



MAURITIUS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Special Report
OF THE
Public Accounts Committee
FOR THE
1980 Session

**"Financial and other aspects of the 'Sale' of Chagos Islands
and the Re-settlement of the Displaced Ilois"**

**FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
FOURTH SESSION**

PRICE : Rs 10

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
L. CARL ACHILLE, GOVERNMENT PRINTER,
PORT LOUIS, MAURITIUS
JUNE 1981

807 10-4-82

HD1030
3
263M38
1981

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Financial and other aspects of the "Sale" of Chagos Islands
and the Re-settlement of the displaced Ilois

Introduction

Your Committee investigated into the Revenue received by Government in 1975 for the "SALE" of the Chagos Archipelago and in 1972, for the re-settlement of the displaced Ilois and also into all the disbursements effected in relation to this matter. In the course of our inquiry we came across some disturbing facts which we have felt should be brought to notice.

£ 3 m cash compensation from U.K. in 1965

Your Committee was informed that financial compensation for the "SALE" of Diego Garcia was effected in two stages. The sum of £ 3 m was paid by the British Government in financial year 1965/66 and was credited to capital Revenue, item L IV/4 — "Sale of Chagos Islands", as per the Accountant General's Financial Report for the financial year 1965/66. This item did not appear in the Estimates of 1965/66. Your committee enquired whether the word "sale" had caused any problem at the time but was unfortunately unable to obtain any information on this matter. It has also not been possible to get any information on the basis on which the sum of £ 3 m was arrived at in the discussions with the British Government in 1965.

In an answer to a Parliamentary Question (PQ B/754 of 1979) the Prime Minister informed the House that the compensation of £ 3 m was meant for the implementation of development projects in Mauritius. The money was therefore credited to Capital Revenue and was not earmarked for any specific project.

Your Committee was also not able to ascertain whether any cash compensation was effected to the company exploiting the copra plantations in the Chagos at the time. We learned from the representative of the Prime Minister's Office that it was a Seychellois Company, namely Moulinie & Co.

£ 650,000 from U.K. in 1972 for Resettlement Scheme

The second payment of £ 650,000 by the British Government was effected on 28th October, 1972 and credited to Capital Revenue, item L 1/8 — "Financial Assistance for Resettlement Scheme" in the Financial Report of 1972/73. This item had not appeared in the Estimates for the year 1972/73. This figure was arrived at after discussions had taken place between the British and Mauritian Governments, on a special scheme "devised to build housing estates and establish pig-rearing co-operatives on land to be provided by the Government of Mauritius", (Foreword to the Prosser Report submitted to Government in 1976) for the resettlement of persons displaced from Diego Garcia. Land at Roche Bois and at Pointe aux Sables was duly acquired for this purpose.

No details on how and when this initial scheme was worked out, were provided to your Committee.

11/09/82

In the Foreword to the Prosser Report, the Prime Minister's Office states the following:

"Not long after, it became clear that the displaced persons concerned were not happy with the proposed scheme. An official survey confirmed that the majority was in favour of the simple expediency of sharing the financial assistance received from Britain among the workers, irrespective of their need for proper housing and for a planned means of future livelihood".

Your committee has not obtained any information on the survey mentioned above although there was an official request for the details of how and when the displaced persons showed dissatisfaction with that initial scheme.

The Prosser Report

For 5 years after funds had been made available by the U.K. Government for the resettlement of the displaced Ilois, the Government of Mauritius was unable to arrive at a satisfactory decision on the manner in which the funds should be utilised. In 1976, the Prime Minister discussed the problems affecting the displaced Ilois with the British Government and it was decided that Mr A.R.G. Prosser, C.M.G., M.B.E. Adviser on Social Development in the Ministry of Overseas Development would visit Mauritius in order to advise on an appropriate solution to the problem.

The major recommendations made by Mr Prosser were the following:

- (a) The immediate setting up of a Resettlement Committee with a first-class administrative officer attached to it on a full time basis. The Government did implement this recommendation. Its composition was in fact reinforced by the inclusion of the Secretary to the Cabinet as its Chairman. It was unfortunate however, that the Committee was not provided with an administrative officer on a full time basis. The Principal Assistant Secretary of the Ministry for Rodrigues was assigned this duty on a part time basis. Your committee appreciates the fact that his normal duties as P.A.S. in his own Ministry must not have left him much time to deal with the Ilois problem.
- (b) Another important recommendation was an occupational training scheme for the unemployed. Mr Prosser even made the interesting suggestion that functional training could be combined with the building of houses necessary for the Resettlement Scheme. This scheme will be described later. Mr Prosser recommended that the sum of Rs 750,000 should be set aside for this purpose, immediately. It is very unfortunate that Government never considered this interesting recommendation.
- (c) Welfare services. Mr Prosser suggested that the Resettlement Committee should allocate Rs 60,000.— to the Social Welfare Commissioner so that the present Social Worker could be funded for a period of 3 years. We were informed that a primary school teacher was seconded for duty to the Social Welfare Division to work with the Ilois on a full time basis. But we obtained no information on the length of time for which she was thus employed.

(d) The housing scheme proposed by Mr Prosser was in fact the most important recommendation in his report. As Mr Prosser rightly pointed out "the most intractable problem for the Ilois has been housing". (Prosser Report — para. 4). He worked out that after deducting the sum of Rs 750,000 for training purposes and Rs 60,000 for the services of the Social Worker, the sum of Rs 18,500 would be available for each individual household of the 426 families. He suggested a scheme whereby each household in need of a house could be provided with a 15,000 rupee house which would be of "sound construction but.....slightly outside the high quality of building regulations which govern housing in Mauritius". (Prosser Report, para. 22) the remaining Rs 3,500 would be distributed to each household for basic furnishing purposes. In the Foreword to the Prosser Report, the Prime Minister's Office did not accept this recommendation to provide the Ilois with sub-standard houses. The Government went very far, by undertaking to allocate the necessary additional funds in order that the houses constructed for the Ilois are not below standards acceptable in the country. In a general way, the Government felt that the Prosser recommendations as amended were in the long term interest of the Ilois community.

Your Committee was informed by representatives of the Prime Minister's Office that Mr Prosser's recommendations for a housing scheme had been rejected by the representatives of the Ilois on the Resettlement Committee and that the latter had opted for cash compensation.

However, your Committee was seriously concerned by some of the facts that came to light in the survey carried out in January 1977 in specific relation to the housing issue. It is true that representatives of the Ilois did formally request that the money available be distributed in cash to the Ilois, at a meeting of the Resettlement Committee held on 4th December 1976. However, the survey carried out in January 1977 revealed that of the 557 families who had registered, 341 had opted for a house and 213 for cash compensation. 3 had not expressed any option. Of the 38 families in Agalega, 6 had opted for a house in Mauritius and 32 for cash payment with the possibility of continued employment there. It should also be well noted that representatives of the Ilois did enquire, at a meeting of the Committee held on 19th February 1977, whether there was any possibility of satisfying both options. According to the minutes of proceedings of that meeting, the Resettlement Committee felt that this proposal would not be feasible. However, the Chairman added that the views of the Committee would be submitted to the Government and a decision would be taken at a later stage. In spite of the fact that a majority of households, over 60% opted for housing, one year later, in December 1977, Government decided to effect cash compensation to all Ilois, irrespective of their date of arrival.

Your Committee wanted to know in very concrete terms, the way in which the proposal for a housing scheme was presented to the Ilois. We wanted to know whether Government had worked out in detail the type of houses to be built, the length of time it would take to construct them, and whether such information had been made available to the representatives of the Ilois. Your Committee was unfortunately, not provided with this information.

What your Committee found even more surprising was the fact that after it had been discovered in January 1977 that a majority had opted for housing and that the representatives of the Ilois had in February 1977, requested that both options, namely housing and cash compensation, be considered, the Prime Minister, in December 1977, stated the following in a reply to a Parliamentary Question (B/746 of 1977):

"The Government has finally given up hope to convince the families from Diego Garcia that it is in their best interests to have houses built for them rather than to have a cash compensation only. So steps are being taken to share the grant as well as the interest accrued thereon to the families".

Surveys of the Ilois

It has not been easy to establish the exact number of persons that were transferred from the Chagos Archipelago. In reply to a Parliamentary Question in the House of Commons in November 1965, in relation to defence facilities in the Indian Ocean, the Secretary of State referring to the Chagos Archipelago and Aldabra, Farquar and Desroches islands said the following:

"Their population are approximately 1000, 100, 172 and 112 respectively". (See Annex I).

On 14 December 1965, in the Legislative Council, Mr Forget, on behalf of the Premier and Minister of Finance informed the House that:

"The total number of Mauritians in the Chagos Archipelago is 638, of whom 176 are adult men, employed on the plantations". (See Annex I).

In Mauritius, two main surveys were carried out to establish the total number of Ilois families. The first survey was carried out by the Public Assistance Officers who collected relevant information from the displaced Ilois everytime a group landed in Mauritius. The survey revealed that 426 families had been transferred from the Chagos since 1965. This figure of 426 families was considered to be the correct one by Mr Prosser.

In 1976, when the possibility of the distribution of cash compensation to all Ilois, irrespective of their date of arrival, came up, the Resettlement Committee, set up in 1976, upon a recommendation made by Mr Prosser, decided that a registration of all Ilois settled in Mauritius should be carried out. This second major survey was carried out, in January 1977, by the Public Assistance Division of the Ministry of Social Security under the aegis of the Resettlement Committee. In this case, press and radio/TV communiques were issued asking all displaced persons to register themselves. The figure arrived at in this second survey was 557 families.

Of these 557 families —

378 persons were under 5 years of age
543 persons were between 5 - 12 years of age
334 persons were between 12-18 years of age
1068 were adults
102 were above 60 years of age.

Over 150 persons had arrived before 1965. (See Annexures II & III)
The survey also indicated that there were 38 Ilois families in Agalega.

Although the Ilois were provided with facilities for their registration, a number of persons were left out for various reasons. The representatives of the Prime Minister's Office informed your Committee that there have been a certain number of complaints from those who claim not to have received any compensation; the Permanent Secretary of the Prime Minister's Office has even received letters from some Ilois in Rodrigues, Australia and South Africa. It should be noted that there was, in fact, no facilities provided for registration of the Ilois in Rodrigues, Agalega and St. Brandon, when the 1977 survey was carried out.

Government has now decided to proceed with a new survey of all those who had failed to register in 1977. Your Committee recommends that this facility should be extended to those Ilois residing in the Seychelles as well.

The Ilois in Agalega

Your Committee was informed that in the Resettlement Committee, a suggestion was made to the effect that a possibility existed for the families in Agalega to be given shares in the Agalega Corporation to the value of their allocation instead of being paid in cash. Your Committee was not provided with any information on the manner in which cash compensation was actually effected in Agalega.

Cash compensation

When Government finally decided to go ahead with cash compensation, payment was effected in March 1978 on the basis of the survey carried out in January 1977. The following payments were then made:

	Rs	Total
351 children under 5	1,000	351,000
459 children between 5 and 11	1,200	550,800
474 children between 11 and 18	1,500	711,000
1081 adults	7,590	8,204,790
109 old age pensioners (additional)	250	27,250
71 females with children (additional)	250	17,750
TOTAL	...	9,862,590
Amount available (including interest)	...	11,167,604
Amount paid	...	9,862,580
BALANCE	...	Rs 1,305,014

Disbursements as from 1972

Various disbursements were effected as from 1972 when funds were made available by the British Government. The total amount disbursed from 1972 to 1977 was Rs 155,773.33 (Annex IV). Apart from the cash compensation of Rs 9,858,827 effected in 1977/78, there was a further disbursement of Rs 18,605 in 1978/79. Your Committee has, however, not been able to obtain any details on the nature of all the disbursements effected, apart from the cash compensation of Rs 9,858,827 effected in 1978. It should also be noted that interest was, of course, not credited on the disbursements. Interest on the account was paid at 6% per annum between 28th October 1972 and 31st December 1977 although the Bank Rate had risen to 7% from March 1977 to January 1978, and to 9% from January 1978 to October 1979 and has been 10½% since then.

Your Committee fails to understand why interest was not credited to the Fund after December 1977. If accounts had been properly kept, a higher sum would have accumulated in the form of interest.

Further financial assistance from U.K. Government

At a meeting of the Resettlement Committee held on 19th February 1977, a representative of the Ilois wanted to know whether there was any possibility of obtaining further assistance from the British Government. The Committee according to the Minutes of Proceeding of that Meeting "agreed that there was little, if any likelihood of such assistance forthcoming".

However, representatives of the Prime Minister's Office informed your Committee that it had always been the wish of the Mauritian Government that such further assistance should be provided by the U.K. Government. Your Committee has however, not been informed whether such request has been made formally and officially by the Government since March 1978.

In a reply to a Parliamentary Question in June 1980, (B/766 of 1980) the Prime Minister informed the House that:

"Regarding the additional compensation to be paid to the Ilois, the British Government has already offered a supplementary amount of £1.25 million for their resettlement but is unable to pursue the matter because of a court action in the United Kingdom. The matter being *sub-judice*, we have to wait for the outcome".

Your Committee is aware of the fact that the Prime Minister is referring to the court action entered by certain members of the Ilois community presenting legal claims to the U.K. Government. They are being represented by Mr B. Sheridan who during his visit in Mauritius in November 1979 tried to make the Ilois sign a document (a deed of acceptance and power of attorney) the terms and conditions of which are reproduced in Annexure V.

In reply to a Parliamentary Question in November 1979 (P.Q. B/1033 of 1979) the Prime Minister informed the House that Government had spent Rs 2,015 on Mr Sheridan during his visit in Mauritius. This would imply that he was in Mauritius in an official capacity, to a certain extent.

General Comments

1. Your Committee feels that this whole problem of displaced persons which arose since 1965 did not receive the serious attention it deserved on the part of government until 1976 when Mr Prosser visited Mauritius. The first serious survey to establish the exact number of persons involved was carried out as late as in January 1977.

2. The compensation of £650,000 was linked to a specific scheme when it was made available in 1972. The money was distributed 5 years later when conditions of life had become very difficult due to rapid inflation during that corresponding period. Mr Prosser himself made a very pertinent remark in that respect in specific relation to the housing scheme:

"Unfortunately, from the time of the signing of the agreement between the Mauritius Government and the British Government the cost of housing in Mauritius has risen approximately 500%" (Prosser Report. Para 19)

Mr Prosser made that remark in 1976 and the money was distributed in March 1978.

3. Throughout his Report, Mr Prosser placed emphasis on the necessity to find an urgent solution to the problem, because of the terrible conditions in which he found the Ilois when he visited Mauritius. In para. 24 of the Report he says:

"The fact is that the Ilois are living in deplorable conditions which could be immediately alleviated if action is taken on the lines I have suggested".

Cash compensation was effected almost two years after Mr Prosser had written his Report.

4. Your Committee feels that it is very unfortunate that Government promised that additional funds would be made available in the Resettlement Scheme being proposed by Mr Prosser but no such additional financial assistance has been forthcoming.

5. There is a serious lack of information on the nature of disbursements that were effected since the grant became available in 1972. The Ilois do not seem to be at all aware of the details of these disbursements.

Your Committee was also not at all satisfied with the approximate way in which interest on the account was worked out. In our opinion total interest accrued on the account, should have been much higher.

6. The survey carried out in January 1977 was not comprehensive enough. A number of Ilois were left out for some reason or another.

7. Your Committee feels that the Ilois were not presented with a housing scheme worked out in concrete terms nor were the advantages of such a scheme over straight cash payment sufficiently stressed. It is normal that for persons, who have been living in deplorable conditions for such a long time cash compensation represented immediate relief. But as it was rightly pointed out by the Prime Minister's Office in the Forewood to the Prosser Report, the recommendations in the Report, especially the housing scheme would have been "in the long term interest of the people concerned".

8. Finally, Your Committee is concerned that it has not been confirmed whether Government has so far made any *formal and official* request for further financial assistance despite the fact that the majority of the Ilois are still living in deplorable conditions.

V. NABABSING,
Chairwoman.

3rd October, 1980.

EXTRACT FROM DEBATES NO. 27 OF 14 DECEMBER 1965

DIEGO GARCIA — SALE OR HIRE (No. A/33) Mr J. R. Rey (Moka) asked the Premier and Minister of Finance whether he will make a statement on the question of the *sale or hire* of the Island of *Diego Garcia* to either the United Kingdom Government or to the Government of the United States of America or to both jointly and state what is the price offered by the would-be purchasers and what is the minimum price insisted upon by the Government of Mauritius?

Mr Forget on behalf of the Premier and Minister of Finance:—

I would refer the Honourable Member to the following communiqué issued from the Chief Secretary's Office on 10th November on the subject of the Chagos Archipelago, a copy of which is being circulated. In discussions of this kind which affect British arrangements for the defence of the region in which Mauritius is situated, there could, in the Government's view, be no question of insisting on a minimum amount of compensation. The question of the sale or hire of the Chagos Archipelago has not arisen as they were detached from Mauritius by Order in Council under powers possessed by the British Government.

(COMMUNIQUE)

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE UNTIL 2000 HOURS LOCAL TIME
WEDNESDAY 10TH NOVEMBER

Defence facilities in the Indian Ocean

In reply to a Parliamentary Question the Secretary of State made the following statement in the House of Commons on Wednesday November 10th :

"With the agreement of the Governments of Mauritius and the Seychelles new arrangements for the administration of certain islands were introduced by an Order in Council made on the 8th November. The islands are the Chagos Archipelago, some 1,200 miles north-east of Mauritius, and Aldabra, Farquhar and Desroches in the western Indian Ocean. Their population are approximately 1,000, 100, 172 and 112 respectively. The Chagos Archipelago was formerly administered by the Government of Mauritius and the other three islands by that of the Seychelles. The islands will be called the British Indian Ocean Territory and will be administered by a Commissioner. It is intended that the islands will be available for the construction of defence facilities by the British and U.S. Governments, but no firm plans have yet been made by either Government. Compensation will be paid as appropriate."

The cost of compensating the Company which exploits the plantations and the cost of resettling elsewhere those inhabitants who can no longer remain there will be the responsibility of the British Government. In addition, the British Government has undertaken in recognition of the detachment of the Chagos Archipelago from Mauritius, to provide additional grants amounting to £ 3 m. for expenditure on development projects in Mauritius to be agreed between the British and the Mauritius Governments. These grants will be over and above the allocation earmarked for Mauritius in the next period of C.D. & W assistance.

ANNEX I—Continued

The population of the Chagos Archipelagos consists, apart from civil servants and estate managers, of a labour force, together with their dependents, which is drawn from Mauritius and Seychelles and employed on the copra plantations. The total number of Mauritians in the Chagos Archipelago is 638, of whom 176 are adult men employed on the plantations.

ANNEX II

SURVEY OF ILOIS

Locality	No. of families	Year of Arrival					Un- known
		30's	40's	50's	60's	70's	
1. Baie du Tombeau	5	—	—	4	1	—	—
2. Bois Marchand	2	—	—	—	2	—	—
3. Beau Bassin	9	—	4	1	1	14	1
4. Cassis	94	—	1	17	61	10	1
5. Cité La Cure	22	—	1	3	7	23	—
6. Docker's Flat	40	—	—	6	11	—	—
7. Grand River North West	5	—	—	2	3	—	—
8. Le Hochet	5	—	—	—	4	1	—
9. Les Salines	31	—	1	6	35	8	1
10. Pointe Aux Sables	16	—	2	11	14	14	3
11. Pailles	4	—	2	—	10	4	—
12. Port Louis	26	—	—	9	2	2	2
13. Petite Rivière	225	3	7	28	139	35	13
14. Roches Bois	10	—	—	2	7	1	—
15. Ste. Croix	12	—	1	—	10	1	—
16. Other areas
TOTAL	557	3	19	91	319	104	21

ANNEX III

SURVEY OF ILOIS

Population according to Age-Group

Locality	No. of families	Under 5					12-18		Adults		Over 60	
		Under 5	5-12	12-18	18-25	25-35	35-45	45-55	55-65	65-75	75-85	85+
1. Baie du Tombeau	5	3	1	3	7	1	15	22	17	3	—	—
2. Bois Marchand	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3. Beau Bassin	9	3	6	49	181	64	107	10	1	—	—	—
4. Cassis	94	67	27	14	30	5	10	10	10	10	10	10
5. Cité La Cure	22	24	48	2	8	19	22	22	22	22	22	22
6. Docker's Flat	40	31	2	5	8	19	22	22	22	22	22	22
7. Grand River North West	5	1	6	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
8. Le Hochet	5	43	38	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9. Les Salines	31	24	38	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
10. Pointe Aux Sables	16	14	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
11. Pailles	4	26	14	22	117	370	45	1	1	1	1	1
12. Port Louis	225	130	210	117	6	9	28	1	1	1	1	1
13. Petite Rivière	10	11	18	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
14. Roche Bois	12	9	18	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
15. Ste. Croix
16. Other Areas
TOTAL	557	378	543	334	1068	102

= 2,425

ANNEX IV

	Rs
Amount received on 28.10.72	...
Disbursed in 1972-73	...
Balance on 30.6.73	...
Disbursed in 1973-74	...
Balance on 30.6.74	...
Disbursed in 1974-75	...
Balance on 30.6.75	...
Balance on 30.6.76	...
Disbursed in 1976-77	...
Balance on 30.6.77	...
Disbursed July 77 to December 77	...
Balance on 31.12.77	...
Interest at 6% per annum	...
28.10.72 to 30.6.73 (246 days) — $246 \times \frac{6}{100} \times Rs 8,666,583 =$	350,462
1.7.73 to 30.6.74 = $6 \times Rs 8,554,181$	513,250
1.7.74 to 30.6.75 = $6 \times Rs 8,539,006$	512,340
1.7.75 to 30.6.76 = do	512,340
1.7.76 to 30.6.77 = $6 \times Rs 8,514,903$	510,894
1.7.77 to 31.12.77 = $184 \times \frac{6}{100} \times Rs 8,510,893$	257,425
TOTAL	2,656,711

Amount received ... Rs 8,510,893 (after disbursement)
Interest to 31.12.77 ... Rs 2,656,711

Rs 11,167,604

N. NALLETAMBY
Accountant-General

31st December, 1977

DEED OF ACCEPTANCE AND POWER OF ATTORNEY

This is the Deed of me (1).....and the adult members of my family who have hereunto subscribed their names and seals.

I am an Ilois who left that part of British Indian Ocean Territory known as (2).....in the ship (3).....on the.....day of.....19.....never to return. My family who came with me then are (4).....and the following children:—

<i>Adult children's names</i>	<i>Addresses</i>	<i>Dates of Birth</i>
<i>Infant children's names</i>	<i>Adresses</i>	<i>Dates of Birth</i>

We know that the United Kingdom Government has alresady paid the Mauritian Government £650,000 for the resettlement of the Ilois poeple who came to Mauritius following the setting up of British Indian Ocean Territory and has offered to make available a further £1,250,000 for the purpose provided it is accepted by the Ilois in full and final settlement of all claims whatsoever upon the United Kingdom Government by the Ilois arising out of the following events:— the creation of British Indian Ocean Territory, the closing of the plantations there, the departure or removal of those living or working there, the termination of their contracts, their transfer to and resettlement in Mauritius and their prohibition from ever returning to the Islands composing British Indian Ocean Territory (the events) and of all such claims arising out of any incidents or circumstances occurring in the course of the events or out of the consequences of the events, whether past, present or to come (" their incidents circumstances and consequences ").

So that this money may be paid to help the Ilois.

1. We appoint Bernard Sheridan of 14 Red Lion Square, London WC 1 as our Attorney in accordance with S. 10 of the Powers of Attorney Act 1971 and in particular we authorize him to receive the £1,250,000 on behalf on the Ilois in such instalments and amounts and subject to such conditions as he in his absolute discretion and without need to make further reference to us, may agree with the United Kingdom Government.
2. We appoint him as our solicitor to act on our behalf in relation to all matters connected with the payment of the £1,250,000 and I, (5).....authorize him to act on behalf of my infant children named above as their next friend.
3. We accept the money already paid to the Mauritian Government and the money to be paid to Mr Sheridan as aforesaid in such instalments as he shall agree in full and final settlement and discharge of all our claims however arising upon the United Kingdom Government (both upon the Crown in right of the United Kingdom and the Crown in right of British Indian Ocean Territory) and upon its servants agents and contractors in respect of the events their incidents circumstances and consequences and we further abandon all our claims and rights (if any) of whatsoever nature to British Indian Ocean Territory.
4. We understand accept and agree that by entering into this Deed we shall not be able to sue the United Kingdom Government in respect of the events their incidents circumstances and consequences and hereby covenant not do to so.
5. We agree that all questions concerning the validity and construction of this Deed and any disputes arising upon it shall be governed by English law and justiciable only in English Courts.

- 8487 310
- (1) Insert name and address of head of family
 - (2) Insert name of Island
 - (3) Insert name of ship and date of leaving BIOT
 - (4) Insert name and address of wife
 - (5) Insert name of head of family