

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1744th
MEETING

Monday, 11 December 1967,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Requests concerning Gibraltar (agenda item 23) (concluded)</i>	433
<i>Requests concerning Equatorial Guinea (agenda item 23) (continued)</i>	433
<i>Agenda item 70:</i>	
<i>Question of Oman (concluded):</i>	
<i>(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;</i>	
<i>(b) Report of the Secretary General</i>	
<i>Draft report of the Fourth Committee</i>	433
<i>Agenda item 97:</i>	
<i>Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (continued)</i>	
<i>Statements by representatives of specialized agencies</i>	433
<i>Consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.882 and Add.1 (concluded)</i>	435
<i>Agenda item 69:</i>	
<i>Question of Fiji: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	437

Chairman: Mr. George J. TOMEH (Syria).

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING GIBRALTAR (AGENDA ITEM 23) (concluded) (A/C.4/702 AND ADD.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant the hearings requested in documents A/C.4/702 and Add.1.

It was so decided.

REQUESTS CONCERNING EQUATORIAL GUINEA (AGENDA ITEM 23) (continued)

2. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received three requests for hearings concerning Equatorial Guinea, the first from Mr. Francisco Macías Nguema, Vice-Chairman of the Consejo de Go-

bierno Autónomo and leader of the Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial MONALIGE); the second from Mr. Francisco Salomé Jones, Vice-Chairman of the Movimiento de Unión Nacional de la Guinea Ecuatorial (MUNGE), and the third from Mr. Antonino Eworo Obama, Chairman of the Idea Popular de la Guinea Ecuatorial (IPGE). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to circulate the three requests as Committee documents, in accordance with the usual practice.

It was so decided.^{1/}

AGENDA ITEM 70

Question of Oman (concluded):*

(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(b) Report of the Secretary-General

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/C.4/L.883)

3. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia), Rapporteur, introduced the Fourth Committee's draft report on the question of Oman (A/C.4/L.883) and drew attention to paragraph 10, in which the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly was reproduced.

The draft report (A/C.4/L.883) was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 97

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (continued)** (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. I, annex III, and chap. V, annex; A/6825, A/C.4/L.882 and Add.1)

STATEMENTS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

4. Mr. VARCHAVER (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that, in his statement introducing the item under discussion (1726th meeting), the representative of Bulgaria had accurately described the action undertaken by UNESCO, and particularly by its General Conference, in implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The latest resolution adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its fourteenth session, entitled

*Resumed from the 1742nd meeting.

**Resumed from the 1742nd meeting.

^{1/} The requests were subsequently circulated as documents A/C.4/695/Add.2-4.

"UNESCO's tasks in the light of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its twentieth session on questions relating to the liquidation of colonialism and racialism", was the logical continuation of earlier resolutions adopted and action undertaken during the previous six years with respect, for example, to refugees and the special educational and training programmes for South Africans, for South West Africa and for the Territories under Portuguese administration. As in the case of all UNESCO resolutions, a detailed work plan for its implementation had been elaborated, thus enabling UNESCO to contribute to the process of decolonization by helping to cultivate a sense of human dignity and equality and to develop skills for earning a living among peoples of the newly independent countries and those that had not yet attained independence. The resolution which the General Assembly would adopt in connexion with the item under consideration would, of course, be duly communicated to the governing organs of UNESCO, in accordance with article IV, paragraph 1, of the Agreement between the United Nations and UNESCO.

5. Dr. COIGNEY (World Health Organization) said that the Director-General of WHO had communicated to the World Health Assembly, at the appropriate time, the resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and the Special Committee, including resolutions 2105 (XX), 2054 (XX) and 2107 (XX), and the World Health Assembly had taken a certain number of decisions which he wished to draw to the attention of the Committee.

6. In resolution WHA 17.50, the World Health Assembly had suspended South Africa's right to vote. In resolution WHA 18.48, the World Health Assembly had adopted an amendment to the Constitution of WHO providing for the suspension or exclusion of any member State which deliberately practised a policy of racial discrimination; that amendment would only enter into force when it had been ratified by two thirds of the membership. In resolution WHA 19.31, the World Health Assembly, having considered resolution AFR/RC15/R2 adopted by the Regional Committee for Africa at its fifteenth session, had suspended Portugal's right to participate in that Committee and in regional activities until it had furnished proof of its willingness to conform to the injunctions of the United Nations; it had also suspended technical assistance to Portugal in implementation of operative paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 2107 (XX). WHO had had no direct relations with the Southern Rhodesian authorities since the unilateral declaration of independence and was no longer carrying out any projects in that country. General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) concerning South West Africa would be brought to the attention of the governing organs of WHO at their next sessions. The Director-General of WHO was ready to collaborate, as far as he could, in the implementation of the programme envisaged by the General Assembly. An agreement was at present being negotiated with the Organization of African Unity (OAU), with which WHO already had working relations. The Director-General of WHO would not fail to bring to the attention of the Executive Board of WHO and the World Health Assembly any

decisions adopted during the course of the Committee's deliberations.

7. Mr. SHAHEED (International Labour Organisation) pointed out that, under the Agreement between the United Nations and the ILO, the latter had agreed to arrange for the submission, as soon as possible, to the appropriate organ of the ILO, of all formal recommendations which the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council might make to it and, while any final decision concerning ILO action rested with its governing organs, the latter always had given, and would give, full consideration to all such recommendations. It was generally recognized that a change in the legal and political status of Non-Self-Governing Territories was essentially a political matter and therefore one for the United Nations itself to deal with. The ILO had always been prepared to supplement and assist the political actions of the United Nations within the sphere of its responsibilities and subject to its constitutional mandates, the decisions of its governing organs and the rules and regulations approved by its member States.

8. Through a number of resolutions and measures, the ILO was morally associated with the promotion of the cause of dependent peoples. The 46th session of the International Labour Conference had adopted a resolution, prompted by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), declaring that the ILO must do its utmost to further the freedom and independence of colonial peoples and to eradicate the adverse consequences of colonialism in the fields of conditions of work, standards of living, statutes and rights of workers. The 48th session of the International Labour Conference had unanimously approved measures aimed at the elimination of apartheid in labour matters in the Republic of South Africa. In November 1965, the Governing Body of the ILO had requested the Director-General to have no official or unofficial, direct or indirect, contacts with the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, and the 51st session of the International Labour Conference had approved a resolution condemning the racial discrimination in respect of employment, occupation and freedom of association practised by that régime.

9. Other ILO action had stemmed from its constitutional mandate and from its normal procedures. As long as there had been a substantial number of Non-Self-Governing Territories, the ILO had promoted improvements in the status and conditions of workers in the dependent Territories by adopting standards for such Territories and by promoting the application in Territories of standards adopted for independent States with a view to reducing the gap in standards of life and work and to raising standards in the Territories to the level necessary for independence. At the International Labour Conference a continuing dialogue was maintained with Portugal concerning its application of the Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labour.

10. At its 164th session in 1966, the Governing Body of the ILO had requested the Director-General to draw the attention of the United Kingdom Government to the desirability of making provision in the settlement of the Rhodesian problem to ensure respect for the fundamental human rights embodied in ILO

standards, including the full implementation of the Forced Labour Convention (1930) and the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention (1957), the elimination of forced labour as a means of political coercion or as a punishment for holding or expressing political or ideological views, the full and free enjoyment by employers and workers of the right to associate, organize and bargain collectively, and the abolition of all forms of racial discrimination in employment and occupation.

11. Research carried out by the ILO into standards and conditions of work in dependent Territories had resulted in the publication of such works as African Labour Survey and Labour Survey of North Africa. The ILO had in the past co-operated with the Trusteeship Council in reviewing labour and social situations, and was helping to solve the acute social problems which arose during the transition to independence. In particular, it was making a continuing contribution towards the elimination of forced labour and discrimination in employment and the promotion of freedom of association, as well as in the field of labour-management relations and worker's educational programmes.

12. Since the main source of financing for the ILO's technical co-operation activities was the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the ILO was bound to follow the rules and regulations which applied to programmes financed by UNDP, namely, that technical assistance could be provided only on the basis of a request from the Government concerned and only through the official channel designated by that Government. The technical assistance provided by the ILO under its own regular budget followed those general rules, but with a few necessary changes. For instance, a request for a project was receivable if made by a regional or other intergovernmental organization outside the framework of the United Nations, which meant that a request from the OAU was receivable. The funds available to the ILO under its regular budget were, however, extremely limited and were mainly spent in supplementing the activities in connexion with UNDP projects.

13. Mr. CONSOLO (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) said that document A/6825 accurately reported the consultations which had taken place between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of the Bank and between the Legal Counsel of the United Nations and the General Counsel of the Bank pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 2184 (XXI) and 2202 (XXI). He had nothing to add to the Bank's position as stated in the letter dated 18 August 1967 from the President of the Bank to the Secretary-General of the United Nations (A/6825, annex IV), in which he expressed the earnest desire of the Bank to co-operate with the United Nations to the extent consistent with its Articles of Agreement.

14. Mr. WOODWARD (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) assured the Committee that FAO had a keen interest in the actions and pronouncements of the General Assembly concerning decolonization and was ready at all times to co-operate in considering requests which might be addressed to the specialized agencies, although action in specific

cases was dependent upon whether they fell within the functions and capacities of FAO and within the programme of work established by its governing bodies. Since the FAO Conference consisted of 116 member States, representing almost the same membership as the General Assembly of the United Nations, it was reasonable to conclude that, as practicable and appropriate within its specialized field, the FAO Conference would establish policy guidelines broadly similar to those established by the General Assembly.

15. The World Food Programme, which was a joint endeavour of the United Nations and FAO, had given food aid to a number of refugees in various places. FAO's activities were mainly directed towards technical assistance to developing countries, including those emerging from colonialism, and FAO was the major participating and executing agency for UNDP.

16. He assured the Committee that all resolutions of the General Assembly were given careful attention by FAO and that, if there were any questions which specifically called for a reply from FAO within its field of competence, he would refer them to his organization.

17. Mr. KARASIMEONOV (Bulgaria) thanked the representatives of the specialized agencies for their statements, which indicated the desire of their agencies to make a greater contribution towards decolonization. The recommendations which it was proposed in draft resolution A/C.4/L.882 and Add.1 should be addressed by the General Assembly to the specialized agencies would help the latter in their useful work and in bringing their activities in the field of decolonization into harmony with those of the United Nations. The suggestions made and the information provided during the debate would enable the Economic and Social Council, the various specialized agencies and international institutions, the Special Committee and Member States to consider specific measures designed to promote the effective implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.4/L.882 AND ADD.1 (concluded)

18. Mr. GUSTAFSON (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote, said that it was of great importance that, within the framework of the United Nations Charter and the rules governing the various agencies and institutions, the whole United Nations family should contribute towards the attainment of the goals of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The implementation of Articles 58, 63 and 64 of the Charter, however, gave rise to legal and administrative problems which had not been solved. No studies similar to the report on consultations with IBRD (A/6825) had been made regarding the other agencies and institutions. The Enlarged Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would study some of the problems that had been raised, and his delegation did not wish to take a definitive stand on the questions dealt with in draft resolution A/C.4/L.882 and Add.1 until the result of that and other studies was available. Although it sympathized with much of the draft resolution, it would, therefore, abstain in the vote.

19. Mr. PRETORIUS (South Africa) said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.882 and Add.1 virtually directed the General Assembly to compel the specialized agencies to take political considerations, rather than technical criteria, into account in deciding on requests for technical assistance. That would undermine the whole technical structure of their operations. The specialized agencies, and in particular IBRD, were being invited, in some instances, to act in violation of their constitutions or statutes. South Africa refused to be a party to such a procedure. The sponsors of the draft resolution appeared to have forgotten the words of the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report for 1964-1965,^{2/} in which he had said that political issues must not be allowed to distract Member States from their specific duty to respect the Charter, the conventions and the constitutional procedures of the agencies, or from their general obligation to safeguard, in the common interest, the future of international order. South Africa was fortunate enough to be able not only to provide for its own needs but to offer assistance to others; it was a donor, not a recipient, of technical assistance. If, however, the specialized agencies were to be exploited in the furtherance of political objectives, other States which were not as fortunate as South Africa might one day suffer. His delegation had no option but to oppose the draft resolution.

20. Mr. MARTINEZ (Argentina) said that he was glad to see that the draft resolution reflected the ideas outlined by his delegation during the debate. The fourth preambular paragraph recognized the importance of the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies which conferred reciprocal rights and obligations, and the sixth preambular paragraph described the humanitarian character of the assistance which might be given to those directly affected by the action of the colonial Powers. Operative paragraphs 1, 5 and 7 met the general requirements proposed in his delegation's statement and operative paragraph 6 should be understood in the context of the institutional hierarchy which existed within the United Nations. His delegation, however, could not support the provisions of operative paragraph 3, which it considered too restrictive, or of operative paragraph 4, which contained elements that might have the opposite effect to that sought. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, but requested a separate vote on paragraphs 3 and 4, on which it would abstain.

21. Mr. COLLAS (Greece) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, which was directed towards the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in which it was right that the whole of the United Nations family should participate. His delegation had some reservations concerning operative paragraphs 3 and 4 and would abstain in a separate vote on those paragraphs, since they raised a number of legal, administrative and other problems which had not yet been solved satisfactorily.

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 1A, p. 2.

At the request of the representative of Portugal, the vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.882 and Add.1 was taken by roll-call.

Afghanistan, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Brazil, Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 68 votes to 7, with 23 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Portugal, the vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.882 and Add.1 was taken by roll-call.

Malaysia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar.

Against: Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Brazil, Malawi.

Abstaining: Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Japan.

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 68 votes to 7, with 25 abstentions.

The vote on the draft resolution as a whole was taken by roll-call.

Guatemala, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Iceland, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.882 and Add.1 as a whole was adopted by 83 votes to 2, with 17 abstentions.

22. Mr. GARCIA (United States of America) said that the United States had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because, although sharing some of the general objectives of the sponsors, it had serious reservations regarding several features of the text; in particular, it strongly opposed operative paragraphs 3 and 4, considering that they contained provisions which were inconsistent not only with many of the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies but with the basic instruments governing the activities of several agencies.

23. Mr. KANNANGARA (Ceylon) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole and of operative paragraphs 3 and 4 individually. It regarded the resolution as consisting of statements on questions of principle providing guidelines for the consideration of the specialized agencies alongside their respective basic instruments. In its view, the resolution could not be regarded as giving directives or making requests in the nature of directives to the specialized agencies, and certainly not directives to them to violate their basic instruments. The reasons for Ceylon's position had been set forth in his earlier statements.

24. Mr. PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 3. It would have found it possible to support such a provision only if it had been explicitly stated that the paragraph must be read in the light of the sixth preambular paragraph. With regard to operative paragraph 4, on which Mexico had also abstained, he wished to recall, without entering into a discussion

of the relationships between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, that his delegation had drawn attention at the 1492nd plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 13 December 1966 to the arguments against the Assembly's opposing outright all kinds of assistance to a particular country. On the other hand, in view of the clear anti-colonialist intention of the resolution, it had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

25. Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole but abstained in the separate votes on the two paragraphs. It could not endorse operative paragraph 3 because, while it agreed in general with the aims of that paragraph, it would have preferred a clearer formulation more in conformity with the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. With regard to operative paragraph 4, Venezuela had stated its position on such recommendations on several occasions and still doubted whether it was advisable for the specialized agencies to take political factors into account in their decisions. His delegation's inability to support those two paragraphs should not be interpreted as indicating any support for the policies of Portugal, South Africa and the Southern Rhodesian régime, policies which it categorically condemned.

26. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole as a reaffirmation of the basic principles of decolonization. His delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraphs 3 and 4, which seemed to add nothing to the aims of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the resolutions referred to in the fifth preambular paragraph.

27. Mr. TEVOEDJRE (Dahomey) said that as a sponsor of the draft resolution his delegation did not need to explain its vote. He wished to say, however, that it had joined in sponsoring operative paragraphs 3 and 4 because it considered that principles which were enunciated must be given practical effect; his delegation hoped that the specialized agencies would take speedy action to bring effective assistance to refugees from the colonial Territories in Africa, and to put pressure on Portugal and South Africa to desist from policies which had been universally condemned. His delegation would continue the battle in the governing bodies of the specialized agencies.

28. Mr. BISWAS (Pakistan) said that his delegation, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, would naturally have voted in favour if it had been present at the time of the vote.

AGENDA ITEM 69

Question of Fiji: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*)* (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. VII)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

29. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand) said that the sentiments embodied and the principles enunciated in

*Resumed from the 1742nd meeting.

General Assembly resolution 2185 (XXI) and the Special Committee's resolution of 15 September 1967 (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. VII, para. 101) seemed unexceptionable at first sight and that the pattern proposed in those resolutions for political development appeared attractive in its simplicity. New Zealand was certainly not opposed to independence, to "one man, one vote", to equality and racial harmony. But it had voted against Assembly resolution 2185 (XXI). It had done so because of its fundamental objection to the time-table laid down for achieving the resolution's aims and for carrying out the programme envisaged in operative paragraph 4. The evidence available to New Zealand as a neighbour of Fiji did not suggest that the majority of the people of Fiji favoured the kind of hasty time-table laid down in that resolution; the evidence was, in fact, that they were opposed to it at the present juncture.

30. The principle that the wishes of the people of a Territory should be decisive had been a consistent theme in the Committee's debates. There was plenty of evidence available regarding the attitude of the majority of Fijians—and by "Fijians" he meant all the people of Fiji—towards the key questions raised in operative paragraph 4 (a) and (b) of resolution 2185 (XXI). Independence had not been an issue at the Constitutional Conference of July/August 1965. None of the representatives at the Conference had seemed to feel that their constituents were pressing for early independence; one group had favoured "full internal self-government" while the remainder had favoured "further progress... in the direction of internal self-government". On the voting issue, there had been common agreement at the Conference that election on the basis of a common roll was a desirable long-term objective, but in the short run the two main groups had favoured two differing formulæ involving communal rolls and cross-voting. No compromise being reached between those formulæ, the Indo-Fijian representatives, with one of their number dissenting, had reverted to the call for a common roll and single-member constituencies.

31. None of the major political parties which had contested the general election in 1966 had advocated immediate or even early independence for Fiji, although one party had seen independence as an ultimate objective. Presumably the leaders of all parties considered that to advocate immediate independence for Fiji would not be in the best interests of the Territory at the moment. In the election, a fairly decisive victory had gone to the Alliance, a party which clearly did not seek independence or favour a common-roll system of voting at the present stage. The Alliance, the party which laid emphasis on multi-racialism, had secured twenty-two of the thirty-six seats contested, its successful candidates including representatives of all ethnic groups. The leader of the Alliance, Mr. Ratu Mara, had formed a multi-racial Government following the elections and was now Chief Minister. That respected leader had publicly stated that his Government was not seeking independence, but was committed to "a steady, orderly development of internal self-government". It was inconsistent to praise the Chief Minister's progressive leadership and at the same time disregard his words and his policies.

32. Thus the evidence indicated that the time-table envisaged in resolution 2185 (XXI) would not attract the support of a majority, or even a significant minority, of the people of Fiji at the present moment. If the attitude of the people changed, New Zealand would modify its position; that was in keeping with paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which spoke of the transfer of powers to the people "in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire".

33. One reason for the attitude of the leaders of the Fijian people was apparently the view that a greater degree of economic independence was desirable as an accompaniment to political independence. The main factor slowing down constitutional advance seemed, however, to be the absence of a real accommodation between the two main ethnic groups. In the absence of such an accommodation, the indigenous Fijians did not seem to be prepared to accept the apparent risks to them involved in a "one man, one vote" system and in independence under such a system. For that reason they were prepared to accept what they seemed to regard as the balancing element in the equation: the continued presence of the administering Power. It might be surmised that those Indo-Fijians who also viewed an early move to independence with reluctance felt that such a development might disrupt the current stability and economic growth in Fiji.

34. The foundation for a lasting accommodation between the ethnic groups was now, however, being laid. A growth in co-operation between the races at the national level was being paralleled, according to observers, in a general improvement in relations at the personal level. But it did not follow that it would be wise to demand the abolition without delay of what had been called discriminatory measures. That expression presumably covered the provision in the Constitution for two members of the Legislative Council to be elected by the Council of Chiefs—and indigenous institution—and the law which had ensured that most of the land of Fiji remained in the hands of the indigenous people. Although further adjustments would clearly have to be made in those fields, it might be said that the policy of emphasizing the paramountcy of the interests of the indigenous people contrasted favourably with the situation in some other Territories. Facile comparisons with the situation in places such as Southern Rhodesia should not be accepted. The discriminatory measures in Fiji had been mainly designed to protect the indigenous inhabitants, not an expatriate minority, and, though changes dictated by the new population balance were necessary, progress must not be over-hasty. The habits of co-operation and mutual trust on which racial accommodation would be established could not be forced. Representatives of the two main ethnic groups were now in firm control of the Legislative Council and they would certainly not allow themselves to be dominated by the small community of Fijians of European extraction. The latter group were obviously over-represented in the legislature at present, but that was a transitional situation.

35. He wished to conclude by respectfully suggesting to those who might be considering the introduction of a draft resolution on the lines of that adopted at the previous session that they should give the matter fur-

ther thought. At the previous session, numerous delegations had spoken of the need for closer study of the situation before firm judgements could be made and a detailed programme recommended. When the administering Power, as was within its rights, had declared itself unwilling to allow a visiting mission, the Committee had reacted by making just such firm judgements and adopting just such a detailed programme. His delegation realized that the Committee would have liked, at the current session, to be able to study the situation in Fiji in the light of a report from a visiting mission. There was, however, no such report and, in the interests of the Fijian peoples, the Committee should not succumb to the temptation to endorse a time-table for self-determination which was known in advance to be unacceptable to the Fijians and which might thus give Fijian leaders the impression that the United Nations regarded their views as irrelevant. One result of the attitude taken by the Committee at the previous session had been that opinion in the Territory itself had hardened against the acceptance of a United Nations mission, since it had been argued that any such mission would operate on the basis of the restrictive mandate set out in resolution 2185 (XXI), incorporating as that text did a number of prejudgements on controversial issues. His delegation would hope that the mistake of the previous year would not be repeated. It was confident about the outcome of the programmes of political and social advance which the Fijians themselves had freely chosen.

36. Mr. ADEGOROYE (Nigeria) said that his delegation's attitude to the question of Fiji reflected Nigeria's policy of support for all colonial peoples struggling for freedom. The United Kingdom representative had spoken of differences between the ethnic groups in Fiji which made the attainment of independence within the foreseeable future a problem. In operative paragraph 2 of resolution 1951 (XVIII), the General Assembly had invited the administering Power to work out with representatives of the people of Fiji a new constitution providing for elections on the basis "one man, one vote" and the creation of representative institutions, to take immediate steps for the transfer of all power to the people, and to endeavour to achieve the integration of the various communities. It seemed to his delegation that the provisions of that resolution had constituted a sufficiently broad framework for the administering Power in its efforts to assist the people towards self-determination and independence. The recommendations of the 1965 Constitutional Conference had fallen far short of the provisions of that resolution. About the only positive achievement of the Conference had been the provision for an elected majority in the Legislative Council and universal adult suffrage. Since Fiji had been a United Kingdom colony for over ninety years, it might be asked why it had taken the administering Power so long to convene a constitutional conference; the fact that it had been finally convened soon after the adoption of resolution 1951 (XVIII) suggested that the involvement of the United Nations had had a salutary effect on the administering Power.

37. His delegation did not find merit in a complicated voting system based on racial or communal differences. The system was reminiscent of the discredited Southern Rhodesian Constitution of 1961. In both

constitutions, the European minority had a disproportionately high representation. The position of the Indian community in Fiji deserved some consideration. Although it was claimed by the administering Power that the Indians had preserved links with friends and relatives in India, others disputed that fact. The United Nations would wish to be assured that the present tripartite system of representation did not reflect a policy of "divide and rule".

38. Much had been said about the success of the voting system as far as the cross-voting arrangements were concerned. It might also be mentioned that, as far back as 1929, elections to the municipality in Suva had taken place successfully on a common roll. Those facts pointed to the desirability of introducing a common-roll system throughout the Territory. He failed to see why more time should be asked, since circumstances were now favourable to the introduction of such a system.

39. With regard to the powers of the Legislative Council under the Constitution, those powers were so circumscribed by the Colonial Laws Validity Act of 1865, by the veto power of the Governor and by other provisions as to make the Council virtually impotent. The Governor had exclusive power over external affairs, defence, internal security and the public services and had wide discretionary powers to veto bills which he considered contrary to the interests of public order, public faith and good government.

40. In a colonial situation which had been aptly described by the administering Power as unique, the United Nations would be discharging its obligations properly only by requesting an appropriate organ to study the situation on the spot. Such a study would help and not hinder the process of decolonization. His delegation could not accept the United Kingdom's view that such a visit would serve no useful purpose. The United Kingdom representative had argued that the leader of the majority party in Fiji was opposed to such a visit, but Fiji was still a dependent Territory and more evidence would be needed to convince the United Nations that the Fijians, and not the United Kingdom Government, rejected the mission. Nigeria appealed to the United Kingdom to review its position and facilitate the work of the Sub-Committee which had been established. The recent visit of a United Nations mission to Aden should show that visiting missions were not necessarily objectionable.

41. It was his understanding that the deed by which Fiji had been ceded to the United Kingdom by the chiefs in 1874 had included a clause requiring the United Kingdom to return the Territory to the chiefs. His delegation would like the United Kingdom to state categorically into whose hands it intended to transfer power upon independence.

42. It was not a fact that none of the political parties in Fiji were anxious for discussion relating to independence. The Federation Party advocated early independence and he was certain that if the United Kingdom fixed a target date for independence the people would sink their differences and work together towards that goal.

43. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) said that while decolonization seemed to be accepted by all as the ultimate

goal there was a diversity of views on the course to be followed to achieve that goal. Some argued that the delicately balanced communal situation in Fiji called for a realistic and patient approach. Others, appealing to principles, asked that Fijians should be granted the right to freedom immediately. His delegation considered that it was the Fijians themselves who must decide their future status. No one had put forward any arguments justifying the denial of the right of the people of Fiji to determine their own future and no one had challenged their political maturity. The administering Power had declared that it was ready to discuss what should be done if and when the people of Fiji signified their desire for further constitutional change. The right course would seem to be to consult the people as a whole and abide by their decision. In such consultation, the will of each inhabitant should carry the same weight, whatever his origin, and no one should have a privileged vote. There must be equality of rights, in accordance with Article 1, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Charter. The will of the people could be ascertained only on the basis of the majority principle.

44. It had been suggested that, owing to the existence of communities in Fiji with different cultures, languages and ways of life, a common electoral roll would not have beneficial effects. He must take issue with that line of reasoning. The policy of segregation and division had brought harm to many peoples. To treat two different communities living in the same Territory as national entities was tantamount to dual self-determination. It was clear from the records of the proceedings of the San Francisco Conference that the framers of the Charter had understood the principle of self-determination as applying to a single people in a given area. There were no grounds in the Charter for the recognition of "communities". As Professor Bourguin had pointed out, any other interpretation would be dangerous since the population of States was not homogeneous and the principle of self-determination could be used to disrupt the unity of States.

45. His delegation maintained that the principle of self-determination should be applied in Fiji on the basis of universal adult suffrage and it could not agree that the application of the principle should be postponed.

46. The Constitution of Fiji contained provisions specifically classifying the people according to ethnic origin; such provisions could hardly be regarded as contributing towards the unity of the Territory. It was only in unity that the people could prosper and rid themselves of foreign divisive influences. Segregation and communal strife might often serve foreign interests, but they were never in the interests of the people of the country concerned, as Cyprus was in a position to know.

47. The Cypriot delegation held that United Nations resolutions must be implemented in all circumstances. It would encourage a crisis of confidence in the United Nations if it was accepted that Members were free to implement some resolutions and ignore others.

48. Mr. COLERIDGE-TAYLOR (Sierra Leone) said that two main questions had emerged during the Committee's discussion of Fiji and it was the Committee's answers to those questions that would determine the

extent to which all those concerned could work together for the decolonization of the Territory.

49. The first consideration was whether Fiji was a colonial Territory to which the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) were fully applicable. To that question there was a unanimous and positive response. Fiji was, first and foremost, a colonial Territory and the immediate task of the Committee was to work for its decolonization.

50. The second question was whether there were any special problems so difficult as to require suspension of resolution 1514 (XV) until they had been solved. To that question the approaches had been divergent and apparently irreconcilable. On the one hand, it had been argued by the administering Power that the absence of communal co-operation and harmony was sufficient justification for disregarding the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee and delaying independence. On the other hand, it had been argued that, whatever problems might exist, they should have no bearing on the issue of self-determination and independence.

51. In that dispute, neither side could be wholly correct. While the administering Power was undoubtedly correct in emphasizing the serious problems of disunity and the importance of overcoming it, his delegation could not agree that that premise justified the conclusion that resolution 1514 (XV) should be suspended in the case of Fiji. There were bound to be innumerable difficulties in uniting peoples of various backgrounds spread over 844 islands scattered over several hundred miles of ocean. In addition, the rate at which the people were being prepared for independence was open to question. It was true that a new Constitution was in operation and that the Council of Ministers was representative of the various ethnic groups constituting the Territory's population, but it would seem that the Legislative Council was unnecessarily restricted and rendered almost ineffectual by the inordinate residual authority of the Governor, who was empowered to refuse assent, to reserve legislation, and to ensure that bills were passed by certification. As the representative of the Crown, he retained the power to revise or amend the Constitution and to make other laws for Fiji by Order in Council. The Governor was even empowered to dissolve the Legislative Council at his discretion.

52. His delegation considered that the authority and responsibilities of the Council of Ministers should be enlarged if the appointed leaders were to acquire the necessary practice in government.

53. With a population so evenly divided it was inevitable that there should be some racial unease and in the circumstances any remedial action or any progress in that direction was welcome. His delegation therefore congratulated Mr. Ratu Mara, the new Chief Minister, on having appointed members of the various communities to his first Council of Ministers and nominated a member of the opposition Federation Party as Deputy Speaker. The administering Power also had some responsibility in that regard and since Fiji was not the first colonial Territory with that type of problem, the administering Power could be guided by its own experience.

54. The United Nations could help in the process of establishing harmony and expediting the decolonization of the Territory. In his delegation's view, General Assembly resolution 2185 (XXI), which had endorsed the Special Committee's decision to appoint a Sub-Committee to visit Fiji, was a step in that direction. Not only would the Sub-Committee have obtained first-hand information on the Territory but it would have been in a position to offer suggestions for a solution to the many problems facing the Territory. It was a matter for regret that the administering Power had once again refused to welcome a visiting mission from the Special Committee.

55. The measures recommended to the administering Power in operative paragraph 4 of resolution 2185 (XXI) were valid and comprehensive enough to serve as a basis for the speedy implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). It was that paragraph, in particular, that had prompted his delegation to co-sponsor the original draft resolution and it hoped that at the current session the Committee would adopt a resolution that would be equally comprehensive. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the Special Committee's resolution of 15 September 1967 (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. VII, para. 101) because operative paragraph 2 had embodied only two elements of operative paragraph 4 of resolution 2185 (XXI).

56. His delegation's aim continued to be the immediate decolonization of Fiji and it urged the administering Power to speed up that process in every possible way.

57. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) said that the special circumstances dominating the political and constitutional life of Fiji were the presence of several communities which were racially and culturally diverse. Two large communities of almost equal numbers, the indigenous Fijians and the Fijians of Indian descent, constituted the majority of the population. His delegation recognized that the Fijians as a whole wished to build a unified and multiracial nation. The Indo-Fijians had come to the Territory in peace and had so far lived with the other Fijians in peace. They were not seeking to establish political control over other Fijians or to create an exclusive and dominant State of their own. They were not agents of an alien Power, but an important and progressive element in the country, for which they sought independence and freedom in a united multiracial State, as did all loyal Fijians.

58. The people of Fiji believed that they could preserve unity and diversity and could channel diversity into unity. They had already matched their words with deeds and were to be commended for the political acumen they had demonstrated: first, in the organization of the new parties which had emerged and had obtained support for their policies on a nation-wide basis rather than on purely communal lines; secondly, in their unanimous adoption of the progressive Agricultural Landlord and Tenant Ordinance; and thirdly, in the nomination by the Chief Minister of Indo-Fijians to the Executive Council. The people of Fiji had embarked on a path free from racial hatred and racial conflicts and it remained for the administering Power to help and encourage them to continue along that path.

59. Concern about the racial constitution of Fiji and the future of the community should not be used to further the interests of one community over the others.

Yet the racial system was weighted heavily in favour of the Europeans, who numbered less than 5 per cent of the population. Out of thirty-six elected members of the Legislative Council, Europeans held ten seats as against twelve for the Fijians of Indian origin, who constituted about 51 per cent of the population, and fourteen for the indigenous Fijians, who constituted 41 per cent. Europeans occupied four of the eight seats in the Council of Ministers. There was no denying that the share of power retained by the European community was disproportionate and unjust.

60. His delegation shared the regret expressed by the Philippine representative that no representatives of the Fijian people had appeared before the Committee and hoped that their absence was not due to any pressure or to lack of faith in the United Nations. That made it all the more important that a United Nations mission should visit Fiji. In keeping with its consistent policy that the United Nations role in the process of decolonization was paramount, his country considered that a visit by a United Nations mission to the Territory would help the Organization to arrive at a just solution of the problem. If the administering Power had nothing to conceal, it should allow a mission to visit the Territory.

61. Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) said that the special circumstances of Fiji should not be regarded as an obstacle to the application of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) or as justification for delaying the exercise of the right to self-determination and independence.

62. The Venezuelan delegation agreed with the representative of the administering Power that the presence of diverse communities in the Territory created special problems. It did not agree, however, with that representative's statement that the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee on the Territory had failed to take into account many of the complexities of the problem of Fiji. The recommendations adopted by those two bodies were evidence of their awareness of the problems. In resolution 2185 (XXI), the General Assembly, in addition to reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Fiji to freedom and independence and expressing regret that the administering Power had not yet taken effective measures to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee, had endorsed the Special Committee's decision to appoint a sub-committee to visit the Territory for the purpose of studying at first hand the situation in the Territory. In operative paragraph 4, the Assembly had called upon the United Kingdom to hold general elections in accordance with the principle of "one man, one vote" for the purpose of forming a constituent assembly to draw up a democratic constitution and form a representative government and transfer full powers to that government. It had also called for the abolishing of all discriminatory measures so as to foster communal harmony and national unity in the Territory. In general, the Special Committee had repeated those recommendations in its resolution of 15 September 1967 and had addressed an urgent appeal to the administering Power to reconsider its negative decision concerning the visit of the Sub-Committee to the Territory.

63. His delegation therefore considered that there was no justification for the United Kingdom representative's statement, which had merely sought to make the United Nations responsible for a situation that was the result of the United Kingdom's colonial policy. The United Kingdom had chosen to ignore the recommendations of the General Assembly and the Special Committee. It had done nothing to promote racial and cultural harmony or to encourage the development of a feeling of national unity. It was clear that much of the responsibility for the problem facing the Territory lay with the United Kingdom. He wondered how the administering Power could justify the survival of the anachronistic electoral system and the absence of the principle of "one man, one vote", or explain the fact that the executive and legislative bodies were virtually dominated by persons representing a minority of less than 5 per cent of the population. The United Kingdom had refused to allow the Sub-Committee to visit Fiji for the purpose of obtaining information that might enable the Committee to assist the people of the Territory. It was regrettable that that lack of co-operation was preventing the United Nations from helping to solve the problems of the people in their efforts to achieve freedom and independence. Much useless shedding of blood would have been avoided in many Territories if the administering Powers concerned had accepted the co-operation which the United Nations had offered them.

64. According to the Special Committee's report (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. VII, para. 6), defence, external affairs, internal security and the public service, *inter alia*, were reserved to the Governor at his discretion. He appointed the non-official members of the Executive Council and was required to reserve certain kinds of bills which appeared to him to affect the Royal Prerogative or purported to amend the Constitution. The Governor was also empowered to dissolve the Legislative Council. It was clear that the administering Power had not fulfilled the provisions of the resolutions of the Special Committee and the General Assembly. The present electoral system in Fiji could not produce communal harmony and national unity in the Territory.

65. The wages paid to workers in the Territory were extremely low. With regard to education, he welcomed the recommendation for the establishment of a University of Fiji which would serve the interests of the whole of the South Pacific region.

66. In conclusion, he said that his delegation would spare no effort to lead the people of the Territory to freedom and independence. It asked the administering Power to understand that it was Venezuela's sincere desire to unite the people of Fiji in the supreme objective of freedom and independence.

67. Mr. ABDEL-WAHAB (United Arab Republic) said that in resolution 2185 (XXI) the General Assembly had called upon the United Kingdom Government to fix an early date for the independence of Fiji and to take certain measures to speed up the attainment of independence by the people of the Territory in peace and in harmony. None of those measures had been implemented thus far by the administering Power. In an attempt to justify that attitude, the United Kingdom representative had told the Committee that the General

Assembly had failed to take account of many of the complexities of the problems of Fiji or even to acknowledge their existence. It was ironical that that delegation should make such a statement in view of the fact that the United Kingdom had refused to allow a Sub-Committee to visit the Territory in order to study the situation there at first hand. The United Kingdom wanted neither to allow a visiting mission to investigate the situation nor to accept the General Assembly's conclusions, which was based on the available information.

68. Fiji, like any other colonial Territory, might be faced with certain problems, which were the result of colonial policy. The United Nations might differ with the administering Power in the assessment of those problems and their effect on the process of decolonization, but all parties should agree that the people would be better able to solve their problems if they were left alone.

69. The Committee had been told that the special circumstances of Fiji which dominated the political and constitutional life of the Territory were the presence of several communities which were racially, culturally and, to some extent, economically and geographically diverse. Such a statement was familiar to anyone with a knowledge of United Kingdom colonial policy. The Committee had been told of the effect of the differences between the two main communities in the Territory on the process of decolonization, but it had been told nothing about the European community. The Europeans, who constituted less than 5 per cent of the population, had ten seats in the Legislative Council, whereas the two main communities, who represented 91 per cent, had twenty-four seats. Four of the eight seats in the Council of Ministers were held by Europeans. The Committee had been told that the establishment of a common roll for the two main communities would accentuate racial divisions. His delegation considered, on the contrary, that the political separation of the population along ethnic lines would widen rather than narrow the gap. The success of the cross-voting system was eloquent proof that a common roll was not difficult to achieve and would help to create harmony among the various communities. The people of Fiji had expressed their determination, through their leaders, to create one nation and to live in harmony in a multiracial society. The United Kingdom Government should therefore implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Special Committee without delay and thus enable the people of Fiji to attain independence in peace and harmony.

70. His delegation would heed the appeal made by the New Zealand representative, provided that that representative could persuade the United Kingdom Government to accept the visit of a United Nations mission to Fiji.

71. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syria) said that the key element in the question of Fiji was the need to mould the ethnically diverse inhabitants of the Territory into a single, united community. Indeed, a united community would be better able to face the challenge of sovereign and independent statehood. The representatives of the administering Power had claimed that that was its goal. In the last analysis, however, what mattered most was the way in which that goal was attained. The insti-

tutions established by the administering Power in Fiji to carry out the process of decolonization discharged what could be called legislative and executive functions. It should be noted, however, that the machinery for electing the indigenous representatives to those institutions was cumbersome and complex. The administering Power claimed that the purpose of such a complex procedure was to ensure a certain desirable balance. He wondered whether that balance was one of ethnic interests. It was a fact, however, that originally valid ethnic considerations had now given way to loyalty to Fiji and to the Territory's future, and the creation of such artificial concepts as a balance of interests was likely to produce results contrary to the goal of unity. He wondered whether the administering Power was seeking equal rights or divided loyalties and whether it was concerned for the culture and traditions of the various communities or merely interested in consolidating the privileged position of a tiny minority. The Legislative Council functioned under the heavy handicap of knowing that any decision it took could be overruled by the Governor. It could not introduce certain bills without the consent of the Governor, and other restrictions were imposed by the Colonial Laws Validity Act, 1865, and by the provisions of the Constitution itself.

72. In the Executive Council, the number of ministers representing the Fijians was smaller than that representing the European minority. That was bound to lead to disunity and conflict. Moreover, the Governor was empowered to act against the advice of the Executive Council in the interests of public order, public faith or good government. The administering Power would of course reply that the Governor's powers were constitutional, but the Committee's concern was to accelerate the process of decolonization.

73. In conclusion, he appealed to the administering Power to reconsider its negative attitude regarding the visit by a United Nations mission to the Territory.

74. Mr. DEBRAH (Ghana) recalled that in 1963 and 1964 the Special Committee had adopted resolutions on Fiji^{3/} in which it had correctly reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the Territory to independence. In resolution 2185 (XXI) the General Assembly had expressed its regret that the administering Power had not yet taken effective measures to implement the various resolutions on the Territory. The United Kingdom had told the Special Committee that everything was being done to accelerate the constitutional development of the Territory. When the General Assembly had endorsed the Special Committee's decision to appoint a sub-committee to visit Fiji, the United Kingdom representative had said that his Government did not agree that any useful purpose could be served by such a visit, that that view was shared by the leader of the majority party and that the people of Fiji had the right to expect the Special Committee to show understanding, patience and forbearance.

75. The Ghanaian delegation would submit that the Special Committee would be greatly assisted in its

^{3/} Ibid., Eighteenth Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23, document A/5446/Rev. I, chap. VII, para. 165; *ibid.*, Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex No. 8 (part I), document A/5800/Rev. I, chap. XIII, para. 119.

search for a full understanding of the problems of Fiji and show the necessary forbearance if it had the opportunity to visit the Territory and study the problems on the spot. The Special Committee's decision that the sub-committee should be appointed by the Chairman in consultation with the administering Power was designed to assure the United Kingdom that the mission would be guided by the principles set forth in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). A visit would provide an opportunity for the Government of Fiji, the administering Power and the political leaders of the Territory to state their views on Fiji's constitutional advance, the applicability of the principles of resolution 1514 (XV) to the Territory, and whether they considered their march to independence to be consistent and unimpeded. His delegation had no doubt that the Sub-Committee would faithfully report its findings to the Special Committee, which would in turn inform the Fourth Committee of its deliberations. Any Fijians who felt that justice had not been done to them by the Special Committee would have an opportunity to appear before the Fourth Committee as petitioners. The Fourth Committee would thus be able to adopt resolutions which would enable the people of Fiji to determine their future as they saw fit.

76. The United Kingdom Government might feel that its approach to the problem of Fiji was the correct and just one, but it should admit that the objective views of independent observers could prove helpful inasmuch as the problems had not been fully solved. It was in that spirit that his delegation appealed to the administering Power to explain to the Government of Fiji that the visit was meant to pursue Fijian interests. His delegation was anxious that any measures proposed for the future of Fiji would lay the foundations for a society in which all its peoples would have equal rights, opportunities and duties before the law. The constitutional procedures which were worthy of merit were those which would help to weld the people of Fiji into one nation.

77. His delegation recognized that in the drafting of a constitution the political, social and cultural peculiarities of the country concerned should be taken into account. The Committee had been told that the special circumstances in Fiji were the presence of several communities which were racially, culturally and to some extent economically and geographically divergent, and that each community had been apprehensive lest the other should secure a dominant position in the life of the country. If that was true, it would appear that one of the urgent problems was to find a framework in which those people of different races, proud of their distinct cultural heritage and way of life, could live together in peace, friendship and co-operation. His delegation's recognition of the problem did not mean that it considered that the proposals designed to solve them were adequate and that the constitutional measures now in force were satisfactory. His delegation might have given consideration to the United Kingdom delegation's statement that the people of Fiji should be given time to grow accustomed to their new constitutional amendments and to political parties with a multi-communal or non-communal approach, had it not been apprehensive that the statement could be used as a pretext

for delaying independence indefinitely or even delaying the time when the ultimate decision of self-determination would be taken by the people of Fiji.

78. His delegation welcomed the hopeful signs that had emerged from the last elections in the Territory. They had shown that, in spite of the fact that the new proposals had been put into practice less than a year after the Constitutional Conference, its effect had been to set in motion the process of achieving the kind of racial understanding which was sought for the Territory. Although the elections had not solved all problems concerning communal relations, they had revealed that constitutional advance should not necessarily be dependent upon a full integration of the races. The people of Fiji were doubtless aware that racial disharmony and strife were not in their interest and that they would build a safer and better home for themselves and their children if they lived in harmony. He had noted the encouraging statements made in that regard by the leader of the opposition Federation Party and by the Chief Minister.

79. Although the present Constitution might be an advance on the previous one, he could not fail to remark that the distribution of seats in the Legislative Council was over-weighted in favour of those who were neither of native nor of Indian origin. That was an anomaly which led to resentment, did not en-

hance racial harmony, and called for immediate correction.

80. Given the kind of leadership now available in Fiji, his delegation considered that greater powers should be transferred from the Governor to the Chief Minister and to a more indigenous Cabinet. Mr. Ratu Mara, the Chief Minister, had already proved himself to be a progressive leader who was sincerely tackling the task of building his country as a truly multiracial society. His delegation was confident that the Fijian authorities were aware of the fact that the sooner they assumed full responsibility for the management of their own affairs, the sooner would they become accustomed to the practice of self-government.

81. Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said, in reference to the remarks of the United Arab Republic representative, that he saw little purpose in trying to persuade the United Kingdom Government to accept a visiting mission to Fiji, since that Government had made its attitude quite clear in that regard. Moreover, it was hardly logical, simply because the United Kingdom would not agree to receive a visiting mission, to proceed to recommend a time-table which was known to be unacceptable to the people of the Territory.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.