

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1336th  
MEETING**

Monday, 8 October 1962,  
at 3.5 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 56:</i>	
<i>Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) (continued). Consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.748 and Add.1 (continued) . . . . .</i>	35

**Chairman:** Mr. Guillermo FLORES AVENDAÑO  
(Guatemala).

AGENDA ITEM 56

**Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) (A/C.4/560, A/C.4/L.747, A/C.4/L.748 and Add.1) (continued)**

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.4/L.748 AND ADD.1 (continued)

1. Mr. PUREVJAL (Mongolia) congratulated the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur on their election. His delegation, which was one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.748 and Add.1, deemed it essential, in view of the extremely tense situation prevailing in Southern Rhodesia, that the urgent measures provided for in the draft resolution should be adopted and it shared the view expressed by many delegations that the Government of the United Kingdom was responsible for the present situation. He hoped that the draft resolution would be approved unanimously.

2. Mr. DIALLO (Mali) referred to the telegram read out by the Secretary of the Council at the previous meeting in which a group of petitioners requested that the discussion of the draft resolution should be suspended until they arrived in New York. Considering the explosive character of the situation, which threatened the maintenance of peace and security in Central Africa, he was of the opinion that draft resolution A/C.4/L.748, which concerned a particular aspect of the problem of Southern Rhodesia, should be examined and adopted as a matter of urgency, so that steps to remedy the situation and restore democratic conditions in the Territory could be taken immediately.

3. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) congratulated the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur on their election and assured them that they would have the full co-operation of his delegation. He also wished to thank the petitioners for their statements; in particular, the statements by Mr. Dumbutshena (1333rd and 1334th meetings) were proof that the Africans of

Southern Rhodesia were capable of governing themselves.

4. The position of his delegation on the question of Southern Rhodesia had not changed since the General Assembly's sixteenth session. In resolution 1747 (XVI) the General Assembly had *inter alia* requested the Administering Authority to undertake the convening of a constitutional conference, in which there should be full participation of representatives of all political parties, for the purpose of formulating a constitution in place of the Constitution of 6 December 1961; to take immediate steps to restore all rights of the non-European population and remove all restraints and restrictions in law and in practice on the exercise of the freedom of political activity; and to ensure the immediate release of all political prisoners. As the recent actions of Sir Edgar Whitehead showed, nothing had been done to implement that resolution; indeed, the contrary was true. From the information available to the Committee it was apparent that Southern Rhodesia was a Non-Self-Governing Territory where a majority of 3.6 million Africans were ruled by a minority of 250,000 Whites; racial discrimination was practised in the political, economic and social fields and in education; the proposed new Constitution violated the letter and spirit of paragraph 5 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)); the electoral law set the principle of universal suffrage at defiance; the recent repressive measures, applied *inter alia* to ZAPU and its leaders, and the steps taken to advance the date of the forthcoming elections so that the world would be confronted with the rule of the European minority as a fait accompli appeared to be aimed at crushing the opposition, and ran counter to the provisions of operative paragraph 2 (a) of resolution 1747 (XVI); finally, those measures and the police régime in force had provoked political repercussions and were likely to aggravate the situation, with all the consequences that that might entail for peace in Africa. The representative of ZAPU had told the Committee that his party sought power for the African majority, without division into racial groups, that it rejected any constitution providing for minority representation and that it was opposed to any racial discrimination in the exercise of electoral rights.

5. The United Kingdom as the administering Power had the constitutional authority, the economic capacity and the moral obligation to comply with the demands of the African people. If it refused to do so, it was the duty of the Committee to persuade the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia to ensure that steps were taken to solve the problem.

6. As far as the immediate present was concerned, Mr. Nkomo, the President of ZAPU, should be released and the ban on that party should be lifted. His delegation therefore supported draft resolution A/C.4/L.748, of which it was a sponsor. That draft resolution

was an essential first step, although it would not suffice in itself to bring about a final settlement of the question.

7. Ceylon had been granted universal suffrage by the United Kingdom as far back as 1930 and independence in 1947, yet those blessings were now being refused to the Africans of Southern Rhodesia. He did not think that the Government of the United Kingdom was incapable of solving the constitutional and political difficulties which it was encountering in that Territory. He appealed to the United Kingdom Government to use its legal, constitutional, moral and economic power in Southern Rhodesia and to ensure the implementation of the resolution by taking the necessary steps to restore peace, harmony, goodwill and justice in that Territory.

8. Mr. ATIDEPE (Togo), referring to the telegram which the representative of Mali had mentioned, pointed out that the discussion and adoption of the draft resolution before the Committee would not put an end to the consideration of the question of Southern Rhodesia but would simply make it possible to come to grips with a particularly explosive situation. He therefore urged that the Committee should continue its consideration of the draft resolution, which would not stand in the way of its hearing the petitioners later.

9. Mr. KHOSLA (India) congratulated the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur on their election. His delegation, which reserved its right to discuss the situation in Southern Rhodesia at greater length, supported the draft resolution before the Committee. It regretted that the situation in the Territory was continuing to deteriorate and that a small privileged minority was seeking to tighten its grip on the defenceless African masses. The repressive measures applied to ZAPU were further proof that it was impossible to trust the European political leaders. Sir Edgar Whitehead was trying to prevent the formation of an African party which might put an end to European rule, and as justification for the ban on ZAPU he was claiming that the party was now resorting to violence. The speaker quoted from a number of newspaper articles showing that the Africans as a general rule were firm adherents of the doctrine of non-violence preached by Gandhi. However that might be, his delegation hoped that the United Kingdom Government would heed the warnings that Mr. Garfield Todd, a former Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, had uttered in that connexion, and would take steps to prevent the situation from degenerating into a new conflict of the Algerian or Angolan type. He also expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be approved unanimously and that the release of Mr. Nkomo would help to restore an atmosphere of confidence.

10. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) congratulated the officers of the Committee on their election. The priority the Committee had given to the question of Southern Rhodesia was an indication of the importance of the problem and the draft resolution now before the Committee was further proof of its urgency. In the view of his delegation, the Committee should approve the draft resolution, hear the other petitioners and then adjourn the general debate pending the results of the draft resolution. His delegation asked the United Kingdom to make provision for the measures which should be taken forthwith, for the tone of the general debate would depend on the application of those measures.

11. Mexico had the greatest respect for Africa's aspirations, which it considered to constitute a great

contemporary historical movement, and it felt that the United Nations should do everything it could to help that movement. It was in that spirit that the Committee should consider the amendments to draft resolution A/C.4/L.748 which his delegation wished to propose, with a view to ensuring the attainment of the objectives envisaged. It was apparent from the debates in the General Assembly at its sixteenth session and from those 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 that the situation in Southern Rhodesia was complex and that the crisis had been building up for a long time: the strong European minority which controlled the wealth of the country was seeking either a form of independence which would perpetuate that situation or the maintenance of ties with the metropolitan country based on common feelings and interests; the racial situation in the Territory was similar to apartheid, although discrimination had not been elevated to the level of a doctrine. It would therefore be timely to approve a draft resolution which would make it possible to ease the situation and in his opinion the draft resolution before the Committee was entirely acceptable. Accordingly, his delegation was suggesting only minor amendments to the text.

12. He would like the end of the second preambular paragraph to be amended so as to state that the situation constituted a denial of political rights and that its continuance would be likely to endanger the maintenance of peace and security in Africa and the world at large; the text would thus be in conformity with Article 33 of the Charter. The other amendments concerned the nature of the request to be addressed to the United Kingdom Government. The Special Committee had found itself unable to accept that the situation in Southern Rhodesia should remain anomalous in the sense that the Territory was not fully self-governing and that at the same time it was not subject to a responsible administering Power. Blaring that principle in mind, his delegation considered that, without abandoning principles, it was nevertheless possible to show courtesy to the administering Power. He therefore suggested that operative paragraph 1 should be amended so as to state that the General Assembly requested the Government of the United Kingdom to take, as a matter of urgency, whatever measures would be most effective to secure the objectives envisaged; and that paragraph 2 should be amended so as to state that the Assembly decided to keep the item entitled "Question of Southern Rhodesia" on the agenda and to consider, before the end of the seventeenth session, how the resolution had been implemented. The Committee would agree that it could not ask the United Kingdom Government to take action as it would a committee of the Assembly; the new wording would have the same result but it would take into account the personality of a sovereign Member State as such. The Africans were afraid that their condition of political inferiority would become permanent if the new Constitution was promulgated; his delegation was of the opinion that the United Kingdom Government could recommend that the application of the Constitution should be suspended and that the forthcoming elections should not take place until there was a definite improvement in the situation in the country. Moreover, the representative of ZAPU had stressed the great importance which his party attached to postponement of the elections.

13. In the view of his delegation, the measures envisaged in the draft resolution should precede the

postponement of the elections, for once the elections had taken place the situation could not be altered. He therefore appealed to the United Kingdom Government to abandon its negative attitude, based on the virtual autonomy of the white minority since 1923, and to participate in the debate. There had been similar precedents in the United Nations but all the States which had taken refuge in splendid isolation had inevitably found that time was not on their side. It was impossible to believe that the political genius of England had been exhausted. The United Kingdom could play a great role in the process of creating a multi-racial society which was now going forward in Central Africa; the establishment by the United Kingdom Government of a Central African Office under the Secretary of State for Home Affairs was proof that that Government attached to the problem the importance which it warranted; the moral power it wielded was sufficient to persuade the Government of Southern Rhodesia that it should, as a matter of urgency, take steps to remedy the situation.

14. He expressed the hope that the sponsors of the draft resolution would agree with his observations and adopt the amendments which he had suggested.

15. Mr. AGUIRRE (Uruguay), reserving the right of his delegation to deal with the substance of the question at a later stage, said that his country did not approve of the ban on ZAPU; the representative of that party had said that the acts of violence committed by the Africans were the consequence of the repressive measures adopted by the authorities of Southern Rhodesia. He appealed to the United Kingdom as the administering Power responsible for that Non-Self-Governing Territory and expressed the hope that the United Kingdom Government would respond to his appeal.

16. With regard to the draft resolution, he shared the views of the Mexican representative, particularly in connexion with the second preambular paragraph. The world political situation was such that any incident was likely to endanger international peace and security. The Charter specifically spoke of a danger to the peace and prescribed a number of methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes. It was therefore correct to say, in the words of the Charter, that the continuance of the present situation was likely to endanger international peace and security. If the resolution adopted by the General Assembly were not respected, the situation would then become what the Charter described as a serious one.

17. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) said that he would merely comment briefly on the draft resolution, reserving the right of his delegation to speak again on the general question of Southern Rhodesia. The request made to the United Kingdom in the draft resolution, of which Indonesia was a co-sponsor, referred to General Assembly resolution 1747 (XVI); it was based on the belief that the United Kingdom, as administering Power, had the power to take action.

18. In that connexion, he quoted a memorandum from ZAPU to the United Nations (A/AC.109/4), in which Mr. Nkomo enumerated the reserved powers which the United Kingdom continued to hold in Southern Rhodesia in matters of foreign affairs, defence, the right to conclude treaties, to adopt laws and to take control of the government of the Territory if it saw fit. Those provisions were embodied in the 1923 Constitution.

19. The United Kingdom Government claimed that, as a result of a number of agreements it had entered into,

it no longer possessed the powers conferred upon it by the 1923 Constitution, thus taking the view that a mere agreement could annul a constitutional provision. Its position, however, was not unassailable, for in 1959, the Government of Southern Rhodesia had proposed to the United Kingdom "that the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia should be revised with a view to transferring to Southern Rhodesia the powers vested in the United Kingdom Government", as was stated in the introduction to Southern Rhodesia Constitution: Part I—Summary of Proposed Changes, published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office.<sup>1/</sup> That document added that the new Constitution would "eliminate all the reserved powers at present vested in the Government of the United Kingdom".<sup>1/</sup> Thus Southern Rhodesia would be free to amend the Constitution without consulting the United Kingdom, except in so far as the right of the United Kingdom to safeguard the position regarding international obligations and undertakings given by the Government of Southern Rhodesia in respect of loans under the Colonial Stock Acts was concerned.<sup>2/</sup> It was curious to note that, although it was prepared to give up its powers for protecting the Africans, the United Kingdom reserved the power to protect British stockholders.

20. The United Kingdom Government would no doubt like to extricate itself from a situation which might appear embarrassing. The request made to it was really a demand by the African population of Southern Rhodesia, and the Indonesian delegation hoped that the Committee would approve it unanimously.

21. Mr. DIEPENHORST (Netherlands) said that his delegation shared the concern of the sponsors of the draft resolution and that the proposed text had his delegation's full sympathy. It felt, however, that the Committee should not vote upon the draft resolution until it had heard the new petitioners, whose testimony would supplement statements of the two petitioners whom the Committee had already heard. Moreover, although the situation in Southern Rhodesia was undoubtedly serious, his delegation thought that expressions like "endangers peace and security in Africa and the world at large", in the second preambular paragraph, should not be used too frequently for they would tend to lose their significance if used indiscriminately. It also felt that the draft resolution did not take sufficient account of the position of the United Kingdom Government, which was being asked to release Mr. Joshua Nkomo, the President of ZAPU, and all the other imprisoned nationalist leaders. The United Kingdom would need to have the power to take such action, but the fact was that the United Kingdom could not go against the measures enacted by the Government of Southern Rhodesia; the Committee would recall that the Reverend Michael Scott had said that the United Kingdom Government no longer had any armed forces in Africa on which it could rely to impose its decisions. The draft resolution was therefore addressed to the wrong party and would consequently prove ineffective. In the circumstances, the Netherlands would abstain in the vote, but it supported the amendments suggested by Mexico and appealed to the United Kingdom to exert all possible moral influence on Southern Rhodesia to uphold the cause of human rights in the Territory.

22. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution in principle and would

<sup>1/</sup> Cmnd. 1399, p. 3.

<sup>2/</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

vote in favour of it. It was deeply concerned at the developments in Southern Rhodesia in recent weeks and the situation was likely to deteriorate rapidly unless steps were taken to create a more favourable atmosphere. There might be differences of opinion on whether that explosive situation was the result of the state of emergency, of the arrests and imprisonments or, as the Southern Rhodesian Government claimed, of ZAPU's resort to unconstitutional methods, but that was not the point: the prevailing state of affairs was the result of inequities in the electoral law and of the Government's intention to hold elections based on a system which disregarded the rights of the Africans. It would not improve so long as the decision to hold elections and the electoral law itself had not been suspended and a constitutional conference of representatives of all parties had not been called.

23. The draft resolution should be approved as a first step. The Irish delegation would support it. That did not mean that it agreed with all its provisions; in that respect, it fully shared the views of the delegation of Mexico. In the second preambular paragraph, it would be better to follow the words of the Charter more faithfully and not to depart from the language used in previous resolutions. His delegation therefore appealed to the sponsors to give favourable consideration to the amendments proposed by Mexico. The first would improve the text by means of a very slight change; as for the others, it would surely be politically wise to use more moderate language. The Committee was dealing with a new problem, that of white minorities, which was the most delicate of those it had to settle in connexion with the process of decolonization; it was fortunate that the administering Power in the present instance was the United Kingdom, which enjoyed an excellent reputation in respect of the liberation of its former colonial territories, adopted an attitude towards the United Nations which was not one of defiance, and represented the link between the United Nations and the Government of Southern Rhodesia. Its task should be made easier by the use of rather less categorical terms which would help it to give effect to the provisions of the resolution. It would be better to adopt a reasonable text which the United Kingdom would endeavour to implement by all means in its power rather than to adopt a more drastic resolution which would have little chance of yielding concrete results. The suggestions put forward by Mexico were therefore excellent and the Irish delegation appealed to the Committee to accept them.

24. Mr. CALINGASAN (Philippines) said that it was his understanding that the draft resolution dealt only with recent developments, namely, the arrest of Mr. Nkomo and other nationalist leaders and the ban on ZAPU, and that it did not attempt to deal with the whole problem. His delegation therefore reserved the right to give its views on the substance of the problem at a later stage and would confine its remarks to draft resolution A/C.4/L.748, which it fully supported and for which it would vote. The arrest of the nationalist leaders reduced the chances of a peaceful settlement and might lead to bloodshed. General Assembly resolution 1747 (XVI) had acknowledged that Southern Rhodesia was a Non-Self-Governing Territory; hence the United Kingdom had the right to intervene to secure the release of the prisoners and the lifting of the ban on ZAPU. His delegation appealed to the United Kingdom Government to exercise its rights, or at least to use its influence, in that respect and to do its utmost to prevent bloodshed. His delegation would give its

views on the Mexican amendments when it had examined them. It appealed to the members of the Committee to vote in favour of the proposed text.

25. Mr. PASCUCCI-RIGHI (Italy) said that his delegation had always been in favour of removing all restrictions on political freedom and that the arrest of the African leaders had created a situation so serious as to warrant action by the Committee even before hearing the petitioners. It therefore agreed with the sponsors of the draft resolution. It would point out, however, that the draft resolution was addressed to a Government other than that of Southern Rhodesia and that the *de facto* situation must be taken into account, for otherwise the words were likely to remain a dead letter and to have no practical effect. In the present instance, it was not the responsibility of the United Kingdom to maintain order and it was not easy to exercise constitutional rights which had not hitherto been used. The Italian delegation therefore had some reservations regarding the original text of the draft resolution, which failed to take sufficient account of realities. It fully supported the views expressed by the Mexican delegation and the amendments that delegation had suggested. Italy was prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution as amended in accordance with the Mexican delegation's suggestions. It was convinced that the United Kingdom Government was not unaware of the dangers inherent in the situation, and it was the course of wisdom to adopt a text which would strengthen the influence it could exercise over the decisions of the Government of Southern Rhodesia.

26. Mr. LEMA (Congo, Leopoldville) recalled that the question of Southern Rhodesia had been examined by the General Assembly during its resumed sixteenth session in June with the special attention demanded by the gravity of the problem, and that the majority of Member States had at that time confirmed that Southern Rhodesia was still a Non-Self-Governing Territory. They had also noted that the Government of the United Kingdom had led many countries to independence and that Southern Rhodesia offered it an opportunity of completing one of its last tasks in the field of decolonization. Nevertheless, he noted with regret and anxiety that no progress had been made in regard to Southern Rhodesia's independence.

27. His delegation, which at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly had still been expressing confidence in the wisdom and enlightenment of the United Kingdom Government, was deeply disappointed to note that the Government had confined itself to repeating that there seemed to be no possibility of intervening or of changing anything in the 1961 Constitution. It seemed to feel that, after all, the Africans in the Territory were not too badly off; they would have political liberty one day, and although they had only four seats in the Legislative Assembly now, they would have more in ten years' time. A respite of ten to fifteen years was being asked, at the end of which many Africans would be fully prepared for their new tasks and would enjoy full political and civil rights. Such an argument was not altogether convincing, for the social and cultural conditions obtaining in the Territory, the *de facto* racial discrimination which persisted there, were hampering and delaying the education and progress of the Africans. The theory that the progress and education of the African people would be a gradual process was aimed merely at ensuring their permanent subordination to the alien minority. Other United Kingdom colonies more backward and less developed than

Southern Rhodesia had made rapid strides towards complete political emancipation. The United Kingdom representative's argument that only 5 per cent of the population of the former United Kingdom colonial empire was not yet independent merely strengthened the case of the African people of Southern Rhodesia. If 95 per cent of the colonial peoples had been able to benefit from the application of the principles of the United Nations Charter, it should be possible to guarantee the remaining 5 per cent the same treatment.

28. Since failure to take the necessary action might lead to tragedy, the future of Southern Rhodesia must be examined with all due seriousness, and cold-war considerations must be set aside so that wisdom, reason and intelligence might prevail over intransigence. The Congolese delegation was convinced that the situation had remained unchanged because the United Kingdom lacked the will to decide. The fact that the United Kingdom Government had not exercised the constitutional powers which it had held since 1923 did not authorize it to close its eyes to a development which was a violation of the Charter and the resolution of the United Nations and a threat to international peace and security. Moreover, constitutional means were not the only ones at the United Kingdom's disposal; it could also use economic and political pressure. It was no secret that the economic and financial interests of the United Kingdom and Southern Rhodesia were closely linked; in fact, they were the interests of a single financial group whose members seemed to have far too much influence on the policies of the United Kingdom Government.

29. The Congo had experienced and was still experiencing an unfortunate crisis, accentuated by the Katangese secession, which had been brought about by foreign financial interests. It was therefore in a position to know how difficult it was to argue convincingly with such interests. If the worse was to be avoided, everything possible must be done, in so far as Southern Rhodesia was concerned, to ensure that justice triumphed over passions and financial interests.

30. Unless fundamental human rights were respected in Southern Rhodesia, political prisoners set free and the freedom of action of the African political parties restored, the situation could only develop into serious and bloody disturbances. The Africans had the right to self-determination, and the exercise of that right could not long be withheld from them. Independence would come, with or without the settlers and other foreign residents, in co-operation with them or despite them. There had been numerous instances in which peoples of the most diverse origin had been able to find common goals and had co-operated in attaining them. The Congolese delegation was convinced that the nationalist leaders and the indigenous people of Southern Rhodesia were moved by a desire to co-operate with the settlers and other foreign residents in the harmonious development of the country. That desire must not, however, be confused with the acceptance of a "coexistence" which would mean parallel but unequal and unjust development. Peace and security would not return until the non-European peoples had been able to exercise their right to self-determination, in accordance with the Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation therefore supported the draft resolution.

31. Mr. ARTEH (Somalia) said that the United Kingdom should not lose sight of the principles of reason,

wisdom and far-sightedness which had marked its previous decisions in colonial matters. The question was whether it would listen to the many voices that had been raised to ask it to sacrifice the interests of fascist settlers to respect for the rights of millions of Africans and whether it would decide to use its influence on the Government of Southern Rhodesia, or whether, on the contrary, it would continue to assert that it was not responsible for what was happening in the Territory. The delegation of Somalia hoped that the United Kingdom would prove capable of grasping the realities of the situation.

32. Although some delegations had expressed doubts concerning the United Kingdom Government's responsibility, the delegation of Somalia believed that the United Kingdom was ultimately responsible for the decisions of the Federal Government and that it had the power to intervene. It had been said that the draft resolution constituted interference in the domestic affairs of a country, but the existence of a colonialist government was in itself interference and was a violation of the Territory's integrity. Some speakers had suggested that the language used in the draft resolution was in some cases too strong, but in fact its tone was reasonable and moderate. The delegation of Somalia hoped, therefore, that it would be adopted by an overwhelming majority.

33. Mr. VALENCIA (Ecuador) said that the question of Southern Rhodesia was one of the most important with which the Committee had to deal, not only because of its legal and political implications, but also because of the urgency given to it by the measures recently adopted by the Government of Southern Rhodesia in respect of ZAPU, the most representative party in the Territory.

34. His delegation placed great stress on the fact that General Assembly resolution 1747 (XVI) had affirmed that Southern Rhodesia was a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI. It believed that there was no half-way house between non-self-Government—in which an administering Power was responsible for a Territory—and sovereignty, and that the United Kingdom was the Power responsible for the government of Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom should therefore use all its influence to bring about an improvement in the present situation in that Territory.

35. The Ecuadorian delegation was also gravely concerned over the racial segregation which was practised in Southern Rhodesia. That aspect of the situation should be kept under close watch by the United Nations, for it was a serious danger and pointed straight towards the system of apartheid which had been formally condemned by the international community.

36. Furthermore, the United Kingdom, in divesting itself of all its powers in favour of the white minority, would create a situation to which the African countries could be expected to react forcefully. It was therefore right and opportune to ask the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to see that such a mistake was not made.

37. For all those reasons it seemed obvious that a draft resolution requesting the United Kingdom to take urgent measures to secure the release of political prisoners and the immediate lifting of the ban on ZAPU deserved full support. The same applied to the improvements to the text suggested by Mexico which, in his view, were completely justified. The Ecuadorian

delegation hoped that the United Kingdom would react favourably to the appeal thus addressed to it, as it had done on previous occasions.

38. Mr. EREBIH (Mauritania), after congratulating the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur on their election, said that his delegation would support draft resolution A/C.4/L.748, which it had co-sponsored and which was concerned with problems on which the Mauritanian delegation had already made its position clear.

39. It was obvious that in asking the United Kingdom Government to intervene, the sponsors of the draft resolution had no wish to question the principle which had always guided the United Kingdom in its task of decolonization. They addressed the United Kingdom simply because it was the only country to which the United Nations could appeal in order to bring about an improvement in the situation in Southern Rhodesia, and also because it was vital that there should be a change in that Territory, where human rights were being disregarded.

40. With regard to the amendments put forward by the Mexican representative, he did not feel entitled to speak on behalf of the other sponsors of the draft resolution, but thought he might say that the amendments would be studied with due objectivity.

41. With regard to the language of the draft resolution, the critical nature of the situation in Southern Rhodesia had induced the sponsors to use terms which to some ears might appear violent. In the opinion of his delegation, the language of the draft resolution was not overly violent in view of the fact that the problem in question represented a threat to international peace and security. His delegation hoped that, in view of its constructive character, draft resolution A/C.4/L.748 would be adopted unanimously.

42. Mr. ATIDEPE (Togo) said that his delegation had listened very carefully to the amendments suggested by Mexico, and that the sponsors of the draft resolution were willing to examine them sympathetically. If the Mexican representative would put them in writing, the meeting could be suspended to allow the sponsors to work out a definitive text, which could then be put promptly to a vote.

43. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden) said that although her delegation was generally in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.748, it was not completely satisfied with it. Her delegation therefore supported the Mexican amendments, which would make the resolution more realistic and thus more effective. The United Nations should be cautious about using such categorical terms as those at the end of the second preambular paragraph. In the view of the Swedish delegation, it would be better to keep to the wording used by the Charter, for example in Article 33, which referred to disputes "the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security". That wording would be quite appropriate to the situation under consideration; moreover, such a formula had been used in General Assembly resolution 1702 (XVI), concerning South West Africa.

44. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) thought that draft resolution A/C.4/L.748 was extremely moderate. Its only purpose, in fact, was to secure the release of Mr. Nkomo and the other nationalist leaders who had been arrested and to persuade the United Kingdom to use its influence to have the ban on ZAPU lifted. It was

noteworthy that the Government of Southern Rhodesia had not taken the exceptional measures concerned until after the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers in order to prevent the latter from expressing their views on the matter during the Conference.

45. The Liberian delegation was willing to accept the Mexican amendments but urged the Committee to adopt the draft resolution without delay.

46. Mr. BUDU-ACQUAH (Ghana) said that he appreciated the efforts of the delegations which were trying to improve the proposed text. However, it must not be forgotten that the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, was under an obligation by virtue of Chapter XI of the Charter, and more particularly of Article 73 e, to furnish information on Southern Rhodesia. Those who spoke of the constitutional situation in which the Government of the United Kingdom found itself were neglecting the fact that that Government was refusing to comply with its obligations under the Charter. In its resolution 1747 (XVI) of June 1962, the General Assembly had taken into consideration the powers retained by the United Kingdom in Southern Rhodesia.

47. There seemed to be a feeling in some quarters that the Committee should wait to hear other petitioners before discussing draft resolution A/C.4/L.748. Such a procedure was not, however, indispensable to the Committee in order to make a decision and it would involve unnecessary delay. Moreover, there could not be any doubt about the responsibility of the United Kingdom Government in Southern Rhodesia. In fact, the present Constitution of Southern Rhodesia had been granted by the Government of the United Kingdom, and it was known that the Parliament of the United Kingdom discussed the situation in Southern Rhodesia and that White Papers concerning that Territory were published by the United Kingdom Government.

48. For that reason the Ghanaian delegation held the conviction and the hope that the appeal made to the United Kingdom would not be left unanswered.

49. Mr. RIFAI (Jordan) said that he shared the belief that the problem of Southern Rhodesia must be settled urgently, and he hoped that draft resolution A/C.4/L.748 would be put to the vote without delay. The Jordanian delegation gave its unreserved approval to the substance of the draft resolution, which could undoubtedly be improved in its wording without being weakened. In that connexion, the amendments proposed by Mexico and eloquently supported by the representative of Ireland were quite satisfactory. He supported those amendments and asked the sponsors of the draft resolution to adopt them. The Jordanian delegation, for its part, would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.748.

50. He then recalled the suggestion made by the representative of Togo that the meeting should be suspended in order to permit the sponsors of the draft resolution to consider the Mexican amendments. He believed that the Committee should come to a decision on that point.

51. After an exchange of views in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) and Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) took part, Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) said that it would be preferable to conclude the discussion of draft resolution A/C.4/L.748 before hearing a further petitioner.

52. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) read out to the Committee the amendments to draft resolution A/

C.4/748 which he wished to suggest. At the end of the second preambular paragraph, the word "endangers" should be replaced by the words "the continuance of which is likely to endanger". In operative paragraph 1, the word "Requests" should be replaced by the word "Urges", and the word "measures" by the words "those measures which it considers most effective". Operative paragraph 2 should be replaced by the following text: "Decides to retain on its agenda the item entitled 'Question of Southern Rhodesia' and to discuss, before the end of the seventeenth session, the implementation of the present resolution."

53. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he would like some clarification regarding the meaning of the Mexican representative's amendment to operative paragraph 2. He asked in particular whether, if that amendment was adopted, the petitioners would be heard and whether the Committee would continue to discuss the question of Southern Rhodesia or would pass on to the other agenda items. His delegation needed more precise information in that connexion in order to decide whether the amendment was acceptable.

54. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) believed that, in view of the recognized urgency of the question of Southern Rhodesia, the Committee should proceed in the following order: firstly, adopt the draft resolution; then, hear the petitioners; and, finally, pass on to the other agenda items while waiting to hear whether the United Kingdom had implemented the resolution adopted.

55. If draft resolution A/C.4/L.748 was adopted, it could only improve the situation in Southern Rhodesia, but some time would be required before that improvement became evident.

*The Committee decided, by 75 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, to suspend the meeting for fifteen minutes.*

*The meeting was suspended at 5.45 p.m. and resumed at 6.20 p.m.*

56. Mr. ATIDEPE (Togo), speaking for the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that they had not accepted the amendment to the second preambular paragraph suggested by the representative of Mexico. The situation in Southern Rhodesia was in fact not merely likely to endanger international peace and security; it constituted an actual threat to peace, as was explicitly clear from General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which at the present time was the charter of decolonization.

57. On the other hand, the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted the Mexican amendment to operative paragraph 1, with the result that the beginning of the paragraph would read: "Urges the Government of the United Kingdom to take, as a matter of urgency, measures which would be most effective to secure", the rest of the paragraph remaining unchanged.

58. With regard to operative paragraph 2, although it had been established that by virtue of Chapter XI of the Charter and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) the United Kingdom was under an obligation to report to the General Assembly, the sponsors of the draft resolution agreed, in a spirit of conciliation, to the replacement of the words "to report to" by the words "to inform" and of the word "on" by "regarding".

59. The Togolese delegation hoped that the Committee would vote in favour of the text of the draft resolution as just revised.

60. Mr. KHOSLA (India) emphasized, in connexion with the amendment to operative paragraph 2, that the Committee had the authority to request the Government of the United Kingdom to report to it, but that in order to render their draft resolution as acceptable as possible, the sponsors had agreed to make it less categorical.

61. With regard to the amendment to the second preambular paragraph suggested by the representative of Mexico, he believed that it was better to retain the wording originally proposed by the sponsors, since it was more in harmony with the terms of similar resolutions adopted relative to the question of South West Africa, for example, resolution 1568 (XV).

62. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for the goodwill with which they had examined the amendments which he had suggested.

63. After an exchange of views in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. HOUAISS (Brazil) and Mr. ATIDEPE (Togo) took part, Mr. ATIDEPE (Togo) formally moved that, in view of the urgency of the question dealt with in draft resolution A/C.4/L.748, the Committee should close the debate and take a vote immediately.

64. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) thought that there was good reason not to close the debate in order that the representatives still on the list of speakers might have an opportunity to speak before the voting.

65. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that although he had not asked to speak before the voting, he was opposed to the closure of debate for the same reasons as the representative of Senegal had just mentioned.

66. While he could understand the desire for urgent action, he thought the Committee could stay in session into the evening, in order to hear all speakers, and then vote.

*The Togolese motion for closure of the debate was adopted by 38 votes to 15, with 21 abstentions.*

67. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, said that, as had been noted by a number of delegations, the debate had concerned not the substance of the agenda item but rather some recent measures taken by the Government in Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom delegation had no new statement to make on the point, and, for the reasons which it had clearly indicated during the debate in plenary session, it would abstain from participation in the discussions and would not take part in the voting on the draft resolution.

68. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) proposed that the final part of the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, namely, the words "and endangers peace and security in Africa and the world at large", should be put to the vote separately.

69. Mr. EREBIH (Mauritania) objected to a separate vote on those words.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure, he would put the Mexican representative's proposal to the vote.

*The Mexican proposal was rejected by 40 votes to 25, with 12 abstentions.*

71. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote draft resolution A/C.4/L.748 and Add.1 as orally revised by the sponsors.

*At the request of the Cameroonian representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast,

Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia.

*Against:* Portugal, South Africa.

*Abstaining:* Turkey, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Greece, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Spain, Thailand.

*Present and not voting:* United Kingdom.

*Draft resolution A/C.4/L.748 and Add.1, as revised, was adopted by 68 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.