



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.109/SR.26
2 May 1962

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 29 March 1962, at 11.15 a.m.

CONTENTS

Southern Rhodesia: General Assembly resolution 1745 (XVI)
(A/AC.109/L.4/Rev.1 and Corr.1, L.5) (continued)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. JHA	(India)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. PLIMSOLL	Australia
	Mr. KOUN WICK	Cambodia
	Mr. WODAJO	Ethiopia
	Mr. RASGOTRA	India
	Mr. THEODOLI)	Italy
	Mr. ZITO)	
	Mr. ANDRIAMAHARO	Madagascar
	Mr. TRAORE	Mali
	Mr. LEWANDOWSKI	Poland
	Mr. RIFAI	Syria
	Mr. NSILO SWAI	Tanganyika
	Mr. Taieb SLIM	Tunisia
	Mr. MOROZOV)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. OBEREMKO)	
	Mr. CROWE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. BINGHAM	United States of America
	Mr. VELAQUEZ	Uruguay
	Mr. SILVA SUCRE	Venezuela
	Mr. PAVICEVIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. STAVROPOULOS	Under-Secretary
	Mr. CHACKO	Secretary of the Committee

SOUTHERN RHODESIA: GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1745 (XVI) (A/AC.109/L.4/Rev.1 and Corr.1, L.5) (continued)

Mr. CROWE (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom Government would like to invite the Chairman and the members of the Committee to London to discuss the work of the Committee in all its aspects out of a desire to establish friendly and fruitful relations with it. It would welcome the opportunity to inform the Committee of the facts and to listen to members' views, and would be very ready to discuss the Committee's work generally with the Chairman and members if they wished to visit London for the purpose. His Government had thought originally of inviting the Chairman and members of the Bureau, but it was prepared to extend the invitation to a group the Chairman might wish to appoint. He assumed that the timing of the visit would be arranged to suit the mutual convenience of Her Majesty's Government and of the Committee.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the terms of the United Kingdom invitation were not clear to his delegation. The wording used by the United Kingdom representative was somewhat evasive and disregarded the question of the purpose for which the sponsors had proposed that the Sub-Committee should be established. He would like to receive a clear assurance from the United Kingdom delegation that the talks, in accordance with paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, would deal with the future steps which the United Kingdom Government proposed to take in Southern Rhodesia for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in that Territory. Otherwise, the Sub-Committee on arriving in London might find that the United Kingdom Government declined to discuss that subject with it.

His delegation would not, however, oppose the dispatch of the Sub-Committee, in accordance with the terms of the draft resolution, since a number of Afro-Asian delegations appeared to feel that it would be of use.

Mr. Taieb SLIM (Tunisia) welcomed the United Kingdom Government's reply to the Committee's request, which he hoped would enable some positive steps to be worked out to solve the problem of Southern Rhodesia.

The CHAIRMAN said that he assumed that the Committee would have no objection to the Sub-Committee discussing with the United Kingdom Government

(The Chairman)

not only the problem of Southern Rhodesia but matters relating to other dependent Territories under United Kingdom administration, naturally without committing itself or the Committee in any way.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria) considered that the visit of the Sub-Committee to London and its discussions with Her Majesty's Government should be directed chiefly towards the subject of Southern Rhodesia. If the United Kingdom Government wished to discuss other matters the Sub-Committee would naturally not refuse to do so, though it should not enter into any discussions of substance but should merely take note of the views expressed by the United Kingdom Government and convey them to the Committee.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the United Kingdom representative had not replied to his question.

Mr. CROWE (United Kingdom) replied that he had nothing to add to what he had already said.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, that being so, the Committee should settle the question of the Good Offices Sub-Committee without regard to the statement by the United Kingdom representative, which was irrelevant to the subject under discussion. The United Kingdom representative had attempted to confuse the issue and to make it appear that it was not the Committee which was sending a Sub-Committee to London but Her Majesty's Government which, on its own initiative, was inviting the Chairman and certain other members to discuss the general subject of the Committee's work. The purpose of that manoeuvre was obviously to evade the question raised in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, he considered that the Sub-Committee should go to London, though not in accordance with the terms of the United Kingdom proposal. If any benefit to Southern Rhodesia resulted, well and good; if not, the Committee should resume its discussion of the problem of Southern Rhodesia in the light of the draft resolution and the Polish amendments, with a view to obliging the United Kingdom Government to take effective steps to grant independence to the Territory. In two or three weeks' time, when the Sub-Committee had returned from London, the situation would be clear and the Committee could then decide what action it should take.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

He emphasized that the Sub-Committee would not be empowered to extend the scope of its work without specific instructions from the Committee. The discussions concerning Southern Rhodesia would be held in the light of the draft resolution and of the Chairman's summary of the views expressed in the Committee. Any talks concerning other United Kingdom Territories should be conducted by other sub-committees set up for the purpose and guided by specific directives. Naturally the Sub-Committee would report to the Committee any statements made by the United Kingdom Government concerning other Territories.

The CHAIRMAN said that it might be useful if he now gave the Committee his summary of the views that had been expressed in the Committee. There had been general agreement that:

Firstly, the Territory of Southern Rhodesia had not attained a full measure of self-government;

Secondly, the discussions in the Committee, including the statements of responsible leaders from Southern Rhodesia, had emphasized the gravity of the situation in the Territory and the need for urgent positive action by the United Kingdom Government to prevent a drift towards upheaval and conflict;

Thirdly, the Constitution of 6 December 1961, which further entrenched the authority of the European settlers who formed a small minority of the population of the Territory, was unacceptable to the indigenous people, who constituted well over 90 per cent of the Territory's population, and its application and enforcement in the face of rejection by the vast majority of the people of Southern Rhodesia was likely to lead to a dangerous situation;

Fourthly, fresh efforts must be made towards formulating new constitutional arrangements in Southern Rhodesia. Most members considered that the Constitution of 6 December 1961 should be set aside and that the United Kingdom Government should convene a fresh constitutional conference of a representative character without delay, with the full participation of representatives of African political parties, for the purpose of formulating a new Constitution for Southern Rhodesia which would ensure the emergence into independence of Southern Rhodesia at the earliest possible date, in conformity with the principles of the Charter and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples embodied in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

/...

(The Chairman)

Fifthly, civil liberties should be fully restored and all restraints and restrictions in law and in practice on the exercise of freedom of political activity should be removed;

Sixthly, a Sub-Committee of the Special Committee should immediately establish contact with the United Kingdom Government in London to discuss, in the light of the Committee's views, future steps in regard to Southern Rhodesia and to report to the Committee as soon as possible.

In accordance with the Committee's request that the Chairman should nominate the members of the Sub-Committee, he proposed that that body should consist of the representatives of Tanganyika, Tunisia and Uruguay, in addition to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) welcomed the statement by the United Kingdom representative, which his delegation regarded as one further concrete sign of the United Kingdom's co-operation with the Committee.

The proposal his delegation had made at the twenty-fourth meeting, which had been accepted by the Committee, had been prompted by the fact that a very serious situation was developing in the Territory, owing to the fact that elections were to be held in October under the new Constitution. His delegation felt strongly that the Committee should act before any step was taken that might prejudice future negotiations between the representatives of the people of Southern Rhodesia, the Government of the Territory and the United Kingdom Government. In view of the urgency of the matter the Sub-Committee should proceed to London without delay to impress upon the United Kingdom Government the views expressed in the Committee, which had been admirably summed up by the Chairman.

The United Kingdom Government had now invited the Sub-Committee to discuss the Committee's work in general and problems relating to a number of other Territories with which the Committee was not at present dealing. In his delegation's opinion that invitation was very welcome. Nevertheless he wished to make it clear that the question of Southern Rhodesia should be the first item to be discussed with the United Kingdom Government.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) said that the Chairman's summary accurately reflected the views expressed in the Committee on the question of Southern Rhodesia and provided terms of reference for the Sub-Committee in its talks with the United Kingdom Government. He considered that the procedure proposed by the

(Mr. Lewandowski, Poland)

delegation of Ethiopia at the twenty-fourth meeting could be put into effect and that the Committee could expect an early report from the Sub-Committee on the situation in Southern Rhodesia and on the results of its talks with the United Kingdom Government.

With regard to the suggestion that the Sub-Committee should also acquaint itself with the United Kingdom Government's views on other Territories under its administration, he felt that those views could best be conveyed to the Committee by the United Kingdom delegation. As he understood it, the Ethiopian representative's proposal was that the Sub-Committee's terms of reference should be to discuss, in the light of the Committee's debate, problems concerning Southern Rhodesia only.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India) unreservedly welcomed the United Kingdom Government's invitation to the Sub-Committee, which in his delegation's view was a very important step forward.

The people of India during their struggle for freedom had witnessed the conflict between British liberal opinion at home on the one hand and the conservative opinion of British vested interests abroad. It was due to the final assertion of those liberal opinions that a great forward movement towards independence had taken place in vast areas of the world which had been under British rule, and in his view it was those same liberal feelings which were responsible for the fact that the United Kingdom Government, after having originally made categorical reservations about the composition and functions of the Special Committee, was today willing not only to participate in the Committee's work but also to invite a Sub-Committee of the Committee to go to London. That step promised further progress in establishing a proper relationship between the Committee and the Government which held more than three-quarters of the remaining colonial Territories.

The United Kingdom representative had said that his Government would be glad to listen to all that the Sub-Committee might have to say and would wish to consider with it the general aspects of the Committee's work. He understood that since the United Kingdom Government had not excluded a discussion with the Sub-Committee on the question of Southern Rhodesia, it would be included in the agenda. His delegation had no objection to the suggestion that the ambit of the discussion

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

should be much wider than originally proposed. A consideration of developments in, for example, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland or any other Territory under United Kingdom administration would be welcome. It was true that the Sub-Committee would be handicapped in discussing those matters in the sense that they had not yet been debated in the Committee, but on the other hand the Sub-Committee appointed by the Chairman was an extremely representative group and its opinions should be perfectly acceptable to the Indian delegation. Of course it was not intended that the Sub-Committee should enter into any commitments with respect to other Territories under United Kingdom administration. In summing up the debate, however, the Chairman had laid down a specific framework of reference as far as the discussions concerning Southern Rhodesia were concerned and there was therefore no danger that the Special Committee's work would be prejudiced in any way.

Mr. TRAORE (Mali) welcomed the invitation of the United Kingdom Government, which it regarded as a very important step in the direction of co-operation.

The summary of the Committee's views made by the Chairman was entirely satisfactory to his delegation.

His delegation approved the composition of the Sub-Committee as announced by the Chairman. He hoped that the Sub-Committee would be given clear and precise terms of reference.

He welcomed the proposed widening of the scope of the Sub-Committee's discussions with the United Kingdom Government to include problems relating to other Territories under United Kingdom administration.

Mr. Taieb SLIM (Tunisia) observed that the Chairman's summing up accurately reflected all the points that had been raised during the debate.

Mr. RIFAI (Syria) thanked the Chairman for the admirable way in which he had summarized the views expressed in the Committee. He expressed his delegation's satisfaction with the co-operation of the United Kingdom Government in respect of the task conferred upon the Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN stated that, in the light of the discussion which had followed the statement of the United Kingdom representative, the consensus of opinion in the Committee appeared to be, firstly, that the Sub-Committee's principal task would be to discuss the question of Southern Rhodesia in the light of the Committee's views as stated in the Chairman's summary, and secondly that it could also, if necessary and if the occasion arose, discuss other colonial questions involving the United Kingdom Government and coming within the scope of the Committee's task, in the light of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1654 (XVI).

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation endorsed that summary, which clarified the Sub-Committee's terms of reference and stressed that its main duty was to discuss the problem of Southern Rhodesia. He recalled that a time-limit of two or three weeks for the Sub-Committee's mission had been mentioned and he wondered whether the Chairman could include that point in his summary.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had two other points to mention with regard to the Sub-Committee. Firstly, in the event of any member of the Sub-Committee being unable to participate for any reason, he asked the Committee to consider giving discretion to the Chairman to fill that vacancy, in which case he would of course inform the Committee of the action taken. Secondly, the Committee apparently wished the Sub-Committee to leave almost immediately and to report back within two or three weeks. It would, however, be necessary first to consult the United Kingdom Ministers and consider their convenience. If the Committee so wished, he would consult the United Kingdom representative concerning a date for the Sub-Committee's departure for London which would be convenient to both parties. In view of those considerations it might be advisable for the Committee to authorize the Chairman to make a slight modification in the Committee's time-table; for instance, it might have to resume work a little later than 12 April.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Soviet Republics) stressed that it was very important for the Sub-Committee to leave as soon as possible and to return within two or three weeks to present its report. He felt that the United Kingdom

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

Ministers should make every effort to accommodate the Sub-Committee and not keep the representatives of six States waiting. On the understanding that three weeks should be regarded as the absolute maximum, his delegation would not oppose the general wish of the Committee that the Sub-Committee should be established and dispatched to London.

He agreed with the Chairman's definition of the Sub-Committee's terms of reference; they comprised in essence the task laid down in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution (A/AC.109/L.4/Rev.1).

He did not, however, agree with that part of the Chairman's last statement which had suggested giving the Sub-Committee carte blanche to discuss other colonial Territories with the United Kingdom Government. Without questioning the capabilities of the Sub-Committee, he felt that, for purely practical reasons, it would serve no useful purpose for it to embark upon such general discussions on matters not previously dealt with by the Committee itself. That did not mean that the Sub-Committee should refuse to listen to any information on such questions which might be given to it, but it should not, on its own initiative, widen the scope of its mission.

Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) observed that, despite the United Kingdom Government's constructive response to the Committee's request, the representative of the Soviet Union had made certain remarks which should not be allowed to pass unheeded. He had spoken, for example, about Ministers keeping the representatives of six countries waiting. There was an important principle at stake there: namely, that when the United Nations wished to send a representative or a commission to a Member State, the arrangements were worked out by agreement between them. It frequently happened that the commitments of Cabinet Ministers were such that a particular time was not suitable and therefore some slight modification had to be made in the programme. Some Members, including the Soviet Union, had in fact refused to allow United Nations representatives to go to their country.

On the question of what the Sub-Committee should discuss, the position had been admirably stated by the representatives of India, Ethiopia and others. It was a matter which could safely be left to the discretion of the six members. Such discussions would not commit either the Committee or the United Kingdom

/...

(Mr. Plimsoll, Australia)

Government. There was every advantage in United Kingdom Ministers, civil servants and public figures gaining an insight into the Committee's preoccupations and learning how it viewed its tasks. Similarly, after its discussions with the United Kingdom Government the Sub-Committee would speak with more authority and knowledge.

The Australian Government would not have chosen the exact words used by the Chairman if it had been called upon to state its own policy on the question under consideration. It would have had reservations, elaborations and qualifications to make. But the Chairman in his statement had tried to represent the broad trend of thought in the Committee; each member was making some concessions in agreeing on the procedure to be followed.

Mr. TRAORE (Mali) said that his delegation entirely endorsed the second part of the Chairman's summary. He did not think that the second part of the Sub-Committee's task - the discussion with the United Kingdom Government of its colonial problems - should be debated at length in the Committee. The latter was about to discuss a draft questionnaire; on the basis of that questionnaire the Sub-Committee would be able to consider certain colonial problems with the United Kingdom. The main point to be decided at the moment was the exact date for the resumption of the Committee's work.

Mr. ANDRIAMAHARO (Madagascar) said that his delegation fully endorsed the Chairman's summary as reflecting the consensus of opinion in the Committee. It welcomed the fact that the United Kingdom delegation was meeting the Committee's wishes regarding the dispatch of the Sub-Committee to London for discussions on that country's colonial problems. His delegation also approved of the Chairman's nomination of the six States to constitute the Good Offices Sub-Committee. There was every reason to consider that, in assigning that task to the Sub-Committee, the Special Committee was fulfilling the mission entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) associated his delegation with the statement made by the representative of Australia and congratulated the Chairman on his skilful handling of the proceedings, including his able summaries.

/...

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the doubts expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union, said that it did not seem to him that the second part of his summary gave the Sub-Committee carte blanche: all it meant was that the Sub-Committee, as a body of responsible men, would use its discretion regarding whether and how far it would discuss other matters; moreover, any discussion it conducted would be in the light of the Declaration on the granting of independence, which was an important qualification.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to make it quite clear that his delegation endorsed the sending of a Sub-Committee to London to discuss the question of Southern Rhodesia. With regard to the possible discussion of other subjects, he understood that it was not intended that the Sub-Committee should take the initiative in raising other matters. He was not suggesting that the Sub-Committee should refuse to discuss other matters if the United Kingdom Government raised them. His only concern was to ensure that the Sub-Committee should not substitute itself for the Committee as a whole in dealing with all the Territories on the Committee's programme of work.

If, therefore, the United Kingdom wished to give the Sub-Committee any information about its intentions with regard to other Territories under its administration, such information should be accepted by the Sub-Committee as a preliminary statement of position which might be useful for the subsequent discussion of those Territories by the Special Committee.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of Mali had raised the question of the date of the resumption of the Committee's meetings. Obviously, if the Officers of the Committee had not returned by 12 April the Committee would be unable to meet on that date. That was why he was suggesting that the Chairman should be given discretion to change the date if necessary.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.