

termed the principle of non-violence. The United Kingdom authorities in Aden and Aden Protectorate, however, had always tried to destroy the movement by any means in their power and instead of tracing the guilty person they had arrested leaders and ordinary members of the Peoples Socialist Party in order to destroy the movement.

3. The Sub-Committee on Aden mentioned in its report (A/5446/Rev.1, chap. V, appendix) that the petitioners who had appeared before it had expressed faith in the United Nations. They did not want to lose that faith. They did not know to whom they could appeal other than to the United Nations. The leading members of the party had declared a hunger strike and must by now be in a critical condition. He appealed to members to do something to help them.

4. He had cabled to his colleagues in Aden, in order to raise their morale, that the United Nations would do something for them, and had received the following reply:

"Yours 12 thanks. Thirty-five citizens including ATUC executives in prison in Fadhli State, one of the member States of this Confederation, and are being tortured. Prison unhealthy. Food poor. All declared hunger strike. Mass arrests continue. Hundreds deported. News of the building of the Aden Trades Union Congress forbidden. Feel this our last telegram before you fly London for contacts. Aden Trades Union Congress."

5. That was the situation in Aden. The only hope lay within the United Nations.

6. On behalf of the people of Aden and Aden Protectorate, he thanked the Member States who had voted in favour of the draft resolution on Aden (A/L.436 and Add.1) which had been submitted to the General Assembly two days earlier (1277th plenary meeting). He appealed to the Committee to endeavour to secure the release of the prisoners. His party would not object to the guilty man being arrested and prosecuted. They would never obstruct legal proceedings. They wanted the man to be prosecuted and, if found guilty, to be sentenced, but they thought it wrong that hundreds of people should suffer for his crime. The United Nations could press the United Kingdom Government and the Administration in Aden to annul the declaration of emergency, which gave the High Commissioner unlimited power, even the power of life and death. Aden was at present a fascist police State. He wished the members of the Committee could see for themselves the deterioration in the situation there.

7. Mr. SONN VOEUNSAI (Cambodia) said that his delegation had been a member of the Sub-Committee appointed by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to deal with the question of Aden. The Sub-Committee on Aden had heard representatives of the Peoples Socialist Party plead their cause, and those representatives had never given any indication that they believed in violent action. As the petitioner had said, those responsible for the recent incident should be prosecuted and punished, but a large-scale wave of arrests was not justified. His delegation appealed to the United Kingdom Government to remedy the situation. He would recall that in resolution 1949 (XVIII), adopted by the General Assembly two days earlier, the administering Power had been asked to release all political prisoners.

8. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) said that the mass arrests and deportations described by the petitioner could hardly be justified by one isolated incident. The actions of the United Kingdom authorities seemed to be related to the fact that the Peoples Socialist Party and the trade-unionists of Aden had opposed United Kingdom designs in the region; the objective of the administering Power had been to intimidate the people and imprison the progressive leaders in order to prevent the exercise of self-determination. His delegation protested vehemently against the actions of the colonial authorities; he endorsed the Cambodian representative's appeal to the United Kingdom Government and he appealed to the Committee to take action on the matter as it had done on an earlier occasion when freedom-fighters in Southern Rhodesia had been arrested.

9. Mr. KARSENIO (Indonesia) said that the information just placed before the Committee provided new evidence of the colonial practices of the United Kingdom. Not satisfied with imposing a so-called Federation against the wishes of the people—a manoeuvre with which Indonesia was familiar—the United Kingdom was now using an unfortunate incident as a pretext for the suppression of a popular movement. The United Nations had already made efforts to put an end to the critical situation in the region, but without success. Everything should be done to persuade the United Kingdom to release those who had been arrested; the Secretary-General might perhaps be asked to use his good offices. He hoped that the Special Committee would give high priority to the question of Aden when it opened its next session.

10. Mr. DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela) said that he had been shocked at the information given by the petitioner since he had always believed that the United Kingdom respected the principles of justice. Political persecution by the administering Power could not improve the situation in a Non-Self-Governing Territory. His delegation did not consider that an isolated act of violence justified indiscriminate repression and the suppression of a political organization. The United Kingdom should show that it was a civilized Power by making every effort to restore calm in Aden and by working towards the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) there. He hoped that the United Kingdom would take note of the appeals of representatives.

11. Mr. DIALLO Seydou (Guinea) said that the facts regarding the situation in Aden had become known to the world through the World Federation of Trade Unions. Trade unions in England might have the right to organize strikes but in Aden they had not had that right for years and elementary freedoms were being flouted there. Guinea supported the workers of Aden in their demand for total liberation and independence.

12. Mr. EL-SHAFAI (United Arab Republic) said that the alarming situation in Aden and in certain protectorates belonging to the so-called Federation of South Arabia had been described in the world Press. Hundreds had been arrested and hundreds more had been forced to leave their homes and had been deported to Yemen. The petitioner had made it clear that his organization deplored the recent bombing incident and considered that those responsible should be prosecuted. The incident did not, however, give the authorities the right to detain 500 people and to deport "suspects" who had been making their living in the area for years. The Committee was faced with an

emergency situation and an emergency solution was called for. He hoped that it would be possible for the Committee to adopt a draft resolution on the matter.

13. Mr. HASHIM (Sudan) agreed that the urgency of the situation required a draft resolution.

14. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) deplored the criminal act of terrorism in Aden which had caused injury to a number of persons including the United Kingdom High Commissioner. His delegation condemned terrorism and did not believe that the incident had been the work of responsible political organizations. There was reason to suspect that it had been organized by enemies of the liberation movement wanting to give the United Kingdom authorities a pretext for taking arbitrary action for the suppression of political organizations and trade unions. In any case the act did not justify the detention, deportation and torture of hundreds of nationalists, liberals and trade unionists. The cable which the petitioner had read out to the Committee made it clear that the authorities were attempting to silence the liberation movement. He noted that the incident was being used as a pretext for closing the frontiers between the Yemen Arab Republic and the occupied part of Yemen. It was only natural for the United Nations to take action in a situation in which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was being flouted and which ran counter to the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly calling upon the United Kingdom to release all political prisoners.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that, since no delegation seemed to wish to put questions to the petitioner, he would ask him to withdraw.

Mr. Mohamed Salem Basendwah, representative of the Peoples Socialist Party and Aden Trades Union Congress, withdrew.

16. Mr. SMIGANOWSKI (Poland) associated himself with the delegations which had deplored the action taken against trade unionists and others in Aden. He assured the petitioner of his delegation's solidarity and appealed to the United Kingdom authorities to release all political prisoners and ensure a return to normal conditions in the area.

17. Mr. MONGONO (Nigeria) said that although his delegation did not approve of violence, it regretted the mass arrests which had been made following the recent incident. He appealed to the United Kingdom to co-operate with the United Nations in the question of Aden. It was regrettable that the good aspects of United Kingdom colonial policy were not evident in the case of Aden and that the United Kingdom had failed to co-operate with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Since many delegations had expressed their concern at the developments in Aden, he suggested that the Committee might agree to ask the United Kingdom to take note of the general concern expressed by delegations.

18. Mr. DIALLO (Mali) said that recent events in Aden had brought the situation there to the attention of world public opinion. He deplored the arbitrary repression of the people of Aden in connexion with incidents for which they were not responsible. Many countries represented in the Committee had had experience of incidents deliberately created by the colonial authorities in order to implicate the libera-

tion movements. The objectives of the colonialists in the region were well known and, in his delegation's view, explained their desire to suppress democratic organizations. Such measures, however, could not hold down a people which was determined to free itself from foreign domination. The matter was of concern to all men of goodwill and the United Nations should take speedy action to remedy the situation.

19. Mr. MGONJA (Tanganyika) said it was not the first time that a state of emergency had been declared in a United Kingdom colony. The world had recently welcomed the accession to independence of Zanzibar and Kenya; the latter State had only attained its freedom after a struggle which had led at one point to the declaration of a state of emergency. The situation of the people of Aden aroused the sympathy of all, especially of those countries which had recently emerged from colonial rule. He hoped that the United Nations would keep a careful watch on developments in the area.

20. Mr. SHUKRI (Syria) associated his delegation with the protests which had been expressed at the actions of the colonial authorities in Aden. Syria would support any draft resolution designed to bring about the release of those who had been detained.

21. He proposed that the petitioner's statement should be circulated as a Committee document.

It was so decided.^{1/}

22. Mr. SANKEY (United Kingdom) said that he wished to outline the facts of the situation. A hand-grenade had been exploded at Aden airport when Ministers of Aden State and of the Federation of South Arabia, together with some United Kingdom officials including the High Commissioner, had been about to depart for London for constitutional talks. An Indian woman had been killed and forty-three people injured; the ruler of Fadhli State had been seriously hurt and the High Commissioner had received a slight hand injury. The Supreme Council of the Federation of South Arabia had declared a state of emergency throughout the Federation. Twenty-nine leaders of the Peoples Socialist Party had been detained and 142 Yemenis—who were not citizens of Aden and who had abused the hospitality of Aden—had been escorted back to their country. As a result of the incident, it was possible that the constitutional talks scheduled to take place in London would have to be postponed.

23. It was clear, therefore, that many of the petitioner's allegations, such as the allegation that 500 persons had been arrested, were grossly exaggerated.

24. An attempt had been made to suggest that the administering Power had organized the incident as a pretext for repression. His delegation categorically rejected that monstrous accusation. The incident had been a calculated attempt to assassinate the leading Ministers of Aden and of the Federation, and the United Kingdom High Commissioner, and to sabotage the constitutional talks concerning the forthcoming elections in Aden, which would be a further step towards self-government and independence. It was true that there had so far been only one explosion, but the authorities had not been in a position to know whether the incident was an isolated one or the beginning of a campaign of violence on the part of those wishing to frustrate Aden's constitutional prog-

^{1/} See A/C.4/638.

ress to independence and to bring about its annexation by a neighbouring country. Preventive measures had been unavoidable, and those arrested had been people who had never, so far as his delegation was aware, renounced the use of violence; indeed they had been continually incited to violence by broadcasts from neighbouring countries. In order to determine who had been responsible it was only necessary to consider who would benefit from the assassinations and from a delay in the constitutional talks. Certainly the administering Power did not benefit.

25. It was also a remarkable coincidence that the explosion had taken place the day before the United Nations was to vote on a draft resolution concerning Aden. It should be noted that the petitioner had known of the recent developments in Aden before the resolution had been voted on and had informed the Committee of them in a letter (A/C.4/636), which had been circulated. There had been no strong reaction in the Committee at that time and the petitioner had not asked to address the Committee. The communication had also been read out to the General Assembly, at its 1277th plenary meeting, yet no attempt had been made to amend the draft resolution in any way in view of the new incident or to defer the vote on it. Now, however, on the last day of the Committee's work, the petitioner had asked to speak and an attempt was being made by some delegations to stampede the Committee into adopting a second resolution, with no new facts and no new arguments—an attempt to force through a resolution which those delegations had not had the courage to put forward in the General Assembly.

26. Some delegations suggested that the measures of the administering Power were not justified by the incident, but many African States had experience of assassination attempts and knew that preventive measures were necessary at such times. There was no evidence that the actions taken by the administering Power had been unreasonable. Those who had been arrested would be brought to trial in the normal way. The return of alien residents to their country was also a perfectly normal measure.

27. He hoped that the Committee would not allow itself to be misled into taking a hasty decision based on incorrect information.

28. Mr. Natwar SINGH (India) observed that his delegation's views on Aden were well known. As long as the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples was not applied to the Territory, unrest there would continue. He hoped that the administering Power would take note of the operative part of resolution 1949 (XVIII) adopted at the 1277th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, which called for the immediate release of all political prisoners and detainees in the Territory. The administering Power should realize that the vast majority of Member States were in favour of the immediate implementation of the Declaration in Aden.

29. Mr. EL-SHAFEI (United Arab Republic) said that the United Kingdom representative had expressed surprise that the sponsors of the draft resolution adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 1949 (XVIII) had not proposed amendments to the text when the news about the recent incidents in the Territory had become known. That resolution, however, dealt with the whole situation in Aden and the Federation of South Arabia. An emergency situation had now arisen

in Aden and it must be dealt with by emergency action. The United Kingdom representative had accused the sponsors of the draft resolution of lack of courage. His delegation considered that if there was any lack of courage it had been shown by the administering Power, which, because of a single incident, had arrested and deported hundreds of people.

30. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) said that, even if the figures given by the United Kingdom representative were accurate, twenty-nine was a large number of party leaders to be arrested without any valid reason. He contested the other figures given by the United Kingdom representative, since the figures in the cable read out by the petitioner were entirely different. The Yemeni delegation was inclined to attach more credence to the cable and to reports from journalists which came from Aden itself. Only the colonialist authorities could benefit from the present situation. There were colonialist elements which were enemies of the liberation movement and might well be responsible for the incident which had given the colonialist authorities the opportunity to take repressive action.

31. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) said that, despite the United Kingdom representative's attempt to persuade the Committee that the situation in Aden was not important, his delegation considered that the Committee should take action. His delegation contested the United Kingdom representative's assertion that certain people had abused the hospitality of the Territory by engaging in violence. The nationalists who had been detained on the pretext of the bomb explosion were the leaders who had objected to the inclusion of Aden in the so-called Federation of South Arabia. It was they who had urged the people not to vote for the establishment of the Federation. The action of the authorities was clearly an act of intimidation. His delegation had doubts about the United Kingdom representative's statement that the people involved would be tried by the usual procedure, since there were various kinds of trials in countries under colonial domination.

32. The United Kingdom representative had wondered why the Arab delegations had not referred to the matter as soon as the news had become known. The fact was that the Arab delegations had hoped that the United Kingdom Government would see reason and would free the prisoners and stop deporting people. That had not occurred, however, and the time had come for the General Assembly to act.

33. Mr. SANKEY (United Kingdom) said that he was not convinced by the reasons given by the Iraqi delegation for not bringing up the matter earlier.

34. The Iraqi delegation had stated that the United Kingdom did not consider the situation in Aden to be important. That was quite untrue. The United Kingdom Government's reasons for considering it to be important were not, however, the same as those advanced by certain delegations. As he had stated before, the figures given for the number of arrests had been ridiculously exaggerated; the correct figure was twenty-nine.

35. Furthermore, the action taken by the administering Power had been entirely warranted in the circumstances and there was no justification for condemnation or for the attribution of sinister motives to the administering Power.

36. The Iraqi representative had said that the members of the Peoples Socialist Party were the very people who had opposed the constitution and the estab-

lishment of the Federation of South Arabia. That was precisely the point that had been made by the United Kingdom delegation.

37. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) denied having said that the twenty-nine party leaders had opposed the constitution. He had said that they disliked the proposal for the establishment of a South Arabian Federation and had advised their people not to vote for it. As he had already stated, the United Kingdom authorities were suppressing the Peoples Socialist Party because its members did not support their designs in that part of the world.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that, since he understood that a draft resolution was being prepared, the debate would be suspended for the time being.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (chapter on Territories under Portuguese administration) (A/5446/Rev.1, chap. II; A/C.4/618 and Add.1; A/C.4/620; A/C.4/L.782/Add.1) (concluded)

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (PART II) (A/C.4/L.782/ADD.1)

39. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica), Rapporteur, submitted the draft of the Fourth Committee's supplementary report on Territories under Portuguese administration (A/C.4/L.782/Add.1), which gave a brief account of the hearing of petitioners at the Committee's 1507th and 1508th meetings.

The draft supplementary report (A/C.4/L.782/Add.1) was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 55

Question of South West Africa (A/5634, A/C.4/L.790 and Add.1) (concluded)

40. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee at its 1514th meeting, he had consulted the President of the General Assembly, who had stated that the question of South West Africa was still on the agenda. The Committee should therefore vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.790.

41. Mr. SHUKRI (Syria) said that the sponsors had discussed the proposals made by the United States and Norwegian representatives at the previous meeting and were willing to accept the amendment proposed to the preambular paragraph should it be submitted formally. They would prefer to mention operative paragraph 2 as it stood.

42. Mr. ATTWOOD (United States of America) said that his delegation would not make a formal proposal for the amendment of the draft resolution.

43. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-AHMAN (Sweden) formally proposed that the last preambular paragraph should be amended to read: "Considering further that the situation obtaining in South West Africa is seriously disturbing international peace and security".

44. Mr. SHUKRI (Syria), on behalf of the sponsors, accepted that proposal.

45. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bulgaria, Ceylon, Kuwait and Upper Volta had asked to join the list of sponsors (A/C.4/L.790/Add.1).

46. Mr. MANKOU (Congo, Brazzaville) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution considered that the time had come to take action on the question of South West Africa. Although some delegations were still trying to suggest that there were signs of a co-operative attitude on the part of the Pretoria Government, the information given in the Secretary-General's report (A/5634) did not bear out that view. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted and that the Security Council would take up the matter at an early date. The problem could not be solved without the assistance of the friends of South Africa, but it seemed that such assistance would not be forthcoming because of the fears of those States for the stability of the pound and the dollar. The Powers concerned should realize that their long-term interests would not be served by supporting the oppression of African peoples. He appealed to South Africa's friends to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

47. Mr. SILVA (Ceylon) said that his delegation considered that the time for delay and compromise had passed and that it must now be recognized that the situation in South West Africa was a threat to world peace. Full use should be made of the machinery of the Security Council. He appealed to all delegations, especially those great Powers which were in a position to persuade South Africa to modify its intransigent attitude, to join in supporting the draft resolution.

48. Mr. ATTWOOD (United States of America) thanked the sponsors for accepting the amendment to the last preambular paragraph. The United States would support the draft resolution as amended. His delegation wished to state, however, that it did not interpret operative paragraph 2 as calling for a specific meeting of the Security Council. As his delegation had stated in the debate on the question of South West Africa, it did not consider that the situation there required Security Council consideration at the present time or that there was any helpful action which the Security Council could now take. The United States delegation understood the paragraph as a request to the Security Council to consider the matter after the International Court of Justice had rendered its decision and in the light of the subsequent reaction of the South African Government to that decision. Earlier consideration by the Security Council would be justified only if new developments in South West Africa clearly altered or aggravated the situation. The United States would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution if it thought that an earlier meeting of the Council, likely to prejudge the verdict of the International Court of Justice, was intended.

49. His delegation had certain reservations about the wording of operative paragraph 1; it felt that the word "deplores" was preferable to the word "condemns" and that if the latter word was to be used it would be more appropriate to condemn the refusal than to condemn the Government.

50. His delegation was following closely the proceedings in the International Court and attached particular importance to the obligation of Member States to comply with decisions of the Court in disputes to which they were parties. As his delegation had stated, that concept was emphasized by the provision in Article 94 of the Charter for giving effect to judgments of the Court. He would like to assure the Committee that the United States, for its part, would increase its efforts towards a solution of the question consistent with the right of the South West African people to self-determination.

51. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Congo, Leopoldville) assured the United States representative that the sponsors did not regard the resolution as requesting a Security Council meeting at any particular time. Under the rules of procedure of the Security Council, when the General Assembly drew its attention to a situation it was for the Council to decide whether the matter required examination. He thanked the United States for its promised support for the draft resolution.

52. Mr. EDWARDSSEN (Norway) said that his delegation would abstain on operative paragraph 2 were it put to the vote separately, since it did not favour such a request to the Security Council. He supported the remarks of the United States representative. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution now that the final preambular paragraph was worded in a way which placed it in the context of Chapter VI of the Charter.

53. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.790 and Add.1, as amended by Sweden.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.790 and Add.1, as amended, was approved by 88 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

54. Mr. PATRICIO (Portugal) said that Portugal had voted against the draft resolution, as it had done in the case of similar draft resolutions in the past, because the matter was *sub judice* before the International Court and any decision by the General Assembly seemed premature.

55. Mr. YOMEKPE (Ghana) said he wondered whether the explanation of the vote given by the Portuguese representative was the true explanation.

56. Mr. DIALLO Seydou (Guinea) registered his delegation's satisfaction at the fact that certain Western Powers had found it possible to support the draft resolution. He appealed once more for the support of those Powers which had still found it necessary to abstain on the draft resolution.

57. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) asked that it should be recorded that Liberia had not participated in the voting.

58. She wished also to make it clear that the question before the International Court was that of the violation of the Mandate in respect of South West Africa.

59. Mr. HASHIM (Sudan) noted with satisfaction the favourable vote of the United States on the draft resolution.

60. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Rapporteur should be authorized to report direct to the General Assembly on the Committee's decision.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 49

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/5401 and Add.1-12, A/5402 and Add.1-5, A/5403 and Add.1-11, A/5404 and Add.1-4, A/5514, A/5524) (*continued*):

- (a) Political and constitutional information;
- (b) Information on educational, economic and social advancement;
- (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION CONCERNING ADEN (A/C.4/L.792)

61. The CHAIRMAN suggested that those intending to submit a draft resolution on the question of Aden should introduce it orally without waiting for it to be circulated. Delegations had asked that the matter should be treated as urgent and that the draft resolution should be voted on immediately instead of after the normal twenty-four hours. He noted that, under rule 121 of the rules of procedure, as a general rule no proposal should be put to the vote unless it had been circulated not later than the previous day. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to treat the matter as an urgent one and to vote on the draft resolution immediately.

62. Mr. SANKEY (United Kingdom) thought that that question could not be decided until the draft resolution had been introduced.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that he agreed.

64. Mr. CISS (Senegal) said that rule 121 authorized the Chairman to put proposals to the vote immediately, at his discretion.

65. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that that part of the rule referred to procedural motions and amendments.

66. Mr. EL-SHAFEI (United Arab Republic), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, submitted draft resolution A/C.4/L.792.

67. Mr. KING (United Kingdom) requested that a vote should be taken on the question whether the draft resolution should be debated and voted on at the current meeting.

The Committee decided by 48 votes to 20, with 18 abstentions, to vote on the draft resolution at the current meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 5.45 p.m. and was resumed at 6.5 p.m.

68. Mr. ATTWOOD (United States of America), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.792, for in its opinion no evidence had been presented which would warrant the adoption of any resolution at that time.

69. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution, which had been submitted at the very last moment and contained a number of serious allegations in respect of which his delegation had had neither the time nor the complete evidence necessary for a proper assessment of the situation.

70. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark) said that the Committee was being asked to vote on a draft resolution which had only just been circulated. No member of the Committee had had the time to consider it and still less to seek instructions from his Government. The Committee had not been given the opportunity of assessing the allegations made in the text. For the foregoing reasons his delegations would vote against it.

71. Mr. YOMEKPE (Ghana) said that his delegation, which had been one of the sponsors of resolution 1949 (XVIII), would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.792. The only difference between the provisions of the two texts was that the draft resolution now before the Committee was concerned with an emergency situation.

72. His delegation understood operative paragraph 1 (b) to relate to the deportation of residents arising from the proclamation of the state of emergency, without affecting the genuine and legal deportations which were within the powers of the authorities in all States.

73. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) said that the draft resolution was dealing with facts and not with allegations. The United Kingdom representative himself had admitted that arrests and deportations had taken place in Aden. For humanitarian reasons, and on the principle that political considerations should never be used by an administering Power as a pretext for depriving people of their freedom and means of livelihood, he appealed to the Committee to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

74. Mr. EL-SHAFEI (United Arab Republic) said that he appreciated the difficulties of a number of representatives who had been unable to obtain instructions from their delegations. He hoped that those who might have to abstain in the Committee for that reason would vote in favour of the text in the plenary meeting.

75. Mr. MGONJA (Tanganyika) recalled that when the situation in Aden had been discussed in the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, his delegation had expressed concern over the disturbing state of affairs in the Territory. At that time the United Kingdom representative had denied that tension prevailed in the Territory, but the Committee's attention had now been drawn to the proclamation of a state of emergency there. The people of Aden should be allowed to settle their difficulties themselves, in freedom and independence. For the foregoing reasons and bearing in mind that his delegation had voted in favour of resolution 1949 (XVIII), he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.792.

76. Mr. CISS (Senegal) said that, as his delegation had not had time to study the situation in Aden, it would have been happier had the draft resolution not gone into details. On purely humanitarian grounds, however, it would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

77. Mr. KING (United Kingdom) said that he had been surprised to hear references to humanitarian considerations. It seemed that the throwing of bombs and the killing of innocent bystanders were not regarded as inhumane acts by some people. Now that his delegation had received the text of the so-called emergency draft resolution it was confirmed in its view that the latter was unjustified and unnecessary. His delegation had clearly set out the true facts of the situation. No evidence had been produced to show that the situation in Aden was critical or explosive or that it endangered peace and security. The draft resolution had been presented at the last minute for reasons that were perfectly obvious to every member of the Committee. His delegation would vote against it.

78. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) said that his delegation would abstain because it had not obtained adequate information on which to base a judgement.

79. Mr. AZIMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that although the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.792 had had a very short time in which to prepare their text, they had submitted a well-thought-out draft resolution which fully corresponded to the requirements of the situation. They showed respect for and faith in measures to be taken by the administering Power. The action recommended in the draft resolution was the very minimum acceptable in the circumstances and he did not think that any delegation should have any difficulty in supporting it. For the foregoing reasons the USSR delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

80. Mr. MONGONO (Nigeria) said that his delegation had been a sponsor of the draft resolution which had been adopted as General Assembly resolution 1949 (XVIII) and which had a bearing on the present situation, particularly in view of the requests addressed to the administering Power in operative paragraph 7. He would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.792 despite the fact that he would have liked further clarification in respect of the third preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 1. He appealed to all those who sympathized with the plight of the unfortunate people now suffering under the colonial yoke in Aden to support the draft resolution.

81. Mr. SONN VOEUNSAI (Cambodia) said that since the United Kingdom had failed to heed earlier appeals not to take extreme measures in Aden, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

82. The Cambodian delegation would have been ready to agree that the text should be voted upon at a subsequent meeting so that no delegation should say that it had had no time to consider the draft resolution. That was why it had abstained in the vote on whether or not to invoke the emergency procedure.

83. Mr. ALBERTSSON (Iceland), referring to the humanitarian aspect of the question, said that it was common knowledge that political prisoners had been and still were to be found in a number of countries, including States Members of the United Nations. It therefore seemed to his delegation that if the United Nations was to take action to secure the release of political prisoners it should do so on a much broader

basis than that proposed in the draft resolution. His delegation would therefore vote against the latter.

84. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Ireland) said that he would vote against the draft resolution because he had not had the opportunity of bringing it to the attention of his delegation or of assessing the usefulness of the text in relation to the situation prevailing in the Territory. His vote would not be committing his Government to any particular point of view with regard to the incidents which had occurred in Aden earlier in the week. If the wording had been different he might have abstained. His delegation had voted in favour of similar resolutions in respect of incidents in other territories, such as Southern Rhodesia, but he was not convinced that the events in Aden resembled those in Southern Rhodesia.

85. Mr. HACENE (Algeria) said that the facts of the situation in Aden were beyond dispute. The United Kingdom representative had contested the number of arrests but not the fact that arrests had been made. He disagreed with the United Kingdom representative that no humanitarian considerations were involved. Only those who had experienced the atmosphere surrounding the arrest of suspects could understand the state of mind of the families of those who had been arrested. It was also necessary to ask to whom those victims were suspect and for what reason. Many representatives of African-Asian States Members of the United Nations had been at one time or another regarded as suspects. He thanked the African delegations which had appreciated the humanitarian aspect of the problem and had decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution despite the emergency nature of its presentation. He hoped that their example would be followed by others.

86. Mr. SILVA (Ceylon) said that his delegation had expressed its feelings of sympathy and understanding for the people of Aden by voting in favour of resolution 1949 (XVIII). It understood the gravity of the events in Aden and the atmosphere of fear generated by the arrests and the proclamation of a state of emergency, especially since those acts had been taken by colonial authorities. Nevertheless he would be obliged to abstain on the draft resolution since he had not had time to consult his delegation.

87. Mr. SEIGNORET (Trinidad and Tobago) said that he would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because of the conflicting nature of the statements made in the Committee and of the fact that he had not had an opportunity of discussing the text with his delegation.

88. Mr. KOOLI (Tunisia) protested against the colonial methods employed by the United Kingdom in Aden and expressed support for the people of Aden struggling for freedom. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and appealed to all peace- and justice-loving States to do likewise.

89. Mr. NGOKO (Cameroon) said that when there was a threat to peace the United Nations could not afford to wait. His delegation knew the meaning of the terms "suspect" and "subversive activities" in situations such as that prevailing in Aden. It was also aware of the United Kingdom's defiant attitude in colonial matters and of its customary policy of stifling the voice of conscience. For all those reasons he would vote in favour of the draft resolution despite the fact that he had been unable to consult his delegation.

90. Mr. BRUCE (Togo) said that his delegation's attitude of struggle against all forms of colonialism was well known. It supported open opposition to and struggle against colonial rule such as was occurring in the Territories under Portuguese administration. On the other hand, he did not see how the United Nations could adopt any draft resolution which could be said to defend bombings by unknown persons who ran away leaving innocent people to suffer. Unfortunate though it was, the situation described by the petitioner would occur in any country. For the foregoing reasons he would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.792.

91. Mr. LUQMAN (Mauritania) said that, having heard the statement by the petitioner and having noted that the United Kingdom representative had confirmed that arrests had been made in the Territory, his delegation had arrived at an assessment of the situation prevailing in Aden. It felt that the Committee should take action designed to restore order in the area and it would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

92. Mr. MANKOU (Congo, Brazzaville) said that the Committee was dealing with a colonial problem. The United Kingdom's efficiency in misleading outside observers was well known. In the circumstances he would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

93. Mr. DIALLO Seydou (Guinea) recalled that the present leaders of Ghana, Cyprus or Kenya, to mention but three former colonial territories, had at one time or another been regarded as suspects and their political and trade-union organizations had been attacked. Whenever the authorities took action against such organizations, fundamental rights and freedoms were violated. It was against that historical background that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

94. Mr. EOUAGNIGNON (Dahomey) said that although he had been unable to consult his delegation he would vote in favour of the draft resolution on the principle that it was better to let ten guilty men go free than to deprive a single innocent man of his freedom. He had no way of determining how many persons had been arrested but whenever mass arrests took place injustice was bound to be committed. Furthermore, as a medical man, he knew that persons who, if left free, might have proved their innocence, often reacted so strongly to imprisonment that their ability to defend themselves became impaired. What was needed was not mass arrests but a calm inquiry.

95. Mr. HENNIG (Austria) said that the draft resolution before the Committee had been presented at the last moment and he had had no time to study it carefully. He would vote against it for the reasons given by the Irish representative. His vote would not be tantamount to an expression of opinion on the substance of the matter.

96. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus) recalled that his delegation had voted in favour of resolution 1949 (XVIII). In view of the late introduction of draft resolution A/C.4/L.792 he had been unable to consult the leader of his delegation and would therefore abstain when the text was put to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville),

Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria.

Against: Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium.

Abstaining: Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.792 was approved by 42 votes to 20, with 28 abstentions.

97. Mr. VELAZQUEZ MUÑOZ (Panama) said that his delegation, which always supported self-determination, had abstained in the vote because it did not feel that it had enough information on which to form a judgement concerning the situation prevailing in Aden.

98. Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) explained that he had abstained in the vote for lack of instructions.

99. Mr. ANOMA (Ivory Coast) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it was clear from the statements by the petitioner and the United Kingdom representative that the situation in Aden deserved United Nations attention.

100. Mr. LYNCH-SHYLLON (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation had abstained because it had not had sufficient time in which to study the facts and obtain instructions. His abstention in no way detracted from his delegation's position on colonial matters and he hoped that he would be able to vote in favour of the text in the plenary meeting.

AGENDA ITEMS 49, 50, 51, 52, 53 AND 54

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/5401 and Add.1-12, A/5402 and Add.1-5, A/5403 and Add.1-11, A/5404 and Add.1-4, A/5514, A/5524) (concluded):

- (a) Political and constitutional information;
- (b) Information on educational, economic and social advancement;
- (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information

Dissemination of information in the Non-Self-Governing Territories on the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples; report of the Secretary-General (A/5523) (concluded)

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/5548 and Add.1) (concluded)

Question of the continuation of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/C.4/630, A/C.4/632) (concluded)

Election, if required, to fill vacancies in the membership of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (concluded)

Special training programme for Territories under Portuguese administration: report of the Secretary-General (A/5531/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2) (concluded)

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/C.4/L.791)

101. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica), Rapporteur, introducing the draft report of the Committee on agenda items 49, 50, 51, 52, 53 and 54 (A/C.4/L.791, said that three changes should be made in paragraph 9. The following sentence should be inserted between the first and the second sentences of the paragraph: "He said that in accordance with the Joint Statement made by the President of Indonesia, the Prime Minister of Malaya and the President of the Philippines the 'inclusion of Sabah in the Federation of Malaysia did not prejudice either the claims or any right thereunder'". In the third sentence the figure "1227" should be amended to "1237". The following words should be added at the end of the paragraph: "and referred to his delegation's statement at the 1206th meeting of the General Assembly, on 17 September 1963".

102. In paragraph 11 the words "Secretary-General" should be replaced by "Under-Secretary".

103. The following sentence should be added at the end of paragraph 15: "The representative of Cambodia stated that, as a co-sponsor, he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution had he been present during the vote".

104. Mr. MAJUNTIN (Malaysia) asked that a sentence should be inserted at the end of paragraph 9 indicating that his delegation had replied to the statement by Indonesia.

105. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica), Rapporteur, said that to meet the Malaysian representative's request he would insert the following sentence: "The representative of Malaysia then exercised his right of reply".

The draft report of the Fourth Committee (A/C.4/L.791), as amended, was adopted.

106. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Rapporteur should be authorized to add a paragraph to the report concerning the hearing of the petitioner from Aden and the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/L.792, for consideration in the plenary meeting.

It was so decided.

Completion of the Committee's work

107. Mr. ANOMA (Ivory Coast) observed that the Committee's work during the eighteenth session had been carried out within the perspective of Chapters I, XI, XII and XIII of the Charter, which defined the obligations of Member States and which had inspired the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. Thus it was essential that the obligations of the colonial Powers, as confirmed by the Declaration, should produce positive results. As long as the objective of self-determination and independence had not been attained, no colonial Power which was a signatory to the Charter could

claim that the efforts of the United Nations to bring about self-government and independence for the peoples under its domination constituted an increase in its obligations under the Charter. Article 2, paragraph 2, provided that Member States should "fulfil in good faith" the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter. Hence *bona fides* was a categorical imperative for every Member State in fulfilling its obligations under the Declaration.

108. Such was the process which had led Zanzibar and Kenya, after many other African States, to independence. His delegation welcomed the victory of the people of those two countries in their struggle for freedom from the colonial yoke. At the same time he expressed his delegation's gratitude for the spirit of understanding shown by the United Kingdom Government. He appealed to that Government to continue its enlightened policy and to lead all its other colonies, peacefully and without bloodshed, to total independence.

109. Turning to the question of the Portuguese colonies, he said that the Salazar Government should endeavour to prepare the peoples under its domination for self-determination and independence. In order to do so Portugal must divest itself of its anachronistic desire that its African Territories should at all costs be transformed into Portuguese provinces.

110. South Africa, too, should prepare the people of South West Africa for self-determination and independence.

111. Every day the map of Africa was being changed through the dynamic and revolutionary policy being unflinchingly pursued by all men of goodwill who loved peace, solidarity, justice and freedom. The whole African continent, from Cairo to the Cape, from Dakar to Zanzibar, should be freed from the colonialist yoke and from racism and hatred. That was an arduous task which must be carried out firstly by the Africans and secondly by all States. Finally the colonial problems of the whole world must be solved, for the greater good of all the peoples of the earth.

112. Mr. LUQMAN (Mauritania) welcomed the emergence to independence of two new African States, Kenya and Zanzibar, which he hoped would shortly be admitted to the United Nations. He expressed the hope that before the opening of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly most of the resolutions adopted by the Fourth Committee with regard to the independence of Non-Self-Governing Territories would have been implemented and that the countries responsible for the administration of those Territories would take into account the aspirations of the people and the views of States Members of the United Nations.

113. Mr. LE GUEN (France), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Belgium, Greece, Italy and the Netherlands and of his own delegation, Mr. ANOMA (Ivory Coast), speaking on behalf of the African group, Mr. AZIMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. TARAZI (Syria), speaking on behalf of the African-Asian group, Mr. LUQMAN (Mauritania), Mr. VELAZQUEZ (Uruguay), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Latin American countries, Mr. SMIGANOWSKI (Poland), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the socialist States, Mr. NABAVI (Iran), speaking on behalf of the delegation of Turkey and of his own, Mr. BEN MUSA (Libya), speaking on behalf of the thirteen Arab delegations, Mr. Chiping H.C. KIANG, (China), Mr. SONN VOEUNSAI (Cambodia), speaking on behalf of the delegations of India, Yugoslavia and

Afghanistan as well as his own, Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Japan, Philippines and Thailand as well as his own, Mr. SEIGNORET (Trinidad and Tobago), speaking on behalf of the Commonwealth countries, Mr. ATTWOOD (United States of America), Mr. de PINIES (Spain) and Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, Ireland and Israel, paid tributes to the Chairman for the admirable manner in which he had conducted the Committee's work. They also congratulated the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur and all the members of the Secretariat who had contributed in bringing the Committee's work to a successful conclusion.

114. Mr. CARDUCCI-ARTENISIO (Italy), Vice-Chairman, congratulated the Chairman, the Rapporteur, the Under-Secretary and the Secretariat on their work and thanked the Committee for their kind words about him.

115. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica), Rapporteur, paid a tribute to the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman and expressed appreciation to the Under-Secretary, the Committee Secretaries and other members of the Secretariat for the help they had given him. He thanked the speakers who had complimented him on the manner in which he had performed his task.

116. Mr. AMACHREE (Under-Secretary for Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) conveyed the Secretariat's gratitude to the Committee for the latter's expressions of thanks.

117. He announced that Mr. Kunst, who had served the Committee for many years, would be retiring at the end of 1963. He was certain that the Committee would want to offer him its best wishes.

118. The CHAIRMAN, summing up the work of the Committee at the eighteenth session of the General Assembly, said that the Committee's agenda had been particularly heavy since, in addition to the many items of long standing, it had included the important question of Oman, which had hitherto been considered by the Special Political Committee. At the beginning of the session it had been decided that the Committee would try to conclude its work by 10 December and, despite the delay caused by the tragic events in the United States and by the consideration of the important question of principle raised by Mr. Galvão's request for a hearing, it was concluding its work only three days after the date originally set.

119. He felt that he should refer to the fact that whereas in the two months during which the Committee had been dealing with extremely important questions affecting the international community its work had not been noticed by the New York Press, Mr. Galvão's visit had earned the Committee the distinction of being featured on the front pages of the daily newspapers.

120. The successful conclusion of the Committee's work had been made possible thanks to the co-operation extended to the Chairman by every member of the Committee. It had also illustrated the value of the suggestions made by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Improvement of Methods of Work of the General Assembly.

121. He paid a tribute to the members of the Committee for their self-imposed discipline and for the dignified manner in which they had discussed the items on the Committee's agenda and had adopted

various decisions on questions most of which were highly explosive.

122. Credit for the successful conclusion of the Committee's work was also due to the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur, as also to the Under-Secretary, the Committee Secretaries and all the staff who had serviced the Committee.

123. It should be a matter of satisfaction to every member of the Committee to have been able to contribute to promoting the noble objectives of the United Nations—the equality of all men and of all nations in the world—through the eradication of colonialism. By its work the Committee was also helping to remove one of the major obstacles in the way of the maintenance of international peace and security. He hoped that in the near future the administering Powers would heed the Committee's recommendations and would co-operate loyally in the early liberation of all the Territories which were still unaffected by world progress.

124. He welcomed the independence of Kenya and Zanzibar, whose liberation marked the end of colonialism in East Africa, to the great joy of all the friends of freedom and peace.

125. Some of the last Non-Self-Governing Territories, the largest of which were Angola, Mozambique, so-called Portuguese Guinea, South West Africa and

Southern Rhodesia, were a source of grave and constant concern to all and had been the subject of much important discussion in the Committee. In his double capacity as Chairman and as spokesman for young Africa determined to rid itself of the last bastions of colonialism, with or without the co-operation of the colonial Powers, he appealed to the latter to pay more attention to the General Assembly and Security Council recommendations concerning the Territories under their administration so that peaceful solutions could be found for the grave problems of decolonization. By granting immediate independence to those Territories they would succeed in transforming their present relationship of domination into superior relationships of co-operation, mutual respect and progress.

126. He was hopeful that before the next session of the General Assembly serious efforts would be made in that direction and that their results would lead to the early disappearance of the Committee through the final solution of the colonial problem. The Committee would then have accomplished the sacred and noble mission of having contributed to real respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for mankind as a whole, which would have been rid of all discrimination based on race, colour or creed.

127. He declared the Committee's work concluded.

The meeting rose at 9 p.m.