



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Request concerning agenda item 54 (Non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV)).</i>	119
<i>Agenda item 56:</i>	
<i>Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) (continued)</i>	
<i>Hearing of petitioners (continued) and request for a supplementary hearing</i>	119

Chairman: Mr. Guillermo FLORES AVENDAÑO (Guatemala).

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUEST CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 54 (NON-COMPLIANCE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF PORTUGAL WITH CHAPTER XI OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND WITH GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1542 (XV))

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a request for a hearing relating to the territories under Portuguese administration. If there was no objection, the request would be circulated and taken up at a later date.

It was so decided.^{1/}

AGENDA ITEM 56

Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) (A/5238, chap. II; A/C.4/560, A/C.4/561) (continued)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (continued) AND REQUEST FOR A SUPPLEMENTARY HEARING

2. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that Mr. Dumbutshena had requested a second hearing in order to give the Committee information about the education of the African population in Southern Rhodesia.

3. He suggested that the Committee should grant Mr. Dumbutshena a further hearing when it had finished hearing the petitioners whom it was now questioning and had heard the other petitioners whom it had decided to hear after them.

4. Mr. KIDWAI (India) was in favour of the Committee's hearing Mr. Dumbutshena again. Nevertheless, at the present rate of progress the Committee might not even conclude its consideration of the question of Rhodesia by the end of the session. His delega-

^{1/} The request was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/566.

tion therefore proposed that the time allowed to each delegation for questioning the petitioners should be limited to twenty or thirty minutes.

5. Mr. EL-SHAFEI (United Arab Republic) thought that, in view of the fact that the petitioners of the multi-racial group had given information about education in Southern Rhodesia at the previous meeting, the Committee should hear Mr. Dumbutshena immediately, on condition he restricted his statement to education and that no questions were put to him. That would prevent the Committee from gaining a distorted picture of the situation.

6. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) thought that the Committee would run the risk of further delays if it heard Mr. Dumbutshena again immediately. If the petitioner had something more to offer than mere statistical information, he felt it would be preferable not to hear him until after the other petitioners.

7. With regard to the Indian proposal, it would be better to wait until more representatives were present before discussing it.

8. Mr. BOEG (Denmark) agreed with the Indian and Yugoslav representatives and supported the Chairman's suggestion concerning the second hearing requested by Mr. Dumbutshena. His delegation thought, however, that it might perhaps be useful to ask Mr. Dumbutshena to submit such additional information as he possessed in writing. After all, the Committee could just as easily consider written petitions, and statistical data were easier to grasp in writing.

9. Mr. COTTRELL (Secretary of the Committee) read out the request from Mr. Dumbutshena in which he announced his intention of submitting facts and figures about the education of Africans in Southern Rhodesia and recalled that he had reserved the right to make a further statement before the Committee.

10. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) said that he was in favour of granting Mr. Dumbutshena another hearing, but as the petitioner had not asked to be heard at any particular stage of the Committee's proceedings his delegation supported the proposal of the Indian, Yugoslav and Danish representatives. Moreover, the request before the Committee was so worded as to suggest that Mr. Dumbutshena wished to be heard after the other petitioners.

11. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana) felt that the Committee had lost a great deal of time in the last few days by reason of the fact that the petitioners now being questioned were failing to give satisfactory replies. It might perhaps be advisable to ask the members of the Committee whether they wished to go on questioning them. If delegations had no important questions to put to the petitioners, the latter could be invited to withdraw.

12. Mr. RIFAI (Jordan) pointed out that the Chairman had made a suggestion to which no objection had been

raised. If members wanted to save time, the best thing they could do was to support it.

The Chairman's suggestion was adopted.

13. The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee, bearing in mind the excessively slow progress of the Committee's work, to consider the Indian representative's proposal that the time allowed to each delegation to question the petitioners should be limited.

14. He further pointed out that the points of order raised during meetings also led to much loss of time. If they could be eliminated, the Committee's work would be considerably expedited.

15. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) felt that the Indian representative's proposal was an excellent one; he gave it his unreserved support.

16. Mr. PASCUCCI-RIGHI (Italy) likewise shared the view of the Indian representative. The Committee might perhaps save time also if the questions were put concisely and not in the form of out-and-out commentaries, which should be kept for the general debate. The petitioners, for their part, should restrict themselves to giving direct answers.

17. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) felt that the Indian representative's proposal would not entirely solve the problem, for some questions were complex and necessitated numerous subsequent explanations. It should be possible, however, to ask the various delegations scheduled to put questions to the petitioners to agree among themselves so that the same questions should not be asked several times. That was a recognized parliamentary practice; it might even be possible to draw up a list of questions to be asked, in order to avoid repetition.

18. Mr. MONGUNO (Nigeria) said that he, for his part, would prefer a limitation to be placed on the number of questions rather than on the time allowed to each delegation.

19. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) supported the Indian representative's proposal that a limit should be placed on the time allowed to each delegation to question the petitioners. Half an hour per delegation seemed to him a reasonable time for that purpose.

20. Mr. MAKKAWI (Lebanon), too, gave the Indian representative's proposal his whole-hearted support.

It was decided that the time allowed to each delegation to question the petitioners should be limited to thirty minutes.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. W. A. F. Burdett-Coutts, Mr. A. D. Butler, Mr. J. Dombura, Mr. J. M. Gondo and Mr. T. J. Hlazo, representing an independent multiracial group, took places at the Committee table.

21. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana), speaking on a point of order, recalled his suggestion that, in view of the unsatisfactory replies being given by the petitioners of the multiracial group, they should be asked to withdraw so that the Committee might proceed to hear the other petitioners. He was putting his suggestion forward again as a formal proposal, in order to save the Committee further loss of time.

22. Mr. BOEG (Denmark) pointed out that in adopting the Indian proposal the Committee had implicitly decided to go on questioning the petitioners of the multiracial group; indeed, it was because so many delega-

tions had put down their names to question the petitioners that the Committee had decided to limit the time allowed to each delegation for that purpose.

23. Moreover, if the Ghanaian proposal were adopted, the situation would be without precedent in the history of the Committee, which had always made a point of hearing all petitioners and allowing delegations to ask them as many questions as they wished. The fact that some thirty delegations had asked for the floor in order to question the multiracial group showed that an appreciable proportion of the Committee considered it useful to hear the members of that group.

24. For those reasons, he asked the Ghanaian representative not to press his proposal.

25. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) agreed with the Danish representative that the Committee would create a regrettable precedent if it adopted the Ghanaian representative's proposal. The best solution would be to leave it to each member of the Committee to choose his own course of action and to show his attitude towards the petitioners as he thought fit—for instance, by refraining from putting questions to them.

26. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) moved the adjournment of the debate on the Ghanaian proposal, under rule 117 of the rules of procedure.

27. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) pointed out that the Committee had granted a hearing to the multiracial group. If the petitioners were not welcome to any particular delegation, it was free to adopt whatever attitude it saw fit, but it should not try to persuade the majority of the Committee to cancel a hearing that had been granted. His delegation therefore felt that the Committee could not refuse to hear the petitioners and for that reason it supported the Yugoslav proposal.

28. Mr. RIFAI (Jordan) said that it would be better if the Ghanaian representative would withdraw his proposal and merely appeal to the members of the Committee to be as brief as possible when questioning the petitioners concerned. If the Ghanaian representative pressed his proposal, the Jordanian delegation would be forced to support the motion for adjournment put forward by the representative of Yugoslavia.

29. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana) said that the Haitian representative had misunderstood his proposal, the sole purpose of which had been to avoid further loss of time. He agreed to the adjournment of the debate on his proposal.

30. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to question the petitioners.

31. Mr. EREBIH (Mauritania) said that he would not question the petitioners because they were acting as though they were official representatives of Southern Rhodesia. His delegation did not wish to engage in controversy with a delegation which was not accredited to the United Nations.

32. Mr. DIALLO (Mali) asked Mr. Hlazo if, in his view, the Constitution of 1923 was more progressive than that of 1961, or less so.

33. Mr. HLAZO said that the Constitution of 1923 had been a starting point, for at that time the educational level of the Africans had been too low. The new Constitution was a step forward compared with the old one.

34. In answer to another question from Mr. DIALLO (Mali), Mr. HLAZO said that Southern Rhodesia was a self-governing State and not a British colony.

35. Mr. DIALLO (Mali) recalled that Mr. Hlazo had indicated that, in his group's opinion, the emancipation of the Africans must proceed within a colonial framework. After the Second World War, however, many African and Asian countries had freed themselves from the colonial yoke, even though their peoples were not entirely literate, thanks to indigenous élites which had led the revolution and won independence for their countries. There was a similar indigenous élite in Southern Rhodesia. He asked why, in that case, Southern Rhodesia could not follow the example of the countries he had mentioned.

36. Mr. HLAZO reiterated his view that the Africans would soon have a majority in the Southern Rhodesian Parliament and that all the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia without distinction of race would then be independent.

37. Mr. DIALLO (Mali) remarked that the independent multiracial group, which, according to the petitioners, represented a broad sector of public opinion, had been formed because all had not seemed right in Southern Rhodesia. He asked what was the group's programme and what help it expected from the United Nations.

38. Mr. BUTLER said that both he and his compatriots had already explained in detail the circumstances which had led them to request a hearing from the Committee.

39. Mr. DIALLO (Mali) repeated his question about the programme of the group of petitioners. Mr. Butler had said that neither the United Kingdom nor the United Nations was entitled to interfere in the internal affairs of Southern Rhodesia, but at the same time he had called for action by the United Nations. That apparent contradiction might be clarified if the petitioners explained the programme of the multiracial group that they represented.

40. Mr. BUTLER said that the five petitioners before the Committee were in fact a multiracial group but they did not represent a multiracial movement. They had come to New York in their personal capacities and they represented a large sector of Rhodesian public opinion. Their presence before the Committee was clear evidence that the other petitioners who had been heard on the question did not represent the entire population.

41. Mr. DIALLO (Mali) said that he had gathered from the statements made by Mr. Hlazo and his compatriots that they represented an organized anti-racial group. In actual fact, as was perfectly clear from the statements that Mr. Butler had just made, they represented only the opinion of some Southern Rhodesians who favoured co-operation between all races in the country. If the five petitioners merely represented an idea, their testimony did nothing to change the picture of the situation in Southern Rhodesia. His delegation reserved the right to support the principle of self-determination for all peoples.

42. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) asked Mr. Butler what he meant when he said that the subversive activities in Southern Rhodesia were organized from outside the country.

43. Mr. BUTLER said that, according to public opinion in Southern Rhodesia, the disturbances, acts of sabotage, arson etc. were organized with outside help. He did not wish to accuse other countries, but the Committee should know that many people in Southern Rhodesia were expressing that view.

44. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) asked Mr. Butler whether he was opposed to the immediate granting of universal franchise in Southern Rhodesia.

45. Mr. BUTLER said that it was his sincere conviction that universal franchise would be introduced in Southern Rhodesia in the very near future, but the slogan "one man, one vote" had been so used and so abused that it was in danger of becoming meaningless. Universal suffrage should be granted when the people were able to exercise reasonable judgement. If they were not, the principle became "one man, one vote for one party". The vote was a symbol of choice and the right to choose was the very essence of self-determination. It was worse to have no choice than to have no vote.

46. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) asked Mr. Butler whether he thought that a constitution which deprived 90 per cent of the African population of the right to vote and provided for very unequal representation of the two communities in Southern Rhodesia was democratic.

47. Mr. BUTLER said that it was hardly possible to deprive someone of something he had never had. Some Rhodesians claimed that the tribal system which had existed before the arrival of the Europeans had had a measure of democracy, but the truth was that when the Europeans had arrived the country had been terrorized by the Matebele tribe, who had been inveterate raiders. Modern democracy had begun to emerge only much later.

48. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) asked whether a knowledge of the indigenous languages should not be an adequate requirement for voters.

49. Mr. BUTLER said that on that point the Africans themselves disagreed; some felt that one of the indigenous languages should become the official language of the country, but others did not accept that view for they felt that the indigenous languages were inadequate for the needs of the modern world and that the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia must know a language that was widely spoken, such as English.

50. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) recalled that Mr. Dombura had said that he had made several visits to different reserves in Southern Rhodesia to explain democracy to the Africans. He asked what democratic principles the petitioner had explained to his compatriots and what he had told them about the right to vote.

51. Mr. DOMBURA said that, outside the towns, the concept of democracy was foreign to tribal life: the rural inhabitants often asked whether they would be paid for voting, or whether it was compulsory to belong to a party. He tried to encourage them to claim the right to vote and he explained the machinery of government to them.

52. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) said that that reply did not satisfy him. The petitioner had stated that the aim of his group was to make every man a full citizen; the Ceylonese delegation would like to know whether the petitioner considered himself to be a full citizen under the new Constitution.

53. Mr. DOMBURA said that he would not regard himself as such so long as all sections of the community were not united and opposition was being expressed from both sides. Nevertheless, the group to which he belonged had been able to bring men of all

aces together in order to solve the problem. Time would prove whether it had succeeded.

54. In reply to a question from Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon), Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS said that the principal point in the policy of the United Federal Party (UFP) with which he disagreed and which had led him to resign related to the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland and was consequently outside the scope of the agenda item under discussion. It was his opinion, too, that the laws of a discriminatory character had not been repealed quickly enough.

55. With reference to the Malian representative's observations, he wished to state that he had decided to come to the United Nations because other petitioners had described the situation in his country in a rather unfavourable light. A very great number of Rhodesians shared his opinion on that point, and very few of them would agree that the principle of "one man, one vote" would be practical.

56. In reply to another question from Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon), Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS said that Sir Edgar Whitehead had repeated on various occasions that there should be no discrimination of any kind in Southern Rhodesia and that personal merit alone mattered. He had added that all levels of government service must be legally open to everyone regardless of race. It was a fact that in everything concerning the Africans Sir Edgar Whitehead practised what he preached.

57. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) asked whether the platform of the UFP included the repeal of discriminatory measures and an extension to Africans of the franchise and of the right to be elected to Parliament.

58. Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS said that Sir Edgar Whitehead had promised that, if re-elected, he would take steps to repeal the Land Apportionment Act and to make racial discrimination illegal. He himself could not say what UFP policy was, since he was no longer a member of that party.

59. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon), recalling that the petitioner had explained the reasons why in his opinion universal suffrage could not be granted, asked whether that meant that the granting of universal suffrage would be impossible if those same conditions continued to exist in the country.

60. Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS said that industrialization and the existence of a strong European minority would continue but that that would not prevent the granting of universal suffrage to the people as a whole. All the petitioners who had been heard had said that they did not want the Europeans to leave. Furthermore, only industrialization would enable Southern Rhodesia to progress. On the other hand, the steady rise in the level of education of the Africans and the increase in wages would soon bring an end to the conditions which were now preventing the granting of universal suffrage.

61. In reply to a question from Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon), Mr. GONDO said that he was a member of the United Federal Party.

62. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) asked whether the petitioner could prove the charge that the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU) was receiving money from foreign Powers.

63. Mr. GONDO said that while it was impossible for him to give exact figures, it was generally known that

ZAPU had several offices outside Southern Rhodesia and that the activities which it was carrying on within that country would not be possible if it was receiving nothing more than membership dues.

64. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that her delegation had always spoken in favour of the right of petitioners to be heard. In view, however, of the large number of delegations which had expressed a desire to ask questions and the number of petitioners still to be heard, she felt that she already had sufficient information and would therefore not put any questions.

65. U TIN MAUNG (Burma), referring to introductory statement by Mr. Butler (1346th meeting), asked him whether he wanted to be a candidate in the legislative elections that were soon to take place in Southern Rhodesia.

66. Mr. BUTLER said that he would agree to be a candidate in the legislative elections if that was the desire of the United Federal Party.

67. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) asked the petitioner what factors would then determine his stand.

68. Mr. BUTLER replied that in UFP, as in all the other parties, policy was determined at periodic congresses. He would therefore refrain from stating his own stand until that policy had been determined.

69. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) said that it was the right of every candidate to make his decision on the basis of what was offered to him. He wondered whether the petitioner believed that, in the event of the success of the first mission to the United Nations which had been entrusted to him by his party, his political superiors would promote him to a high post in the party machinery.

70. Mr. BUTLER replied that his journey to New York, as well as his past and possible future political activities, meant a financial loss to him rather than any kind of gain. It would be much more profitable for him to remain aloof from such activities.

71. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) said that for the present he would refrain from any comments on the petitioner's reply. He then reminded the petitioner of his statement at the 1348th meeting, in reply to a question from the representative of the Ivory Coast, that 6,000 active members of ZAPU had intimidated the rest of the population, and he asked the petitioner whether he believed that 6,000 persons could succeed in intimidating 3 million where there was a police force of 13,000 men responsible for maintaining order.

72. Mr. BUTLER recalled what had happened in Germany when Nazism had taken hold there. He then pointed out that Southern Rhodesia was a very big country and that the police force was largely made up of a reserve which was not on continuous duty. For most of the time, only the regular police, which comprised only a few thousand men, was responsible for maintaining order. The fact that its forces were scattered throughout the entire area of an immense territory made it easy for a few well-organized bands to terrorize the people. News of an attack or of acts of aggression at one place rapidly spread far and wide, and everyone feared that what had happened yesterday to others would happen tomorrow to him. Intimidation was therefore entirely possible.

73. U TIN MAUNG (Burma), addressing his remarks to Mr. Burdett-Coutts, asked him, in view of the fact that he had several times expressed the certainty that

the party of Sir Edgar Whitehead would be victorious in the elections, why he was not seeking to run as a candidate of that party.

74. Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS replied that he would not be a candidate of that party or of any other party simply because he had no desire to do so.

75. U TIN MAUNG (Burma), addressing his remarks to all the petitioners, asked them what they expected from the United Nations. He pointed out that the multi-racial group had come to ask the United Nations for its aid even though that group disagreed with the resolutions of the United Nations.

76. Mr. GONDO said that his colleague, Mr. Butler, had endeavoured to explain that the opinion of the United Nations concerning the problems of Southern Rhodesia seemed to be based on the statements of one particular party. The intention of the petitioners was to present an ideal and a method by which the question of race would be left out of consideration in order that the political problem of the Territory might be dealt with. It had seemed to them that that approach should be made known.

77. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) took note of the petitioners' replies and said that his delegation would comment on them in the general debate.

78. Mr. RIFAI (Jordan) asked Mr. Butler whether in their private lives the members of the multiracial group applied the principle of segregation or whether they lived together and sent their children to the same schools.

79. Mr. BUTLER replied that one of the petitioners had a farm on which he lived; he himself lived in a district where only Europeans had the right to maintain a fixed residence, although there were more Africans there than Whites; Mr. Burdett-Coutts also lived on his own farm. Another petitioner lived at Highfield and Mr. Gondo lived in an apartment house at Fort Victoria. All were free to meet and to assemble where they pleased.

80. Mr. RIFAI (Jordan) asked Mr. Butler for his views on the amendments to the Unlawful Organizations Act and the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act.

81. Mr. BUTLER replied that the Unlawful Organizations Act had been amended because three parties in succession had had to be banned. It had been hoped in each case that the banned party would be succeeded by an organization using more rational methods than arson, intimidation and sabotage. What had happened, however, was that although new labels had been adopted the same methods had been employed. Hence it had been found necessary to introduce restrictive measures based on the methods actually employed. As far as the new Law and Order (Maintenance) Act was concerned, he thought that it did not differ appreciably from similar legislation in force in other countries.

82. Mr. RIFAI (Jordan) asked Mr. Hlazo what he understood by a "middle-of-the-road" policy.

83. Mr. HLAZO replied that it was the policy of those who were equally far removed from both extremes; in the present instance, it meant those who were in a position half-way between the European extremists on the right and the African extremists on the left, and who were even ready to condemn Government policy if it was at variance with their principles of moderation.

84. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) said that, despite the assertion made by Mr. Hlazo, the Government was not to the right of the group to which the petitioners belonged; they represented the Government itself. Recalling Mr. Burdett-Coutts' statement that the Whites were jealous of their privileges, he asked what those privileges were.

85. Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS said that they were, for example, the privileges accorded to Europeans under the Land Apportionment Act.

86. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) asked how Mr. Burdett-Coutts felt about the distinction which was made between European children and African children in the matter of education.

87. Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS replied that the existing situation, in which European children were entitled to free education, could not last and that the Europeans would soon have to pay for their children's education, particularly at the secondary level.

88. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) said that he thought the petitioner should be able to mention other privileges enjoyed by the Whites. He asked whether the petitioner did not think that the reason why the new Constitution was so warmly supported by the Europeans was that its effect would be to safeguard the privileges they enjoyed.

89. Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS replied that the new Constitution had been accepted in a referendum in which it had been supported by a majority of two to one. He did not think that that majority had voted for the Constitution in the hope that it would perpetuate the existing state of affairs and permit the Europeans to retain power. It was his impression that the majority had felt it was voting for a Constitution which would permit the Africans eventually to take the reins of power into their own hands, without, however, indicating the pace at which the situation was to evolve.

90. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) pointed out that the Europeans who were jealous of their privileges could have voted only for a Constitution under which those privileges would be safeguarded.

91. Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS said that he could not assert that the UFP would win the elections; it was not inconceivable that victory would go to the Rhodesian Front, which could be said to represent the Europeans who really were "jealous" of their privileges. There were a number of indications, however, that it was the UFP which was likely to win and its victory should in the long run lead to the elimination of discriminatory measures and of the policy of racial segregation.

92. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) said that if that was the case it would have to be admitted that the Whites were willing to give up their privileges. He asked the petitioners whether they thought that Southern Rhodesia should become independent before the Africans won a majority in the Legislative Assembly.

93. Mr. GONDO replied that he did not think it right that Southern Rhodesia should try to obtain independence under the present Constitution. Moreover, the matter was complicated by the fact that Southern Rhodesia was still a member of the Federation.

94. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) recalled that it had been said that that Constitution would be the last before independence and that Sir Roy Welensky had stated that it would take the Africans two hundred years to win a majority in Parliament. He would like to know if

Mr. Gondo would be willing to wait two hundred years, or even twenty, for his country to gain its independence.

95. Mr. GONDO replied that even twenty years seemed to him much too long to wait. The Constitution of 1923 had probably in its time been considered the last. It had become apparent that it no longer met the requirements of the situation. The present Constitution, which was doubtless considered definitive, would probably prove not to be so. However, an interval of twenty years before the attainment of independence would be much too long and five or seven years should suffice.

96. Mr. BUTLER, replying to the same question, remarked that the United Kingdom had no written Constitution. Theory and the written word were one thing, practice was another. What counted in the present instance was the conditions in which the right to vote was granted. He did not think that there were many objections to the Constitution itself; the question was, who had and would have the right to vote and who would hold power. The Prime Minister himself had said that he expected to see an African majority in Parliament in fifteen years. His own preference would be for an interval of two years; he thought that that was feasible and it was towards that goal that his efforts were directed. Any policy which lacked the support of both the European and the African elements in the population was doomed to failure; his own party

had followers in both groups. It would be regrettable if one party, knowing that it had the support of the United Nations, were to imagine that all it had to do to win power was to assault people. If the Committee condoned such methods no good could result and that was why the petitioners had come to request its aid.

97. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) observed that he had been unable to elicit replies to his questions, which must therefore have been embarrassing.

98. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received from the Reverend Michael Scott a written statement concerning Southern Rhodesia. If there were no objections he would take it that the Committee wished that statement to be treated as a petition and circulated as such.^{2/}

It was so decided.

99. Mr. ATIDEPE (Togo) complained that the statements made by petitioners in English were being circulated without a French translation.

100. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would take note of that observations.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.

^{2/} The statement was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/564.