



THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

ARUSHA DECLARATION PARLIAMENT

*Address by the President
Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere
to the National Assembly*

Dar es Salaam

6th July, 1970

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members,

In June, 1965 I came to this House to announce the Dissolution of the Independence Parliament, and in September of that year we had our first election under the One Party State Constitution. Since then we have made many changes in Tanzania; it is appropriate that, at this last regular meeting of what may be called the Arusha Declaration Parliament, I should remind Members of our purposes and our achievements, as well as mention some of the things which remain to be done.

Our Constitution:

The elections of 1965—like those which will be held later this year—were conducted under a Constitution drawn up by us, and designed by us to meet our own needs and circumstances. It marked a great change. For Tanganyika began Independence in December 1961 with a constitution drawn up at a time when TANU was concerned almost exclusively with one thing—Independence. For that reason we concentrated our attention on the powers of the Governor-General; the control of the Government over the civil service, the police and the army; and on the relationship between the judiciary, the people and the Government. In addition, British agreement to our constitution was necessary. For all these reasons the Independence Constitution of Tanganyika was neither particularly suited to the needs of our development nor was it entirely ours. Yet it achieved our purposes; for it secured our complete political independence and it enabled us to draw up our own Republican constitution without interference from anyone. That constitution came into force in December, 1962.

By the beginning of 1963, therefore, Tanganyika was operating under a constitution devised by the Government of this country and accepted by the Parliament and people. Yet gradually we became dissatisfied with it. We became increasingly aware that real democracy in Tanganyika was not finding expression through the machinery we had set up. Therefore we appointed a Presidential Commission, which travelled the country obtaining the people's views on the constitution and listening to their ideas, before drawing up proposals for a democratic One Party State. This Report was considered by, and amended by, the National Executive of TANU; it was also accepted by the Afro-Shirazi Party in so far as its proposals affected Zanzibar. In July, 1965 Parliament then passed the Constitution based on that

Report. Ever since then the United Republic of Tanzania has been operating on a constitution which was drawn up and devised by Tanzanians, and which was based on a realistic appreciation of our own history and our own needs.

This constitution, which has been amended as we found it necessary, is called an "Interim Constitution". But we must not be unduly perturbed by that title, for it does reflect any doubts about our electoral system and Party structure. Like all other provisions of the constitution, these could of course be changed if not less than two thirds of the Members of this House so decided. But I am bound to say that nothing so far has indicated the necessity for basic amendments to the One Party election system, apart from the changes which were necessary to implement the leadership qualifications and which have already been made.

In fact, the only reason why our constitution is called "interim" is because, at the time of the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar in 1964, we acted quickly knowing that only by immediate action would we ever achieve our ambition for unity. Recognizing the problems of such a procedure, we decided that we would regard our arrangements as being interim while we gained experience of the necessities and the problems involved. Then, if it became necessary, either or both of the Parties could ask for the arrangements to be reconsidered. I would add that in practice we have been discussing advances and problems as they have arisen, and a number of consequential constitutional amendments have already been passed by this House.

The timing and circumstances of the Union also account for the fact that elections to the National Assembly are held on the mainland but not in Zanzibar. For our action was taken within a few months of a violent and bloody revolution in Zanzibar, which had been the necessary and inevitable result of the island's history. For Zanzibar had become independent in December 1963 under a constitution carefully and cleverly devised by the colonial Government and the Sultan's Government in order to frustrate the freedom and the development of the mass of the people. There had been two elections before Independence, but both were a sham, in that they did not result in a Government which reflected the people's expressed wishes. Not surprisingly, the people of Zanzibar refused to accept this, and at the first opportunity they overthrew the Sultan's Government. They did this at great cost in lives and under circumstances which inevitably left a heritage of bitterness, as well as a realistic recognition that attempts might be made to subvert the new regime and return the masses to the control of the minority. It was for this reason that the electoral system which was appropriate to, and desired by, the people of the mainland could not be adopted by Zanzibar. Not only

were the people understandably suspicious of elections because of their experience; they also knew that elections at that time could be used by anyone who wished to confuse the people and nullify the then fragile institutions of the people's government.

However, I will return later to a discussion of the Union between our two sovereign nations. My purpose for the moment is simply to point out that the word "interim" in the title of our constitution does not imply any instability or lack of control by the people over their own destiny. Neither does the word imply any time deadline after which the Union is in jeopardy. It is simply a public acknowledgment that when both sides are ready we shall look again at the present arrangements of union and see whether any alteration is required. So far we have not felt this to be urgent, but it may be that during the next Parliament discussions on this subject between TANU and the Afro-Shirazi Party will be begun.

Our present constitution thus governs the way we govern ourselves. It defines the powers and the duties of all our different political institutions, and is the basic law of this country, which must be followed by everyone. The constitution defines the role of the Party, the Parliament, the Courts and the President. It says what the President may do in his own discretion, and what he may do in co-operation with Parliament; and it lays down the supremacy of the people, specifying the manner in which they may legally exercise and effect their rights through TANU, the courts of this country, the Permanent Commission of Enquiry, and through their elected representatives. Our constitution is, in other words, the basis of Tanzania's orderly development. Following it ensures that the unity of our people, and their rights, cannot be lightly tampered with, and that effective government and development activity is still ensured.

Our achievements:

What then have we achieved over the last five years under this constitution? The answer is, a very great deal. Let us look first at the Union.

(a) The Union:

Without any question, the manner and the implications of the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar is the most misunderstood aspect of Tanzania's political development. It may not matter very much when foreigners get confused, but unfortunately there are many times when Tanzanians themselves appear to misunderstand it!

Under the constitution there are two Governments in this United Republic: the Union Government and the Zanzibar Government. The constitution lays down the powers of each; but at the time of Union it was clearly specified that Union Government powers, in so far as they required the assumption of duties previously carried out by the Zanzibar

Government, would come into effect gradually. In practice, this integration of Union matters has been effected by agreement between the two Governments, and not simply by the President exercising his legal authority. This procedure has been adopted because of the fact that our Union is a voluntary coming together of two equal nations; it is not the result of one State conquering another. Yet in fact, almost all the affairs included in the schedule of the Act of Union have now been integrated. Not only this, there have also been constitutional amendments to provide for certain matters to be transferred to the Union from the Zanzibar Government. Thus it has become possible for the whole United Republic to comply with and benefit from the Treaty for East African Co-operation; and questions relating to mineral resources have been transferred to the Union.

For all these reasons not even our enemies now talk of a "Union in name only". We have already reached a position where the Union seems natural and inevitable to our people, so that when difficulties occur we automatically think of a solution in the context of the Union. We take its existence for granted. Perhaps I should add that this has its own dangers! When it is young, every living thing must be cared for and guarded very carefully.

In 1960 I said that if the countries of East Africa want to federate, it will be easier to do this before independence rather than after, because independence brings its own problems. We have now seen the truth of that statement, and there is no need for me to enlarge upon the problems of securing unity in Africa. But the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar is a demonstration that unity can be achieved if the will exists, in spite of the difficulties. The fact that our Union has become stronger over the past five years is thus a great achievement which is an encouragement to all those who desire the unity of the whole of Africa.

(b) *East African Community:*

There is, however, another area in which our country has moved towards our ambition for greater unity in Africa since 1965. In December, 1967 the Treaty for East African Co-operation came into effect, with provision for a real Common Market between Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, and arrangements for jointly controlled common East African services. I do not need to go into details about this Treaty; you are all familiar with it. I will only remind the House that it was carefully worked out by the sovereign governments of our three nations to maximize for each country the benefits of co-operation. There are already signs that it will achieve this objective.

Of course, this move to unity in East Africa has not been without its problems for any of the countries involved, and some difficulties of implementation will continue to be experienced. But that is the nature

of international co-operation, and experience suggests that nothing which is worth doing is easy to do. In any case our Treaty for East African Co-operation has already achieved sufficient success to be widely hailed as an example of what can be done to increase co-operation in our continent; indeed, it has set something of a fashion for similar efforts elsewhere. I believe, therefore, that co-operation in this part of Africa will gradually expand both geographically and functionally in the years to come. Certainly that is my hope and that is what our Government has been working for.

(c) *Political development within Tanzania:*

The past five years have been, if anything, even more eventful internally, and once again we have many achievements to our credit.

First I must mention the successful completion of our first Five-Year Development Plan. It is true that not all the projects included in that Plan were fully implemented; we cannot claim that. But we did achieve a degree of success which was quite remarkable in the light of our large ambitions and the resources of men and money which were, in the ultimate, available to us. In particular we discovered at the end of that Plan that we had been pursuing a policy of self-reliance long before we officially adopted it! For, as you know, the extent to which we had financed the First Plan from within our own resources was out of all proportion to our expectations when we drew up the Plan. Over 70 per cent of the Development expenditure under that Plan had been found from within Tanzania, as against something like 22 per cent which we had expected to provide. We can take some satisfaction out of that achievement.

But in some ways the most important achievement of the past five years (and the only ones which I intend to enlarge upon today) have been the changes leading up to, and consequent upon, the Arusha Declaration—changes in which the members of this House have played a full and important part.

The Arusha Declaration was, and is, a statement about both politics and economics. These two aspects are equally important and cannot be separated from each other. For the Declaration is about the way in which we shall make a reality of human equality in this country, and how our citizens will achieve full control over their own affairs.

Since the Arusha Declaration three years ago, our practical emphasis has been on the necessity for public ownership and control over the economy. It was this aspect which required immediate action because it involved considerable changes in the institutions which existed before 1967. But the nationalization of the banks, of insurance, of food manufacturing plants, and of the wholesale, export and import trade, only makes a country socialist if the nation is governed by the people

themselves through their freely-elected representatives. This is specifically emphasized in the Arusha Declaration. Socialism is not possible without democracy, any more than it is possible without a full acceptance of human equality, regardless of race, tribe, religion or sex.

State ownership and control of the key points of the economy can, in fact, lead to a greater tyranny if the state is not itself controlled by the people, who exercise this control for their own benefit and on their own behalf. For socialism is not an alternative to political democracy; it is an extension of it. It is a system by which political democracy is made an effective reality in the lives of the people, because of their control over the instruments with which they earn their livelihood. Socialism, in other words, means the extension of political democracy to include economic democracy; it does not exist while either of these aspects is missing. The people cannot say that they control the economic institutions of their country if they do not at that same time control the political institutions through their ability to choose their own leaders. Political control and economic control by the people cannot be separated.

I think it is important to stress these two components of socialism so that the House understands the significance of own position and its own actions. For the National Assembly has been one of the people's institutions which has accepted the Arusha Declaration, and helped to implement it. Since February, 1967 an important part of the work of this Parliament has been to pass the necessary legislation and to supervise developments so as to ensure that our policies result in the quickest and greatest possible benefit to the people.

No one can say that this House, or the Government either, has made no mistakes in these matters; that would be an exaggeration. And anyone who suggested that we have achieved our objectives would show that he does not understand our goals. We are trying to build socialism; we are not yet a socialist country. But we have many things to be proud of.

First of these is the fact that our leaders, including the Members of Parliament, accepted the leadership qualifications of the Arusha Declaration. There was a certain amount of grumbling at the beginning and some M.P.s even suggested that the qualifications were hard on people who were just beginning to enjoy the fruits of capitalism. But M.P.s were not the only leaders to have such a reaction—as anyone will know, who attended the special TANU Conference in February, 1967! And in any case, a little reluctance to do the kind of duty which demands self-sacrifice or unpleasant effort seems to be human nature; what matters is that the duty is recognized to be right, and that it is done. In this respect the National Assembly has a fine record. Only one M.P. actually left Parliament on the issue, and one slipped out of the country partly for this reason—although on other pretexts. Incidentally, I hope it will not have escaped notice, or been forgotten, that the one man

who refused to comply with the socialist leadership qualifications was the M.P. who talked more about socialism and quoted more socialist textbooks than any other Member of this House! Perhaps this fact will help us to recognize that shouting about socialism, and being a socialist building socialism can be two very different things!

Apart from this, however, the House has co-operated with the Government and Party in passing a great deal of very important legislation. Bills considered here have dealt with questions relating to public control of the economy, changes in the educational system, the wages and incomes policy, the National Library Service, the re-organization of Government machinery to make it more effective for our new purposes, compulsory selective National Service and all the necessary financial provisions for giving emphasis to the rural areas as far as possible.

It may interest the House to realize that, apart from the many Bills relating to the national Budgets, an average of 42 Acts have been passed each year since 1965. Of course, it does not follow that speedy passing of legislation is necessarily an indication of good work by this Assembly! Speed is sometimes essential, but at other times it could indicate a lack of interest in the job, or a lack of care and preparation in the consideration of proposals put to Parliament by Government. In general, however, I think that has not been true of this National Assembly, although some proposals and Bills, especially those of a technical nature, have found the House at a loss. There have, however, been many occasions when the debates of the House have enabled Government to improve Bills under discussion, or to improve proposals submitted for debate.

I am not saying that I believe Parliament has always been right when it forced Government to give further consideration to Bills submitted; understandably perhaps, I feel that Government's proposals were sometimes unpopular with the House for wrong or insufficient reasons! Yet if Members were not persuaded, then they were right to force Government to reconsider the proposal concerned. For this meant that the Government had failed properly to explain its purposes or the reasons why it believed that its proposals would fulfil those purposes. And if M.P.s were not convinced, then they could not explain these things to the people. Parliament was thus carrying out one of the functions I outlined in my Address to this House on October 12th, 1965. I said then that provided both Government and the National Assembly members are "honest and able to advance arguments for their views, the people will be better served by reconsideration of the proposals than by automatic affirmative vote". So even on those few occasions when Government and the National Assembly have had differences of opinion, I believe that this House—and our constitution—has served our people, and given us cause for pride.

Political development, however, involves much more than Acts of Parliament, or National Assembly discussion of White Papers, or Private Members' Motions. As far as our people are concerned what matters is the impact our policies and administration make on their daily lives.

They care about the actions they experience, not our intentions or the Acts in which those intentions are inscribed. The people are not God; they do not judge us on our wishes or intentions, but on the results of our actions. In this respect serious deficiencies unfortunately still exist.

The Annual Reports of the Permanent Commission of Enquiry have shown something of the extent to which some officers of our Party, our Government, and our Courts have abused their powers, to the detriment of the peasants and workers of Tanzania. It is true that the last Report shows that the number of complaints has begun to lessen, and if this is the result of our improvement it is very good indeed. But we must not forget that the Permanent Commission receives complaints only from the most literate, aware, or energetic and courageous of our citizens; its Reports understate, rather than overstate the problem. This means that while we can be proud of the existence and the workings of the Permanent Commission of Enquiry—which was itself set up by this Parliament—we must not be complacent. We must work until all our people are able to rely on enjoying the respect and freedom within the law which is due to them as citizens of our country. This will be achieved only when every officer of Government, Local Government, and Party, and every Judge and Magistrate, acts consistently as an intelligent and humane servant of the community. In this matter we all have a heavy responsibility. For it is the job of the officers of Government and Party and of M.P.s, to explain policies to the people, to listen to them, to answer their questions freely and openly, and then to see that the policies are implemented properly, fairly, and with decent humanity even against those who transgress against our laws.

Yet I do not want to give a false impression. We have made mistakes and we have failed in many respects to do the things we set out to do. But we have worked hard and we have made many changes of great benefit to the peasants and workers of this country. While, therefore, it is appropriate that all of us should meet the citizens we seek to serve with a decent degree of humility and a consciousness of work still to be done, we do not have to meet them dressed in sackcloth and ashes! For we have much to be proud of. Over the past five years there have been many developments which have made the lives of our people much better. Water supplies, roads, bridges, schools, dispensaries, hospitals, improved technical services for the peasants, better working conditions for the wage-earners—in all these things our record is as good as any in Africa, and better than that of most under-developed countries.

We have made a good start. Further, much work has begun which will bring great benefit in the future. For example, the real importance of securing public ownership of the banks, insurance, all the major industries and so on, cannot yet be apparent to the villagers of Tanzania because it takes years to build up these institutions in the manner we require. The importance of our action in this respect can,

perhaps, be usefully compared to the experience of an Ujamaa village which starts a new farm. The people plant some crops like maize, beans, and groundnuts, which will provide their food almost immediately; but if they are wise they also plant things like tea which will begin to bring profit only after three years, and fruit trees which produce only after five or six years. It they are very far-sighted they will also have planted a small soft-wood plantation which will bring profit to the village only after 15–20 years, and even a hardwood plantation which will provide a steady income only after 40 or 50 years. The work of planting all these crops—both long-term and short-term—will have to be done by the founder members of the village. And although the results will not become apparent for years, the planters will have prepared a good heritage for their children and grandchildren through their long-term planning and investment.

Yet if the members of the village have not understood that some of their work will not bring immediate results, or if they have not wholeheartedly agreed to prepare this heritage for their descendants, then they will get disgruntled when the return on their labour is very small for the first two or three years. A side effect of this will be that they will change their leaders at the next opportunity! For the members of an ujamaa village have—and must have—the right to change their leadership, and they will make their choice on the basis of their understanding, not because some visiting expert economist knows that their work has been of great long-term importance. Thus the members may change their leaders because the present ones have not brought quick progress. They will be making a mistake, yet even so it is vital that they have this opportunity regularly to choose the leaders they want. For if the members do not have confidence in their leaders they will not work hard and they will not co-operate in villages plans; so no progress will be achieved—either long-term or short-term.

The next Election:

In just the same way the adults of Tanzania have, and must have, the right to elect their representatives in Parliament every five years. And they too, will make their choice on the basis of their present experience and their understanding of what has been done and why. We shall have our next Presidential and (on the mainland) Parliamentary Election in the next few months.

Elections are expensive to run, and introduce an element of personal uncertainty in the life of every leader. But they are essential to this nation, and indeed to every leader who accepts his role as servant of the people.

Firstly, the periodic right to choose or to reject a particular representative is the only way in which the people can be sure that their M.P.s and President will be truly and exclusively responsive to their interests, their needs and their desires. Secondly, only by periodic

elections can the Members of Parliament know that they continue to enjoy the confidence of the people. And only with such knowledge can we be certain of the people's co-operation and backing in the plans we make for our nation.

These are two very practical reasons for having elections at least every five years, but there is another even more fundamental reason.

The Government of this country—of which the President and the National Assembly are both parts—is intended to be the mechanism through which the people govern themselves. Our jobs exist only because it is impossible for the work of government to be done by the people directly. We are therefore elected to speak and act on their behalf. We can do this, and the people are therefore able to govern through us, only while both we leaders, and the people themselves, know that they will have a chance to decide that there is another person better able to speak for them. For it is the people's confidence, and the people's wishes about policies, which elections are intended to reflect. Further, it is the work they want done in the future which is important to them, not the things we have already done on their behalf; they neither will, nor should, choose their representative out of gratitude.

I know that there are, even in Tanzania, some beliefs that periodic elections are dangerous. It is said that they give to the enemies of our people and of our political system an opportunity to sow confusion; it is said that they could be used to destroy our unity; that they could be used to get rid of good leaders and replace them with bad leaders; or that elections could be an opportunity for rogues who oppose our policies of socialism and self-reliance; and so on. I know that some of the people who have these doubts about elections are very well motivated; they are anxious only to prevent disaster coming to our country. Indeed, I can assure you that I myself am aware that periodic elections do bring these dangers. Yet I am quite unable to see what we can put in their place.

We have rejected the system whereby our leaders are chosen by their mothers—that is, where a person becomes a leader just because he was born to a certain wife; this is a hereditary system—a sultanate. We could say that when our national leaders have once been chosen by the people we should leave them in position for life—meaning that we leave the question of their removal from office solely to God. This system has been proposed many times in Tanzania, although just for a few of our leaders, not all of them. But until now we have rejected this idea. It may be that in religious matters such a system is very appropriate; I do not know. But for matters of this world this system does not differ very much from the hereditary system which we are opposed to.

Let me explain. The wife of a sultan may give birth to a child who grows up to be a very good leader of the nation. That is good fortune. But she may also give birth to a very tyrannical leader. Under the hereditary system you will then have to wait until God removes this tyrant and his wife gives birth to a better leader. But how sad for the people if the next leader is also a tyrant—like his father! It is the same with elected leaders. You may choose a very good leader; that is good fortune. But you may make a mistake and choose a tyrant. What will you do then? There is nothing at all that you can do! You have to endure him until he dies as a result of an accident or disease. And I say that deliberately. Because you cannot logically and legally get rid of a man you have elected for life either by votes or by the use of weapons. Under a system of electing a leader for life you have surrendered the right to remove a man once you have selected him. You have retained only the right to choose in the first place. It is obvious that such a system is no good for us.

Nor can we lead a country as if it were a Church, with the priests and bishops of politics choosing and rejecting each other as leaders, without the believers having any chance to choose or to throw out their leaders. The Church can explain why they have this system. But it is very difficult to get an explanation which would justify a government concerned with this world being run on the same basis. Secular leaders of the people must have trust in the people; that is the only way they can be trusted by the people. A system where leaders choose themselves from among themselves rests on a foundation of mutual trust among the leaders; but it shows that the leaders have no trust in the people.

To sum up, only while there is this kind of recurring opportunity for choice, can the people rest confident that they govern themselves, and no one else governs them; only while this opportunity remains are we, their representatives, forced to overcome our indolence or our selfishness and serve them to the best of our ability. Without free elections the people of an independent country do not govern themselves; they are governed by masters. They may have good masters or bad; their masters may be local or foreign; but they are still masters. And if your masters are good, thank God; if they are bad, God help you!

Our Type of Elections:

It is, however, one thing to recognize the need for some kind of elections; it would be quite a different thing to assume that the electoral system has to be the traditional Western multi-party system. For to fulfil its purpose an electoral system must do two things. It must allow the people to elect a competent government which reflects their feelings and ideas; and it must enable them to do this without damaging the society in which they live, or the long-term objectives they have set themselves.

Our system of one-party democracy was designed by us in the belief that it would enable us to do both these things. For we recognized that the people of mainland Tanzania were united behind TANU and further, that this unity is our greatest strength in the struggle against poverty, as well as against any outside enemies. Our electoral system, therefore, provides the people with an opportunity to choose between two TANU candidates, each of whom is standing after a democratic process of party selection. By this procedure our Party is able to ensure that all candidates in the General Election are people of good character, loyal Party members, and qualified under the Arusha Declaration rules. At the same time, the fact that the Member of Parliament or Local Council is elected by all Tanzanian citizens reduces the danger of the Party getting out of touch with the people. Nor can a Parliamentary seat be used as a reward for past loyalty, regardless of present competence. For TANU is unable to assign a seat to any individual; that choice remains with the people of each constituency. Our system has no "safe-seats"!

I would add that one result of our system is that individuals who have served the nation well are sometimes not elected, even when the United Republic could still benefit from their services in Parliament or Government. But the possibility of defeat for a national leader is unavoidable: in every constituency the people must have the right to select their own representatives. In the exceptional case of an over-riding national need for the services of a person who is not elected, the President has the necessary powers. This provision in our constitution has, however, to be used sparingly; it has not been, and must not be, regarded as a reward for past services, only an indication of future national requirements.

The importance of national unity to Tanzania is also reflected in our prescribed manner of campaigning for election. There are two important aspects to this. First is the fact that the campaign is organized by and paid for by TANU, with the candidates travelling together and speaking on the same platforms. No candidate in our elections is expected to run a private campaign on his own behalf; indeed, we must take care that such "private enterprise" does not enter in to our system. For private campaigning would give rise to the possibility of bribery and corruption, thus introducing an advantage to candidates of greater wealth or lesser morality. It would also lead to divisions within our society, as groups form around individuals and urge their cause on, perhaps, communal grounds.

This brings me to the second important provision in the laid down procedure of campaigning. It is of fundamental importance that nothing shall be said or done by anyone involved which encourages division between our citizens on grounds of race, tribe, religion, or sex. In our society every citizen is of equal worth and must be judged on the basis

of what he does, not what he looks like, or what he believes about God. If we allow candidates to campaign, however indirectly, on the basis of their birth, or their parents' birth, their tribe, or their religious affiliation, then the whole basis of TANU policy is undermined. Who is a Tanzanian citizen is laid down by law, and only citizens will be standing for election. On that point, therefore, nothing more needs to be said. All that matters is whether an individual is a good person, a capable and an honest man or woman, and hopefully, a good socialist! It does not even matter whether his parents or his relations were or are any of these things; we cannot control what others do, only how we ourselves live and act.

Conclusion:

Mr. Speaker: I have been talking for a long time, but I want to conclude by pointing out that in the next five years we shall be building upon the work we have already done. And, as according to the English proverb, "nothing succeeds like success", I think we can look forward with confidence.

For we set out to establish a democratic one-party state. In spite of the doubts freely expressed by many people, we have succeeded in this aim so far. We set out to consolidate the union between our countries, Tanganyika and Zanzibar. In spite of many anticipated difficulties, and despite the gloomy prophecies of many people, we have had great success. We set out to establish the proposition that even a small and poor nation should resist the bullying of large nations and should remain the master of its own destiny. Our United Republic has acted in that manner; we are not a client or satellite of any nation, but we have survived.

And finally, we have decided to act boldly in the implementation of our ambition to build a self-reliant socialist state. I suspect that our success so far has given encouragement to others.

Our work is not finished. But as I do not anticipate the necessity, or the opportunity, to address this House again, I wish to express, on behalf of the Government, the Party, and all Tanzanian citizens, our appreciation of the work which Members have done over the past five years.

Some present Members of the House will seek a renewal of the people's confidence. Some of these may be elected and others may be defeated. But I wish to say now, that whatever the people's decision about their representatives for the coming five years, this House has served the nation well. Every Member will be able to take pride in, saying to his children, and his children's children. "I was a member of the Arusha Declaration Parliament".

Mr. Speaker, to you and every Member of this House I wish the happiness of continued service to the people of Tanzania, and to our socialist beliefs, in whatever field our people may decide is most appropriate to their interests.