



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.109/SR.17
4 May 1962
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

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

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 21 March 1962, at 11.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

Southern Rhodesia: General Assembly resolution 1745 (XVI) (continued)

PRESENT:

Chairman:

Mr. JHA India

Members:

Mr. PLIMSOLL }
Mr. HOOD } Australia

Mr. KOUN WICK Cambodia

Mr. WODAJO Ethiopia

Mr. RASGOTRA India

Mr. THEODOLI }
Mr. ZITO } Italy

Mr. ANDRIAMAHARO Madagascar

Mr. COULIBALY }
Mr. TRAORE } Mali

Mr. SOLTYSIAK Poland

Mr. RIFAI Syria

Mr. MACELELA Tanganyika

Mr. Taieb SLIM Tunisia

Mr. OBEREMKO Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics

Mr. CROWE United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland

Mr. BINGHAM United States of America

Mr. VELASQUEZ Uruguay

Mr. SILVA SUCRE Venezuela

Mr. PAVICEVIC }
Mr. KRLACIC } Yugoslavia

Secretariat:

Mr. PROTITCH Under-Secretary for Trusteeship
and Information from Non-Self-
Governing Territories

Mr. CHACKO Secretary of the Committee

SOUTHERN RHODESIA: GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1745 (XVI) (continued)

Mr. Taleb SLIM (Tunisia) said he recognized the serious attention which all members of the Committee had given to the question of Southern Rhodesia, and he wished to pay a tribute to the spirit of co-operation they had shown in trying to answer the questions put to them by the General Assembly.

He would willingly agree that the Government of the United Kingdom deserved praise for the liberalism it had shown with regard to most of its former territories, and that the United Kingdom had been the first colonial Power to recognize the need to free 600 million people from imperial domination. The Tunisian delegation only regretted that the United Kingdom Government had not applied that wise policy to the rest of its Empire. Today the United Kingdom was faced, particularly in Africa, with a second category of colonial territories, territories in which the usual pattern of colonialism was complicated by the problems resulting from the presence of a large number of settlers.

Particularly, in Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom's colonial policy aimed both at exploiting the wealth of the country through a system of direct domination and at peopling it with European settlers favoured by law and defended against the indigenous people by protective measures, and even by the armed forces and the police.

In that connexion, Mr. Nkomo had made a most valuable and moving statement, one which, he was sure, would help members of the Committee to understand the situation and would open their eyes to the evils resulting from the system of direct rule by the settlers.

Broadly speaking, that particular type of colonialism was nothing new to the people of Tunisia and North Africa. Because they had suffered from it, they could understand the sufferings and efforts of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

He agreed with Mr. Nkomo that the situation could not be improved by amending the Constitution or by preparing another. As several representatives had rightly said, the new Constitution was only an instrument of domination that might well strengthen the white settlers' position, which was in many ways similar to that in South Africa. The Tunisian delegation thought the Committee should reject the argument that the Constitution, if amended, could be a step towards self-

(Mr. Taieb Slim, Tunisia)

determination. The United Kingdom Government should be asked to renounce its present methods entirely and to give its policy a completely new direction, with clearly stated aims consistent with the Declaration on independence and the resolution on the implementation of that Declaration. The time had come for the United Kingdom Government to adapt itself to the realities of Africa and to recognize the legitimate rights of the people of Southern Rhodesia.

The Tunisian delegation had no hesitation in rejecting the multi-racial system of government, which was simply a means to ensure the concealed domination of the white settlers. That was the system which the French had tried to apply in Tunisia and Morocco, under the name of co-sovereignty, and in Algeria, under the slogan "French Algeria". That experiment had failed everywhere; he welcomed the end of the long Algerian conflict and the signing of the cease-fire agreement, which was the first step towards the recognition of a sovereign Algerian State. He was particularly happy to note that the system of co-sovereignty had been abandoned in the agreement, and that after a period of three years the French settlers would have a choice of becoming Algerian citizens or of continuing to live in Algeria as foreigners.

Mr. Nkomo had shown that racialism and discrimination were practised by the settlers, not by the indigenous inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia, who were ready to welcome immigrants from Europe or Asia wishing to become citizens and active members of the country. He hoped that those immigrants would be able to create an atmosphere of fruitful co-operation, and would stop putting their private interests before those of the community and claiming to belong to a superior race with a mission to impose its will on the majority.

The facts being as they were, the Committee should give a negative answer to the question whether the Territory of Southern Rhodesia had attained a full measure of self-government. It should also reply that for that very reason resolution 1654 (XVI) applied to Southern Rhodesia. The Tunisian delegation thought the Committee should carefully examine the following points in preparing its recommendations to the seventeenth session of the General Assembly: (i) the 1961 Constitution had been prepared without the consent of the Africans and had been imposed upon them; (ii) the Constitution was rejected by them and did not

/...

(Mr. Taleb Slim, Tunisia)

meet their legitimate aspirations; (iii) it could not lead to the formation of any democratic system of government; (iv) the Committee should ask the United Kingdom Government to use its powers to suspend the implementation of the Constitution; (v) the Committee should appeal to the United Kingdom to institute negotiations with the true representatives of the people of Southern Rhodesia in order to prepare for the transfer of powers to a provisional Government before the holding of general elections based on universal franchise; (vi) the Committee should consider any measures necessary to provide the people of Southern Rhodesia with any help they might need in the period of transition; (vii) an early date should be fixed for the independence of Southern Rhodesia.

The last point was particularly important. He suggested that the date fixed should be at the end of 1962 or the beginning of 1963. He reserved the right to speak again in the debate and in the discussion of the draft resolution.

Mr. PAVICEVIC (Yugoslavia) recalled that the Yugoslav delegation had been one of the sponsors of resolution 1745 (XVI), in which the General Assembly had instructed the Special Committee "to consider whether the Territory of Southern Rhodesia has attained a full measure of self-government".

The General Assembly had given lengthy consideration to the meaning of self-government and had adopted two extremely important documents on the question, resolution 742 (VIII) and resolution 1541 (XV).

Resolution 742 (VIII), paragraph 6, stated that a territory could become fully self-governing through the attainment of independence, but that self-government could also be achieved by association with another State or group of States if that was done freely. No one would venture to claim that Southern Rhodesia had attained independence; nor had self-government by association been achieved, the association being with two British protectorates and not having been entered into freely by the people of Southern Rhodesia.

In paragraph 8 of the same resolution, the General Assembly put forward as a further criterion of whether a Territory was self-governing that the people should have attained a full measure of self-government. He pointed out in that connexion that the indigenous population, comprising 90 per cent of the inhabitants

(Mr. Pavicevic, Yugoslavia)

of Southern Rhodesia, had no means at all of freely determining their status or of governing themselves.

According to the second part (section A) of the annex to resolution 742 (VIII), the factors indicative of the attainment of other separate systems of self-government included the opinion of the population of the Territory, freely expressed, and the freedom of choosing between several possibilities. A study of the situation in Southern Rhodesia showed that those two factors were completely lacking.

Section C, paragraph 1 (second sub-paragraph) of the second part of the annex defined the legislature in a self-governing territory as characterized by the enactment of laws for the territory by an indigenous body whether fully elected by free and democratic processes or lawfully constituted in a manner receiving the free consent of the population. The Legislative Assembly of Southern Rhodesia did not conform to that definition in any respect.

Paragraph 2 of the same section of the annex referred to a further factor - the effective participation of the population in the government of the territory through an adequate and appropriate electoral and representative system, conducted without direct or indirect interference from a foreign Government. Again, that description did not apply to Southern Rhodesia.

The same could be said of the factor of economic, social and cultural jurisdiction, which was the subject of paragraph 3 of that section. Certainly the people of Southern Rhodesia did not enjoy the degree of autonomy illustrated - to quote a passage from that paragraph - by freedom from economic pressure exercised by a foreign minority group which, by virtue of the help of a foreign Power, had acquired a privileged economic status. One need only read the Land Apportionment Act to see to what extent such economic pressure was exerted.

Lastly, even a cursory study of the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia and of a large number of statutes - the Southern Rhodesia Electoral Law, the Unlawful Organizations Act, the Land Apportionment Act, the Law and Order Maintenance Act, the Native Education Act etc. - showed that the people of Southern Rhodesia were far from having attained full, or even partial, self-government. It was clear from all those legislative instruments and from documents which had been presented to the Committee that such terms as "elections",

/...

(Mr. Pavicevic, Yugoslavia)

"electors", "electorate", "referendum", "elected representatives", "self-government", "responsible government", etc. referred exclusively, or almost exclusively, to the settlers.

That fact was equally apparent from the moving account given by Mr. Nkomo, who had described with an uncommon sense of responsibility the true situation in his country. It was to be hoped that that account would have the effect of overcoming the doubts and reservations which some representatives had expressed.

For the reasons he had stated, his delegation would reply in the negative to the question put to the Committee in resolution 1745 (XVI). The view of the Yugoslav delegation was that:

- (1) Southern Rhodesia had not attained self-government and was a colony, as stated, incidentally, in the opening article of its Constitution;
- (2) The United Kingdom should respect the obligations deriving from the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter;
- (3) The United Kingdom Government should protect the indigenous population of the Territory as required by the Charter and the Declaration;
- (4) The Committee should make positive recommendations, for the attention of the General Assembly, concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia.

The Yugoslav delegation believed that it was the Committee's duty, under the terms of resolution 1514 (XV), to recommend to the United Kingdom Government that it should abrogate the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia, annul all the legislative instruments which discriminated against the indigenous population, and promulgate a new electoral law based on universal suffrage, in order to ensure that the people of Southern Rhodesia had complete freedom and the right to establish for themselves whatever form of government they thought best and freely to decide their own future.

The Yugoslav delegation was firmly convinced that that was the only way to ensure the peaceful progress of Southern Rhodesia towards independence, and it joined Mr. Nkomo in hoping that the United Kingdom would repair as soon as possible the errors it had committed in the past. That hope was based on the policy applied by the United Kingdom in other territories and on the statement the United Kingdom representative had made concerning his country's general policy on the question of decolonization.

/...

Mr. VELASQUEZ (Uruguay) thought that the question whether the territory of Southern Rhodesia had attained a full measure of self-government could be answered on the basis of the facts before the Committee.

With regard to the policy of the administering Power, the Uruguayan delegation agreed with the Australian delegation that the United Kingdom's policy, if its goal was in fact the establishment of a multi-racial society, was a noble and worthy one. The idea of a society in which all races lived in harmony and equality was in conformity with the United Nations Charter and with the natural law; the fact that it was doubtless sometimes being used as a cloak for domination of the Africans by Europeans did not detract from its intrinsic truth. Moreover, those who were somewhat sceptical of the sincerity of that objective should trust the British people's sense of history and should hope that the errors of the past would not be repeated.

The existence in Southern Rhodesia of a large minority of white settlers was a factor whose influence must not be underestimated. Leaving aside more recent examples, there were many instances in the history of the former Spanish colonies in America in which the settlers had enjoyed de facto sovereignty, socially, economically and even politically, and in which attempts made by the Administering Power to improve the lot of the indigenous inhabitants had met with resistance from the settlers, who had constituted an oligarchy determined to defend its own interests and privileges. In such cases, it could hardly be asserted a priori that the Governments of colonial Powers were always responsible for acts committed by their nationals.

Relations between the United Kingdom and Rhodesia, or the Central African Federation, were complex, but the Committee could answer the question before it without having to subject them to close scrutiny. In the first place, General Assembly resolution 742 (VIII) stated that the manner in which a territory could become fully self-governing was primarily through the attainment of independence. However, even if it were assumed that the territory of Rhodesia had attained independence through a full transfer of powers, it would still not be in the position envisaged by resolution 742 (VIII), by the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, or by the United Nations

(Mr. Velasquez, Uruguay)

Charter. Even if a transfer of powers had taken place, there would be the question who had been vested with those powers. The concept of sovereignty was a matter, not only of the State in the sense of the established power, but of the State as a complete political whole comprising both the people and the Government. Strictly speaking, therefore, sovereignty existed only if the people itself - and not a limited category of it or a minority - really held the power. An analysis of the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia and of the statements made before the Committee sufficed to show that, even if a hypothetical sovereignty had been transferred to Southern Rhodesia, the real power lay in the hands of the established executive and not of the people, i.e. the Africans who made up 92 per cent of the population. The restrictions on the right to vote, the existence of discriminatory laws and the unequal representation of electors registered on the two electoral rolls all testified to the fact that the territory of Southern Rhodesia did not enjoy full autonomy.

Obviously, opinions might differ as to the constitutional system best suited to a given country. A number of systems were compatible with democratic principles, provided that any departure from the formula "One man one vote; one vote, one representative" was based on rational grounds and not on such factors as colour. It was not enough to declare on paper that all men were equal; equality was not actually achieved unless means, opportunities and resources were available to all.

His delegation hoped that the Committee's work would make it possible to work out a formula which would enable the rightful claimants to Southern Rhodesian sovereignty to regain their rights by peaceful means.

Mr. COULIBALY (Mali) thanked the members of the Committee for the confidence they had shown in his country and himself by electing him Vice-Chairman. The Republic of Mali, which was deeply involved in the struggle to liquidate colonialism in all its forms, realized that many peoples, still under foreign domination, cherished great hopes that the United Nations would help them achieve independence. Those peoples had welcomed the establishment of the Committee, which they regarded as a means of implementing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. In his determination to uphold those hopes, he would strive as Vice-Chairman to make the Committee an effective instrument for the attainment of the aims defined in General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1654 (XVI).

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had decided to grant hearings at the present meeting to Mr. Garfield Todd and Mr. Paul Mushonga. Owing to circumstances beyond his control, Mr. Mushonga would only arrive in New York that afternoon. He therefore proposed that he should be heard the following morning.

It was so decided.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Garfield Todd, Chairman of the New African Party, took a seat at the Committee table.

Mr. Garfield TODD (New African Party) thanked the Committee for giving him a hearing.

As he had been unable to read all the summary records, he was aware of the views expressed before the Committee, and particularly those of the United Kingdom delegation, only through the comments made on them at the 15th meeting by the United States representative. According to Mr. Bingham, several delegations, instead of asking the United Kingdom to relinquish its limited authority over Southern Rhodesia, had urged the United Kingdom Government not to relinquish its authority under present conditions, and all were agreed on the following points:

Firstly, the United Kingdom should not wash its hands of Southern Rhodesia nor grant it independence immediately, an eventuality which the United Kingdom did not appear to be even considering.

Secondly, the United Kingdom had a continuing responsibility to encourage and help the people of Southern Rhodesia to move towards a form of government that would give each element of the population an equitable share of opportunity and responsibility. There might be differences of opinion regarding the degree of the United Kingdom's responsibility but there would be no denial that it existed. Finally, to judge from the statement made by the United Kingdom representative, the present situation in Southern Rhodesia did allow for peaceful change and progress was being made towards the objective of greater African participation in the Government.

The United States representative had also noted that when the United Kingdom representative had described the new Constitution as a step in the direction of such African participation he had referred to it as only a beginning and had quoted with evident approval a statement by Sir Edgar Whitehead to the effect that the

(Mr. Garfield Todd, New African Party)

new Constitution was bound to lead in time to an African majority and that that was something for Europeans to welcome.

The United States representative had voiced the conviction that efforts should be made to work out agreed solutions that would enable all the people of Southern Rhodesia to achieve without violence a free and prosperous future. Such solutions, he had said, should be based on the freely expressed wishes of the people and should lead to harmonious racial relationships that would permit all elements to play a full part in the political, social and economic life of the country. The United States representative had expressed his firm belief that every effort must be made to ensure that change in Southern Rhodesia would be brought about through orderly, constructive and peaceful processes and not by means of violence, so that a firm foundation might be laid for a society based on equal rights and prosperity for all.

He (Mr. Todd) associated himself unreservedly with the opinions expressed in the statement from which he had quoted. But if the United Kingdom's attitude had beyond question been that apparently ascribed to it by the United States representative, there would have been no need for him (Mr. Todd) to appear before the Committee. In addressing the Committee, he would endeavour, through the intermediary of the United Nations, to induce the United Kingdom to adopt the attitude which, according to Mr. Bingham, it had already adopted, to assume the responsibilities which, according to Mr. Bingham, were generally attributed to it, and to use those powers which, as the United Kingdom representative had apparently admitted, his Government still retained.

He admitted that he was a prejudiced witness. Arriving in Southern Rhodesia as a missionary in 1934, he had become representative and then Prime Minister within the Central African Federation. He had had to resign in 1957 because of opposition to his plan to raise the wages of Africans and grant them the right to vote. Mr. Nkomo, on the other hand, had found great difficulty in educating himself, had suffered from racial discrimination on the labour market and had been maltreated by the police; his party had been banned and the Southern Rhodesian authorities had made him suffer deeply in thousands of other ways. It was natural that Mr. Nkomo's views of certain aspects of the problem of Southern Rhodesia should differ from his own. He himself had suffered less directly. However, concerned

(Mr. Garfield Todd, New African Party)

as he was for the dangers facing his country, he did not want the United Kingdom to abdicate the role it had to play in the future of Southern Rhodesia. The Committee seemed to be generally agreed upon that role and recognized that, while Southern Rhodesia enjoyed a certain autonomy, that autonomy was far from being complete.

Tracing briefly the constitutional history of Southern Rhodesia, he recalled that the 1923 Constitution, while granting the Government of Southern Rhodesia a certain autonomy, considerably restricted its legislative powers, certain types of law being held over for Her Majesty's pleasure. No doubt, the then Prime Minister, now Lord Malvern, who was to be commended for his sense of justice, had been able to assert that the United Kingdom Government had never vetoed any of the laws adopted by the Southern Rhodesian Parliament. However, such an assertion disregarded the fact that bills were sent Parliament only when they had been discussed at length with a representative of the United Kingdom Government and had been approved by him.

In July 1960 the difficulties of the regime had led to a crisis accompanied by riots. After he had vainly requested Lord Home to convene a constitutional conference, he and Mr. Nkomo had sent a letter to Lord Home requesting him to suspend the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia. In that letter, they had pointed out that although the Constitution which the country needed was bound over the long term to serve the enlightened interests of the settlers, it would be opposed by them at first. The United Kingdom Government, in consultation with the Federal Government should therefore send additional security forces to Rhodesia. Wrongly interpreted at the time, that letter had been the subject of protests in Parliament where it had been proposed that Mr. Todd should be impeached for high treason or even hanged.

A constitutional conference had been convened and although the Prime Minister had not originally intended to invite to it delegates from the African nationalist movement, Mr. Nkomo had succeeded, not without great difficulty, in taking part in it. He (Mr. Todd) had not attended the conference and he was therefore not in a position to deal with the differences of opinion between Mr. Nkomo and Sir Edgar Whitehead. Nevertheless, he believed that certain things regarding the

(Mr. Garfield Todd, New African Party)

Constitution approved by the conference were quite clear. It was clear that the main reason for the conference, so far as Sir Edgar had been concerned, had been to get rid of the United Kingdom; that the NDP had wanted universal suffrage; and that the existence of two rolls, A and B, giving 220,000 white people fifty seats and 2.5 million African people fifteen seats, could only be an interim measure. It was, of course, for the NDP to say to what extent it had accepted the provisions of the Constitution. In any event, the African nationalists could not have much confidence in such a Constitution, for at least two reasons. First, Sir Edgar had announced that the measure in question was a final measure and, secondly, Sir Roy Welensky had sent his congratulations to the conference, saying that the arrangements adopted were better than what he could have expected. Thus, the Southern Rhodesian Government had achieved a great victory over the United Kingdom, in the sense that all the powers previously reserved to Her Majesty's Government had passed into the hands of a white electorate.

While it was true that the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, as Mr. Bingham had quoted him, had said that the new Constitution was bound to lead in time to an African majority, he had not said in what length of time. Moreover, rather recently, the Prime Minister of the Federation had said that it would take about 200 years for Africans to be equated with whites. Apart from those two rather paradoxical statements, there was another statement, not quoted by Mr. Bingham, which had been made by a member of the Southern Rhodesia Cabinet, to the effect that if and when Africans obtained similar educational facilities to whites they would eventually put an end to the latter's rule. However, the Minister had added that that would require the Government of Southern Rhodesia to spend £50 million on African education instead of £4 million as at present, and that such a thing could not happen in the foreseeable future.

After indicating that he had cited those facts in order to illustrate an attitude of mind, he said that Southern Rhodesia could not be considered in isolation from the Federation, which in its turn was not self-governing. In 1958, Sir Roy had stated that he would get dominion status for the Federation, something that would have happened but for Dr. Banda. By 1960, after the proclamation of an emergency in Southern Rhodesia and the sending of reinforcements to Nyasaland, the idea of dominion status had died. Subsequently, a call for independence by the Federation had not proved any more successful, and it might be that the United Kingdom would now have to dismember the Federation it had created.

/...

(Mr. Garfield Todd, New African Party)

With regard to the 1961 Constitution, which was to enter into force when the present Parliament was dissolved, he said that it appeared to have produced the following reactions. Whereas the United Kingdom seemingly considered it a means of maintaining its influence and power in Southern Rhodesia, the whites of that country considered it a means of giving them control of their own affairs, in which they included the destiny of 2.5 million African people. Unfortunately, the Constitution lacked one essential virtue which even the Monckton Commission had agreed was indispensable, namely, acceptability to the people. It was customary among the white people of Southern Rhodesia to say that Africans did not understand politics. While it was true that they were not familiar with the party system, they did concern themselves with problems connected with schooling, land and employment, matters that were the blood and bones of politics. Actually, as the Monckton Commission had repeatedly emphasized, the great problem in Southern Rhodesia was the division that existed between 220,000 whites and 2.5 million blacks.

After the United Kingdom and Sir Edgar Whitehead had managed to contrive the new Constitution, Sir Edgar had been able to say that the United Kingdom had surrendered its influence in Southern Rhodesia, which was henceforth the master of its own fate. On the other hand, from what the United States representative had said, it appeared that the United Kingdom was not even considering the possibility of washing its hands of Southern Rhodesia. The new Constitution must be a remarkable document if such different reactions could flow from it, and it was therefore worthy of closer study.

The Constitution provided for a two-roll system of registration for elections. Persons registered on roll A had to have high qualifications and elected fifty members. Those on roll B had lower qualifications and elected fifteen members. The Prime Minister had said, concerning the electoral act which reflected those Constitutional provisions, that its passage was "an essential step on the route to our independence" (Col. 366, Hansard No. 10, vol. 49). He had then estimated that between 50,000 and 60,000 Africans would be eligible for the B roll. He had also said that a day would come when there would be hundreds of thousands of B voters but that would only mean a devaluation, and that the scheme had been well thought out (Col. 370, Hansard No. 10, vol. 49).

/...

(Mr. Garfield Todd, New African Party)

He recalled that in 1957 the Federal Government had adopted an electoral act instituting a two-roll policy, which the Monckton Commission had later described as a death-blow to the hopes for the success of the Federation. When only 500 Africans had gone to the polls, it had been said that the Africans were not interested; the truth had been simply that they had not been prepared to be second-class citizens. On the other hand, when a more enlightened electoral act had been passed in Nyasaland, in spite of its two-roll system 110,000 Africans had registered on roll B in one month, electing twenty representatives as against the eight representatives elected on the A roll.

The Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia had wanted the Africans to register. With that in view, he had declared the rolls open for a period of six months and had made a tour, under police protection and without the company of newspapermen, for the purpose of commending the new Constitution to the Africans. The Prime Minister had failed. In order to reach the figure aimed at, some 8,000 Africans would have had to register each month, and yet in two months only 3,000 had registered, in spite of the pressures exerted by certain civil servants and by employers of Africans on their employees on orders from the Government. He asked whether, in view of that failure, the United Kingdom, together with the Government of Southern Rhodesia and representatives of all the people of the country, would now devise a new electoral measure or whether the United Kingdom had to admit that it had given up most of its power in Rhodesia.

He then quoted extracts from a White Paper published in 1959, in which it was stated that in 1959 the Southern Rhodesia Government had proposed to the United Kingdom Government that the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia should be revised with a view to transferring to Southern Rhodesia the exercise of the powers vested in the United Kingdom Government.

Interrupting his statement, the speaker asked the Chairman whether in view of the lateness of the hour he wished to adjourn the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN said that a large number of meetings were scheduled for the afternoon and suggested that the Committee should meet again the following morning.

/...

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was surprised that very often, when several Committees met simultaneously, it was the Special Committee that suffered from technical difficulties. The Special Committee was making rather slow progress; it should have a well defined plan of work and should meet again both that afternoon and the following morning.

After an exchange of views, in which Mr. RIFAI (Syria), Mr. TRAORE (Mali), Mr. RASGOTRA (India), Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) and Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) took part, the CHAIRMAN announced that the next meeting would be held the following morning at 10 o'clock.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.