chief exports which are pulp wood, crawfish, salt and sponges.

Nassau International Airport is the main airfield and provides a twenty-four-hour service for long-range international and local airlines. In addition, there are twenty-three landing strips in the various Out Islands and internal air services are run by a local airways company. There are no railways in the colony but

New Providence is well served with motorable roads, and an asphalt road construction programme is under way on a number of other islands.

The tourist industry is the chief source of employment. Other employers of labour in Nassau are the growing numbers of firms supplying banking investments and commercial services and in construction and in the distributive trades. In recent years a growing demand for labour in the other islands for construction work, for the two large salt works and for lumber work has been partly filled by migrants from elsewhere in the West Indies, particularly from the Turks and Caicos Islands. Agricultural work in the United States provides employment for an average of 1,300 unskilled labourers whose earnings in 1961 amounted to more than \$2.5 million. Unemployment in the colony is negligible. There are fifteen trade unions, with a trade union membership of about 5,000.

The colony offers to industrialists and investors an almost complete freedom from direct taxation and a liberal company law. In recent years there has been a trend towards the establishment of new corporations in Nassau associated with companies in Britain, United States and Canada. There is a continuous inward flow of investment capital, chiefly from Britain and the United States, and considerable building and construction activity.

The development by British and American capital of a free port on Grand Bahama offers excellent prospects for diversification of the economy and for employment in the future, with a large deep-water harbour. The Port Authority is developing 50,000 acres of land for industrial, commercial and residential purposes. A further 105,000 acres is to be developed jointly by the Authority and American and Canadian interests. The Authority is providing educational, medical and other facilities and amenities. This is not a Government scheme, but is based on a concession approved by the Bahamas legislature. Special tax concessions have been granted for business firms operating in the area and licences have been issued to over eighty firms to operate there. The largest is a cement works in which the initial capital investment amounts to some \$60-70 million. Most of the skilled workers will come initially from outside the Bahamas but these will train local people for skilled work. There is also a \$2 million hormones preparations plant. One of the largest off-shore bunkering terminals in the world and a number of light industries are already in operation, as are several hotels. A new hotel was opened there last January and Bahamas airways are doubling their flights from the United States to Freeport.

Education in the Bahamas is compulsory between the ages of six and fourteen. Government primary schools have been free since 1885. Secondary education is provided by a government secondary school and three grant-aided church schools. No local provision is made at present for higher education, for which students go overseas with the aid, in appropriate cases, of Government scholarships. The Bahamas have recently become affiliated with the University of the West Indies. This is likely to lead to increased opportunities for advanced education in the territory.

There are three Government hospitals, Government cottage hospitals on two other islands, and Government clinics on every main Out Island. Hospital services are chargeable at sub-economic rates and provided free to the needy. Clinics of all kinds are held and there is a school medical service.

There is no income tax and no excise duty. The main sources of revenue are customs duties and receipts from fees, public utilities and Post Office licences. The Bahamas are entirely self-supporting financially, including public development.

Even from the short account I have already given of Bermuda's general history and economy the Sub-Committee will realize that this is no ordinary colonial territory. Financially and economically independent, Bermuda has long enjoyed a very substantial measure of political autonomy. Its constitution is now the only example surviving outside the British Isles of the "old representative system". There is a Governor, who is appointed by the Queen in the usual way, and is advised by an Executive Council. The legislature consists of the Governor and two Houses, a nominated Legislative Council (the Upper House) and an elected House of Assembly (the Lower House). The Legislative Council consists of three official members and eight nominated unofficial members. Although its powers are theoretically extensive, real power rests with the House of Assembly, which has full control over finance and where legislation is normally initiated. All thirty-six members of the House of Assembly are elected by universal adult suffrage - there are no official or nominated members. Nominated members of the Legislative Council are drawn mainly from ex-members of the Lower House, but persons prominent in other spheres of public life are sometimes appointed. Unofficial members of the Executive Council are drawn in practice from the members of the legislature.

The Governor has power to dissolve the House of Assembly, though in practice he would consult his Executive Council before doing so. The British Crown has power to disallow acts of the Colonial Parliament but this power has not been used in recent years. The constituent power is shared between the Crown and the Bermuda Parliament, the powers of the Crown being confined to matters which are covered by the existing constitutional instruments or which have not been the subject of legislation by the Bermuda legislature. An unusual feature of Bermuda's Constitution is that a number of Government departments are controlled by statutory executive boards whose members are not official and are not nominated by the Governor. Boards, for instance, control the education and health departments. Their chairmen are members of the House of Assembly.

With the steady growth of Bermuda's prosperity and of the population in recent years there have come demands for constitutional change. It was this which led to the franchise reforms of 1963 and to the formation in that year of the Progressive Labour Party, Bermuda's first political party. The Progressive Labour Party secured six of the thirty-six seats and their presence in the House of Assembly as an organized group will inevitably alter its character. They have supported, although they did not initiate, proposals for further changes including a move towards "responsible government" on more conventional lines. They also favour reducing the minimum voting age from twenty-five to twenty-one, and establishing an orthodox ministerial system. These proposals have been referred to a Joint Select Committee of both Houses, which is expected to report by the end of 1964.

It was announced in August this year that a second political party, the United Bermuda Party, was to be set up and that all the members of the House of Assembly except the members of the Progressive Labour Party and five others are founder members. The United Bermuda Party also favours a reduction of the voting age to twenty-one.

To sum up: Bermuda has long enjoyed extensive autonomy. The territory is prosperous, economically independent and developing rapidly. Its time-honoured Constitution has recently undergone important changes, which have given the whole population the vote. Further changes are now under discussion. Britain, though always ready to help, is also careful to avoid offending a self-reliant community. So far as Bermuda's international status is concerned, Bermudians are virtually

unanimous in their desire to retain their connexion with Britain, of which they are proud. Whether it would be continued if further constitutional changes were decided on, and if so which form it would take, are questions which will be settled between my Government and the people of Bermuda through the normal processes of consultation and discussion.

I now turn to the constitutional position of the Bahamas. Until the beginning of this year the Bahamas had a constitution similar to those of the North American colonies before the American War of Independence. Indeed, it had subsisted in much the same form since 1729 when the British Crown assumed direct control of the colony. Broadly, this was a system of representative but not responsible government.

At a general election held in 1962, both the main political parties (the United Bahamian Party and the Progressive Liberal Party) announced their intention of seeking to obtain for the elected representatives of the people a greater degree of responsibility for the government of the country. Following the expression by these two Parties of their desire for constitutional advance towards internal self-government, the United Kingdom Government convened a constitutional conference in London in May 1963. This conference ended in general agreement on the form of the new constitution, although the representatives of two minority parties made certain reservations relating to the method of appointment and the tenure of certain Senators and the redistribution of constituencies in the Lower House.

The new Constitution came into force at the beginning of this year, and provides for a ministerial system of internal self-government, with a bi-cameral legislature. There is a Cabinet, consisting of the Premier and at least eight Ministers. The Governor acts on advice from Ministers, except in matters where he has a special constitutional responsibility, namely foreign affairs, defence and internal security including police. There is a Senate of fifteen members, of whom eight are appointed by the Governor, five appointed on the advice of the Premier, and two on the advice of the Leader of the Opposition. The Senate has limited powers of delaying legislation which has been passed by the Lower House.

The present House of Assembly (the Lower House), which consists of thirty-three members, will continue until the next general election. In view of the fact that a general election was held shortly before the constitutional conference there will be no further general election until the House of Assembly is dissolved in the

normal course, which means within five years from December 1962. After the next general election, the House of Assembly will consist of thirty-eight members, the election being contested on the basis of twenty-one seats for the Out Islands and seventeen seats for New Providence. In subsequent elections there will be not less than eighteen nor more than twenty-two seats for the Out Islands, and not less than sixteen nor more than twenty seats for New Providence. A Constituency Commission will be charged with reviewing, not less frequently than once in five years, the boundaries and numbers of constituencies and the number of seats within each constituency. Elections will be held on the basis of universal adult suffrage.

The new Constitution, which affords the Bahamas internal self-government, has met with general approval in the colony. Further constitutional progress will be worked out between the British Government and the people of the Bahamas through the normal processes of consultation and discussion so as to reflect the wishes of the inhabitants of the colony.

I now propose to describe conditions in two groups of islands, the Turks and Caicos and Cayman Islands, where the situation is markedly different from that in the territories which we have hitherto been considering.

The Turks and Caicos Islands lie at the south-east end of the Bahamas. The Turks Islands consist of two inhabited islands, Grand Turk and Salt Cay, and a number of islets and rocks. The Caicos group consists of six main islands - South Caicos, East Caicos, Middle (or Grand) Caicos, North Caicos, Providenciales and West Caicos - and a number of islets surrounded by a shallow water reef. The Turks are separated from the Caicos by a twenty-two-mile stretch of deep water. The total land area of the islands is about 166 square miles and they have a population of about 6,000 mainly of African and mixed descent. The islands are generally flat, stony and arid; they lie in the hurricane area and were last hit by a serious hurricane, Donna, in 1960 which did extensive damage in the Caicos Islands. The tidal wave that came with the hurricane carved out a new mouth to Bottle Creek on North Caicos Island and isolated the settlement of Whitby by creating a lake of sea water. There are no rivers or streams, rainfall is uncertain and water storage is a constant problem. The Turks Islands are said to be called because of the likeness of the flower of a species of cactus growing there to a Turkish fez. The origin of the name "Caicos" is not known for certain.



The islands were discovered, apparently uninhabited, by a Spaniard in 1512 and were first occupied by Europeans around 1678 - Bermudan settlers who came for salt. In 1766 a resident British Agent was appointed and soon after the American War of Independence the Caicos were settled by loyalist planters from the southern States of America. After the abolition of slavery in 1834 the planters left the islands and their former slaves remained in possession. In the meantime, in 1799 the islands were annexed by the Bahamas Government but in 1848 a separate charter was granted to the islands divorcing them from the control of the Bahamas. In 1873 the Legislative Council petitioned the British Crown that the islands be annexed to the colony of Jamaica and from 1874 to July 1959 they were administered as a dependency of Jamaica. The link with Jamaica lasted until Jamaica's independence on 6 August 1962, although a formal modification was made in 1959.

The Cayman Islands consist of Grand Cayman, Cayman Brac and Little Cayman and lie to the north-west of Jamaica. Grand Cayman is nearly 200 miles from Jamaica and eighty-ninety miles from the other two islands. The islands are low-lying and protected by coral reefs; they have a total land area of about 100 square miles. They lie in the hurricane area but the last hurricane which seriously affected them was twenty years ago. There is an Anglo-American weather station in the territory specifically for hurricane research. The islands have a population of about 8,000, of whom more than half are of mixed descent and the rest are of European and African descent in roughly equal proportions.

The islands were discovered by Columbus in 1503. No early settlement was made, but from the earliest times the prodigious number of turtles found in the area attracted ships of all nations for revictualling purposes. Professor Archie Carr in his book The Windward Road has pointed out that this source of fresh food for scurvy-ridden ships was a significant and important factor in the opening up of the Caribbean. Captain William Jackson visited Grand Cayman in 1643 after his abortive attempt on Jamaica and described Grand Cayman as follows:

"This place is lowland and all rockye, and there be other 2 islands of ye same name and Quallitie, being by ye Spanyards called Chimanoe, from ye multitude of Alligators here found which are Serpents, if not resembling ye Crocodiles of Egypt. Hither doe infinitt numbers of sea tortoises resorte to lay their eggs upon ye Sandy Bay, which at this time (June) swarm so thick. The Islands is much frequented by English, Dutch and French ships, that come purposely to salt up ye flesh of these Tortoises."

By the Treaty of Madrid in 1670, when Spain ceded Jamaica to Britain, the Cayman Islands were also ceded. The earliest record of a grant of land to settlers is dated 1734. Because of their inaccessibility the islands were for a long time a favoured refuge for those seeking to escape from justice. By the beginning of the nineteenth century the population was about 1,000, of whom half were slaves, and since then the population has steadily risen. In 1863 the arrangements which had grown up for the internal administration of the islands were ratified by Act of Parliament. Under these arrangements the Legislature of Jamaica could legislate for the dependency and amend and repeal any laws passed locally.

The principal source of employment in the Turks and Caicos Islands is the solar salt industry, a government concern which is carried on principally at Cockburn Harbour, South Caicos and on Salt Cay, with headquarters at Grand Turk. This small scale industry with its limited land area has been experiencing considerable difficulty in competing on world markets in recent years, and has had to be heavily subsidized. It employs about 150 men. The principal sources of employment on Grand Turk are the government service, the salt industry and the distributive trades. Crawfishing is the second largest industry in South Caicos, providing the territory's next most important export after salt. The frozen product is flown to markets in the United States. Conch fishing is also carried out by small independent fishermen, the dried conch meat being exported to Haiti. There is a small export of conch shell.

Because of unsuitable soil and climatic conditions no food crops can be grown in Grand Turk, South Caicos or Salt Cay. In the Caicos settlements there is a small subsistence agriculture and a small sisal industry which exports raw sisal to Jamaica. A large proportion of the younger men in the territory emigrate to the Bahamas where considerable employment opportunities have been available in recent years in construction jobs, lumber camps and in the Inagra Salt Works. Remittances are an important source of additional income for many families in the territory.

There may be prospects of developing a tourist industry since the islands have many good beaches, sheltered waters and banks and reefs which offer a wide variety of sport fishing. The current development plan makes provision for the improvement of the territory's infrastructure with the object of attracting the private investment on which the development of a tourist industry depends.

There are thirteen government elementary schools on the island and the school at Grand Turk also has a secondary section. In 1962 the number of pupils was nearly 1,400. Education is free, and in addition nine scholarships are awarded to pupils from the Out Islands attending the secondary school at Grand Turk. Most of the population can read and write.

The public health of the islands is good. There is a twenty-bed hospital of modern design at Grand Turk, together with a dental clinic, and there is a clinic at Cockburn Harbour in South Caicos. Medical officers are stationed at Grand Turk and at Cockburn Harbour.

The islands are heavily dependent on grants from the British Government covering over 60 per cent of their total annual recurrent expenditure. Total grant-in-aid is \$412,000 in 1964 while local revenue is estimated at about \$163,000. In addition to these grants Her Majesty's Government has made under the Commonwealth Development Act and earlier legislation an allocation of about \$750,000 for development during the period 1958 to 1966. Of this allocation \$402,556 has so far been spent. A fairly large proportion of these funds has been committed in recent years for the re-equipping and running of the salt industry, which is wholly owned by the Government. There has also been expenditure on water storage schemes, hospital improvements, a government launch, training schemes and on assistance for development in the Caicos settlements. The current development plan 1964-6 puts particular emphasis on the improvement of communications in the territory, the provision of water storage facilities and of an electricity supply for Grand Turk, training facilities (including technical education) and on the development of the territory's fisheries.

The viability of the economy of the Cayman Islands rests on the fact that the islanders are first-class seamen and readily find employment with overseas shipping companies mainly on bulk-carrying cargo ships. Their remittances to their families enable a standard of living to be maintained considerably higher than the islands' own resources could support. The tourist industry has expanded with the development of air communications and hotel accommodation is increasing. Incentive legislation is in force to encourage the establishment of factories and the erection of hotels. Tourism is aided by the development of external and inter-island communications. There are regular air services between Grand Cayman and Jamaica, Miami, Costa Rica

and Panama. There is an airstrip in Cayman Brac and a regular service by light aircraft is operated. A motor vessel service is maintained between Jamaica and Florida and all three islands and there is more or less regular communication with Central American ports by sailing and motor vessels. Motorable road connects all districts in Grand Cayman and Cayman Brac and there is a motorable track in Little Cayman.

Next to the tourist industry the chief industry is fishing, especially for turtles which are brought to Grand Cayman before export. A comparatively small number of people are engaged in agriculture. The islands are not self-supporting in foodstuffs and the production of food crops and raising of cattle are restricted by the character of the limestone soil. Apart from a little boat building, the only manufacturing industries are two concrete block-making concerns, a small bakery and a small tile-making concern. Thatch rope making is a small cottage industry, mainly carried out by women, for export to Jamaica.

There is free and compulsory education for children between the ages of seven and fourteen in ten Government primary schools and a number of church-sponsored schools. The Government provides scholarships for secondary education and for higher education overseas. There is one Government hospital in Grand Cayman with twenty-eight beds and medical officers are seconded from Britain or Jamaica. There is a clinic on Cayman Brac with a resident medical officer.

The Cayman Islands Government derive their revenue mainly from customs receipts and the sale of postage stamps and by this means the budget is balanced each year. The British Government has allocated under the Commonwealth Development Act and earlier colonial development and welfare legislation a total of \$580,000 for development in the islands during the period 1958 to 1966. Of this allocation \$298,600 has so far been spent, social services (education and health) accounting for 46 per cent, and economic projects (such as road reconstruction and electricity) for the rest.

I now turn to the constitutional position in the Turks and Caicos Islands. In April 1962, a proposal to transfer the sovereignty of the Islands from the United Kingdom to Jamaica on its independence so that the Islands would become a freely associated overseas territory of an independent Jamaica, failed to find a seconder in the Legislative Assembly, and was defeated. In consequence, the present

Constitution came into effect in August 1962, when, upon Jamaica's independence, the Turks and Caicos Islands became a Crown Colony administered directly by Britain. An Administrator is appointed by the British Government.

The laws of the islands are passed by the Legislative Assembly over which the Administrator presides, or in his absence, a Deputy President elected by the members of the Assembly. The Assembly consists of the Administrator, not less than two nor more than three official members, not less than two nor more than three nominated members, and nine elected members, representing nine constituencies and chosen by secret ballot and by universal adult suffrage. Elections for the Assembly were last held in September 1962 immediately after the introduction of the new Constitution.

There is also an Executive Council, over which the Administrator presides and which he is obliged to consult on all important matters. It consists of two official and one nominated member appointed by the Administrator with the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and two elected members elected by the members of the Assembly from among the elected members. Under the "membership" system the two elected members - the Member for Public Works and Social Services and the Member for Trade and Production - are associated with Government business, and are closely identified with the making of policy in regard to the departments and subjects falling within their jurisdiction. There are no political parties.

A Government Officer is stationed at the ports of entry, Salt Cay and Cockburn Harbour, to maintain customs, postal and other services. The Caicos Islands are divided for administrative purposes into four District Board areas, which also form the constituencies for the Legislative Assembly. The District Boards normally consist of eight persons who include the District Constable, the elected member of the Legislative Assembly and usually the school teacher who acts as secretary. Appointments are made by the Administrator after holding unofficial elections.

At the end of 1963, the Government of the Turks and Caicos Islands expressed an interest in joining the Bahamas. The Bahamas Government also agreed to participate in discussions on this question. Accordingly the problem was examined by a Working Party in Nassau last June. The Working Party was composed

of representatives of the three governments involved, to which it made recommendations. At this meeting it was decided that the Bahamas Government, while assuring the Turks and Caicos Islands of their goodwill and sympathy for their desire for association with a larger grouping, could not at present offer a merger. The meeting agreed on proposals for a looser form of association between the Turks and Caicos and the Bahamas on the model of the former association with Jamaica, in order to test the feasibility of the Turks and Caicos proposals for a merger. This is now under consideration by the three Governments.

Finally, I will say something about the constitutional position of the Cayman Islands. In 1959 a new Constitution was introduced and the first elections were held under universal adult suffrage. Most of the constitutional links with Jamaica were severed but the Governor of Jamaica remained the Governor of the Cayman Islands. This change resulted from the grant of full internal self-government to Jamaica. When Jamaica achieved independence in August 1962 the islands were offered the opportunity of remaining with Jamaica and proceeding to independence with that country. After full discussion, however, they chose instead to sever all constitutional links with Jamaica and remain with Britain. A new Constitution came into force under which the Cayman Islands became a British colony.

Under this Constitution the territory is administered by the Administrator who has assumed most of the powers and responsibilities formerly exercised by the Governor of Jamaica. In the exercise of these powers he is required to consult the Executive Council in all important matters.

The Executive Council consists of two official and three unofficial members and is presided over by the Administrator. Two of the three unofficial members are elected by the Legislative Assembly. During 1962 the "membership" system of government was introduced under which the three unofficial members of the Council assume a special interest in a range of subjects and advise the Government on those subjects.

The Legislative Assembly is presided over by the Administrator and consists of two or three official members appointed by him, two or three nominated non-official members appointed by the Administrator and twelve members elected on a constituency basis by universal adult suffrage. The Assistant Administrator and other Senior Civil Servants are all Caymanians.

Elections for the Legislative Assembly were last held in November 1962. All twelve elected seats were contested, and for the first time in the Cayman Islands the election was fought between political parties, the Cayman National Democratic Party and the Christian Democratic Party. In a total poll of 68 per cent of the registered voters the former won seven seats and the latter five seats. There was one unsuccessful independent candidate.

The objects of the parties, as revealed by their election manifestos, are very similar: concentrating on measures to promote the development and well-being of the Cayman Islands, by the promotion and encouragement of new industries and the implementation of the educational programme.

The Cayman Islands are not interested in joining a Federation of the East Caribbean territories. When negotiations were in train in 1961 for independence for the former federation of the West Indies, the Caymans agreed to remain in it. When, however, Jamaica opted to secede from the Federation, the Cayman Islands reconsidered the position. On 19 January 1962, their legislature, after full debate, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"It is the wish of the Cayman Islands:-

1. To continue their present association with Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom;
2. To negotiate with Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom for internal self-government, taking into account the wishes of the people of the Cayman Islands as to timing."

The Legislature further agreed that any negotiations with the British Government for full internal self-government should wait until after a general election had been held later in 1962 after which it would be for the new Legislature, if such were the wish of the people of the Cayman Islands, to put forward proposals for the introduction of a Constitution providing for internal self-government for the islands. The British Government replied accepting the islanders' proposal that the present association of the Cayman Islands with Britain should continue. On the question of constitutional change, Britain agreed that if the newly elected Legislature so desired, Her Majesty's Government would be willing to receive a deputation to discuss any proposals they might be prepared to put forward. So far, however, no request to send such a delegation has been made and no proposals for constitutional change have been put forward by the Legislature.