



UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/7200/Add.7*
31 October 1968

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twenty-third session
Agenda items 66 and 23

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

(covering its work during 1968)

Rapporteur: Mr. Abdul Samad GHAAUS (Afghanistan)

CHAPTER XVI

FIJI

1. At its 594th meeting on 1 April 1968, the Special Committee, by approving the thirty-fourth report of the Working Group (A/AC.109/L.454/Rev.1), decided to consider the question of Fiji at its plenary meetings, it being understood that the Sub-Committee on Fiji, which it had established during September 1967 in accordance with its resolution of 7 September 1966^{1/} and General Assembly resolution 2185 (XXI) of 12 December 1966 "to visit Fiji for the purpose of studying the situation at first hand and to report" would continue its work.
2. The Special Committee considered this question at its 643rd meeting, on 14 October.
3. In its consideration of the question the Special Committee had before it a working paper prepared by the Secretariat (see annex I) containing information on action previously taken by the Special Committee as well as by the General Assembly, and on the latest developments concerning the Territory. It also had

* This document contains chapter XVI of the Special Committee's report to the General Assembly. The general introductory chapter will be issued subsequently under the symbol A/7200. Other chapters of the report will be issued subsequently under the same symbol (A/7200) or as addenda.

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23 (A/6300/Rev.1), chapter VIII, paragraph 120.

before it a report by its Sub-Committee on Fiji (see annex II). In addition, the Special Committee had before it two petitions from Mr. K.C. Ramrakha, General Secretary, Federation Party, Suva, Fiji (A/AC.109/PET.1013).

4. At the same meeting, the Special Committee, following a statement by its Chairman (A/AC.109/SR.643), decided to take note of the report of the Sub-Committee on Fiji and to transmit that report to the General Assembly, together with the working paper prepared by the Secretariat, in order to facilitate consideration of the item by the Fourth Committee. It further decided to consider the question during its next session, subject to any directives which the General Assembly might give in that respect.

ANNEX I*

FIJI

Working paper prepared by the Secretariat

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
I. ACTION PREVIOUSLY TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY	1 - 6
II. INFORMATION ON THE TERRITORY	
Introduction	7
A. General	8
B. Political and constitutional developments	9 - 50
C. Economic conditions	51 - 65
D. Social conditions	66 - 82

* Previously reproduced under the symbol A/AC.109/L.462.

I. ACTION PREVIOUSLY TAKEN BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE
AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1. The Territory of Fiji has been considered by the Special Committee and the General Assembly since 1963. The Special Committee's conclusions and recommendations concerning the Territory are set out in its report to the General Assembly at its eighteenth, nineteenth, twenty-first and twenty-second sessions.^{a/} The General Assembly's decisions concerning the Territory are contained in resolutions 1951 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963, 2068 (XX) of 16 December 1965, 2185 (XXI) of 12 December 1966 and 2350 (XXII) of 19 December 1967.
2. The resolution adopted on 7 September 1966 by the Special Committee provided for the appointment of "a sub-committee to visit Fiji for the purpose of studying at first hand the situation in the Territory and to report to the Special Committee as soon as possible" (A/6300/Rev.1, chapter VIII, para. 120). The General Assembly, by its resolution 2185 (XXI), endorsed the decision of the Special Committee and requested the Chairman of the Special Committee, in consultation with the administering Power, to appoint the sub-committee as soon as practicable.
3. In a letter dated 28 August 1967 (A/AC.109/261), the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Chairman of the Special Committee that the United Kingdom Government did not regard a visit to Fiji by a sub-committee of the Special Committee as necessary.
4. The Chairman of the Special Committee informed the Committee at its 555th meeting, on 11 September 1967, that after further consultations with members of the Committee, he had decided to appoint Bulgaria, Chile, Finland, India and the United Republic of Tanzania as members of the Sub-Committee on Fiji.
5. After considering the question of Fiji at its meetings in 1967, the Special Committee adopted a resolution in which it reaffirmed the inalienable right of

a/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23 (A/5446/Rev.1), chapter VII, paragraph 165; *ibid.*, Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex No. 8, (A/5800/Rev.1), chapter XIII, paragraph 119; *ibid.*, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23 (A/6300/Rev.1), chapter VIII, paragraph 120; A/6700/Add.5, chapter VII, paragraph 101.

the people of Fiji to freedom and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, as well as its view that the administering Power must expedite the process of decolonization in Fiji by holding elections on the basis of one man, one vote and by fixing an early date for independence. It deeply regretted the negative attitude of the administering Power in refusing to agree to a visit by the Sub-Committee on Fiji to the Territory, and urgently appealed to the administering Power to co-operate with the Special Committee and reconsider its decision in order to facilitate the Committee's work. Moreover, it urged the administering Power to implement without further delay the provisions of resolution 2185 (XXI) and, in particular, operative paragraph 4 thereof calling upon the administering Power to implement without delay the following measures: (a) the holding of general elections in accordance with the principle of "one man, one vote" for the purpose of forming a constituent assembly which will be charged with the task of drawing up a democratic constitution and the formation of a representative government, and the transfer of full powers to that government; (b) the fixing of an early date for the independence of Fiji; and (c) the abolishing of all discriminatory measures so as to foster communal harmony and national unity in the Territory.

6. Following its consideration of the question of Fiji at its twenty-second session, the General Assembly adopted on 19 December 1967 resolution 2350 (XXII), the operative paragraphs of which read as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"...

"1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Fiji to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

"2. Approves the chapter of the 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 relating to Fiji and endorses the conclusions and recommendations contained therein;

"3. Reaffirms the provisions of resolutions 1951 (XVIII) of 11 December 1963, 2068 (XX) of 16 December 1965 and 2185 (XXI) of 12 December 1966 concerning Fiji;

/...

"4. Reaffirms the necessity of sending a visiting mission to Fiji for the purpose of studying at first hand the situation in the Territory;

"5. Regrets the refusal of the administering Power to receive the visiting mission in Fiji and urgently appeals to it to reconsider its decision;

"6. Requests the Special Committee to continue its examination of the question of Fiji and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session;

"7. Decides to maintain the item on its agenda."

II. INFORMATION ON THE TERRITORY^{b/}

Introduction

7. Basic information on the Territory is contained in the report of the Special Committee to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session (A/67CO/Add.5, chapter VII). Supplementary information is set out below.

A. General

8. At the end of 1966, the population was estimated to be 483,247. The composition of the population was reported by the administering Power as follows:

<u>Race</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Fijian	200,934	41.58
Indian	242,224	50.12
European	10,685	2.21
Part-European	10,194	2.11
Chinese	5,605	1.16
Other Pacific races	<u>13,605</u>	<u>2.82</u>
	483,247	100.00

B. Political and constitutional developments

9. Introduction of ministerial system. The present Constitution of Fiji, which was promulgated on 23 September 1966, was described in the report of the Special

^{b/} The information presented in this section has been derived from published reports. Also used in the preparation of this section has been the information transmitted to the Secretary-General by the United Kingdom under Article 73 e of the Charter on 5 July 1967 for the year ended 31 December 1966.

Committee covering its work during 1967. Briefly, the Constitution provides for a Governor who exercises authority with the assistance of an Executive Council, and for a Legislative Council composed of not more than four official and thirty-six elected members. The majority of the elected members are elected from separate communal rolls while the remainder are elected by a system of cross-voting. Elections were held in September/October 1966, the Alliance Party winning twenty-two seats and the Federation Party winning nine. The two members elected by the Fijian Council of Chiefs were supporters of the Alliance Party. On 18 October 1966, the Governor appointed six Alliance Party members of the Legislative Council as members of the Executive Council. The other four seats were filled by public officers. Subsequently, the leader of the Alliance Party, Ratu K.K.T. Mara, became Leader of Government Business and Mr. A.D. Patel, Leader of the Federation Party, was designated Leader of the Opposition.

10. On 1 September 1967, a ministerial system of government was introduced in Fiji when, as provided for in the Constitution, the Governor appointed the members of the Executive Council as Ministers, thus replacing the Executive Council by a Council of Ministers. The Council of Ministers, whose chairman is the Governor, has the same powers as the former Executive Council.^{c/} Members of the Council of Ministers were given executive powers in the respective departments for which they are responsible. Formerly, as members of the Executive Council, their departmental duties had been limited to assisting in the formulation of policy.

11. The members of the Council of Ministers with their portfolios are as follows: Ratu K.K.T. Mara, Chief Minister, also in charge of co-ordinating economic planning and the Government Information Services; Ratu Edward Cakobau, Minister of Commerce, Industry and Labour; Mr. Charles A. Stinson, Minister of Communications, Works and Tourism; Mr. Vijay R. Singh, Minister of Social Services; Mr. D.W. Brown, Minister of Natural Resources; Mr. John N. Falvey, Minister without Portfolio (all the foregoing are members of the Alliance Party); Mr. K.S. Reddy, Assistant Minister for Social Services; Ratu Penaia Ganilau, Minister of Fijian Affairs and Local Government; Mr. H.P. Ritchie, Minister of Finance; Mr. G.P. Lloyd, Chief Secretary; and Mr. Justin Lewis, Attorney-General (the latter four are public officers).

^{c/} For a brief description of the powers of the Government and the Executive Council, see A/67CO/Add.5, chapter VII, paragraphs 6-8.

12. On 1 September 1967, the day the ministerial system was introduced, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Patel, introduced a motion in the Legislative Council which reads as follows:

"Undemocratic, iniquitous and unjust provisions characterize the existing Constitution and electoral laws of Fiji and their operation have caused alarm in the minds of right-thinking people, and have hampered the political advancement of Fiji along democratic lines. And this House therefore is of the opinion that Her Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom should call a Constitutional Conference immediately to ensure that a new Constitution is worked out based on true democratic principles without any bias or distinction on the grounds of colour, race, religion or place of origin or vested interest either political, economic, social or other so that Fiji may attain self-government and become a nation with honour, dignity and responsibility as soon as possible."

13. Speaking to the motion, Mr. Patel said, inter alia, that it was a matter of public knowledge that the present Constitution had been imposed upon the Indian community against the expressed wishes of its elected representatives at the London Conference. The Indian community had opposed the Constitution and still opposed it because it was undemocratic, iniquitous and unjust. It was a serious obstacle in welding various communities in Fiji into a nation and had seriously hampered the political progress of the Territory towards independence by bringing into existence a reactionary government. Although the Indian community was the majority in Fiji, it had only twelve members in the Council while the European community, a very small minority of about 20,000 people including the Chinese, had fourteen members, and the Fijians, who were the second largest community, had only fourteen members.

14. Mr. Patel recalled that the United Kingdom Secretary of State had appealed to the Indian delegation to the London Conference to give the Constitution a try. Continuing, Mr. Patel said: "We accepted this Constitution under protest, we stood for election and we have worked in this Council in the spirit and hope of making a bad Constitution work to the benefit of the masses of the people, not the privileged classes who enjoy the benefit of a colonial system of government". The time had come, he said, when in the interests of democratic freedom, it was necessary to call for a halt. If the present situation continued any longer, he said "attitudes will harden, difficulties will be created, the real aspirations and wishes of the overwhelming number of people in this country will

be misrepresented abroad and as is happening now, everybody who comes from outside will be told that we in Fiji like colonialism, we do not want freedom, nobody wants freedom. Racial attitudes stiffen, the divisions will become still more rigid and defined and when the real time comes, people of this colony will find it almost impossible to break all these rigid barriers in order to unite the various communities of this country - lead them to nationhood".

15. Mr. Vijay R. Singh, Minister for Social Services, in a statement opposing the motion before the Council, said, inter alia, that, in fact, the operation of the Constitution had created confidence in the minds of "right thinking people". The Leader of Opposition had failed to point out that despite "the evils of communal roll", as the Opposition would have it, people of all races had worked together in social and educational and sporting organizations, and were now working together in political organizations. Mr. Singh said that the whole tenor of Mr. Patel's speech was racial, and that the people of Fiji were more concerned with their economic future than with any constitutional theories that Mr. Patel wished to expound. He then moved that the motion be amended to read as follows: This House,

"(i) considers that the resolution of the Legislative Council passed on 21 December 1965 correctly expresses the views of the great majority of the electors of all races in this country, then and now;

"(ii) records with gratification the repeated assurances of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom that there is no constitutional impediment to the progress of this country towards full internal self-government; and

"(iii) notes that the transition to a ministerial system of government less than ten months after the introduction of the 1966 Constitution is plain evidence of the ability of the Alliance Government to govern the nation with honour, dignity and responsibility and on democratic principles."

16. The Opposition walked out of the Council chamber while Mr. Singh was speaking in support of the amendment. Later, the motion, as amended, was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 4 abstentions. Those who abstained were members of the Council who were public officers.

17. Subsequently, the Federation Party issued a statement saying that the members had walked out in protest at the existing Constitution, and the introduction of the ministerial system under it. The statement said that the Party proposed to resort to non-co-operation.

18. In a statement issued on 21 September 1967, a government spokesman said that although the Government had not been officially informed by the Opposition of its reasons for walking out of the Legislative Council, it had been stated at Federation Party meetings that the Government had ignored the Opposition and had not co-operated with it. In fact, the statement continued, there had been many instances of government co-operation with the Opposition. The Opposition had been consulted, or offered the opportunity of consultation, about each of the four most important government measures introduced during the meeting of the Legislative Council from which members of the Opposition had walked out. These four measures were the Interpretation Bill, the Agricultural Landlord and Tenant Ordinance, and legislation relating to the Overseas Aid Scheme, and the Emperor Gold Mining Company. Although the Government had offered these opportunities for consultation, the spokesman continued, the Opposition had made no attempt to approach the Government about the grievances listed in the motion on the Constitution with a view to discussing them. In addition, all Ministers had informed members of the Opposition that they were available for discussion at any time.

19. Speaking at a party meeting held in December 1967, Mr. Patel was reported as saying that although it was the duty of the Government to consult the Opposition on all important issues this had not been done. He had not been consulted before Ratu Mara went to London for discussions on the proposed entry of the United Kingdom into the European Economic Community (EEC). Nor had he been consulted on the introduction of the ministerial system. Federation members had walked out of the Council in protest against this and other injustices. He pointed out that, under the Constitution, in Suva, 34,000 Indians had one representative while 6,500 Europeans and Chinese had the right to vote for three representatives. He added that the Federation Party had the support of ninety-five countries at the United Nations.

20. The Opposition boycotted the meetings of the Legislative Council held in December and, according to the latest reports, is continuing its boycott.

21. Report by Chief Minister on his world tour, October 1967. The Chief Minister, Ratu K.K.T. Mara, returned from a world tour in October 1967. In a report on his tour, the Chief Minister said that he had been given the opportunity to present and project Fiji on a much wider scale than had been possible formerly. He had undertaken the tour to study the workings of the ministerial system in countries which had gone ahead of Fiji in that direction and also to see how countries with similar racial situations to Fiji's had dealt with them. Perhaps the most valuable part of his tour had been his talks with the leaders of multiracial societies in Guyana, Trinidad, Jamaica, Malaysia and Singapore. Speaking of this part of his tour, the Chief Minister said, "The one golden thread I found running through the policies of all these countries was first the recognition that there are ethnic differences between peoples, that they cannot be ignored and that they should not be ignored. But second, that if the Government sets out broad enough principles to ensure that they accommodate the rights and aspirations of all the people in the country, then a basis is provided for harmony and progress."

22. Speaking of his visit to India, which he described as "an important item" on his itinerary, the Chief Minister said that he had talked with the President and a number of senior ministers. He had greatly appreciated the opportunity to discuss Fiji's position, policy and aspirations and to receive a sympathetic and understanding hearing.

23. In answer to a written question concerning the action the Government of the United Kingdom proposed to take upon the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on Fiji and, in particular, upon the decision that a United Nations mission should visit the Territory, the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. George Thomas, replied on 17 January 1968 in the House of Commons: "None. The United Kingdom voted against this resolution. We do not consider that a United Nations mission would serve any useful purpose."

24. Use of the term "Fijian". During the debate on the Interpretation Bill, 1967, on 29 August 1967, Mr. A.D. Patel, the Leader of the Opposition, expressed dissatisfaction with the definition of the word "Fijian" as set out in the bill. He noted that the definition had been broadened to include people of other races who had migrated to Fiji from islands of the South Pacific. He contended, however, that all the inhabitants of the Territory should be described as "Fijians" regardless of their race.

25. Mr. Adi Losalini Dovi, opposing the suggestion made by Mr. Patel, said that it was understood all over the world that "Fijian" meant the indigenous people of Fiji and that it would be misleading to suggest otherwise. The amendment proposed by the Opposition to delete the clause containing the definition was defeated by 27 votes to 9.

26. Local government. There are two systems of local government in the Territory, one for indigenous Fijians and one for residents in urban areas. These systems were briefly outlined in the Special Committee's report on its work during 1963.^{d/} Changes that have been introduced since that date are set out briefly below.

(a) Fijian Administration

27. The local government system having jurisdiction over all indigenous Fijians in the Territory is known as the Fijian Administration. This system derives its authority from the Fijian Affairs Ordinance of 1944, as amended, which the administering Power states is designed to continue the development of the policy of building on indigenous institutions followed since 1876.

28. For the purposes of the Fijian Administration, the Territory is divided into fourteen yasanas (provinces), based on the old tribal boundaries, each of which consists of a number of tikinas (districts). The chief executive officer of each province is called a Roko Tui and the head of each district a Bu'li; each province has its own council. Above the provincial councils are the Great Councils of Chiefs, and the Fijian Affairs Board.

29. The Fijian Affairs Ordinance was amended during 1966 to give effect to a number of reforms which had been recommended by the Council of Chiefs. These recommendations were the result of a study carried out by a special committee of the Council of Chiefs in 1962. The committee, which issued its report in 1963, recommended, inter alia, the introduction of the principle of direct election of the majority of members of the provincial councils, the extension of the powers, duties and functions of such councils, and the introduction of a system of land rating based on the unimproved value of land instead of the personal rate, known as the "provincial rate". Between 1964 and 1966, the details of the new system were worked out and explained to the Fijians, and, in 1966, the first stage of implementing the recommendations was begun. The main changes are set out briefly below.

^{d/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23 (A/5446/Rev.1), chapter VII, paragraphs 17-18.

30. The main duties of the Fijian Affairs Board, which is an executive body, are to make appointments, to make regulations, to control provincial revenue and expenditure, and to submit to the Governor such recommendations and proposals as it may deem fit for the benefit of the Fijian people. By the amendments to the Fijian Affairs Ordinance made in 1966, many of the powers of the Board were delegated to the provincial councils which are now empowered to make their own by-laws. The amendment also increased the membership of the Board which now consists of the Secretary for Fijian Affairs as chairman; eight Fijian members of the Legislative Council elected by the Fijian members of the Legislative Council; two members of the Great Council of Chiefs who are not members of the Legislative Council, elected by those members of the Great Council of Chiefs who are not members of the Legislative Council; a legal adviser; a financial adviser and such other advisers as the Board may recommend from time to time, to be appointed by the Governor. Prior to the amendment of the ordinance, the Board consisted of the Secretary for Fijian Affairs as Chairman, the six Fijian Members of the Legislative Council, a legal adviser and a financial adviser, the latter two being appointed by the Governor. The ordinance provides that any new legislation proposed by the Government involving any important matter affecting the rights and interests of Fijians must first be referred to the Board for its consideration before it is presented to the Legislative Council. The Board, in turn, may refer the matter to the Great Council of Chiefs. Both the Board and the Great Council are required to prepare memoranda containing their comments on the legislation referred to them.

31. The changes brought about in the Great Council of Chiefs by the 1966 amendments are described by the administering Power as having made it possible to ensure that representation in the Great Council is as broad as possible and that the elective system is employed while retaining the right of the Governor and the Secretary for Fijian Affairs to nominate members. Membership of the Great Council now consists of the Secretary for Fijian Affairs as chairman; the fourteen Fijian members of the Legislative Council; not more than seven chiefs appointed by the Governor; not more than eight persons appointed by the Secretary for Fijian Affairs; three persons (of whom at least two are to be provincial council members) elected by each provincial council with twenty or more members; and two persons (of whom at least one is to be a provincial council member) elected

by each provincial council with fewer than twenty members. It is the duty of of the Great Council to submit to the Governor such recommendations and proposals as it may deem to be for the benefit of the Fijian people and to consider questions, including legislation, referred to it by the Governor or the Board. The Great Council of Chiefs elects two members to the Legislative Council by secret ballot. Those eligible for election include Fijians who are not members of the Great Council and who are not necessarily of hereditary rank. Prior to 1966, the Great Council, then known as the Council of Chiefs, consisted of the Roko Tui of all provinces, six chiefs appointed by the Governor, a magistrate, a school teacher, and an assistant medical practitioner appointed by the Secretary for Fijian Affairs, and a representative of each province elected by secret ballot at a full meeting of the respective provincial council (provinces with a population of over 10,000 sent two representatives each). In 1960, the membership of the Council of Chiefs had been broadened to include four representatives of workers in the industrial areas.

32. The composition and powers of the provincial councils were set out in regulations made after the amendments to the ordinance came into force in 1966. These regulations, which introduced the elective system in the provincial councils, provide for a majority of elected members. Each council is to consist of a specified number of members elected by persons resident in the tikina of the province, a specified number of chiefs nominated by the Secretary for Fijian Affairs, and a specified number of members elected by persons owning land within the province but living in urban areas. The franchise is extended to Fijians over the age of twenty-one years, able to understand and speak Fijian and who fulfil certain residential qualifications.

33. Under the new system, the Roko Tui will become the chief executive officer of the provincial councils. For the first three years of the new system, the Governor will appoint the Roko Tui on the advice of the Fijian Affairs Board. Thereafter, the Council itself will be empowered to recommend to the Fijian Affairs Board for submission to the Governor the name of a suitable person to be appointed to that position.

34. The functions of the provincial councils, as defined in the regulations, are "to promote the health, welfare and good government of Fijians resident in the

province". To carry out these functions, each council is empowered to make by-laws on such matters as roads, public health, village planning, water supplies and education. Additionally, each council is empowered to levy a land rate on the unimproved capital value of land in the province owned by Fijians. However, until such time as a land rate is applied, each council is empowered to levy a rate, known as a "provincial rate", on male Fijians between the ages of twenty-one and sixty years of age.

35. The new legislation empowers the Fijian Affairs Board to establish other councils within the provinces which, subject to the approval of the provincial council and of the Secretary for Fijian Affairs, may make orders for the good government of Fijians residing in the area of its jurisdiction. No such councils have yet been established.

36. The existing system of Fijian courts is maintained under the new legislation. In each tikina there is a court, consisting of a Fijian magistrate appointed by the Governor. Appeals from a tikina court lie to a provincial court which consists of three members, at least two of whom are Fijian magistrates; the third member may be a district officer. Appeals from the provincial courts lie to the Supreme Court. In addition, the legal adviser to the Fijian Board is empowered to alter or reverse the findings of any Fijian court except in the case of an acquittal. The administering Power reports that under the current reorganization of the Fijian Administration, it is proposed that the Fijian magistracy should come more directly under the judiciary, that Fijian magistrates should be given more training and that tikina courts should be abolished as soon as possible.

37. The Fijian Affairs Board make regulations which apply only to indigenous Fijians. The purpose of these regulations and the changes that are being made with respect to them are described by the administering Power in the following terms:

"The Fijian Affairs Regulations result from a recognition that much of the Colony's necessarily complicated legislation is inapplicable to Fijian village life. For example building requirements difficult of attainment are replaced by simple adequate standards geared to the Fijian house-building pattern, and a short clear sanitary code governs village hygiene. Such simplification enable justice to be administered predominantly by Fijian magistrates which in its turn means that cases can be heard locally and speedily. A number of regulations are concerned with traditional Fijian moral standards and some enable communal work to be carried out. However,

/...

there are provisions for the exemption from the latter of enterprising villages and individuals, and the regulations are constantly kept under review and modified from time to time as may be seen desirable in the light of changing conditions.

"One of the aims of the reorganization of the Fijian Administration is to carry out a review of the present Fijian Affairs Regulations and to determine, with the help and assistance of Central Government Officers, which of the existing Regulations should be included in other legislation and which are considered suitable for colony-wide application. Other provisions of the Fijian Affairs Regulations are being considered for repeal or amendment to coincide with present practice and thought; and for inclusion in Regulations to be made by the Fijian Affairs Board and approved by the Legislative Council, or any by-laws to be made by a Provincial Council and approved by the Fijian Affairs Board."

38. Elections for the provincial councils were conducted in May, June and July 1967. The land rating system was expected to be applied in two provinces, as a trial, at the beginning of 1968.

39. In November 1967, the Minister for Fijian Affairs and Local Government was reported to have announced further changes in the Fijian Administration.

According to this report, the Minister said that the Fijian magistracy and Fijian courts would be abolished in some provinces by January 1968 and in the remaining ones by January 1969. He also announced that the post of Bu'li as the official head of administration in each tikina would be abolished by the end of 1967. Bu'lis would be replaced by assistant rokos.

40. The Minister for Fijian Affairs and Local Government, in his report issued in 1967, said that the full effect of the changes would take some years to become established. When the reorganization was fully implemented the Secretary described provincial councils in the following terms:

"They will have a new look, for they will wear the full costume of local government councils as these are known elsewhere in the world - in structure and organization, in powers and functions, in methods of finance, and in their relations to a central ministry of local government. It is agreed that they cater for only one race within their various boundaries. But the Fijians need time to establish themselves in their own new provincial councils and to learn their ways, and this feeling was reflected in the Council of Chiefs resolution of 1965".

(b) Urban local government

41. In 1967 there were eight local government bodies functioning in the Territory, namely:

- (i) The Suva City Council and the Lautoka Town Council, established under the Local Government (Towns) Ordinance, covering 50,000 and 11,000 persons respectively; and
- (ii) The township boards of Ba, Labasa, Levuka, Nadi, Nausori and Sigatoka, established under the Township Ordinance, covering a total population of some 16,000.

42. Until 1966, the membership of the township boards was entirely nominated. In his report issued in 1967, the Minister for Fijian Affairs and Local Government stated that over the past few years it had become evident that public opinion in townships was in favour of the introduction of the electoral principle in establishing the membership of the township boards. Discussions with the boards took place during 1965 and 1966 when it became clear that the elective system unanimously favoured was that of the common roll with a franchise to include both rate payers and residents. The Townships Ordinance was therefore amended in 1966 to provide for elections which were to be held every two years for the first four years and, thereafter, every three years. The new legislation provides for the election of a majority of members of each board, on the basis of a common roll; the remaining members, who are to be nominated, include public officers such as representatives of the Director of Public Works and the Director of Medical Services. Elections, on the basis of a common roll, were held in December 1966. The Minister reported that they promoted a lively degree of interest, that the response to registration was very satisfactory and that the poll varied from 80 per cent to 97.5 per cent.

43. The Suva City Council consists of eighteen elected and two nominated members. The elected members are elected from three wards, each returning an equal number of European, Fijian and Indian councillors. In accordance with the Townships Ordinance, the electoral roll is in three divisions setting forth the names and particulars of European, Fijian and Indian electors respectively.

44. The Lautoka Town Council consists of eight elected and two nominated councillors. The town elects four European and four Indian councillors.

45. In February 1967, the Suva City Council considered a recommendation from a special committee it had set up to consider a request from the Secretary for Fijian Affairs and Local Government for the councils' views on a proposal put forward by the Lautoka Town Council. The Lautoka Town Council had proposed that "reference to race in electoral rolls, municipal elections and the composition of the councils should be deleted from the Local Government (Towns) Ordinance but that provision for nominated councillors should be retained".

46. The committee recommended that the Secretary for Fijian Affairs should be informed that: "The City Council does not agree with the views of the Lautoka Town Council, but is of the opinion that the present basis of the franchise for municipal elections should remain unaltered". During the debate on an amendment to this recommendation, which would have had the effect of accepting the proposal of the Lautoka Council, the mover of the amendment drew attention to the composition of the electoral rolls of the city which contain 422 Fijians, 589 Europeans and 4,830 Indians. This meant, he said, that Fijians had one representative for every 70 registered electors, Europeans one for every 98 and Indians one for every 804 registered electors. He also felt that it would be a retrograde step for the Suva Council to refuse to accept the principle of a common franchise which the rest of the colony accepted at the local government level. He recalled that during the existence of the former Suva Township Board all electors were on a common roll. He pointed out that there was general acceptance in the Territory of the principle of the common roll; the dispute was about the timing of its introduction. Speakers opposing the amendment agreed with the principle of the common roll but stressed that the time was not opportune to introduce it. They also referred to the fear of domination by one race. One speaker said that the Council had worked together peacefully because there was equal representation of races. The amendment to accept the Lautoka proposal for a common roll was defeated by 9 votes to 6. The Council then adopted (with four members opposing) a second amendment requesting that the basis of the franchise should be changed to follow the system of classification adopted in the Legislative Council electoral rolls. It was explained that the effect of this amendment would

be to replace the nominated members by elected members elected on Fijian, Indian and general rolls.

47. Public service. The administering Power reports that the Fiji Public Service in 1966 consisted of the following:

Expatriate officers

Pensionable	196
Contract or seconded	277

Local officers holding senior posts^{a/}

Europeans	72
Fijians	65
Indians	81
Others	24

Total number of local officers (all grades)

Europeans	377
Fijians	3,364
Indians	2,651
Others	258

a/ Posts with a salary exceeding a minimum of £1,527.

48. The Legislative Council decided on 8 December 1967 to appoint a select committee to advise the Government on matters relating to further localization of the civil service. The Chief Secretary, moving the motion, said that the select committee would be appointed to consider and to be available to advise the Government during negotiations about possible successor arrangements to the Overseas Service Aid Scheme, for which the Government had announced its intention of finding some alternative. He said that the time had now come to take a further step to show that the Government was committed to ensure that posts at all levels in the civil service were filled by local people with a minimum of delay so that Fiji would depend less and less on overseas officers. He said that the United Kingdom Government had agreed to provide under the Technical Assistance

/...

Programme an adviser with experience in implementing and planning a successful localization programme elsewhere.

49. Commenting on the acceptance by Opposition Members of two seats on the select committee, the Federation Party, in a statement issued on 9 February 1968, said that this should not be construed to mean that the Federation Party's boycott of the Legislative Council, or its political non-co-operation, had ended. The boycott and non-co-operation continued "just as strongly as before". The statement pointed out that the select committee was a non-political committee and that it had been agreed by both the Government and the Opposition that the civil service should be "a neutral zone, and should be entirely free from political pressures or interference of any kind". It further pointed out that each member sat on the committee as a member of the Council itself, and not as a member of the political party which he represented.

50. Judiciary. The first Fiji-born person to be appointed as a First-Class Magistrate in Fiji, Mr. Moti Tikaram, was appointed as an acting puisne judge on 11 December 1967. He becomes the first Fiji-born person to sit in the Supreme Court.

C. Economic conditions

51. General. The economy of the Territory is dependent on four main industries: sugar, copra, gold mining and tourism, of which sugar is by far the most important.^{e/} In 1966, the sugar industry went through a difficult period when the world price for sugar was uniformly low, falling to £13. 10s. Od. sterling per ton in December.^{f/} However, the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement enabled Fiji to dispose of 140,000 tons of sugar manufactured in 1966 at a price of £47. 10s. Od. sterling per ton. Fiji exported 238,903 tons of sugar during 1966 at a value of £F10,548,446, compared with 305,116 tons in 1965.

^{e/} For further information on economic conditions see A/6868/Add.1, appendix IV, and A/AC.109/L.506, appendix XI.

^{f/} Until 27 November 1967, £F111 equalled £100 sterling, or approximately \$US280. However, on that date, the Fijian pound was revalued by 6.5 per cent to a rate of £1.045 Fijian to £1 sterling. This move followed the devaluation by 14.3 per cent of the pound sterling - making a net devaluation of slightly more than 7 per cent. The new Fijian pound is now equal to \$US2.30.

52. On 23 November 1967 the parties to the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement concluded a series of meetings in London at which the negotiated price for 1968 was fixed and the 1965 price quotas confirmed. The agreement, which is designed to create a measure of stability in both export and consumer markets, is in the form of a commercial contract between the United Kingdom Government and the sugar industries of certain Commonwealth countries, the former undertaking to buy, and the latter to supply, agreed quantities of sugar at annually negotiated prices. Signed in 1951, its initial duration was until 1959, but the expiry date has been extended annually by one year. In 1967, however, extension was not discussed in view of the United Kingdom Government's application for membership in the European Economic Community (EEC). As a result of the meeting, the negotiated price for 1968 will be £43.10s. sterling per long ton with a special payment of up to £4 sterling per ton for the less developed exporting Territories. This price is to be reviewed at the 1968 talks when the arrangements for the 1969-1971 period will be determined. Negotiated quotas for 1968 will again be at the level consolidated in 1965. Accordingly, Fiji's quota will be 140,000 long tons.

53. The copra industry also had a difficult year in 1966. Production declined by 5,000 tons compared with 1965, largely owing to a hurricane in 1965, a lack of rain in producing areas and aging trees. The Suva basic price declined from £F63. 8s. 6d. a ton in March 1966 to £F44. 14s. Od. a ton in December 1966. Copra grading was introduced in March 1966 and there was a rise in the proportion of first-grade copra from 28 to 53 per cent; third-grade copra dropped to 11 per cent. Coconut planters continued to take advantage of subsidy schemes and the administering Power hopes that the target of 60,000 acres of new planting will be achieved by 1968.

54. The condition of the gold mining industry remained much the same as in 1965. A total of 109,701 fine ounces of gold was exported in 1966 at a value of £F1,505,511. Some 7,000 persons (workers and their families) depend on gold for their livelihood and it is largely for this reason that the Government has provided financial assistance for the Emperor Gold Mining Company, Ltd., to undertake exploration, research and development.

55. The tourist industry is Fiji's fastest expanding industry. Tourist numbers increased by 11 per cent, from 40,135 in 1965 to 44,561 in 1966. The number of cruise ship passengers increased from 15,032 to 20,225 in the same period, or by 35 per cent. Estimated expenditure by tourists in the Territory rose from £F4.25 million in 1965 to £F5.6 million in 1966. According to a report prepared in 1965 by a firm of consultants, Fiji is expected to be handling 85,000 visitors annually by 1970. To meet the needs of this number of tourists, it is estimated that at least 2,830 hotel beds will be required. It was reported in November 1967 that Fiji had 1,080 beds available in hotels and motels and that facilities containing a further 840 beds were under construction. This left a minimum gap of 910 beds to be filled by 1970. It was also reported in November 1967 that, since the beginning of 1966, nearly £3 million sterling had been invested in hotels and motels in the Territory.

56. The administering Power reports that, in 1966, the financial position of the Territory was less favourable than that of previous years. Because of high world sugar prices and increasing production, 1963 and 1964 were exceptionally good years, economically and financially. This effect spilled over into 1965 and government reserves at the end of that year amounted to £F5.8 million. Because of the anticipated effects of adverse climatic conditions on both sugar and copra production and the depressed world sugar price, the 1966 budgeted revenue was £F11,854,655, compared with £F12,579,916 in 1965. Expenditure in 1966 was budgeted at £F12,872,375, compared with £F11,655,562 in 1965.

57. The value of trade of the Territory for the years 1964, 1965 and 1966 is set out in the table below:

	1964	1965	1966 ^{a/}	<u>Previous highest</u>	
		(Fijian pounds)		(Fijian pounds)	Year
Domestic exports	23,120,846	17,805,875	15,782,404	23,120,846	1964
Re-exports	2,993,927	3,441,783	3,327,083	3,441,783	1965
Total exports	26,114,773	21,247,658	19,109,487	26,114,773	1964
Total imports	27,625,649	29,081,019	25,287,729	29,081,019	1965
Total trade	53,740,422	50,328,677	44,397,216	55,195,792	1964
Balance of visible trade					
Deficit	1,510,876	7,833,361	6,178,242	7,833,361	1965
Surplus	-	-	-	2,632,097	1953

^{a/} Provisional.

/...

58. Funds for development. The United Kingdom has allocated £2.7 million sterling as development and welfare grant aid to Fiji for the period 1966-68, and £2.7 million sterling for 1969-70, giving a possible maximum for the period of the 1966-70 Development Plan^{g/} of £5.4 million sterling (£5.6 million). In August 1967, it was announced that the Government was planning to raise a loan of £2 million (sterling) in London for expenditure on capital works.

59. Early in 1967, it was reported that the Australian Government had rejected an application by the Fijian Government for a loan of £3,650,000 to help finance Fiji's five-year development plan. The question was debated in the Fiji Legislative Council on 22 March when the Opposition introduced a motion expressing deep disappointment over this rejection. The Government, however, introduced an amendment to the original motion which would welcome the Australian Government's assurance that they were studying other possible ways and means of supplying assistance. The amended motion was adopted. In April 1967, the Acting Financial Secretary of Fiji visited Australia for the purpose of exploring possible avenues for raising money needed for Fiji's development plan. On his return, he was reported as stating that he had had discussions with Australian Treasury officials and with a firm of underwriters. On 23 May, the Acting Financial Secretary announced the launching of a development loan for £Fl.9 million. Of this sum, £F800,000 would be for conversion of 1961 loan stock, while the remaining £Fl.1 million would be new money to help finance the Territory's five-year development plan. The loan, which was underwritten by a Melbourne firm, would be quoted on both the Melbourne and Sydney stock exchanges. This loan was subsequently reported to have been fully subscribed.

60. A press report published in November 1967 on the activities of the Fiji Development Company (FDC), showed that the company was engaged in agriculture, timber and housing in the Territory. The FDC was established in 1960 by the Commonwealth Development Corporation (CDC) to investigate and formulate development schemes in Fiji and in other United Kingdom Territories in the south-west Pacific. The company does not make grants but invests its funds in development schemes for the promotion or expansion of economic projects that will

^{g/} See A/6868/Add.1, appendix IV, paragraphs 20-25, and A/AC.109/L.506, appendix XI, paragraphs 9-15.

not only help to increase the wealth of the Territories, but will also yield a reasonable return on the money invested.

61. The FDC is concerned in two agricultural projects in the Territory, the Lomaivunai Settlement Scheme which it manages on behalf of the Land Development Authority, and an oil palm pilot project. The latter, which was established in 1963, is reported as giving promise of success. The report states that the initial investment required for a basic 6,000-acre oil palm project is of the order of £2 million sterling and it is hoped that a decision to proceed will be made in 1968. In the timber industry, the company provides the major financial backing for the Pacific Lumber Company which began operations in 1962. This company is managed by the Fletcher Timber Company of New Zealand which, together with the Native Land Trust Board (on behalf of the owners of the concession area) is a substantial shareholder. In housing, the FDC managed the Government's Housing Authority from 1961 to 1967 during which time the Authority's investment in housing increased from £165,000 to £914,000 sterling. The FDC also sponsored a building society in partnership with the Government.

62. The report states that the company's activities are now changing from a company offering management services mainly to government statutory bodies to that of an investment company. It was expected that by January 1968, the company's management arrangements with the Government would have ceased and that its emphasis would be shifted to commercial, industrial and agricultural enterprises, preferably in partnership with others. The report notes that the company's oil palm project gives promise of a major agricultural breakthrough, and that the company has acquired an option on a valuable hotel site near Nadi airport with a view to investment in the expanding hotel and tourist industry.

63. Land. Land in Fiji is owned by the Crown, private freeholders and Fijians. At the end of 1966, there were 319,000 acres of Crown land, 447,000 acres of freehold land and 3,748,000 acres of Fijian land. Administrative control of tribal land (Fijian land), owned communally by more than 6,600 recognized land-owning units, is vested in the Native Land Trust Board which is presided over by the Governor and contains a majority of Fijian members. According to the administering Power, much of the Fijian land has been reserved from leasing under a policy for

securing to the owners adequate lands to provide for their land needs in the foreseeable future. This reserved land, the report continues, may be leased only to members of the "Fijian race". Fijian-owned land outside the reserves may be leased to anyone by the Native Land Trust Board.^{h/}

64. In July 1966, the Legislative Council of Fiji adopted the Agricultural Landlord and Tenant Ordinance, 1966. During the second reading of the bill, the Attorney-General, speaking of its "fundamental purpose" of the bill said the following on 18 July 1966:

"... [the bill] seeks to destroy a pernicious system that we have at the moment in Fiji. This system in relation to tenures of agricultural land is that, at the present moment, we have short tenancies, low rents and little, if any, security for the tenants. The result of this system means that there is little, if any, encouragement to develop agricultural land, because it is quite clear that the incentive in relation to the tenant is nothing but bad. He bleeds the land white in relation to his short term of tenancy, he can obtain little if any compensation for his term and, with the exception of buildings on stilts, he cannot remove the buildings from the land. He cannot remove these buildings which form part of the agricultural tenancy in question."

65. The ordinance, which came into force on 28 December 1967, provides security of tenure, the power to control rents on agricultural tenancies, the payment of compensation by a landlord for improvements effected by the tenant and by a tenant who causes dilapidation or damage, the application of certain statutory conditions to tenancies, statutory periods for reassessment of rent, the appointment of a tribunal to which landlords and tenants may apply, and the limitation and control of share-farming.

D. Social conditions

66. Labour. The wages and conditions of employment of more than half of those employees on whom labour statistics are collected, are regulated by agreements which unions and groups of employers have negotiated. In industries where there is no collective bargaining machinery, wages and other conditions of employment are fixed by agreement between the individual worker and his employer. In some cases this has not been entirely satisfactory and, to remedy the position, wages

^{h/} For further information on land distribution see A/6868/Add.1, appendix IV, paragraphs 47-62 and A/AC.109/L.506, paragraphs 58-65.

councils have been established for a number of trades. In 1966, the Wholesale and Retail Trades Wages Council and the Building and Civil and Electrical Engineering Trades Wages Council published orders which provided for a minimum hourly rate of 1s. 11d. and 2s. 2d. respectively for adult unskilled workers.

67. Approximately 70 per cent of Fiji's wage-earning employees earn 16s. or more for eight hours' work a day. The average hourly rates of pay are about 2s. 2d., while the average working week ranges between 40 and 48 hours in length.

68. The administering Power reports that it has intensified its industrial, supervisory and management training programmes.

69. By the end of 1966 there were twenty-two trade unions registered under the Trade Unions Ordinance of 1964.

70. In June 1966, the Legislative Council adopted the Fiji National Provident Fund Ordinance, 1966, which introduced a system of social security by setting up the National Provident Fund. The Fund, which is administered by a board, is, in essence, a system of compulsory savings for wage earners. Employees covered by the Fund contribute 2s. (Fijian) for each pound earned in the preceding month. The Fiji National Provident Fund started to register contributors in June 1966 and to receive contributions from 1 August. At the end of December 1966, the Fund had registered about 2,300 employers and 38,000 employees. Their combined monthly contributions by the end of 1966 were about £F83,000.

71. Following a request by the Government of Fiji, Professor H.A. Turner, a British economist, was asked in 1967 by the United Kingdom Commonwealth Relations Office and Ministry for Overseas Development, to undertake a survey in the Territory with the following terms of reference:

"Having regard to the economic situation in Fiji, to examine and advise on:

(a) the general level of wages and incomes and relativity between different grades and categories of employee in relation to the needs of economic development and of employment creation;

(b) methods which might be adopted for the determination of wages and incomes in relation to prices and the needs of economic growth."

Professor Turner, who arrived in Fiji on 14 August 1967, submitted his report on 17 September 1967.

/...

72. In the introduction to his report, Professor Turner said that the request of the Government of Fiji had arisen from a series of discussions at meetings of the Labour Advisory Board for Fiji during 1966. It appears that the economy of Fiji had enjoyed a period of special prosperity during 1963 and 1964, owing to the sharp rise in the world price of sugar (from which a quarter of the country's national income, and about half of its overseas earnings, is currently drawn). Owing to the subsequent fall in the world sugar price, however, it had been feared that a considerable contraction in the income of the economy would follow in later years. It had also been suggested by some that recent increases in wages indicated a trend which could not be supported by the economy of the country without a reduction in employment (which had already ceased to expand in the way required by the development plan) and in other incomes - particularly those of farmers. On the other hand, Professor Turner continued, it was also clear that, partly owing to adverse weather conditions, in 1964-65 there had been a sharp rise in the cost of living, which had subsequently failed to return to its former level. During his budget address to the Legislative Council in 1966, the Governor had referred to the need for restraint by trade unions, employers and traders in relation to increases in wages, prices and profits; and the representatives of trade unions and employers on the Labour Advisory Board had also agreed, with reservations, that a policy was required for prices, wages and other incomes. In 1967, however, no decision had been reached on either the content of such a policy or the mechanism through which it should be executed.

73. Among the suggestions made by Professor Turner was the following:

"that the Labour Advisory Board should be reconstituted so that its functions in relation to wage determination are separated and allocated to a new Incomes and Prices Advisory Board. I understand it is under consideration whether an economic planning advisory council should not be set up to advise the Government on economic and social development matters in general. If such a body were established, it would presumably include representatives of unions, employers, etc.: and the proposed Incomes and Prices Advisory Board might then well be constituted as a sub-committee of the Planning Council".

74. On 5 October 1967, members of the Airport, Hotel and Catering Workers' Union and the Municipal Workers' Union went on strike. Of the nearly 800 men involved in the strike, 400 were members of the former union, who were working on building

projects in Suva, and nearly 400 were Suva City Council workers. The strike was extended on 10 October, when ninety-six employees of Qantas Imperial Airways at Nadi airport were called out. On 11 October, some members of the Transport Workers' Union also stopped work for a few hours in support of the striking unions.

75. On 11 October, the Government of Fiji put into force Public Safety Regulations which gave the Government greater powers to deal with any disorders that might stem from the strikes. The Chief Minister, Ratu K.K.T. Mara, announcing the measures taken by the Government, was reported to have warned that the Government would not tolerate intimidation of workers or interference with essential services. He said that the regulations would enable action to be taken to maintain services essential to the life of the community and to enable public order to be preserved. He wished to make it clear that the Government was not interfering in an industrial dispute between employers and workers.

76. It was reported that following the statement made by the Chief Minister, transportation facilities in Suva returned to normal. The builders and municipal workers reported for duty on 13 and 15 October, respectively, while talks between the parties concerned got under way. Qantas workers did not return until early in November. Negotiations on the claims presented by the unions are still continuing.

77. Public health. The total recurrent expenditure on public health in 1966 was estimated at £F1,346,399, and capital expenditure at £F326,638, compared with £F1,298,229 and £F293,978 respectively for 1965. Other notable items of estimated expenditure were: South Pacific Health Service, £F10,094; Fiji School of Medicine, £F59,379; Fiji Leprosy Hospital, Makogai, £F38,973; research library, £F1,421; and family planning, £F15,230.

Educational conditions

78. In 1966 the primary and secondary school enrolments were 99,138 and 8,466 respectively, compared with 93,983 and 7,566 for 1965. The number of full-time pupils in technical and vocational schools was 733, an increase of 87 over 1965; 280 students were attending teacher-training colleges compared with 253 in the previous year. In addition, 66 other students completed intensive, three-month,

teacher-training courses. Moreover, 178 students were studying overseas on scholarships of a minimum duration of one year. Of these scholarships, fifty-six were held by students intending to teach or by teachers undergoing further training.

79. In 1966, there were 646 schools scattered over fifty-five islands. They were staffed by 3,326 teachers, of whom 2,547, or 76 per cent, were trained. In addition, there were forty-three kindergartens.

80. The Fiji Development Plan for 1966-70, which was adopted by the Legislature in 1966, envisages a total primary and secondary school roll of about 131,000 by 1970 and an expenditure of £11 million over the next four years.

81. Government gross expenditure on education for 1966 was estimated to be over £F2 million compared with £F1.9 million for 1965.

82. The United Kingdom Government announced in March 1967 that it would be prepared to offer £1.25 million sterling, to be made available over a period of some five years towards the initial costs of a university in Fiji, including related institutes, of which up to \$500,000 sterling could if necessary be devoted to recurrent costs. In addition, the United Kingdom Government would be prepared to consider negotiation of an agreement under the British expatriates' supplementation scheme by which it would for a time meet part of the expatriate cost of employing British staff at the university. In 1966, the Higher Education Mission to the South Pacific had recommended the establishment of a university of Fiji which would serve the interests of the whole of the South Pacific region. The initial capital cost was put at £1,375,000 sterling and operating costs at £356,000 sterling a year.

ANNEX II*

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON FIJI

Chairman: Mr. Jorge HUNEEUS (Chile)

1. At its 463rd meeting, on 7 September 1966, the Special Committee adopted a resolution concerning the question of Fiji,^{a/} in operative paragraph 4 of which it decided "to appoint a Sub-Committee to visit Fiji for the purpose of studying at first hand the situation in the Territory and to report to the Special Committee as soon as possible".
2. The General Assembly by its resolution 2185 (XXI) of 12 December 1966, endorsed the decision of the Special Committee and requested "the Chairman of the Special Committee, in consultation with the administering Power, to appoint the Sub-Committee as early as practicable".
3. In a letter dated 28 August 1967, addressed to the Chairman of the Special Committee, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations stated, inter alia, that the United Kingdom Government did not regard a visit to Fiji by a sub-committee of the Special Committee as necessary and was unable to agree to a visit by the sub-committee as then proposed.
4. At the 555th meeting, on 11 September 1967, the Chairman informed the Special Committee that, following his further consultations with the members of the Committee and in the hope that it would be able to assist the Special Committee in its consideration of the question, he had decided to appoint Bulgaria, Chile, Finland, India and the United Republic of Tanzania as members of the Sub-Committee on Fiji.
5. Following its consideration of the question of Fiji at its meetings in 1967, the Special Committee, at its 561st meeting on 15 September, adopted a

* Previously reproduced under the symbol A/AC.109/L.495.

a/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23 (A/6300/Rev.1), chapter VII, paragraph 120.

resolution^{b/} on the question in which it, inter alia, deeply regretted "the negative attitude of the administering Power in refusing to agree to a visit by the Sub-Committee on Fiji to the Territory", and urgently appealed to the administering Power to "co-operate with the Special Committee... and to reconsider its decision... in order to facilitate the work of the Special Committee".

6. At its twenty-second session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2350 (XXII) of 19 December 1967, in which it reaffirmed the necessity for sending a visiting mission to Fiji; it regretted the refusal of the administering Power to receive a visiting mission and urgently appealed to it to reconsider its decision. It also requested the Special Committee to continue its examination of the question of Fiji and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session.
7. The Sub-Committee on Fiji held its first meeting on 1 July 1968 and unanimously elected Mr. Jorge Huneeus (Chile) as Chairman.
8. At the same meeting, the Sub-Committee authorized its Chairman to request the representative of the administering Power to furnish as soon as possible information concerning the steps taken and/or envisaged by it in implementation of General Assembly resolution 2350 (XXII), with a view to enabling the Sub-Committee to visit the Territory. Accordingly, the Chairman, in his letter of the same date addressed to the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, requested the information desired by the Sub-Committee.
9. In a letter dated 30 July 1968, the Acting Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom addressed a reply to the Chairman's letter, in which he stated, inter alia, as follows:

"I now have the honour to inform you, on instructions, that the United Kingdom Government has considered your letter but regrets that it sees no grounds for varying the position set out in the letter No. 15124/62/67 of 28 August 1967, to the Chairman of the Special Committee, circulated as a document of the Special Committee (A/AC.109/261)."
10. At its second meeting on 30 August the Sub-Committee authorized its Chairman to draw up a draft report on its work. The draft report was considered and adopted by the Sub-Committee at its third meeting on 6 September.
11. The Sub-Committee deeply regrets that, owing to the continued refusal of the administering Power to receive the visiting mission in Fiji, it has not been possible to discharge the tasks entrusted to it in the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Special Committee.