

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED

A/AC.109/PV.245
20 April 1964

ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL
COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 20 April 1964, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. COULIBALY (Mali)

1. Territories referred to Sub-Committee I: Mauritius, Seychelles and St. Helena
2. Question of South West Africa (continued)
3. Situation in Southern Rhodesia

Note: The Official Record of this meeting will be the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/AC.109/SR.245. Delegations may submit corrections to that summary record for incorporation in the final version.

TERRITORIES REFERRED TO SUB-COMMITTEE I (A/AC.109/L.98 and Add.3): MAURITIUS, SEYCHELLES AND ST. HELENA

Mr. KING (United Kingdom): Mauritius lies in the Indian Ocean some 500 miles east of Madagascar, its nearest neighbour. Roughly pear-shaped, it is some thirty-eight miles long by twenty-nine miles broad with an area of 720 square miles. The island is almost completely encircled by coral fringing reefs, within which are peaceful lagoons and a succession of beautiful beaches of white coral sand. Together with its mountains, the seashore is the pride of Mauritius.

The island of Mauritius is of purely volcanic origin but volcanic activity ceased many thousands of years ago. It has three main groups of mountains, which are a striking feature of the landscape, rising abruptly from the surrounding plain with their lower slopes covered with dense vegetation - now being replaced by sugar cane or tea - and their upper slopes ending in precipitous rock peaks. The rivers are short and fast, flowing generally at the bottom of deep ravines and interrupted by water falls; some of these have been harnessed for hydro-electric purposes. Mauritius enjoys a sub-tropical climate, with high humidity throughout the year and sufficient rainfall to maintain a green cover of vegetation. The greenness of the island is indeed a striking feature of the territory, giving the impression of high natural fertility. Unfortunately, as is so often the case in tropical or sub-tropical countries, this is deceptive, as the soils are generally shallow and rather poor in phosphates. The fertility of the island is in fact largely due to man's intervention and skill.

Mauritius was uninhabited until the seventeenth century, when a settlement was established by the Dutch, who had previously named the island after Prince Maurice of Nassau. The Dutch settlers never numbered much over 300 and the settlement was abandoned in 1710. The island was claimed by France in 1715, and the French renamed it Ile de France. A French settlement was established in 1722. The settlement flourished and by the end of the eighteenth century was estimated at nearly 60,000, of whom 50,000 were of African origin.

The island was captured by the British forces in 1810 during the Napoleonic wars and was ceded in 1814 by France to Britain, who restored its

original name. In the ensuing years, labourers were recruited in India to work in the sugar-cane fields, and by the middle of the nineteenth century the population had risen to 300,000, nearly 200,000 of them being immigrants from India. The population has more than doubled in the last century, and now numbers 700,000 persons, of whom two-thirds are of Indian origin or descent.

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

Mauritius thus has the unenviable claim to fame of being one of the most densely populated agricultural areas in the world, with an average density of almost 1,000 persons per square mile.

Mauritius has no known mineral resources, and its economy rests mainly on sugar production. Sugar cane covers 90 per cent of the total area under cultivation and accounts for over 95 per cent of the island's exports. Apart from sugar, the main crops are tea, tobacco, maize and aloe fibre, which is used in the making of sacks. In all, nearly 45 per cent of the total area of the island is cultivated, an intensity of cultivation with few parallels in the tropics. In addition, there is a substantial area under forests, which have a dual function as a protection for the unproductive ground, which forms a catchment area for a number of the rivers, and as a source of most of the timber needed by the island for construction and for use as fuel.

With such a high proportion of land under arable crops and forest cover there is little room for livestock production, although cattle, pigs, sheep and goats are raised and poultry-keeping is growing in popularity.

The central economic problem of Mauritius is the pressure of its rapidly expanding population on the limited area of land available. The Mauritius Government is very conscious of the need for maximum utilization of all available resources and is anxious to encourage diversification of agriculture. It has introduced a five-year tea-development programme in 1961 which aims at planting a further 2,500 acres by mid-1965. Six hundred and fifteen acres have been cleared to date. In addition, land has been leased to individual planters under a Government-sponsored scheme and the Mauritius Agriculture Bank has started granting loans for tea plantations on Crown Lands. The potentiality of tea as a crop can be seen from the fact that in 1953 Mauritius produced only 900,000 pounds of tea and imported more tea than it exported, whereas by 1963 production had risen to over 3.25 million pounds, of which about two-thirds was exported.

In addition to expansion in tea-growing there is also scope for increasing the production of vegetables and other food-crops. One of the principal difficulties in the past has been the unsatisfactory nature of the marketing arrangements for such crops, and the Mauritius Government plans to establish a

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

marketing organization to encourage the producers. Improvements are also planned in the cattle industry in order to increase the output of milk and other animal products.

Two important requirements for the successful diversification of agricultural production on marginal land are that it should be adequately protected against erosion and that it should have irrigation water available. The natural drainage basins require continued and even intensified protection of important watersheds by the planting and permanent preservation of forest reserves, and there is an urgent need for an assessment of the total water availability and its present and potential uses as well as the practical possibilities of controlled use of both surface and ground waters. Without this assessment a considerable quantity of soil data already available cannot be put to use. The Government of Mauritius has therefore submitted a request to the United Nations Special Fund for assistance in a land and water resources survey. This request will be considered by the Governing Council of the Special Fund within the next few months. If this project can be successfully carried out the data collected will enable the Government to plan maximum use of its natural resources based on total control of the land and water resources; and, as a follow-up programme, soil and water conservation, reforestation of watersheds, replanning of existing farms and resettlement of fragmented holdings will be taken up.

A major part of any additional employment must be in the industrial sector, and the Mauritius Government is doing all it can to encourage the establishment of manufacturing and processing industries. Fibre produced on the island is manufactured into sacks by a Government-owned factory for use in the sugar industry. Other local industries include engineering, printing and tanning, and the manufacture of rum, wine, edible oil, soap, cigarettes, beverages, dairy produce, salt, lime, bricks, leather and rubber footwear, and confectionery.

Specific measures are being taken by the Mauritius Government to encourage the expansion of industry. Income-tax concessions are made to new industries and the customs tariff has been revised to give preferential treatment to selected industries. These incentives have already produced results, both in a

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

marked increase in the number of products manufactured locally -- which now include carbon dioxide, metal doors and windows, steel furniture, spring mattresses, paint, and car batteries -- and in the establishment of a modern sawmill, a brewery and a factory for processing milk. Proposals for setting up other industrial enterprises are under consideration.

One of the principal instruments at the disposal of the Mauritius Government for stimulating a diversification of the economy is the newly-created Development Bank, which will make funds available for investment in productive enterprise, particularly in the field of secondary industry and tourism.

In addition, a major effort is being made under the current development programme to strengthen the physical infrastructure in a number of important sectors, and these will undoubtedly assist the establishment of new industries. First, new harbour installations are being constructed at Port Louis, the island's only port, to improve the existing facilities. Second, plans have been made for the further development of the international airport at Plaisance, including the extension of the runway to enable it to meet the requirements of heavy jet aircraft. Third, the construction of a new double carriage-way trunk-road between Port Louis and Phoenix has been completed, and this will both increase the safety of traffic between the capital and the up-country townships and assist in the movement of exports to the port.

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

Apart from this trunk road, there is a heavy programme of improvements to roads and bridges in other parts of the island. Fourth, the World Bank has made a \$7 million loan to Mauritius last September for the development of electric power facilities. The loan will help to finance the construction of a 12,000 kilowatt diesel power station at Port Louis and an expansion and improvement of the transmission and distribution systems. The project will increase the island's public power supplies by nearly a third. All these measures will help Mauritius to strengthen and diversify its economy.

Mauritius has financed the greater part of its development in recent years from its own resources, but an important contribution has been made by the British Government, in grants and loans under the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts and in other assistance, towards reconstruction after the 1960 cyclone. In all, the British Government is contributing about one third of the total cost of the current development programme which covers the period 1960 to 1965, and total expenditure of which is estimated at £26.1/2 million.

I should now like to turn from economic matters to developments in the social sphere. Housing is a very important problem, particularly in view of the destruction brought by the disastrous cyclones in recent years.

The Mauritius Government has pursued a vigorous policy in this field, and a Central Housing Authority was established in January 1961. Contracts were made later in that year for the construction of 6,000 houses in urban areas and 3,000 houses in rural areas; and by mid-1963, 5,471 of these houses had been completed.

Mauritius at present has eight general hospitals with over 1,500 beds. A scheme for the construction of a new Central Hospital for the North is now in the architectural planning stage. It envisages a 550 bed hospital with an attached nursing school.

In the field of social security, Mauritius has had an extensive system of public assistance for many years, as well as an advanced system of non-contributor pensions for all. Since January 1962, a family allowance scheme has been in force, under which family allowances are paid to all families with three or more children of under 14 years of age and who are not liable for income tax.

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

With regard to educational development, primary education is virtually universal and there are 105 secondary schools with some 27,000 pupils. The current development programme provides for the expenditure of over £1 million on improvement of primary and secondary educational facilities. Post-secondary education is provided by a College of Agriculture and a Teacher's Training College; in addition, over 750 students from Mauritius are pursuing courses of study abroad.

I should now like to review political and constitutional developments since 1959, when the first general elections were held on a basis of universal adult suffrage. At the elections held in March of that year, the Labour Party won 23 out of the 40 elected seats in the Legislative Council; the Independent Forward Bloc won 6 seats, the Muslim Committee of Action won 5 seats; the Parti Mauricien won 3 seats; the Trade Unionists won 2 seats and the remaining seat went to an independent.

The Government which was formed as a result of this election consisted of 7 elected Ministers -- six from the Labour Party and one from the Muslim Committee of Action -- 2 nominated Ministers and 3 ex officio Ministers, who together constituted the Executive Council under the chairmanship of the Governor.

In June 1961, constitutional review talks were held in London in order to provide for an exchange of views among the main parties concerned on the working of the existing Constitution. At these talks, a difference of opinion emerged between the Labour Party, which represented about half of the population, on the one hand, and the remaining parties on the other, on the question of further constitutional advance. After discussions had been held with all parties, the British Government put forward proposals based on the assumption that constitutional advance towards internal self-government was desirable, and that its extent and timing must take into account the interests of the various communities and include provisions for adequate safeguards for individual liberties. Two stages of advance were proposed; the first to be brought into operation as soon as practicable, while the second stage would not come into force until after the next general election. These proposals, which represented a compromise between the views of the different parties, were not completely acceptable to all, but

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

the British Government considered that a sufficient measure of acceptance had been indicated to justify their being adopted.

In consequence, the first stage was introduced in the latter part of 1961. Under its provisions, the leader of the majority party in the Legislature -- Dr. Ramgoolam of the Labour Party -- became Chief Minister, and an additional Minister was appointed with responsibility for posts, telegraphs, telecommunications and information.

At the same time, it was provided that the Governor would consult the Chief Minister on such matters as the appointment and removal of ministers, the allocation of portfolios and the summoning, proroguing and dissolution of the Legislative Council.

The second general election under universal adult suffrage was held in October 1963. As a result the Labour Party won 19 seats, the Parti Mauricien won 8 seats, the Independent Forward Bloc won 7 seats, the Muslim Committee of Action won 4 seats, and independents won 2 seats. In accordance with the provisions of the 1961 constitutional review talks, the Legislative Council by affirmative vote requested the introduction of the second stage of the constitutional proposals, and the Chief Minister recommended that these should be introduced. Accordingly, the necessary changes were brought into force on 12 March 1964, just over a month ago. The Executive Council has now become the Council of Ministers and Dr. Ramgoolam has been appointed Premier. In addition, the Legislative Council has been renamed the Legislative Assembly.

An important feature of the new constitution is that the Council of Ministers is not a purely majority party government, but is an all-party government which includes representatives of the **other** parties or elements which have accepted the principle of collective responsibility. The present Government includes 6 Ministers -- including the Premier -- from the Labour Party, 3 from the Parti Mauricien, 2 from the Independent Forward Bloc, 2 from the Muslim Committee of Action and 1 Independent.

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

As a result of the changes which I have described, Mauritius had made substantial progress towards full internal self-government. The willingness of the political parties in Mauritius to co-operate in the implementation of the new constitution and their agreement to serve in an all-party government are encouraging signs for the future. In the agreed communiqué issued after the constitutional review talks in 1961, the Mauritius political parties accepted that the next step after the introduction of stage 2 should be to continue the advance towards internal self-government, and the political parties have agreed to discuss this question during the year beginning October 1965, that is, two years after the last general election.

With regard to the future status of Mauritius, paragraph 5 of the 1961 agreed communiqué had this to say:

"It is not possible at this stage to suggest what should be the precise status of Mauritius after the attainment of full internal self-government. It is the general wish that Mauritius should remain within the Commonwealth. Whether this should be achieved as an independent State, or in some form of special association either with the United Kingdom or with other independent Commonwealth countries, are matters which should be considered during the next few years in the light of constitutional progress generally."

This remains the position.

I now have a statement to make on the Seychelles and St. Helena.

Seychelles and St. Helena have much in common. Both territories consist of a main island (Mahé in Seychelles and St. Helena itself) with an area of about 50 square miles, and a number of smaller islands scattered over an area of some thousands of miles. Both lie in the tropics, a few degrees south of the equator. Both are isolated, Mahé being some 1,000 miles from the coast of East Africa, and St. Helena a similar distance off the coast of south-west Africa. Each lacks an airfield, and depends for its contacts with the outside world on shipping. Each has a very small population -- 43,000 in the Seychelles, and only 4,700 in St. Helena. Neither territory was inhabited before the arrival of the first Europeans - from Britain in the case of St. Helena, and from France in the case of the Seychelles.

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

However, there are a number of sharp contrasts, too. First, their physical aspect is quite different. The principal islands of the Seychelles are of granite, and are of remarkable beauty, with shady, palm-fringed sandy beaches and rock-strewn bays and inlets, making them a first-class tourist attraction. St. Helena, on the other hand, is wholly volcanic in origin and presents a rugged and mountainous appearance; high forbidding cliffs ring the island almost continuously on every side. Two-thirds of the island is barren, and below 1,500 feet the vegetation is very scanty and consists largely of cactus.

The economies of the two territories are also based on different products. That of the Seychelles rests mainly on the production and export of copra, the value of copra exports in 1963 exceeding \$1 million. There is also a substantial export trade in cinnamon (\$280,000 in 1963), and rather smaller but significant exports of patchouli and vanilla (\$41,000 in 1963).

In St. Helena, the principal crop is New Zealand flax, and the main exports consist of hemp, tow, rope and twine made from the flax in local mills. Total exports in 1962 were in the region of \$280,000. As St. Helena hemp is inferior to sisal, with which it has to compete, the Government subsidizes the two firms involved when the price of hemp falls below a figure at which it is economical to keep the mills open.

Both territories have been carrying out important development programmes with assistance from the United Kingdom Government. Since 1945, the Seychelles Government has received \$4.2 million in direct grants under the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts to finance over 100 development schemes of various kinds. Under a new overall development plan for the two-year period until 31 March 1966, expenditure will reach over \$2.1 million, of which \$1.5 million will take the form of grants from Her Majesty's Government and the rest of loans raised locally. The bulk of the grant expenditure will be devoted to natural resources (35.6 per cent), public works and communications (28.4 per cent), and social services (28.9 per cent).

(Mr. King, United Kingdom)

The development of natural resources includes agricultural and veterinary research and extension services leading to more intensive agricultural methods, particularly in copra production; greater use of animal husbandry; afforestation and soil conservation; and assistance to fishermen. Works and communications include the tarmac surfacing and other improvements of important roads, the provision of rural water supplies and a number of minor projects.

The Seychelles Government has for some years been implementing an important land settlement scheme for the local population. Under this scheme, small-holders lease from the Government, at an economic rate, plots of land varying in area from three and a half to ten acres but averaging five acres. Each plot is provided with a cottage and, in the case of hillside plots, two acres of bench-terraces. The small-holders grow export crops such as coconut, cinnamon and patchouli; other cash crops like tobacco; and food crops like sweet potatoes, cassava, yam and other vegetables. The farmers also keep one or two head of cattle each. It is hoped that this land settlement scheme, which now has 140 small-holders occupying 725 acres, will eventually result in the production of a significant quantity both of export crops and food crops for local consumption.

In order to encourage diversification of agricultural production, tea-growing has recently been introduced in the Seychelles and a Government loan is being made available to the Seychelles Tea Company for the erection of a factory as soon as sufficient acreage of tea is in bearing, which is expected to be in about two years' time. Strong efforts are being made to encourage the tourist industry, as the islands of the Seychelles have unsurpassed natural beauty. The Seychelles tax laws provide for development loans as an encouragement to the hotel industry, as well as to fishing and the processing and manufacturing industries.

In the case of St. Helena, development grants totalling well over \$3/4 million have been made in the last five years, and a further allocation of \$420,000 has been made available to meet development costs in the two-year period April 1964 to March 1966. Development since 1959 has been concentrated on agriculture and road improvement, in addition to schemes covering electricity distribution, housing and education.

I turn now to the constitutional position in Seychelles and St. Helena. As would be expected in small territories with populations of only 43,000 and 4,700 respectively, the constitutional arrangements are not elaborate but are designed to suit the basic requirements of efficient administration and popular representation. The main executive organ in each case is the Executive Council, presided over by the Governor, and consisting of twelve members in the case of the Seychelles -- six being Seychellois -- and six in the case of St. Helena, three of whom are islanders.

In addition to the Executive Council, Seychelles have a Legislative Council of twelve members, five of whom are elected, and St. Helena has an Advisory Council of sixteen members, eight of whom are elected. The Governor presides over the Council in each case.

Elections were held in both territories last year. In the Seychelles the elections -- held in August -- were contested on party lines for the first time. The Taxpayers and Producers Association, which has been in existence for many years was opposed by four independent candidates standing with the support of the United Party, which was formed early in 1963. A fifth independent candidate had the support of both the Association and the United Party. The result of the elections was that the Independents -- including the one supported by both parties -- secured three seats, while the Taxpayers and Producers Association secured two.

In St. Helena the elections were held in September of last year. There are no political parties, but seventeen candidates stood for election in six of the constituencies. Candidates from two constituencies were returned unopposed.

I should like to conclude with a word about the future of these two small territories. In Seychelles and St. Helena, the United Kingdom Government is fully conscious of its obligations, under Article 73 of the United Nations Charter, "to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement."

General elections have been held in Seychelles and St. Helena within the last nine months. There is complete freedom of expression in both territories and a general acceptance of the present constitutional position. The inhabitants have n

desire to sever their links with Britain, which have existed for over 150 years in the case of Seychelles, and nearly 300 years in the case of St. Helena, and they wish to remain in continuing association with my country. The exact form in which these relationships of friendship and co-operation should take in the future, and the way in which they may find concrete expression in the constitution of each territory, are matters which will be worked out between my Government and the inhabitants through the normal processes of consultation and discussion.

Mr. RAKOTOMALALA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): I believe that the Special Committee would be interested in hearing some very brief observations which the representative of Madagascar feels obliged to make concerning the statements which have been made concerning Mauritius and the situation obtaining in that territory. Madagascar is a near neighbour of the island of Mauritius since the latter is only about one hour's distance by jet from Madagascar. Exchanges between the two countries are most important from both the cultural and the commercial points of view.

I would say also that my comments will be very objective since, on the one hand, Madagascar has no territorial ambitions with regard to the neighbouring islands and, on the other hand, we have been in a position to observe that, contrary to some other African countries, the situation there as far as interracial relations are concerned is excellent.

Madagascar, which has some eighteen different tribes and where the greatest friendship exists between the various strata of the population, has been able favourably to evaluate the multiracial situation in the island of Mauritius, which, I repeat, is excellent. There is a very fine harmony between the different sectors of the population, the majority of whom are of Indian origin.

Madagascar has had many contacts with qualified representatives of Mauritius. I myself, when I was Minister of Foreign Affairs of Madagascar, attended various commissions, some of which I have presided over, which were also attended by Ministers from Mauritius. Since that time other commissions or conferences have met at Tananarive in which Ministers from Mauritius have participated. I should like to say that these Ministers appeared to be fully independent in the expression of their opinions and their wishes. My sincere opinion -- the opinion of Madagascar -- is that the population on Mauritius enjoys a form of autonomy which we might wish for many other African countries.

I must also say that the political, social and economic situations are excellent. I have noted that the population of Mauritius has had, on many occasions, the opportunity of freely expressing its opinions on the form of progress which that population desires for its country.

For my part, I would say that I am firmly persuaded that the island of Mauritius is being administered according to the principles which form the basis of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and if I have any wish to express, it is that the political evolution of Mauritius should continue on the lines which it has followed in the past, in calmness and wisdom, and that the population, when that stage arrives, will be able to express freely its own will concerning the final framework of that country.

Therefore I would support the report which has been presented to us concerning the island of Mauritius. As far as Madagascar is concerned, we wish that neighbouring island, as I have just said, to continue in peace, tranquillity and wisdom its present political evolution.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian) The Special Committee and its Sub-Committees are taking up the consideration of the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in the so-called small colonial territories. In a very short period of time the Committee will have to deal with twenty-five such territories, considering only those territories which are already included in the preliminary list. Other colonial territories which are not included in the list, but which because of their situation are in no way different from colonial territories that are included in it, will be considered somewhat later.

Even a very cursory examination of the material which is related to these territories, and which relates to the territories that have been enumerated in the seventh report, indicates that the Committee has to tackle quite a considerable task. Among the various territories which have been referred to the various Sub-Committees -- and we understand that this was done to speed up the work of the Committee -- there are several small territories with a very small population; but at the same time we find among them also territories which in their size and population indeed exceed several Member States of the United Nations. Each of these territories has its own history. Each of them is at a given level of economic, political and social development. All this requires from the members of the Committee and the Sub-Committees the consideration of all the attending circumstances, especially with respect to the solution to be given to the problem of the fate of every one of these territories. The finding of proper solutions for each territory must be entirely in keeping with the requirements of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

At the present stage of the discussion the Soviet delegation does not intend to go into the consideration of the details of the situation in each territory or groups of territories. We reserve our right to speak on those matters later. We should like to confine ourselves for the time being to general observations which in our view are significant if we are to find the proper solution in respect of the questions we are considering and discussing.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

The Soviet delegation in the course of the consideration of the question of the programme and the methodology of the work of the Special Committee in 1964 has already stated in a general way its considerations regarding the principles which should be the guide-lines when smaller territories are considered. We indicated at that time that the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples are equally applicable to all colonial territories large or small, irrespective of the location of these territories, whether they are situated in the Pacific, Atlantic or Indian Oceans, or indeed in any other region of the planet.

All peoples, large or small, no matter what the stage of their development, have an equal right to freedom and independence; the right to decide what will be the internal arrangements of their States, and the right to define what will be their development. This right to self-determination and independence flows from the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and has actually been recognized as one of the basic positions of international law as such.

Any attempt on the part of the colonial Powers to preserve their domination over these colonial territories or their refusal to translate immediately into actuality the provisions of the Declaration, regardless of the motivations of such refusals, cannot, if we are to act in accordance with the legal concepts of democracy, not to speak of the legal concepts of the working classes, be assessed otherwise than as a violation of the fundamental rights and freedoms of colonial peoples and as a violation of the norms of international law.

Thus by adopting the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples the United Nations has recognized the struggle of these peoples for freedom and independence, which includes an armed struggle if the colonialists are not prepared to give the peoples peacefully what rightfully belongs to the people. Then, the freedom which was usurped from the peoples should be given back to them and their struggle recognized as legal and justified, while the struggle of the colonialist Powers to preserve their domination, no matter in what form that struggle is expressed, is to be considered as illegal and in fact criminal.

The provisions of the Declaration are equally valid when we consider the solution of the questions pertaining to the fate of the large territories or the small territories; but especially this is important in the case of the small territories, precisely for the reason that these territories are small. The population of these territories is very small; sometimes it is only a few hundreds of people. Therefore, it is the duty of the Committee to be particularly concerned with the fate of these territories and their inhabitants. No matter how difficult the position may be in the larger territories, no matter how cruelly the colonialists deal with the peoples of the larger territories, the fate of the those territories, historically speaking in our times, is rather a matter of perspective. They have at least the advantage that they can unite and therefore arrive at a position where they can discard the burden of colonialism and slavery. But the small peoples are deprived of such an opportunity. Therefore, it is the duty of the United Nations and the duty of all those who are anti-colonialist, to raise their voices in order to protect the rights of the inhabitants of these territories and to provide every support to the peoples of these territories in their struggle for freedom.

Without strict adherence to the provisions of the Declaration, if conditions are not created which will enable the colonial peoples -- and this includes also the small colonial peoples -- to express their will freely without any impediment with regard to the future status and development of these countries, it will be impossible to find a just and equitable solution to any of the problems that are related to the fate of those colonial territories which the Committee will be considering in 1964, and it will be impossible to produce suitable recommendations which are to be submitted to the General Assembly.

What are the conditions and what must be the basis of the work of the Committee when it considers the question of the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly of 14 December 1960 with regard to the smaller territories? First, the principle which underlies this resolution must be unconditionally recognized, namely, the recognition that all peoples have a right to self-determination and independence regardless of the size of the population of any colonial territory and regardless of how developed or backward this or that territory happens to be. This principle should be considered as fundamental in our approach to the problems relating to the future

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

status of any colonial territory. If this or that nation or people does not receive or enjoy the rights of free expression of its will through universal suffrage, elections, plebiscites or referendums, without any violence, and if this path is denied them to solve questions relating to the future of that nation, then the annexation of this territory or of that nation or of that people to any other national entity, be it in the shape of federation, association or integration, cannot be considered otherwise than as annexation; in other words, as a seizure.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

The question of the future status of any territory and of the form it is to take are to be determined by the people themselves, without the application of any violence whatsoever. This is the only way of solving the problem of the future status of any territory, and this includes the small territories, the only way which is in keeping with the spirit and letter of the Declaration.

The conditions prevailing in the various small colonial territories are, of course, very different. There are territories which at present are in a state of colonial occupation but which no doubt happen to be a part of another independent State. For instance, there is Hong Kong and there is Macao. Such territories which have been torn away from the motherland should be restored, in the same way as lands which were torn away from India and Dahomey were restored.

There are also territories with small populations which are ethnically compact and which are ethnically the same as neighbouring countries. There may be a desire in those countries to join the independent State or the territory adjacent on the basis of independence and self-determination. Other territories may prefer the path of complete independence and may not be prepared to join another State. Other smaller territories may wish to join together and constitute an independent federation or another form of independent association. Everything depends on the peculiarities of the conditions which prevail in the various territories. But no matter what those conditions and peculiarities are, the principle of self-determination should be respected. In other words, the population of these territories must have unrestricted opportunity to determine their own fate and future. In other words, it is not the colonial Powers but the people themselves who should determine the future status of a given territory.

To serve this purpose, the Committee should work out and recommend to the General Assembly projects and measures which would enable the General Assembly to see to it that the peoples inhabiting those territories are enjoying full freedom and are in a position to conduct free elections to determine their future. Such elections should then be conducted under the supervision of the United Nations.

Secondly, an extremely important prerequisite to the unimpeded and free expression of the will of the population of the smaller colonial territories -- this condition is equally applicable to any other colonial territories -- is the

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

full and unrestricted freedom of all the democratic organizations in the territory: freedom of association, of meetings, of the Press and of speech, all of which should be guaranteed to and enjoyed by all the democratic elements in the territories. All laws and legislative measures which provide for any type of racial discrimination should be eliminated. All prohibitions and restrictions on the activities of political parties, trade unions and other organizations of the indigenous people should be immediately annulled. All political detainees should be immediately freed. Political emigrants who have left the territory because of their struggle for independence and self-determination should be given the opportunity to return to their countries and to resume their political activities without any restrictions.

Without the implementation of such measures, the statements of the representatives of the colonial Powers to the effect that their Governments are prepared to implement the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples or statements to the effect that their Governments intend to lead the dependent peoples toward self-government, are deprived of any substance, when we consider them from the point of view of the principles enshrined in the Declaration.

Thirdly, a necessary prerequisite to the free expression of the will of the population of colonial territories regarding their future status would also be the withdrawal of all military forces and military personnel of the Administering Powers and the liquidation of all foreign military bases on those territories. The Soviet delegation cannot concur in the view expressed by many delegations to the effect that the question of the military bases of colonial Powers in the territories they dominate is one which should be solved after the territory has actually achieved independence. We reject the theory which has been advanced here by the representative of Australia that the presence of foreign bases in colonial territories is not an impediment to their achieving complete independence from colonial domination. Every-day life proves the contrary. The experience of recent years has shown that foreign military bases in colonial territories, as indeed in any foreign territory, are not only bulwarks of aggression against the freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples, but are indeed bulwarks of colonialism itself. They are not only an impediment in the path of strengthening the independence of the developing countries, but they are in fact significant obstacles to the freedom and independence of those peoples who are still under colonial domination and who are struggling to free themselves.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

The consideration of the question of Aden and the Aden Protectorates in the Special Committee and the General Assembly has shown that the military base in Aden is used by the British not only as a base for their struggle against the national liberation movement in the Arab East and in Africa, against the independent Arab and African States, but also for the direct suppression of the national liberation movement in that occupied territory itself, South Arabia. The systematic bombing by the British Air Force of the centres of guerrilla warfare in the Aden Protectorates is evidence of the fact that the presence of this base in Aden is the main force which impedes the complete liberation of Aden and the Aden Protectorates from foreign domination.

How is it possible in the face of such facts to state that the military bases of foreign Powers or the presence of foreign troops in colonial territories are not obstacles which prevent the achievement of self-government or independence? So long as there are foreign troops or foreign military bases in colonial territories, the rights of the people will be suppressed or restricted.

We must not also overlook the fact that the presence of military bases in any given colonial territory, such as Aden, for instance, or the Maldivé Islands, is a very serious obstacle in the path of achieving freedom and independence. It is not only a factor which infringes upon the sovereign rights of the peoples who are trying to solve the problems of their future existence as an independent State, but in fact it is also a threat to the future of the independent development of those territories. We should not overlook this aspect, because the experience of several States which have recently achieved independence has shown that their attempts to get rid of the foreign military bases in their territories led to further bloodshed and to an unnecessary aggravation of international relations.

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

The fact should not be overlooked that the peoples that are still living under colonial domination do not have the possibility of making their opinion known on the question of foreign bases. Very often, when they accede to independence, they receive as a present a foreign base which constitutes a very heavy burden for the country which limits its sovereignty. Consequently, when the Administering Powers maintain military bases in territories that they administer, they only have as a goal to limit the sovereign rights of the peoples of these territories in the future.

During the course of discussions in the General Assembly it has been stated that these small colonial territories can only be viable provided that they receive economic aid. It has been stated that for this reason they must maintain their ties with the metropolitan country. It has even been stated that the best solution for the small territories of this kind is to join a large colonial Power. In other words, the best method would be a pure and simple annexation of its former colonies by the metropolitan country.

Of course, our Committee cannot concur in such a view. Moreover, we believe that the question of the entry of small territories into federations or other forms of governmental unions is a question to be solved by the people themselves who are concerned, who must express their will freely in their exercise of their right of autonomy and independence.

Regarding the economic development of these small territories, we are convinced that the indigenous populations are perfectly able to tackle their economic problems. For that purpose it is necessary that, along with the mobilization of the national resources of these territories, the privileges of the metropolitan country, of its citizens and of its enterprises be eliminated. It is indispensable that the resources of these territories be used only for the well-being of the indigenous peoples and not in the interests of strangers.

Furthermore, the indigenous inhabitants must get back all the lands which were taken from them on one pretext or another. The United Nations must consider this question on the basis of the requests for assistance which are received directly from the population themselves and not on the initiative of organs which do not consult them. This problem should certainly be studied in the future.

For the time being, we shall limit ourselves to saying that the United Nations should envisage the question of economic aid and other aid to be furnished to these small territories in such a way as to allow the populations concerned a free economic and political development, in conditions of national sovereignty.

These are the observations which the delegation of the Soviet Union wanted to make concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

QUESTION OF SOUTH WEST AFRICA (A/AC.109/65; A/AC.109/L.108; A/AC.109/PET.202 to 219) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Regarding the question of South West Africa, I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the letter dated 17 April 1964, which I received from the Permanent Representative of South Africa in reply to my letter of 13 April 1964, addressed to the Permanent Representative of South Africa. This letter was mentioned during our last meeting.

The letter which I sent to the Permanent Representative of South Africa and his reply may be found in document A/AC.109/65.

Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India): I have just a brief comment on this document to which you, Mr. Chairman, have referred, that is, document A/AC.109/65, containing your letter to the representative of South Africa and his reply dated 17 April. The last portion of this letter from the representative of South Africa states that:

"it is incumbent not only upon the parties to the proceedings" -- that is, our colleagues from Liberia and Ethiopia who have referred a particular legal aspect, a specific aspect, of this case to the International Court of Justice -- "but also upon the United Nations to comply with the sub judice principle which is at issue in this instance".

I am no legal expert, but it is common sense to point out that if the South African representative thinks that the sub judice principle is applicable,

then it is begging the question, that the Odendaal report cannot and must not be implemented because if the case is sub judice, then naturally this report cannot be implemented at all. As we know, if this report is implemented, it will amount to the disappearance of the mandate territory of South West Africa as it will be merged into South Africa against the wishes of the United Nations and against the wishes of the people of South West Africa. I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if you were intending to reply to the representative of South Africa, then this particular point be not made, that by his own logic the Odendaal report cannot be implemented.

Mr. MELOVSKI (Yugoslavia) (interpretation from French): I wish to associate myself with the comment made by the representative of India. If you look at the reply given by the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the letter of our Chairman, it will be noted that the South African Government continues to consider that the question of South West Africa is not within the competence of the United Nations because, in view of the "contentious proceedings" before the International Court of Justice, not only the parties themselves but also the United Nations should not interfere in the matter. Under these conditions, we must know if the position of the South African Government is that it will not implement its partition plan of South West Africa, which is known under the name of the Odendaal plan, and if it is ready to wait for the decision of the International Court of Justice.

Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to support what was said by the representative of India regarding the reply made by the Permanent Representative of South Africa. It is obvious that what is sub judice is not the whole question of South West Africa, but the only thing sub judice is one specific point of law. An opinion has been requested of the International Court of Justice and, as we said at the last General Assembly in the Fourth Committee, this does not mean that the whole question of South West Africa is sub judice and that consequently the United Nations cannot take up the matter.

(Mr. Diaz Gonzalez, Venezuela)

The Government of South Africa has the right to decide whether it accepts or does not accept an invitation to participate in our work. It can reject that invitation. But it is neither right nor correct for it to go on to say that not only the parties to these proceedings before the International Court of Justice, but also the United Nations, are obliged to accept the sub judice principle. There is one specific point of law which is sub judice. An opinion has been requested from the International Court on that specific point of law, but that does not mean that the United Nations has tied its hands, or that the two Governments which are parties to the proceedings have tied their hands with regard to the whole question of South West Africa.

There is only one specific point of law at issue, and therefore our Committee has full liberty to consider the question of South West Africa, even when the Government of South Africa says that we must comply with the sub judice principle. Of course, we must comply with that principle, but only in connexion with the specific point of law at issue.

Mr. Taieb SLIM (Tunisia): I wish to make a brief statement only in connexion with this item. This is not the first time that the Special Committee has addressed itself to a Member State and asked it to co-operate in our work. Nor is it the first time that other organs of the United Nations have tried to make the Government of Pretoria see reason and discuss with us all the problems that are pending. Once more, we can see that this Government is not taking very seriously its own obligations as a Member State.

We wish, therefore, to state that we deplore and condemn this attitude. Unfortunately, it shows that despite all the warnings given to the Government of Pretoria, despite all the resolutions adopted and all the goodwill shown by this Organization, the Government of Pretoria is not yet prepared to see reason. We believe that at this time our Committee and the United Nations should very seriously consider taking serious measures against this Member State which is not complying with its own obligations.

Mr. SONN (Cambodia) (interpretation from French): In connexion with the reply of the South African Government, I would like simply to state that delegations have spoken in the Fourth Committee -- and we can refer to those statements -- completely refuting the application of the sub judice principle in the question of South West Africa.

Mr. SMIGANOWSKI (Poland): I would like to reiterate the position of my delegation and of the Polish Government on the question of the sub judice principle. We have always rejected this argument. The United Nations is not a party to the proceedings which have been instituted by two Member States. It is our considered view that the problem of South West Africa is a political problem, and not a juridical problem, which should be solved by the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): If that is the opinion of the members of the Special Committee, then, without prejudice to the decision which the Special Committee may later take concerning the question of South West Africa, I propose to reply to the letter from the representative of the Government of South Africa, and in this reply I will reflect the opinions which have been voiced this afternoon by members of this Committee.

Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): In reality, I think there is no need even to reply to the letter of the Government of South Africa. Once again, that Government has replied, purely and simply, that it does not want to participate in the work of the Committee, and they produced an argument which the Committee does not accept. I do not think there is any need to engage in polemics with the Government of South Africa with regard to South Africa's opinions.

Mr. Natwar SINGH (India): When I intervened earlier, I did not concern myself with the earlier part of the reply of the representative of South Africa, because, as has been stated by the representative of Venezuela and by the other representatives who have spoken, we have made our stand clear that this Committee and the United Nations is fully competent to discuss this matter

(Mr. Natwar Singh, India)

of South West Africa, regardless of what the South African Government might say. I referred to this particular aspect only in view of the Odendaal report which is before us because, if by their own argument the South African Government thinks the case is sub judice, even in this very limited context, how can they go ahead with the implementation of the Odendaal report, according to their own logic?

I am not discussing the question they have raised regarding our competence from the point of view of the sub judice principle. We have made it quite clear that we do not consider it to be sub judice, except for a particular aspect, and certainly the United Nations does not because there are two nations which have litigation before the International Court of Justice. My point was merely that if you, Mr. Chairman, were to consider sending a reply, not on the substance of the matter because we do not want to argue -- our stand and that of the United Nations on this is well known -- it should be merely to state that if it is sub judice they should not go ahead and implement the Odendaal report, since this would mean, as I said earlier, that South West Africa would be merged with South Africa against the wishes of South West Africa and against the resolutions adopted by the Special Committee, the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly.

Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): The representative of Venezuela quite rightly stated that there is no need to send a letter to the Government of South Africa or to its representative here at the United Nations. This can be seen, first of all, by the letter which was sent by the representative of South Africa, in which it is stated that the South African Government feels that the acceptance of the invitation "would be incompatible with the view which the South African Government has repeatedly conveyed to the United Nations". Thus, the acceptance of the invitation would not be compatible with the point of view of the Government of South Africa; it is not that it would be incompatible with the point of view of the members of the Committee or of the United Nations as a whole. This is the first point I wish to put forward.

My second point is that I do not think it is necessary to reply to the Government of South Africa, even on this point. The Government of South Africa has sent this letter not because that Government is right, but because it simply wants to find a pretext not to have to appear before this Committee. It wants to put forward a pretext for not participating in our discussion. I believe that in the statements we make in this Committee we will be able to express our points of view.

We do not need to ask South Africa whether they are going to implement the Odendaal Report, in view of the contents of their letter in reply to our letter. I believe that the Government of South Africa has no right whatsoever to put into effect any changes in the territory entrusted to it; rather South Africa should act in conformity with United Nations decisions, making no changes and not attempting to annex a territory which does not belong to it.

Mr. MELOVSKI (Yugoslavia) (interpretation from French): I apologize for taking the floor again, but it seems to me I must clarify somewhat what I said before. The position of my delegation is very clear. We associate ourselves with the views expressed by the representatives of Venezuela and Poland. We do not consider ourselves as a party in the litigation with the Government of South Africa, and we believe also that the reply of the Government of South Africa cannot and should not, in any case, interfere with the decision taken by us here to continue our consideration of the question of South West Africa. That is the first point I wished to make.

The second is that when I said that in our opinion, judging by its response, the Government of South Africa was asking the United Nations to refrain from even an examination of this question until a decision thereon is forthcoming from the International Court of Justice, I wanted simply to point out here that, in all logic, we ought not to try to ask for any reply or explanation from the Government of South Africa. We should interpret this reply of the Government of South Africa in the following way: the South African Government, considering itself a party in the litigation before the International Court of Justice, should not apply and will not apply the plan reflected in the Odendaal Report. This was all I wanted to say. I did not say that we considered South Africa bound or not bound by any decision; we do not believe that South Africa would respect the decision of the International Court of Justice or in any way modify the position it has hitherto maintained on the question of South West Africa.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): As Chairman of the Committee I shall do exactly what the Committee wants. Following the intervention of the representative of India, I believed he had proposed that the letter of the representative of South Africa receive a reply in which we would refute the arguments advanced by the representative of South Africa. But in view of other statements subsequently made, it would seem rather clear that there are two possibilities open: first, that the Chairman would reply to the South African letter, refuting and rejecting the arguments advanced therein; and second, that we would not engage in any polemics with the Government of South Africa, but rather, when the time comes to take a decision on the question of South Africa, the Committee would refute the arguments advanced by the Government of South Africa. If I could indicate my personal inclination here, it would be that I lean toward the second possibility. After all, in accordance with our routine practice, we have written to the Government of South Africa as we always do in inviting an administering Power to participate in the debate when it is a question of considering a territory under its administration, but we did not really expect South Africa to participate in such debate in view of its stubborn position with regard to decisions of the General Assembly as well as other bodies of the United Nations. Therefore, if members of the Special Committee so desire, as Chairman of the Committee I will not engage in any polemics with the Government of South Africa; but at the proper moment the Committee will take the decision that seems most proper and will, at that time, refute the arguments advanced by the Government of South Africa.

Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India): Mr. Chairman, when I intervened initially in this discussion I stated that if you were considering a reply you might take into account this particular point about the Odendaal Report. Nothing that the South African Government does really surprises us. They do many strange things, and to use the argument of the sub judice principle with regard to the Odendaal Report is even stranger than their normal logic, and I thought we would throw it back at them. But if the Committee thinks that it is not worth it, I certainly do not make any formal proposal. We can certainly deal with this matter when the Committee discusses this particular item in substance.

It is not my desire to propose that we have a dialogue with the South African Government. We have tried to have this for many years. I will not insist, and I did not insist initially. What I meant was that if you, Mr. Chairman, were considering a reply, then this point, in my opinion, should be taken into account in the reply. But if you feel, and if the Committee feels, that we do not have to send a reply, then I would be perfectly willing to go along with that.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): So then I will not send a second letter. The Special Committee, when it comes to take its decision, will decide upon the type of reply to be given to the letter from South Africa.

SITUATION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I have no other speakers for this afternoon. I propose, therefore, as Chairman to report to the Committee on a certain matter.

For some days now many representatives, members of the Special Committee, have voiced to me their concern with respect to the situation in Southern Rhodesia. In this connexion I would like to indicate to the members of the Committee that, following upon the adoption of resolution A/AC.109/61 of 23 March 1964, I approached the Secretary-General, bearing in mind operative paragraph 8 of that resolution, which requested the Secretary-General to communicate its text to all Member States and to intensify his efforts to achieve implementation of the resolution. After my conversations with the Secretary-General on this matter, he indicated to me that he intended to undertake certain initiatives aimed at improving the situation in Southern Rhodesia. But following the resignation of the Field government and the establishment of a new Government, and in view of the concern voiced by many members, I once again held conversations with the Secretary-General on the question of Southern Rhodesia. In our last conversation the Secretary-General indicated to me that he is not very optimistic in connexion with the measures he had in mind, because of the accession to power in Southern Rhodesia of a Government representing the extreme right in that country.

(The Chairman)

Thus I would like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to paragraph 10 of the operative part of that resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia which the Committee adopted on 23 March. That paragraph 10 stipulated that the Committee decided to maintain the question of Southern Rhodesia on its agenda. In view of the implication deriving from paragraph 10, two new events have occurred since then in Southern Rhodesia.

Firstly, there has been established a new government, and the new government has voiced feelings which are absolutely contrary to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Furthermore, the nationalist leader in Southern Rhodesia, Mr. Nkomo and several of his fellow workers have been arrested by the new government in Southern Rhodesia and have been sent into exile in a region bordering upon a territory under Portuguese administration and South Africa.

Thus, in view of these recent and very grave events which have caused the situation in Southern Rhodesia to deteriorate, and in view of paragraph 10 of the operative part of the resolution adopted on the question of Southern Rhodesia, it is now for the Special Committee to evaluate the situation which has come into being and to take appropriate measures within the terms of reference given the Special Committee by the resolution which established the Committee.

If any member wishes to take the floor now following upon these comments of mine, I shall be very willing to call upon him.

Mr. NAIWAR SINGH (India): Mr. Chairman, my delegation is grateful to you for bringing up this grave matter of the recent events in Southern Rhodesia. You will recollect that several delegations, including my own, had approached you over the weekend, towards the end of last week, requesting you to consider this item. You were good enough to see the Secretary-General in this connexion and to take us into confidence and tell us what was discussed with the Secretary-General.

Naturally, the situation over the weekend has not improved, as far as we are aware. As a matter of fact, it has gone worse. According to press reports, the present head of the Southern Rhodesian Government, Mr. Smith, told a press conference that as far as he could see he did not visualize a nationalist African government ruling Southern Rhodesia during his lifetime, and Mr. Smith is only forty-five years old. These are his public statements and we have to take him

(Mr. Natwar Singh, India)

at his word. Therefore, it is incumbent on this Committee to apply its mind to this particular problem.

I was wondering if the representative of the United Kingdom would be good enough to enlighten us on the rather grim situation in the territory, for which they are ultimately responsible.

Mr. Taieb SLIM (Tunisia): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the declaration that you made. All of us around this table are very much concerned about the prevailing situation in Southern Rhodesia, especially after the steps taken by the new Prime Minister or Chief Minister of that colony and his declaration about the policy he envisages to pursue in that territory.

This is not a great surprise to most of us because during the last two years we have been giving advice and have been appealing to the Administering Authority to do something before it becomes too late. We are terribly shocked by the measures being applied nowadays to all the nationalists in Southern Rhodesia. It is a matter of great concern to our Governments, because we feel that by these tactics and by this kind of policy, it is certainly the best way, unfortunately, to encourage our African brothers to resort to the only way left for them to liberate themselves, and that is by violent means.

In this Special Committee we have always preached peaceful means, trying to reach a happy conclusion with regard to independence and self-determination. We are sorry to see that this course is not being encouraged in Southern Rhodesia. It is the view of my delegation that due to the prevailing deteriorating situation in Southern Rhodesia, another opportunity should be given to all of us to reopen the debate on this matter and, in consultation with others, to see what kind of new procedure we can adopt. It is also the view of my delegation that you should try to consult all of us before opening this new debate. It is a very well known fact that this concern is shared by most Member States of the Organization and that there will be a great number of consultations and meetings these days of the different groups in the United Nations, and we would be well-advised to take into consideration whatever consensus may be reached among different groups.

(Mr. Taïeb Slim, Tunisia)

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your declaration very much. On behalf of my delegation, I wish to indicate that it will be useful -- in fact it is urgently needed -- for us to have another debate on this subject.

Mr. MGONJA (Tanganyika): Mr. Chairman, my delegation wishes to express its appreciation of the statement you have just made on the question of Southern Rhodesia. My delegation shares the deep concern over the grave turn of events in Southern Rhodesia within the last week. Reports from Southern Rhodesia carry very disturbing news. The now familiar drama of the ousting of a Prime Minister of the European settlers and replacing him each time with a more intransigent racist Prime Minister was repeated last week by the exit of Mr. Field and the entry of Mr. Ian Smith. This newcomer has been described by Mr. Nkomo, as quoted in the Economist, "as a member of a suicide squad". Also, in the Economist of last week, 18 April, Mr. Smith is described as the latest alderman-in-chief of the tobacco farmers and also as a member of an ultra group.

(Mr. Mgonja, Tanganyika)

Following these developments, the reign of terror against the Africans was accelerated. Mr. Nkomo and his colleagues were arrested and banished to a remote region near the border of South Africa and Mozambique. This, to say the least, is very ominous.

Furthermore, we read of indiscriminate shooting at groups of Africans, with considerable casualties. Dogs and the European settler police have been set loose against African women and children, and hundreds of African men and women are now continuously being harassed and molested and detained.

All these brutalities and crimes committed against the African peoples by the European settlers of Southern Rhodesia are repugnant and intolerable because they are part and parcel of a systematic and shameful doctrine and practice of racial discrimination and humiliation which has been imposed on the African peoples for much too long now. The continued lack of concrete action by the Administering Power, even at this late and critical stage, will be condemned by the Africans and by freedom-loving people all over the world.

This Committee, charged by the General Assembly with the work of liberating the colonized peoples, decided to keep the question on the agenda when we last discussed it. Obviously, in the view of my delegation, and as has already been stated by the Ambassador of Tunisia, the situation now calls for a new examination and discussion and action, and my delegation is confident that the African States and this Committee will not fail the suffering people of Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): We are very grateful to the Chairman for the statement he has just made about the situation presently prevailing in Southern Rhodesia. This is the more important since, when we discussed this matter in the past, there were certain delegations that maintained that the situation in that part of the world was not so grave and that it did not call for a severe resolution, as the one adopted by the Committee has been described.

We are also grateful that the Chairman has actually taken steps and consulted the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who has to fulfil a mandate under this resolution. In view of the new events which have unfolded -- the existence

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

of an ultra-racist government, and the persecutions which have been initiated and which have already been described by representatives here -- perhaps the measures which the Secretary-General was expected to take will no longer suffice.

The Chairman has properly stressed, as has the representative of Tunisia, that it was necessary to consult the various groups around this table. But at the same time I should like to emphasize another aspect of the subject. Paragraph 9 of the resolution reads:

"Draws the immediate attention of the Security Council to the explosive situation in Southern Rhodesia, which constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security."

I am wondering whether it would not be appropriate, while we are taking up this question and while it is being discussed among the various groups here and in this Committee, not only to consult the Security Council but to enter into discussion with it and find out what measures can be taken to deal with the situation which has been created in Southern Rhodesia. Of course, the Secretary-General of the United Nations will take the necessary steps. But perhaps the Chairman of this Committee should also take up this question with the President and the members of the Security Council, who, on the basis of this resolution, could perhaps also envisage some measures in respect of Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation is grateful to the Chairman for the communications and the explanations which he has provided regarding the situation which has been created in Southern Rhodesia. We are also grateful for the steps which he has taken in consulting with the Secretary-General and raising this question before the Special Committee.

The events which have occurred during the last week in this colony of the United Kingdom indicate that Southern Rhodesia, which was already involved in a continuous state of crisis, is now on the brink of an explosion: the racist Field has left, the arch-racist Smith has taken over, and we now have a series of bloody pogroms. Nationalist leaders are being arrested and sent

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

to so-called security camps, which are actually death camps. In the week which has just passed, according to official information, more than 300 Africans have been arrested. There have been several casualties and clashes with the police. The police have been using firearms, tear gas, dogs. The authorities do not respect women or children. Thus, up to 17 April, 120 women had been arrested for participating in demonstrations before the Office of the High Commissioner of the United Kingdom in Southern Rhodesia. Even at the time that the Committee of Twenty-Four was discussing the situation in Southern Rhodesia, it was evident to all who wanted to see things as they actually are that in London and in Salisbury the ground was being prepared for a proclamation of independence whereby the white racist minority would preserve power. Now that the extreme racist Smith -- and he is so described even by the bourgeois newspapers of the West -- has taken over, we must recognize that a further step has taken place in the direction of violence. Even the New York Times is forced to concede that the present electoral law, unless it is revised, cannot lead to the institution within the Parliament of Southern Rhodesia of an African majority within the next twenty years.

At any rate, the direction taken is such that the people of Southern Rhodesia are to be deprived of any rights for still another generation, and in order to achieve this purpose, pogroms are being carried out in that country along with terroristic practices. Not only are the leaders of the National Liberation Movement being arrested, but also all those who raise their voices against violence and arbitrary methods on the part of the racists. Repression of the very basis of the so-called law of preservation and security is taking place. People are being imprisoned; weapons are used as well as tear gas. And of course the aim is obvious: to suppress the movement for national liberation, to intimidate and weaken the people in their struggle for self-determination. This Committee, which is called upon to protect the interests of the subjugated peoples, must raise its voice and express its full support for the people of Southern Rhodesia in their struggle for freedom and independence. The Committee must warn the colonialists that they will be held responsible for the crimes against the people of Southern Rhodesia and their leaders.

Therefore, we fully share the view that this Committee must return to consideration of this question. Furthermore, it seems to us that the time has come -- and this has already been pointed out -- when, in accordance with paragraph 9 of the resolution adopted on 23 March 1964, the Committee should draw the attention of the Security Council to the situation which has been created in Southern Rhodesia and should take the appropriate steps to induce the Council to act to put an end to the bloodshed in that country, which indeed constitutes a threat to the peace and security of that region.

Mr. DICKO (Mali) (interpretation from French): My delegation is keenly aware of the situation which has recently been created in Southern Rhodesia. The change of government there is, in our opinion, a great aggravation of the situation prevailing. We fully share the concern which has been expressed by all those representatives who have spoken. Thus we are in favour of resuming discussion of this matter in the Committee especially since, in our resolution adopted on 23 March, we decided, in paragraph 10, to keep the subject on the Committee's agenda. My delegation was a co-sponsor of that draft resolution and, like the other co-sponsors, had a feeling when drafting the document that the

(Mr. Dicko, Mali)

Government of Southern Rhodesia was far from realizing the actual situation; and this has been borne out by the recent events in that country. Therefore, we favour the proposal made by certain members of the Committee that consultations should be held and that the Committee should again take up this matter.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I do not know whether, in view of the grave deterioration of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the representative of the United Kingdom would wish to make a statement to the Committee, following the recommendations contained in paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 23 March.

I understand that the representative of Tunisia, basing his remarks on paragraph 10 of the operative part of the resolution, proposes that, after consultation with other delegations and other groups, the Committee should again take up the question of Southern Rhodesia. If I understood him correctly, and if there is no objection -- and I believe there could be none because we are bound by the provisions of the resolution -- I would propose to proceed with the necessary consultations so as to consider once more the question of Southern Rhodesia in the Special Committee to the end that appropriate measures would be taken to meet the grave situation prevailing there at this time. It is a very grave situation indeed. Not only have political leaders been arrested, but also women and children, during demonstrations. According to press reports, more than one or two hundred persons are at present under arrest and this has created a situation of real terror in the territory.

I would ask representatives to consult the Journal to ascertain when the Committee will meet again. In the meantime, I shall proceed with the necessary consultations as to when a special meeting should be held on the question of Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India): I am not sure that it is necessary to take a fresh decision because the question of Southern Rhodesia is on our agenda. The resolution adopted on 23 March states so categorically. If you, Sir, decide

(Mr. Natwar Singh, India)

that we shall discuss the matter tomorrow, that is that; but if you decide to discuss it the day after, that is a different matter. But the item remains on the agenda of this Committee. We have kept it there specifically because we feared that these developments would come to pass in view of the disaster that was taking place in Southern Rhodesia, and we have been warning the Administering Authority that if it did not look out, it would reap the whirlwind and terrible misery would be inflicted upon the indigenous people of Southern Rhodesia. In order to know the latest position, I had to question the representative of the United Kingdom, asking for the most recent information if he was in a position to let us have it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I understood the representative of India. It has been decided that the question of Southern Rhodesia shall be kept on our agenda, as you can see in operative paragraph 10 of the resolution of 23 March 1964 (A/AC.109/61). I said that I would proceed to have consultations, as suggested by the representative of Tunisia, before having a meeting of the Special Committee, which would have on its agenda the item "Southern Rhodesia". My consultations will not concern the advisability of having the question of Southern Rhodesia on our agenda. No, my consultations will be on whether there are speakers wishing to speak on the question and when those speakers wish to take the floor to make a new proposal to the Special Committee in connexion with the question of Southern Rhodesia. I believe, therefore, that there is no divergency here between what I said and what the representative of India has just said. If no one else wishes to speak, it will be so decided. The Special Committee will be called for a plenary meeting and on its agenda there will appear the item of Southern Rhodesia. This will be after I have held the necessary consultations as to the speakers wishing to speak on the subject, because it would not be a good idea to have a special meeting of the Special Committee without having the assurance that there will be speakers. That is why I wish to proceed to consultations.

Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, most gratefully for your kind explanation.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I have no further speakers. The next meeting of the Special Committee will be announced in the Journal.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.