

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION
 Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1001st
 MEETING**

RECEIVED

(Closing Meeting)

Friday, 11 December 1959,
 at 8.50 p.m.

5 AUG 1960

NEW YORK

INDEX SECTION, LIBRARY

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| <i>Requests for hearings concerning the question of South West Africa</i> | 695 |
| <i>Agenda item 40:</i> | |
| <i>Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia: reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and of Italy (concluded)</i> | |
| <i>General debate (concluded).</i> | 698 |
| <i>Hearing of petitioners concerning the question of South West Africa</i> | 699 |
| <i>Completion of the Committee's work.</i> | 701 |

Chairman: Mr. L. N. PALAR (Indonesia).

Requests for hearings concerning the Question of South West Africa

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that three petitioners, Mr. Jariretundu Kozonguizi, Mr. Mburumba Kerina and Mr. H. J. Beukes, had requested hearings concerning the question of South West Africa.
2. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) appealed to the Committee to grant a hearing to the three petitioners. Serious events had taken place in South West Africa which required the Committee's urgent attention.
3. Mr. EL-HASSAN (Sudan) supported the Liberian representative's appeal and stressed that, although the Committee had completed its consideration of the question of South West Africa at the present session, events in that Territory, particularly when they involved loss of life, were always the concern of the United Nations.
4. Mr. Taieb SLIM (Tunisia), Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) and Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) associated themselves with the statements made by the Liberian and Sudanese representatives and strongly urged the Committee to grant a hearing to the three petitioners.
5. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) pointed out that, however serious the events which had taken place in South West Africa might be, the question was no longer on the Committee's agenda. The hearing of petitioners at the present stage would give rise to most serious procedural problems. It might be sufficient if the requests for hearings on South West Africa were embodied in the Committee's records.
6. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon), while expressing his delegation's concern and regret at the tragic events which had occurred in South West Africa, nevertheless agreed with the United Kingdom representative that the hearing of petitioners at the present stage would indeed give rise to procedural diffi-

culties. The best solution might be to refer the matter to the Committee on South West Africa.

7. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) supported the procedure suggested by the representative of Ceylon. The Committee on South West Africa could be convened at short notice in order to give urgent consideration to the events which had taken place in South West Africa.

8. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) strongly objected to any proposal that the Fourth Committee should reopen the question of South West Africa, which had already been discussed and on which a report had been communicated to the General Assembly. The item was no longer before the Committee and could not be taken up again without specific instructions to that effect from the General Assembly. Indeed, his delegation would appeal to the President of the General Assembly against any such action. Nor could his delegation agree to the proposal that the item should be referred to the Committee on South West Africa, for his delegation did not recognize that Committee.

9. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) endorsed the appeal made by the Liberian representative and supported by other African delegations. The question of procedure should not prevent the Fourth Committee from considering the very serious events which had just taken place in South West Africa. The Committee and the Assembly were still in session and the question of South West Africa was still on the agenda. In any case, the Committee should hear the facts and see what further action was necessary.

10. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) formally proposed that the Committee should grant a hearing to the three petitioners on the question of South West Africa immediately after it had concluded its consideration of the question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia.

11. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) and Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) supported that proposal.

12. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) stressed that, whatever opinions the various delegations might hold on the substance of the question, the rules of procedure of the General Assembly could not be disregarded. The question that had arisen was within the competence of the General Assembly itself and could not be decided by a vote in the Fourth Committee.

13. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) moved the closure of the debate, under rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

The motion for closure of the debate on the requests for hearings concerning the question of South West Africa was adopted by 38 votes to 4, with 20 abstentions.

14. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) proposed that, before voting on the United Arab Republic representative's proposal, the Committee should decide, in accordance with rule 122 of the rules of procedure, whether it was competent to grant hearings to the petitioners on the question of South West Africa, an item upon which it had already reported to the General Assembly and upon which the General Assembly had already taken a decision.

15. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), referring to rule 67 of the rules of procedure, asked whether the General Assembly had in fact taken a final decision upon the question of South West Africa.

16. The CHAIRMAN replied that at its 838th plenary meeting the General Assembly had disposed of the question of South West Africa as such, but it had yet to decide upon the composition of the Committee on South West Africa.

17. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) pointed out that as in the past several sub-items appeared under the question of South West Africa. The elections to the Committee on South West Africa had, however, never been regarded as forming part of the substantive item. Proof of this was contained in the fact that the Rapporteur's report submitted to the General Assembly dealt with sub-items (a), (b) and (c) only. As in the past a separate report was submitted on elections.

18. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) pointed out that the hearing of petitioners was not the subject of any item on the agenda and that it was the custom of the Fourth Committee to decide upon the granting of hearings as a separate procedural question. He therefore felt that the Committee was competent to hear the petitioners forthwith but that if, having heard them, it wished to reopen the question of South West Africa it would be necessary to have recourse to the procedure laid down in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

19. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) recalled that ever since the fourth session of the General Assembly when the first petitioner on the question of South West Africa had been heard by the Committee, such hearings had invariably been granted under that particular item. The Secretariat could perhaps inform the Committee whether there had ever been a case where the Fourth Committee had granted a hearing to a petitioner from South West Africa other than under that item.

20. Mr. WIESCHHOFF (Secretary of the Committee) said that the question of hearing petitioners had always related to an item on the Committee's agenda.

21. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) expressed his delegation's conviction that the Committee was fully competent to decide whether or not the petitioners should be heard.

22. Mr. THAPA (Nepal) supported the views expressed by the representatives of Mexico and Uruguay.

23. Mr. Itaat HUSAIN (Pakistan) emphasized that the Committee was not being asked to reopen its debate on the question of South West Africa or to take any action: the petitioners had merely asked to be granted a hearing. He therefore suggested that the Committee should hear what the petitioners had to tell it and

should pass that information on to the Secretary-General for whatever action he might deem fit.

24. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) moved the closure of the debate on the question of the Committee's competence to hear the petitioners.

25. Mr. MACQUARRIE (Canada) moved the adjournment of the debate, in order that the Committee might proceed with its discussion of the Somaliland frontier.

At the request of the Indian representative, a vote on the motion for adjournment of the debate on the question of competence was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Canada, Ceylon, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Greece, Guatemala, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Spain, Turkey.

The motion for adjournment of the debate was rejected by 38 votes to 18, with 12 abstentions.

The Indian motion for closure of the debate was adopted without objection.

26. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) asked for a clarification of the Argentine proposal before it was put to the vote. If that proposal was not linked to the specific question of hearing the petitioners but referred merely to the abstract legal question of the Committee's competence, he saw no reason for it to be put to the vote. What the Committee should vote upon was the concrete question of whether the Committee was competent to grant the petitioners a hearing.

27. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) explained that his delegation had always voted in favour of hearing all petitioners. It was, however, essential that the rules of procedure should be respected. It was his delegation's opinion, that under those rules, once an item had been disposed of by the General Assembly the Committee was not competent to reopen it. In the present instance the item in question had already been disposed of by the General Assembly and the question therefore arose whether the Committee was competent to hear petitioners in connexion with that item. His proposal was that the Committee should decide that question forthwith.

28. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) pointed out that the Argentine proposal related specifically to the United Arab Republic proposal that the Committee should first deal with the question of the Somaliland frontier and then hear the petitioners. The Argentine proposal should therefore be put to the vote immediately.

29. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) declared that while the Argentine proposal was perfectly valid, it was perhaps rather too abstract. He therefore proposed formally that the Committee should vote upon whether or not it was competent to vote on the proposal of the United Arab Republic. His delegation held that it was competent to do so.

30. After a further exchange of views on the exact meaning of the various proposals before the Committee, the CHAIRMAN asked the Argentine representative to explain his proposal once again.

31. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that, as his delegation understood it, any request for a hearing of petitioners must refer to an item on the agenda. Once such an item had been discussed and disposed of it was no longer before the Committee. His proposal, therefore, was that the Committee should decide whether it was competent to take a decision on an item of the agenda which had already been disposed of. If that proposal was too complicated, he was prepared to withdraw it in favour of the proposal of the Mexican representative or that of the United Arab Republic.

32. Mr. BUSNIAK (Czechoslovakia) asked whether the Mexican proposal was a new formulation of the question of competence.

33. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) replied that was so. He had simply converted an abstract proposal by the Argentine representative into a concrete and formal one. He asked that his proposal should be put to the vote forthwith.

34. Mr. URBINA (Ecuador) pointed out that the Argentine proposal had priority over the Mexican proposal. If the Argentine representative withdrew his proposal, the Ecuadorian delegation would put that proposal forward in its own name.

35. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that if the Committee had to decide upon the question of competence he would urge that his proposal should be put to the vote first.

36. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) asked that the Chairman should put his proposal to the vote immediately after the vote on the Argentine proposal.

37. The CHAIRMAN put the Argentine proposal to the vote. Those who considered that the Fourth Committee was competent to grant hearings to the petitioners on an item that had already been disposed of by the General Assembly should vote affirmatively, and *vice versa*.

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

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

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Ire-

land, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Cambodia, Cuba, Federation of Malaya, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America.

Present and not voting: Ceylon.

The Committee decided, by 29 votes to 26, with 12 abstentions, that it was competent to grant hearings to the petitioners.

38. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that there was no longer any need for his proposal to be put to the vote.

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal by the representative of the United Arab Republic that the Committee should grant a hearing to the three petitioners immediately after it had concluded its consideration of the question of the frontier between Somaliland and Ethiopia.

At the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal.

Against: Portugal, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Belgium.

Abstaining: Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan.

Present and not voting: France.

The proposal was adopted by 41 votes to 4, with 22 abstentions.

40. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) said that he wished it to be recorded that the Fourth Committee, in disregarding his request for a ruling from the President of the General Assembly on a matter falling entirely within the General Assembly's sphere and not within that of the Fourth Committee, had violated a Member State's most elementary right of appeal.

41. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) reserved his delegation's position with regard to the votes which had been taken. The Committee had created a precedent which might make it impossible for the Assembly ever to complete a session.

42. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) associated himself with the statement of the United Kingdom representative.

43. Miss TENZER (Belgium) said that her delegation had voted, not against the hearing of petitioners in general, but against the competence of the Fourth Committee to reopen the question of South West Africa.

44. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that his delegation reserved its position in view of the fact that the Assembly's rules of procedure had not been observed.

45. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that his delegation's favourable vote had been an expression of its conviction that the Committee was competent to decide its own procedure.

46. Mr. GOMES PEREIRA (Brazil) reserved his delegation's position on the vote on the competence of the Committee to hear the petitioners.

47. Mr. Itaat HUSAIN (Pakistan) said it was his delegation's view that the Committee had no right to reopen the question of South West Africa but had every right to grant petitioners a hearing. It had therefore abstained on the question of reopening the agenda item concerning South West Africa but, once that had been decided, had voted in favour of granting the hearings.

48. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that it was his delegation's understanding from the statement made to the Committee by its Secretary a little earlier that the Committee had submitted part of its report on the question of South West Africa to the Assembly and that a further part remained to be submitted. It had therefore voted in favour of the Committee's competence to hear the petitioners, in the light of rule 67 of the rules of procedure. Furthermore, since there were no rules of procedure regulating the time at which, or the agenda item under which, petitioners were to be heard, it had voted in favour of granting the hearings.

49. Mr. ALVES MOREIRA (Portugal) said that he had voted against the granting of hearings to the petitioners, not because he was opposed to hearings as such but because he had voted against the competence of the Committee to reopen a question on which the General Assembly had taken a final decision. He therefore reserved his delegation's position on the competence of the Committee to hear the petitioners.

50. Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) reserved his delegation's position because the vote had been taken in violation of the rules of procedure of the United Nations.

51. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand), Mr. KELLY (Australia) and Mr. KORTEWEG (Netherlands) reserved the position of their delegations for the reasons that had been given by other delegations.

52. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that he had voted to uphold the Committee's competence, because new and important events had taken place in South West Africa which required consideration even though the Committee's report on the item had already been sent to the General Assembly.

53. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) associated her delegation with the views of those representatives who had upheld the competence of the Committee and had voted in favour of hearing the petitioners.

54. Mr. MACQUARRIE (Canada) and Mr. URBINA (Ecuador) reserved the positions of their delegations.

55. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that he had voted against the proposal because he had felt that it would be an abuse of the right of petition to grant the request for a hearing after the Assembly had disposed of the agenda item concerned.

56. Mr. LUNA HERRERA (Guatemala) said that he had abstained in the vote proposed by the Argentine representative because he had serious doubts regarding the Committee's competence to reopen the question of South West Africa. That matter having been settled, he had voted in favour of hearing the petitioners.

57. Mr. MAKKAWI (Lebanon) said that he had voted in support of the Committee's competence, because he held that the Committee had the right to decide its own procedure.

58. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) said that he had voted against the competence of the Committee to hear the petitioners because he had serious doubts about the Committee's right to reopen a question already decided by the Assembly.

59. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) said that he had voted in favour of hearing the petitioners because his delegation shared the grave concern expressed by the Committee on South West Africa regarding the measures taken by the South African Government in South West Africa. The most recent events in the Territory seemed to justify that concern.

AGENDA ITEM 40

Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia: reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and of Italy (A/4323, A/4324, A/4325 (concluded))

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

60. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) said that informal discussions had been going on for some days in an effort to reach a measure of agreement on the question of the frontier. Unfortunately, his delegation had as yet received no instructions from its Government regarding the remaining points of disagreement. It felt, however, that an open discussion, in the Committee, of the question and of the helpful suggestions put forward by a number of delegations might help to clarify the issues and to promote further progress towards agreement. To that end, his delegation thought it would be useful if the Philippine representative would clarify the tentative suggestions for a draft resolution he had put forward at the previous meeting.

61. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) said it had always been his Government's view that the United Nations should take no action on matters such as that now under discussion without the agreement of the parties concerned. His delegation would be glad to study the text of the Philippine suggestions, provided that they respected that fundamental principle.

62. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that his suggestions at the previous meeting had been intended simply to reflect the Committee's discussion of the matter and, in particular, its uniformly favourable reaction to the specific suggestion put forward by the representative of the United Arab Republic as a way of meeting the immediate need for a definite interim frontier between the Trust Territory and Ethiopia.

Those facts could be reflected in a preamble along the lines of the text which he had suggested at the previous meeting, and which he again read out to the members of the Committee. It should not be difficult to reach agreement on those preambular paragraphs, for they were, he understood, acceptable to the parties. On the basis of those paragraphs it should be possible to formulate the operative paragraphs, and that could perhaps be done along the lines being worked out by the representatives of Japan and New Zealand. The provisional boundary line had been the basis of administration for some nine years. It could very well, therefore, continue to serve as a provisional frontier without prejudice whatever to the negotiations under way towards a final settlement or to the position of the parties with regard to that settlement. It was very important, however, that the line should be clearly demarcated on the ground, so that there could be no possible cause of dispute and in order to give the Somali State the assurance of security it would desperately need upon its attainment of independence. The operative paragraphs of the draft resolution might thus recommend to the parties concerned, as a matter of urgency and without prejudice to the steps being taken towards a final settlement, that they should arrange as soon as possible for the demarcation on the ground of the provisional boundary line and decide that, pending a final settlement, that line should be recognized as constituting the frontier between Somalia and Ethiopia.

63. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) thanked the representative of the Philippines for his efforts to assist the parties to reach agreement. The representative of the Philippines was mistaken, however, in supposing that a near-agreement already existed between the parties along the lines of the suggestion he had made: that was not at all the case. He did not, therefore, see the value of discussing the suggestion further at the present stage; his delegation would, in any case, have to see the text in writing and to study it before expressing its point of view.

64. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) fully appreciated the position of the representative of Ethiopia. His delegation had not intended to exert any pressure; it had made its suggestion simply with a view to saving time. Although his delegation could not express any formal views on the Philippine representative's suggestion, since it had no instructions on the subject, he would like to suggest, simply as a technical point, that the proposed preambular paragraphs might include a reference to the reports presented by the parties, a mention of the statements made by their representative in the Committee and an adequate reference to the statement of the Somali Government. In general there were, he thought, three points which should be stressed. The first was the general feeling in the Committee that the provisional boundary line should be accepted as the basis of any arrangement, pending a final settlement. The second was that such a boundary should be clearly demarcated on the ground and that for that purpose a commission should be set up. In the third place, the draft resolution should contain an appropriate expression of the interest in the matter consistently shown by the United Nations, for it was a fact that the United Nations had been deeply concerned ever since the question had first been raised and had been anxious that it should be settled prior to the Territory's attainment of independence.

65. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) still felt it fruitless to pursue a discussion in the absence of instructions from Governments, but since the representative of Italy had given unofficial expression to his delegation's views, he too would make some observations on behalf of his delegation. Ethiopia had not felt it necessary to demarcate the provisional boundary on the ground but since Italy and Somaliland had insisted on that provision it was prepared to agree, in a spirit of co-operation. Ethiopia felt, however, that such demarcation should be temporary, pending the final delimitation of the frontier, and that the procedure for the reaching of a final settlement already provided for in General Assembly resolutions 1213 (XII) and 1345 (XIII) should be specifically mentioned in the resolution on the provisional boundary. It felt that that condition was legitimate because it was in accordance with decisions taken by the General Assembly at its past two sessions.

66. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) said that his delegation, in co-operation with that of New Zealand and in consultation with various other delegations, had been endeavouring to draft a resolution for submission to the Committee. The delegations in question considered that any such draft resolution should be based on the entire agreement of the parties, at least as to the substantive part; they had therefore been awaiting the assent of the parties concerned. Despite the efforts being made, however, there was not yet any indication of such agreement. He therefore proposed that the discussion should be concluded at the present stage without a draft resolution.

67. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) supported the Japanese representative's proposal. If instructions were received in time from the Governments concerned, it might, of course, be possible to submit a draft resolution to the General Assembly in plenary session. In the meantime, without any indication of agreement from the parties, he did not think it proper to disclose the basis on which those who were seeking to bring about such agreement were working.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that he assumed that the Committee was agreed, in accordance with the suggestion just made, to conclude its debate on that item and to empower the Rapporteur to report direct to the General Assembly that in the absence of any proposal it had no resolution to recommend.

It was so decided.

Hearing of petitioners concerning the question of South West Africa

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. H. J. Beukes, Mr. Mburumba Kerina and Mr. Jariretundu Kozonguizi took places at the Committee table.

69. Mr. KOZONGUIZI said that he had asked for the hearing on the instructions of the people of South West Africa and as President of the South West Africa National Union. The petitioners had been prompted by the serious situation which had arisen in the Territory, in the capital city of Windhoek, where the forces of the Union Government were butchering their people. He thanked the Committee for granting the petitioners the opportunity to put before it information they had just received from South West Africa. The Committee's decision justified the confidence of their people in the United Nations and it was, at the same

time, a confirmation to them of the concern of the Committee for the people of South West Africa.

70. Three telegrams had been received from Chief Hosea Kutako in the late afternoon. The first had reported that Mr. Kerina's brother had been killed at the hands of Government forces. The second had reported that in connexion with the boycotting of beer halls in the Location, police and military forces had opened fire on the Africans, killing eight and wounding thirty. The third had read:

"Please ask some Member States to ask UNO to call a special meeting to consider recent killings of the Africans in the Windhoek Location. Force used against Africans because of their refusal to move to new Location. Thirteen killed, thirty-two seriously injured."

71. What had happened, in the petitioners' view, exposed the confidence trick played by the Government of the Union of South Africa. It had come to the Committee saying that it was ready to co-operate. The General Assembly had adopted a decision enjoining the Union Government to refrain from moving the people to a new Location. Despite that decision the Government had used force against the Africans, as a result of which a number had lost their lives. The people of South West Africa felt that the hour of decision had come; the United Nations must take a stand either for them or for the Union Government. Various courses of action were open to the United Nations: the security Council could act; the Secretary-General, who was about to visit Africa, could be requested to extend his journey to South West Africa and to give a first-hand report on what was going on there; or a commission could be appointed to go immediately to the Territory to investigate the situation.

72. Mr. KERINA said that he was present as a petitioner in the Committee in response to the request from Chief Hosea Kutako to which Mr. Kozonguizi had referred. He, too, was grateful for the opportunity given to the petitioners to express the feelings of the people of South West Africa. He considered that the Committee's favourable vote had again shown the desire of the United Nations to assist the people of South West Africa in their struggle against the vicious Government of South Africa. The situation in South West Africa had deteriorated greatly and required immediate intervention. The people were suffering at the hands of Government troops and police. It was time for the United Nations to take some positive action, by authorizing the Secretary-General, or his deputy, to go to South West Africa to see what was happening there, or by appointing a commission to investigate the situation on the spot immediately.

73. Mr. BEUKES said that he had come to the Committee as a petitioner because his people were involved in the disturbances in South West Africa and were being killed there. He, too, thanked the Committee for its favourable vote, which showed that it recognized that there was an African personality which could suffer and feel pain. He would call upon those countries which had the right to do so to explore the possibilities for legal action which would free the Territory of South West Africa from its bondage to the Union of South Africa. He would call upon those countries which had a moral right to concern themselves with South West Africa to support the suggestion of Mr. Kozonguizi that the Secretary-General

should be authorized, in the course of his African tour, to visit South West Africa; that would be a proof of the sincerity of the United Nations interest in the people of that Territory.

74. Mr. SEARS (United States of America) said that the Committee, although it had heard the petitioners, had received no mandate from the General Committee to discuss their statements or to take any action in the matter. He would point out, however, that the Committee on South West Africa was competent to do so, and suggested that it should meet as soon as possible to discuss the troubles in South West Africa.

75. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) said it was his delegation's view that the Committee on South West Africa should be convened on an urgent basis to discuss what was not taking place in the Windhoek Location. He expressed his sympathy with Mr. Kerina for the great loss he had suffered.

76. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico), Mr. Itaat HUSAIN (Pakistan), Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon), Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay), Mr. HASRAT (Afghanistan), Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) and U TIN MAUNG (Burma) associated themselves with the remarks of the United States and Irish representatives.

77. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) associated himself with the preceding speakers and expressed the hope that the appeals made by the petitioners would be communicated to the Secretary-General.

78. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) associated himself with the preceding speakers and expressed the hope that the Committee's report would include the statements made at the present meeting.

79. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) extended his delegation's condolences to the new victims who had joined the long list of African martyrs to the cause of independence. It was the responsibility of the United Nations, and particularly of the Fourth Committee, to do its utmost to reduce the number of those victims. In his delegation's view, the Committee could best show its sympathy by adopting a unanimous resolution asking the Committee on South West Africa to consider the situation immediately.

80. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) expressed her deep disappointment at the behaviour of the South African Government, which had recently given indications of a willingness to modify its position. She hoped that the sentiments expressed at the present meeting would be taken into account by the South African Government and she thought that the records of the meeting should be brought to the Secretary-General's attention so that he might take whatever action he considered necessary in view of his authority to take into consideration matters affecting the lives of the people of Mandated Territories.

81. Mr. Taieb SLIM (Tunisia) associated himself with the remarks of the preceding speakers and expressed his delegation's sympathy with the people of South West Africa in their struggle to liberate themselves.

82. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic), Mr. ALWAN (Iraq), Mr. EL-HASSAN (Sudan), Mr. NEKLESSA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. MEYET (Libya) associated themselves with the Tunisian representative's remarks.

83. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) associated himself with the preceding speakers and asked that the petitioners' statements should be circulated as Committee documents.

84. Mr. KOZONGUIZI thanked the Committee for its words of sympathy and reaffirmed the faith of the people of South West Africa in the United Nations and their determination to continue their struggle against South African oppression on the basis of the principles expressed in the Charter.

85. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would consider the proposal of the United States of America to refer the petitioners' statements to the Committee on South West Africa for its urgent consideration adopted.

It was so decided.

Mr. H. J. Beukes, Mr. Mburumba Kerina and Mr. Jariretundu Kozonguizi withdrew.

Completion of the Committee's work

86. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic), Mr. GOMES PEREIRA (Brazil), speaking on behalf of the Latin-American delegations, Mr. LORINC (Hungary), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. SEARS (United States of America), Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon), speaking on

behalf of the delegations of Australia, Canada, Ceylon, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, India, New Zealand, Pakistan, Union of South Africa and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Mr. SRDANOV (Yugoslavia), Mr. EILAN (Israel), Mr. TOURE (Guinea), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Ethiopia, Guinea, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Sudan and Tunisia, Mr. Itaat HUSAIN (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Asian and African delegations, Mr. PASTINEN (Finland), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, Mr. YIN (China) and Mr. VITELLI (Italy), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the countries of Western Europe, thanked the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur and the Secretariat for the excellent way in which they had discharged their duties.

87. Miss SHELTON (Cuba), speaking as Vice-Chairman, and Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland), speaking as Rapporteur, thanked the Committee for the kind words which had been addressed to them and expressed their gratitude to the Chairman and the Secretariat.

88. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Committee for the tributes which had just been paid to him. He was also grateful to the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur and the Secretariat for the splendid support they had given him.

89. He declared the Committee's work concluded.

The meeting rose on Saturday, 12 December,
at 2.40 a.m.