

HGM (79) 9th Session

**COMMONWEALTH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT MEETING  
LUSAKA, 1-7 AUGUST 1979**

*RECORD of the Ninth Session held at Mulungushi Hall, Lusaka,  
on Tuesday, 7 August 1979 at 9.30 a.m.*

Present:

His Excellency Dr. K. D. Kaunda, President of Zambia  
(in the Chair)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| The Right Hon. Malcolm Fraser, M P,<br>Prime Minister of Australia                               | HE Mr. Anthony Roberts, High Com-<br>missioner to the United Kingdom,<br>The Bahamas                       |
| HE Mr. A. N. Hamidullah, High<br>Commissioner to Zambia, Bangladesh                              | The Hon. H. de B. Forde, M P,<br>Attorney-General and Minister for<br>External Affairs, Barbados           |
| HE Sir Seretse Khama, President of<br>Botswana   | The Right Hon. The Lord Carrington,<br>Secretary of State for Foreign and<br>Commonwealth Affairs, Britain |
| The Right Hon. Joe Clark, Prime<br>Minister of Canada  | HE Mr. Spyros Kyprianou, President of<br>Cyprus  |
| The Hon. M. A. Douglas, Minister<br>for Finance, Trade and Industry,<br>Dominica                 | The Right Hon. Ratu Sir Kamiseva<br>Mara, Prime Minister of Fiji   |
| HE Sir Dawda Kairaba Jawara,<br>President of The Gambia  | HE Major Mensah Gbedemah, Armed<br>Forces Revolutionary Council, Ghana                                     |
| Mr. George R. E. Bullen, Adviser,<br>Grenada   | The Hon. R. E. Jackson, Minister of<br>Foreign Affairs, Guyana   |
| The Hon. Shyam Nandan Mishra,<br>Foreign Minister, India   | The Hon. Michael Manley, Prime<br>Minister of Jamaica  |
| The Hon. Daniel T. Arap Moi, M P,<br>President of Kenya  | HE Mr. I. T. Tabai, President of<br>Kiribati   |
| The Hon. C. D. Molapo, Minister for<br>Foreign Affairs, Lesotho                                  | The Hon. D. T. Matenje, M P, Minister<br>of Education, Malawi  |
| The Hon. Tengku Ahmad Rithauddeen<br>bin Tengku Ismail, Minister of<br>Foreign Affairs, Malaysia | The Hon. Dr. Philip Muscat, M P,<br>Minister of Education, Malta   |
| Dr. The Right Hon. Sir Seewoosagar<br>Ramgoolam, Prime Minister of<br>Mauritius                  | The Right Hon. R. D. Muldoon, Prime<br>Minister of New Zealand   |
| HE Major-General H. E. O. Adefope,<br>Commissioner for External Affairs,<br>Nigeria              | The Right Hon. Michael T. Somare,<br>CH, M P, Prime Minister of Papua<br>New Guinea                        |
| Mr. Charles Cadet, Counsellor, High<br>Commission, London, St. Lucia                             | HE Mr. F. A. Rene, President of<br>Seychelles  |
| The Hon. Dr. Abdulai Conteh, Minister<br>of Foreign Affairs, Sierra Leone                        | The Hon. Lee Kuan Yew, Prime<br>Minister of Singapore  |

The Right Hon. Peter Kenilorea, Prime Minister of Solomon Islands

The Hon. Prince Ngaba, Minister for Commerce, Industry, Mines and Tourism, Swaziland

H R H Prince Tuipelehake, Prime Minister of Tonga

H E Mr. Godfrey Binaisa, President and Chairman of the National Executive Committee, Uganda

H E Mr. Shridath S. Ramphal, *Secretary-General*

The Hon. R. Premadasa, Prime Minister of Sri Lanka

H E Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, President of Tanzania

H E Mr. Eustace Seignoret, High Commissioner to the United Kingdom, Trinidad and Tobago

The Hon. Vaovasamanaia Filipo, Minister for Finance, Western Samoa

Also present:

AUSTRALIA

The Hon. Andrew Peacock  
Mr. D. W. Evans

BARBADOS

Mr. S. E. Emtage  
Mr. F. M. Blackman

BRITAIN

Sir John Hunt  
Mr. R. A. R. Barltrop

CYPRUS

H E Mr. Nicos Rolandis  
Mr. Andreas Christofides

FIJI

Mr. J. Kotobalavu  
Mr. R. Sanders

GHANA

H E Mrs. Gloria Nikoi  
Mr. S. E. Quarm

INDIA

Mr. J. S. Mehta  
H E Mr. K. Natwar-Singh

KENYA

The Hon. Charles Njonjo  
The Hon. Dr. Munyua Waiyaki

LESOTHO

The Hon. C. D. Mofeli  
Mr. T. Thahane

BANGLADESH

H E Mr. A. R. S. Doha

BOTSWANA

The Hon. A. M. Mogwe  
Mr. L. J. M. J. Legwaila

CANADA

The Hon. Flora MacDonald  
Mr. A. E. Gotlieb

DOMINICA

Mr. J. N. Johnson

THE GAMBIA

The Hon. L. K. Jabang  
The Hon. M. L. Saho

GUYANA

The Hon. Dr. M. Shahabuddeen  
H E Mr. Cedric H. Grant

JAMAICA

The Hon. Carlyle Dunkley  
Mr. Don Brice

KIRIBATI

Mr. A. Baiteke  
Mr. A. O. Davies

MALAWI

Mr. J. B. Mkandawire

MALAYSIA

Mr. P. A. Hamid  
Mr. A. Singh

MAURITIUS

The Hon. R. Ghurburrun  
Mr. B. Ghoorah

NIGERIA

H E Ambassador S. U. Yoloh  
H E Ambassador J. D. Sokoya

SEYCHELLES

Mr. D. Thomas  
Mr. F. Marie

SINGAPORE

The Hon. C. T. Goh  
Mr. S. Dhanabalan

SRI LANKA

The Hon. Ramil Wickremasinghe  
Mr. R. B. Weerakoon

TONGA

H R H Prince Tupouto'a  
Mr. T. Tufui

WESTERN SAMOA

Mr. A. Hutchison

MALTA

Mr. E. Causon  
Mr. A. J. Falzon

NEW ZEALAND

Mr. B. J. Lynch  
Mr. A. M. Bisley

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Mr. M. Morauta  
Miss J. Kekedo  
Mr. I. Tarua

SIERRA LEONE

H E Dr. S. T. Matturi  
H E Mrs. F. Joka-Bangura

SOLOMON ISLANDS

Mr. Francis Bugotu  
Mr. Frank Saemala

TANZANIA

The Hon. Pius Mseka  
The Hon. Edwin Mtei

UGANDA

The Hon. Otema Allimadi  
Mr. T. Mutebire

ZAMBIA

The Hon. W. Chakulya  
The Hon. M. J. Lumina

*Secretariat:*

Mr. D. A. Anderson  
Prof. K. S. Murshid  
Mr. R. G. Brown  
Mr. M. Malhoutra  
Mr. P. J. Brooks  
Mr. C. W. Sanger  
Mr. S. J. Stellini  
Dr. A. C. Bundu  
Mr. C. R. Laidlaw

## CONTENTS

Item No.	Subject	Page
I	Report of the Committee of the Whole ... ..	167
II	Declaration on Racism and Racial Prejudice ... ..	173

## I. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

*Dr. Kaunda* said that he proposed to deal first with the Report of the Committee of the Whole, which had been circulated, and then, if the Meeting agreed, to consider the Declaration on Racism. He felt that colleagues would welcome an early break for lunch at which time the draft of the Communiqué would be available for study and perusal, and could be considered in the afternoon. Given the good luck which had persisted throughout the Meeting, it should be possible to close the Meeting a day earlier than expected.

*Dr. Kaunda* reminded the Meeting that a number of items had been remitted to the Committee of the Whole for their initial consideration. The Committee's report had been circulated as HGM (79) 24. He suggested that the report should be considered section by section.

At the request of the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, it was agreed that the section dealing with the Commonwealth Youth Programme would be considered last.

## PARAGRAPH 6 ON THE COMMONWEALTH FOUNDATION

*Dr. Kaunda* said he wished to draw particular attention to the reference to Mr. Chadwick who had served the Foundation with great devotion as Director for 14 long years. He would like the Meeting to place on record its appreciation of his services and to wish him well in his retirement. (*Applause*) He asked the Secretary-General to convey to Mr. Chadwick the appreciation of Heads of Government of his services.

The Meeting agreed to paragraph 6.

## PARAGRAPH 7 ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL COMMONWEALTH

The Meeting agreed to paragraph 7.

## PARAGRAPHS 8-10 ON WOMEN AND DEVELOPMENT

The Meeting agreed to paragraphs 8-10.

## PARAGRAPH 11 ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMONWEALTH HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

*Sir Dawda Kairaba Jawara*, Gambia, said that he wished to thank and congratulate the Committee of the Whole for the very thorough manner in which the proposal had been considered. He would like to suggest a small amendment. The Commonwealth of Nations was founded on the very principles of human rights. In 1971 the Heads of Government Meeting had issued the very important Commonwealth Declaration of Principles which embodied all aspects of human rights. In 1977 the London Meeting had reaffirmed its dedication to those principles. The Committee had recommended that a further re-affirmation should be made. The issue of human rights was extremely important. There were serious violations of those rights in many parts of the world. Since the ousting of Idi Amin in Uganda, the Commonwealth record was fairly clean compared with other areas of the world. The ideals, principles and values held by the Commonwealth were so high that the Commonwealth should be in the vanguard of the fight to protect human rights and the rights of the individual.

He suggested, therefore, that what was lacking was not a reaffirmation of principles and values, but a mechanism which could protect those principles and values. In that spirit he had proposed at the London Meeting the setting up of a commission. The London Meeting, however, had been overshadowed by the dark clouds of the very serious violations of human rights in Uganda. Those violations had been condemned in the Communiqué, but condemnation was not

enough. If the Commonwealth was really to be in the vanguard of the fight for human rights, it was necessary to have an instrument with which to protect those principles and to monitor their observance throughout the Commonwealth. Since it was agreed in principle that a commission should be set up, he suggested that the second sentence of paragraph 11 should be amended to read:

"It further recommended that the Secretary-General should be requested to appoint a suitably qualified and representative working party to make recommendations for the consideration of Commonwealth Governments."

If that formula was adopted, the report of the working party would concretise the idea and give governments something on which to comment before the next Heads of Government Meeting, or even earlier.

Mr. Binasa, Uganda, suggested that the proposed working party should not merely make recommendations. He hoped it would draft a declaration of human rights and would go to the extent of suggesting ways and means of enforcement by something like a human rights court for the Commonwealth. A mere recommendation would not have the kind of teeth he would like to see. Perhaps the mendmentation would not have the kind of teeth he would like to see. Perhaps he was a little obsessed with the idea of human rights because he had been a victim of their violations in Uganda for a period of eight years. He felt it was time that Commonwealth countries were asked to consider a draft declaration on human rights, and to suggest amendments or to make comments.

Dr. Conteh, Sierra Leone, supported the amendments proposed by the President of The Gambia. It was the view of his Government, following discussions at the O.A.U., that it was time to move forward beyond mere pious affirmations of principle. At the last meeting of the O.A.U. in Monrovia it had been agreed that a committee of experts should be set up to make recommendations on the the topic to the next meeting of O.A.U. Heads of Government. Therefore, he agreed with the proposal to authorise the Secretary-General to appoint a working party without delay, and to ask it to put something on paper to which governments could react.

The Secretary-General suggested that he might venture a word of guidance in relation to the amendment proposed by the President of Uganda. If the paragraph were amended as proposed by the President of The Gambia, the working party would be competent to put forward whatever drafts they felt desirable emerging out of their consultations. It might be unproductive in terms of the objectives of Heads of Government if one were to specify a requirement to produce a declaration on human rights. The working party's considerations might travel down many byways: they might want to look at precedents and conventions; at the structure of a commission; at a variety of things. He believed that all those possibilities were encompassed within the amendment proposed by the President of The Gambia. His recommendation to Heads of Government would be to leave the recommendation in the wide terms that the President of The Gambia had proposed, so that the working party could be established and then left to decide what they felt needed to be put forward.

Mr. Moi, Kenya, supported the amendment proposed by the President of The Gambia. In view of the variety of constitutions in the Commonwealth, some of which included a Bill of Rights, it was a good idea that the question of human rights should be discussed thoroughly and the views of various governments obtained. Among the factors to be considered were the effects of racialism and tribalism on any system aimed at the protection of individuals.

Mr. Forde, Barbados, said that his country felt very strongly about human rights. Perhaps the point raised by the President of The Gambia could be more properly answered by the deletion of only five words from the draft: "subject

to the views received", and the substitution of one word in the line before that: "The Secretary-General should *also* be requested . . ." It was important that the working party should have before it the views of governments. When Commonwealth Law Ministers met in Winnipeg in August 1977 they were conscious of the need to have governments' views before making their final recommendations to Heads of Government. It was hoped that Commonwealth Law Ministers would meet in Barbados between April and May 1980 at which time it would be useful for them to know the reactions of governments. His proposed amendment would answer the fears of the President of The Gambia and would also hasten and improve the work of the working party.

Dr. Kaunda said that he thought it was very appropriate that Heads of Government should pay so much attention to the subject which was no less important than economic and development issues. He believed that Mr. Forde's suggestion would meet their needs. The paragraph would then read:

"The Committee recommended that Heads of Government reaffirm the importance attached by Commonwealth Governments to the observance of human rights as proclaimed in the Singapore Declaration and other international instruments and welcome in principle the initiative by the Government of The Gambia for the establishment of a Commonwealth Human Rights Commission. It further recommended that Governments be urged by the Secretary-General to communicate to him by the date of the next Commonwealth Law Ministers Meeting the views requested on the subject by Law Ministers at their Winnipeg Meeting in August 1977. The Secretary-General should also be requested to appoint a suitably qualified and representative Working Party to make recommendations for the consideration of Commonwealth Governments."

Sir Dawda Kairaba Jawara, considered that the amendment provided the best of both worlds. Comments would be received from governments and the Secretary-General could go ahead and appoint the Working Party, who would benefit by any comments which any government might wish to submit.

The Meeting agreed to paragraph 11 as amended.

Dr. Kaunda expressed the hope that governments would submit their comments in good time for the meeting of Law Ministers in Barbados in 1980.

Sir Dawda Kairaba Jawara asked for confirmation that the Secretary-General could go ahead and appoint the Working Party without waiting for further views from Governments.

Dr. Kaunda replied that that was the position.

PARAGRAPH 12 ON A COMMONWEALTH FILM AND TELEVISION INSTITUTE  
The Meeting agreed to paragraph 12.

PARAGRAPHS 13 AND 14 ON COMMUNICATION AND THE MEDIA IN THE COMMONWEALTH

The Meeting agreed to paragraphs 13 and 14.

Mr. Fraser, Australia, said that his Government was prepared to put some money into the proposal. Clearly, more could be done if some other governments were also prepared to put a little money in.

Dr. Kaunda commented that the Secretary-General would write to all governments urging them to lend support to the scheme.

PARAGRAPHS 15 AND 16 ON RESOLUTIONS OF COMMONWEALTH MINISTERS OF HEALTH AND OF YOUNG COMMONWEALTH LEADERS  
The Meeting agreed to paragraphs 15 and 16.

PARAGRAPH 17 ON COMMONWEALTH FOOD SECURITY  
The Meeting agreed to paragraph 17.

PARAGRAPHS 2-5 ON THE COMMONWEALTH YOUTH PROGRAMME

*Mr. Wickremasinghe*, Sri Lanka, said that there were two points which concerned him in the report of the Committee of the Whole. The first was the recommendation that the funds available to the Programme be increased to £1 million per annum and that in determining the minimum voluntary contributions for the target figure each government might be guided by its percentage contribution to the Commonwealth Secretariat administration budget. The second was that there should be a review of the management structure and activities of the Programme in the light of current financial constraints.

When the programme was reviewed in 1976 it was recommended by the Commonwealth Youth Affairs Council that the Programme should have an annual budget of £1 million. In his report, the Secretary-General had estimated that with adjustments for inflation it should be £1.4 million per annum. But so far the budget had been in the region of only £700,000. He agreed that the target should be £1 million and he was sure that all governments would make the maximum contribution they could but the problem was that if pledges were to be determined in accordance with the percentage contributions to the Commonwealth Secretariat administration budget, contributions by many developing countries would have to be increased very substantially, in some cases by six or seven times.

As to reviewing the structure, there were certainly some shortcomings in the Programme but whatever review took place the regional approach should not be abandoned. The problems concerning youth in Sri Lanka, India, Bangladesh, Singapore, were somewhat different from the problems relating to young people in other regions. For example, in Sri Lanka and in India there were a large number of unemployed graduates. That was not necessarily the situation elsewhere.

He asked for the support of the developed countries because the Programme was unique. There were, of course, other agencies and organisations which held conferences about youth problems but when he asked one of his officials why he was not attending a particular international conference in preference to an activity arranged by the Commonwealth Youth Programme, he was told, "Sir, that is a talk-shop. I prefer to go to the work-shop."

There were three fields in which the Programme had been able to achieve results: first by promoting between members the flow of ideas and experience involving youth work; secondly by involving young people in programmes of national development; and thirdly by strengthening the bonds of friendship between the youth of the Commonwealth. In respect of the first point he said that most countries in the Commonwealth did not have comprehensive youth policies. Policies had to be developed in societies which were politically pluralistic and many of them would have different and varied racial components and ethnic groups. The only way in which those policies could be developed was by exchanging ideas among all Commonwealth countries working in the field. Ideas were being exchanged on youth employment and that was important because in most Commonwealth countries there was a very high rate of unemployment.

In Sri Lanka the youth services were restricted to the urban areas. The rural sector, which comprised roughly 80 per cent of the population had no youth services at all and the Government was trying to draw up a programme to make

such services available. The fact that most societies were in transition from subsistence agricultural economies to ones based on modern methods of farming and from economies based on agriculture to ones based on manufacturing created additional stresses and demands. Within each village, in each region, as the rate of commercial activity increased, it was found that the parents of young people were unable to provide the kind of advice which youth had earlier sought from them. The Youth Service partly filled the role of parents in giving guidance to young people on their role in society.

Support was required from all Commonwealth countries who could help them. He asked member countries to keep in mind that while most developing countries were prepared to make a maximum financial contribution to the Programme, they might not be in a position to reach the target related to their percentage contribution to the Secretariat's budget. If those targets could not be met then the Programme would fail. He hoped that the more developed countries would fill the gap because the Commonwealth Youth Programme was needed now even more than when it was started in 1973. The collapse of the Programme would have the most serious effects on the youth of the Commonwealth, who comprised more than half its population.

*Dr. Kaunda* remarked that it was very important that leaders of the Commonwealth had allowed a representative of youth to speak for his colleagues, both male and female. The last speaker had reminded him of the appointment he had made a few months before of a colleague to be Minister of Youth and Sport. He was sure that the Zambian Minister would have spoken exactly as the Minister from Sri Lanka had done. The Meeting had heard not the youth of Sri Lanka but the youth of the Commonwealth.

*The Secretary-General*, said that he fully shared the sentiments expressed by the Minister of Youth Affairs of Sri Lanka. The Commonwealth Youth Programme had arisen out of those years of student riots, of protest movements and of great concern among political leaders with the problems of youth. It was a modest Programme and it had remained so. Its total cost was only about a million pounds, and under the Programme a whole range of very important and very interesting things had been done. Among them was the establishment of three Regional Centres, one each in Asia-Pacific, Africa and the Caribbean. Her Majesty the Queen only a week before had unveiled the commemorative plaque at the new building that Zambia, out of its own resources, was providing to house the Commonwealth Youth Programme Africa Centre in Lusaka. Unless the shortfall in funding was met all of the Centres were in jeopardy. If cuts had to be made in the Programme they would primarily fall on the Centres. The Africa Centre did not serve only Africa. The majority of the participants were from Africa but there had been students from Australia, Canada, the Caribbean, and the Pacific and the same cross-fertilisation was taking place at the Centres in Asia-Pacific and the Caribbean.

The future of the Commonwealth rested only in part with today's political leaders. It was also going to be affected by the leadership of tomorrow drawn from among the young leaders of today. It was they who would fulfil the promise of the work undertaken by the present leadership. The youth training programmes in particular represented a very substantial investment in the future of the Commonwealth.

If the deficit were to be met and if this matter were as important as both the Minister and he considered it to be, the formula that had been put up by the Committee appeared to him to be a recipe in futility. It would mean that the deficit would almost totally fall on the shoulders of the developing member states. He believed there was room for all countries, including the poorer countries, to increase their contributions to the Youth Programme but it was totally unrealistic to believe that that deficit could be met wholly by the poorer

ones. He had no quarrel with exhorting governments, particularly governments of developing countries, to look to their percentage contributions as a guide to the targets they should seek to reach. He noted, however, that the Programme was voluntarily funded and its future was going to rest on the ability of those countries that could better afford to contribute to provide the relatively small amounts that were required. He asked governments to do their utmost to ensure that the deficit was made up. He considered that a determination to do that should be reflected in the conclusions that were reached and suggested that the following be added at the end of paragraph 4 of the Committee's recommendations:

"... and that all governments should endeavour to increase their pledges to make good the deficit".

*Dr. Kaunda* remarked that the Centre to which the Secretary-General had referred, and which Her Majesty the Queen had visited, was costing Zambia K800,000. A further K290,000 was to be spent on staff houses, making a total of K1,090,000, or £688,130. In Zambia's present economic situation, that represented a big sacrifice, but a sacrifice that they were prepared to make because they believed that the future of the Commonwealth must involve youth. He was very grateful to the Secretary-General for his very able contribution and strongly supported the proposal made by the Minister from Sri Lanka.

*Mr. Clark*, Canada, said that his country had been involved significantly in the funding of the Youth Programme. Indeed, the disproportionate burden of funding had caused some concern to his finance and treasury board officials. Nonetheless, Canada intended to continue to play an active role in the funding of the Programme. He had noted the Secretary-General's reference to the fact that the Programme had been brought into being to meet the needs perceived in 1973. He suggested that it would be useful if the review which had been proposed to consider the Programme's management structure and activities might also turn its attention, but not in a fundamental sense, to whether or not the direction of the Programme needed to be modified to take account of new circumstances. The Secretary-General had been quite right to point out that a formula of assessed percentages would not meet the funding problems of the Programme because in stark terms it would mean that the contribution of a country like Canada would go down. As long as there was unanimity on the part of other countries to increase their contributions to the Programme, Canada would certainly be prepared to exempt themselves from the assessed percentage basis and would continue to make a disproportionate contribution in a way that reflected her greater capacity to contribute to the Programme.

*Mr. Moi*, Kenya, said that the future belonged to youth. It was important to prepare youth for their future responsibilities. The Programme deserved maximum support because of its importance to development and progress.

He wanted to stress the importance of technical education. In Kenya, there were 3.3 million children in primary schools and methods had to be found to channel them into technical schools so that they themselves and the nation would benefit from the education acquired. It was useless to produce children with merely primary school education. It was better to leave them uneducated than to give them only half an education. Therefore, if the Commonwealth could find ways and means of assisting by providing personnel to develop technical education, that would be very helpful. Kenya was particularly grateful to Canada who had provided a technical teachers' training college. Technical education could help young people participate in various fields of the economy and also in building the nation. Kenya was short of housing and had to use scarce foreign exchange in employing people from the developed countries to help with the housing programme. If the Secretary-General could further increase his assistance in expanding technical education, that would go a long way in helping the youth of tomorrow.

*Mr. Fraser*, Australia, said that Australia's position was very much the same as Canada's. In the light of the importance which members obviously placed on the Commonwealth Youth Programme, he would ask his officials to assess the Australian contribution in relation to it. He supported the Prime Minister of Canada's suggestion regarding the review of the Programme, and the directions it might take. He wondered whether the administration of the Programme could not be made a little more economical. There was a feeling that better value could be achieved in relation to the funds that were spent. Certainly, the Programme ought to continue, and he hoped it would have adequate support.

*Dr. Kaunda* commented that the Committee's proposals regarding assessed contributions were really ridiculous. For example, Zambia was currently contributing £17,341, but that would fall to £15,000, or £2,000 less. St. Lucia contributed £240; on the new assessment it would be required to contribute £7,500; it did not make sense. Lesotho, currently contributing £2,000, would be required to contribute £7,500. Malta's contribution of £573 would rise to £7,500, while Sierra Leone's £2,000, would have to jump to £15,000.

The discussion had made it clear that there was agreement that the Programme should be supported, that it should be reviewed, and that governments should make their contributions as generous as possible.

*Mr. Fraser* enquired whether paragraph 4 was to remain as it was or whether part of it was to be deleted.

*The Secretary-General* said that he was not proposing a deletion. The voluntary assessment percentage could be retained as a guide or target. Many countries would not attain it and he would urge all countries to increase their contributions to make up the deficit.

*Mr. Forde*, Barbados, suggested that in order to meet the points made by the Prime Ministers of Australia and Canada paragraph 5 might be altered to read:

"The Committee recommended that the Commonwealth Youth Affairs Council at its meeting early in 1980 should review the management, budget, structure, activities and future direction of the Programme."

The Meeting agreed to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 and to paragraph 5 as amended.

## II. DECLARATION ON RACISM AND RACIAL PREJUDICE

*Dr. Kaunda* suggested that the Meeting take up the draft Declaration on Racism and Racial Prejudice and called upon the Australian Foreign Minister to present the paper.

*Mr. Peacock*, Australia, as convener and chairman of the ministerial group which had examined the draft Declaration on Racism and Racial Prejudice, proposed the acceptance of the draft before the Meeting. He expressed his appreciation for the assistance of New Zealand and the Secretariat in the early consultations on the draft and, in particular, for the constructive attitude of all members of the drafting group.

The group had been a very representative one, comprising Nigeria, Lesotho, Tanzania, Guyana, India, Malaysia, Cyprus, Canada and New Zealand and had worked into the early morning to reach a consensus on the draft. They believed it most appropriate and singularly important that at that Meeting, at that time, and in that region, the Commonwealth should set out a stated position on racism

and racial prejudice. He believed it would be seen as an historic document and as complementary to the agreement reached by the Meeting on Rhodesia. All other international bodies of any substance had declared themselves on racism and racial prejudice and it was time the Commonwealth did so too. The draft before the Meeting was a constructive, new commitment by the Commonwealth and he trusted that it would be accepted, as its title indicated, as the Lusaka Declaration. The draft had been extensively examined and he hoped that Heads of Government would be able to accept it without change. He formally moved its adoption.

*Sir John Hunt*, Britain, said that he had had only a brief time to look at the draft. He wished to make two points. The first was that it was clearly a document of great political importance and assuming the text was agreed that morning, he hoped it could be formally adopted in the afternoon, to give time to his Ministers to see it. Secondly, on the substance he had only one point at the first reading, and that was in paragraph 3 on page 2. At several points in the draft the word "descent" had come in which had not been in the original Australian text. In most cases it was acceptable, but in paragraph 3 on page 2, "descent" was particularly linked with citizenship and he would like to have the opportunity of checking the position with regard to Britain's nationality laws. He thought that that point might also affect others and asked whether anyone on the drafting group could clarify the point.

*Mr. Peacock*, explained that the word "descent" was present in the original Australian draft, and had been lifted from the definition contained in the International Covenant on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination.

*Mr. Moi*, Kenya, asked whether the words "ethnic origin" meant also tribal background.

*Dr. Kaunda* replied in the affirmative.

*Mr. Kenilorea*, Solomon Islands, asked for purposes of clarification, in relation to the agreed statement on Rhodesia where reference was made to genuine black majority rule, whether the term "black" there connoted favour of certain races and therefore whether the Commonwealth was being racist in that agreement.

*Dr. Kaunda* replied in the negative.

*Mr. Forde*, Barbados, said he had no difficulty with the text as it stood, and thought it would be an historic document. However, he thought the document would have carried a tremendous validity in the Commonwealth had it had appended a declaration on discrimination based on sex. It was one of the worst forms of discrimination, to discriminate against people on the basis of their sexual characteristics and he hoped that at the next Meeting of Heads of Government there would be a similar declaration against sexual discrimination. It was a great pity that men still constituted the majority of leaders because they were short-sighted in their approach to the issue; for instance, they had hesitated in paragraph 3 on page 2 to include the vital word "sex" among the other categories mentioned there. It was still possible for countries, whilst proclaiming equality before the law, to treat women differently in many respects. The time had come when Heads of Government should really recognise that they had to stop that sort of practice in their countries.

*Dr. Kaunda* suggested it would be appropriate to seek a comment from Canada which had been a member of the drafting committee.

*Ms. MacDonald*, Canada, said the reference to the question of discrimination on grounds of sex had been included at Canada's insistence in the declaratory and

operative clauses on page 1 and it had been the drafting group's intention to make it consistent throughout with regard to the other clauses.

*Mr. Forde* welcomed that intention and therefore suggested the insertion of the word "sex" after the word "colour" in the second line of paragraph 3 on page 2.

The Meeting agreed to that insertion.

*Sir Seretse Khama*, Botswana, asked whether the Meeting would be asked to delete the part on citizenship if the British delegation felt, after examination of the text, that their interpretation of the document was in conflict with their citizenship laws.

*Dr. Kaunda* hoped that that would not be necessary, but if there were some problems it was only right that Britain should so inform the Meeting, and if their views could not be accommodated then the guidance of the Meeting would have to be sought.

*Mr. Dunkley*, Jamaica, reverted to the question raised by the President of Kenya as to whether tribe was embraced by the word "ethnic". He understood that it was. He recognised that the matter needed to be approached with caution because it could lay the Meeting open to a variety of sub-divisions on definitions. However, a document like the one under discussion served an educational purpose generally, and having regard to the fact that many member countries were afflicted with tribal problems, he wondered whether it would not be of benefit in that particular context to expand the text to make it clear that tribal discrimination was also being covered.

*Dr. Kaunda* felt that the word "ethnic" was most appropriate and met the point which had been raised.

*Mr. Moi* pointed out that racial discrimination made no distinction in regard to sex.

*Dr. Kaunda* agreed that there was really only discrimination in terms of racial groups, and that between those groups there was no sex discrimination.

*Mr. Forde*, commented that some laws were characterised by both conditions, race and sex, particularly in the laws of South Africa, which did not approve of people of different races marrying. Speaking as a lawyer, he thought by making the distinction in both conditions it was easier to prevent that sort of law being passed. That was one of the reasons why, while recognising that the essential underlying principle was against racial discrimination, other things should be included as well, such as sex, and that, he believed, was a legal justification for the inclusion of the term.

*Ms. MacDonald* cited an example from Canada where, if an Indian man married a white woman that white woman was entitled to all of the special rights and privileges which were accorded the Indian people as the first people of the country, but if an Indian woman married a white man she automatically lost all those privileges. There was discrimination there which was based on race but which was carried forward into sex.

*Mr. Moi* insisted that the origin of racial discrimination was apartheid. Once that, the bigger discrimination, was removed, the one of sex did not arise.

*Sir Seretse Khama* associated himself with the views expressed by *Mr. Dunkley*. The President of Kenya had raised the question of tribes in relation to

ethnic origins. In so far as the title of the paper was "Racism and Racial Prejudice", ethnic origin was appropriate, but he thought ethnic origin should not be equated with tribalism. If reference to tribalism was to be left out, it should be done so deliberately, not because it was possible to read tribalism into ethnic origin. He thought tribalism should also be added to the text. Everyone knew there was racism and racial prejudice, but they also knew there was still discrimination based on tribe.

*Mr. Moi* suggested that if the document highlighted it, they might be highlighting something which had settled down. It might be preferable, therefore, to refer to "ethnic group", although it was understood that that covered the aspect of tribalism as well.

*Dr. Kaunda* said that in most countries when they spoke of ethnic groups, tribalism was included. He understood that its inclusion was not being insisted upon. The document was therefore approved, with the exception of the item to be checked by Britain.

The Meeting adjourned at 12.25 p.m.