

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1389th
MEETING**

Monday, 19 November 1962,
at 10.55 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 57:</i>	
<i>Question of South West Africa (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) Report of the United Nations Special Committee for South West Africa;</i>	
<i>(b) Special educational and training programmes for South West Africa: report of the Secretary-General.</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)</i>	401

Chairman: Mr. Guillermo FLORES AVENDAÑO
(Guatemala).

AGENDA ITEM 57

Question of South West Africa (A/5238, chap. IX; A/C.4/572-576, 578, 579; A/C.4/L.754/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1) (continued):

- (a) Report of the United Nations Special Committee for South West Africa (A/5212 and Add.1-3);**
- (b) Special educational and training programmes for South West Africa: report of the Secretary-General (A/5234 and Add.1)**

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/5212, ANNEX XIII; A/C.4/L.754/REV.1 AND REV.1/CORR.1) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution submitted by the Special Committee for South West Africa (A/5212, annex XIII) and the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.754/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1, to which amendments had been submitted by Poland and the Soviet Union (A/C.4/L.755) and by the United States (A/C.4/L.756). The financial implications of the latter draft resolution were set out in document A/C.4/579.

2. Mr. ARTEH (Somalia) informed the Committee that the delegations of Ceylon and Jamaica had asked to be included among the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.754/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1). He explained that, when the latter had met on the previous Friday, they had made some minor amendments to the text of draft resolution A/C.4/L.754 and Corr.1 and had decided to delete the word "full" in operative paragraph 2. He also pointed out that the words "at its present or" had been added after the word "General Assembly" in operative paragraph 3.

3. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution had also considered the amendments proposed by Poland and the USSR (A/C.4/L.755) and by the United States (A/C.4/L.756) as well as the suggestions made at the previous meeting by the representative of Ireland. He thanked those delegations for the contributions they had made and assured them that their amendments had been studied objectively. The sponsors had decided to retain

the expression "*mutatis mutandis*", which had been accepted by the USSR, in operative paragraph 3. With regard to the proposal, made by the USSR and Poland, that the final words of operative paragraph 3 should be replaced by "at its present session or at its eighteenth session, and, if necessary, to the Security Council", the sponsors had inserted the words "at its present or" but had felt unable to retain the phrase "and, if necessary, to the Security Council". The amendments submitted by the United States had been carefully considered by the sponsors, who had not, however, felt that they would improve the text. Finally, the sponsors had felt unable to accept the suggestions made by the Irish representative.

4. He considered that, as it now stood, the joint draft resolution represented not only the ideas of the African-Asian group but also those of the great majority of members of the Committee. The sponsors asked that the Committee should vote on the draft resolution as a whole, and hoped that it would be unanimously adopted on that very day.

5. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea), referring to the reservations made regarding operative paragraph 6 to the effect that the Security Council alone had the power to take the measures provided for, pointed out that the fact of the Secretary-General being requested to take all necessary steps in order to establish an effective United Nations presence in South West Africa obviously implied that the Secretary-General would consult all the appropriate quarters. He hoped that that comment would dispel the concern voiced by the delegations of the USSR and of Ireland. He recalled that operative paragraph 7 of resolution 1702 (XVI) had requested the Special Committee to keep the Security Council, the Secretary-General and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples informed of its activities. The idea of keeping the Security Council informed was therefore implicitly contained in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

6. With regard to the amendments submitted by the United States delegation (A/C.4/L.756), he pointed out that paragraph 5 of resolution 1702 (XVI) referred to "the situation in respect of South West Africa, which, if allowed to continue, would . . . endanger international peace and security". The words "if allowed to continue" explained why the sponsors of the draft resolution had not thought fit to refer to the Security Council. If South Africa were to decide to change its policy and co-operate with the United Nations, the current situation would not continue. If on the other hand its policy were to remain unchanged, such a continuation would constitute a threat to international peace and security. The sponsors had consequently felt unable to adopt the proposal of the United States that the word "constitutes" in the last preambular paragraph, should be replaced by "may lead to". With regard to the further United

States proposal to replace "Condemns" in operative paragraph 2, by "Deeply deplures", Mr. Bingham himself had said that there was no great difference between the two expressions. The idea behind them was the same, and it was a fact that virtually all the members of the Committee, including the United Kingdom delegation, had condemned the policy of the Pretoria Government.

7. He associated himself with the appeal made by the representative of Somalia and requested delegations not to press for acceptance of their amendments or to ask for a vote by division. The delegation of Guinea was among those which regarded the joint draft resolution as constituting a synthesis that all the members of the Committee should be able to approve.

8. Mr. SMIGANOWSKI (Poland) said that, in submitting their amendments, his delegation and that of the USSR had wished to bring the wording of the joint draft resolution's operative paragraph 3 more closely into line with that of resolution 1702 (XVI) to which that paragraph referred. In view of the contents of operative paragraphs 5 and 7 of resolution 1702 (XVI), however, those delegations would not press for acceptance of that part of their amendment which related to the Security Council.

9. Mr. GREN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) associated himself with the Polish representative's statement. He added however, with regard to the joint draft resolution's operative paragraph 6, that his delegation wished to reaffirm its position as defined at the 1388th meeting. Despite the explanations provided by the sponsors of the draft resolution, it still considered that operative paragraph 6 conflicted with the provisions of the Charter, since it was for the Security Council to decide what steps should be taken to establish an effective United Nations presence in South West Africa. The USSR and the socialist countries, given their opinion that operative paragraph 6 was not in keeping with the provisions of the Charter, would have preferred a separate vote upon it. Nevertheless, in view of the wish expressed by the sponsors, who hoped that the Committee would vote on the joint draft resolution as a whole, his delegation would not press for a vote by division.

10. Mr. LANGLO (Norway) said that his delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution, which represented a reasonable step towards solving the problem of South West Africa.

11. With reference to the situation in the Territory, he recalled that the living conditions of the Africans, who depended primarily on agriculture and cattle-raising, had worsened on account of the drought by which the Territory had been afflicted for four years and of the foot-and-mouth disease epidemic, which had still further reduced their livestock. His delegation had thought that, with a view to remedying that situation, it would be well to recommend the Mandatory Power to seek the assistance of the appropriate specialized institutions, namely FAO and UNICEF. However, as operative paragraph 5 of the joint draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to appoint a United Nations Technical Assistance resident representative for South West Africa, his delegation had not considered it indispensable that the draft resolution should contain a specific reference to the effects of the drought, and it trusted that that would be one of the questions with which the Technical Assistance representative would concern himself.

12. Mr. CHANAFIAH (Indonesia) said that his delegation would unhesitatingly vote for the joint draft resolution, which constituted a realistic effort; the draft took into account all available information, as well as the opinions and wishes expressed by delegations in the general debate. Some representatives would have preferred stronger provisions; but it was the view of his delegation that the draft resolution should be considered in relation to General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) prescribing measures which, if properly implemented, would be most effective and would have a direct bearing on the situation in South West Africa. Since the policy of apartheid and the whole system of administration in South West Africa were inseparable, the elimination of apartheid and the restoration of democracy would remove the main obstacles to a solution of the South West African question. That was why his delegation had attached so much importance to resolution 1761 (XVII).

13. His delegation was in principle prepared to support the idea of revoking the Mandate, but considered that such a step would not, taken in isolation, serve any useful purpose. On the contrary, it might even prove disastrous. Effective guarantees should be established first, in order to protect the people of the Territory of South West Africa against violations of the principles of the Mandate, the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly. Although it was evident that the South African Government was no longer worthy of being entrusted with the Mandate, the latter's revocation was not yet feasible. The draft resolution contained a new element—a United Nations presence in South West Africa, which should enable the Organization to establish its authority in the Territory. His delegation regretfully anticipated South Africa's rejection of that proposal; nevertheless, a United Nations presence very close to the Territory would exert continued moral pressure on the Pretoria Government. In particular, the presence of Technical Assistance representatives in a locality easily reached by the inhabitants of South West Africa would be of great help to those people.

14. The Indonesian delegation did not believe that operative paragraph 6 should cause any misgivings, since it was confident that the Secretary-General, who would be responsible for establishing the effective United Nations presence, would observe all appropriate procedures.

15. His delegation ardently hoped that all Members of the United Nations would co-operate in implementing the provisions of the draft resolution. His country was one of those, referred to in operative paragraph 8, which were seriously concerned about the supply of arms to South Africa, since there was no guarantee that those arms would not be used against the people of South West Africa.

16. He wished to exercise his right of reply in regard to the statement made by the representative of South Africa at the 1381st meeting. The South African representative had said that the Indonesian delegation, among others, had suggested that the so-called Pretoria communiqué dealt with a few limited points only. His delegation had at no time made comments of substance on any point in that document. What it had said was that the so-called communiqué had already been dealt with in the report of the Special Committee for South West Africa (A/5212 and Add.1-3), and also that there remained the fundamental question of whether the South African Government was prepared to recognize

the right of the African majority to self-determination as required under the Mandate, the Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation had so far been unable to trace any statement or document issued by the South African Government which dealt seriously with that question. If South Africa was now prepared to change its policy, his delegation would welcome such a development.

17. Mr. KIDWAI (India) pointed out that the joint draft resolution had two aims: to urge the South African Government to comply fully with its obligations as a Mandatory Power, and to secure a United Nations presence in South West Africa. In aiming at those moderate objectives, the sponsors had used moderate language, despite their strong feelings on the subject. They had deemed it their duty to make a fresh effort to ask South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and with the United Nations Charter.

18. It was heartening to note that several delegations, having changed their position, were now firmly opposing the South African Government's policy of apartheid; that was a step forward in achieving South Africa's compliance with its obligations. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be supported by all delegations and that, in consequence, South Africa would think fit to reconsider and revise its policy towards South West Africa.

19. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) wished to express his delegation's opinion on the joint draft resolution. The conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee for South West Africa, as contained in paragraph 82 of its report (A/5212), coincided with the views which his delegation had always held. Firmness was the only possible reply to the intransigence of the racist South African Government, and he had been gratified to see that a very large number of delegations were of the same opinion.

20. A reference to firm and decisive action on the part of the United Nations suggested, first of all, action by the Security Council, including sanctions if necessary. In its resolution 1702 (XVI), the General Assembly had decided to call the attention of the Security Council to the gravity of the situation in South West Africa, and had requested the Special Committee for South West Africa to keep the Council informed of its activities and of any difficulties which it might encounter. The situation had deteriorated since then, and the South African Government was as arrogant and as defiant as ever. It would therefore appear logical directly to request the Security Council to examine the situation very carefully and to take the necessary measures, including sanctions if necessary, to remedy it. The logic of such a step was reinforced by the fact that the General Assembly had already taken similar action in adopting resolution 1761 (XVII), on the question of apartheid in South Africa.

21. The voting of sanctions admittedly presented substantial difficulties. The Government of South Africa had friends in the Security Council who could veto any draft resolution to that effect. Similar obstacles arose in other organs of the United Nations, including the General Assembly, where South Africa's allies exerted their influence whenever strong action against that country was suggested. But after sixteen years of vain effort to bring about a change of attitude in South Africa through persuasion, criticism and condemnation, the United Nations had to choose between

sanctions and inaction, and if it wished to remain true to the principles of the Charter and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)), it must choose sanctions. The sooner the Security Council resolved to do so, the better it would be for the people of South West Africa, who were suffering one of the most cruel forms of oppression in the history of colonialism.

22. The joint draft resolution did not go as far as his own delegation would have wished, for it contained no direct request to the Security Council. It did however refer, in its third preambular paragraph, to General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII), which contained all the essential elements for a resolution on the question of South West Africa; and it requested the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVII) to discharge the tasks assigned to the Special Committee for South West Africa under resolution 1702 (XVI). His delegation noted with satisfaction the explanations which had been given by the representatives of Somalia and Guinea. While associating itself with the reservations expressed by the USSR delegation, the Bulgarian delegation approved the draft resolution as a whole and would vote in its favour.

23. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that his delegation had not intervened in the general debate because it had had no new elements to contribute. On many occasions it had stated its position on the substance of the problem, and he would refer members of the Committee to an explanation of vote he had given at the sixteenth session (1237th meeting) when he had emphasized all the legal aspects and implications of the question of South West Africa. His delegation would therefore simply state its views on the joint draft resolution now before the Committee.

24. In the first place, it regretted that in recent years the United Nations had often departed from the realm of law to adopt resolutions which, though satisfying to heart and mind, were ineffective. If, for instance, at the previous session, the draft resolution proposed by Sweden (A/C.4/L.713 and Rev.1-3), which had been regarded as unduly moderate and conciliatory, had been adopted, there would have been no occasion to deplore a matter well known to the whole world; moreover, with a report from three former Presidents of the General Assembly, the United Nations would have been in a stronger position vis-à-vis the South African Government. At the current session, also, the course proposed, in particular, by the Mexican and Canadian representatives in their statements at the 1376th and 1387th meetings, would have guided the Committee towards more satisfactory and even more rapid solutions, although certain aspects of the legal thesis of the Mexican representative were open to discussion.

25. The French delegation still believed that the best way of compelling South Africa to change its attitude was to avoid taking extreme positions—both in statements and in draft resolutions—to prevent indignation from clouding judgement and to disregard propaganda developments and erroneous assertions so as to conduct the struggle on the plane of facts and of law and thus enable good sense and justice to prevail.

26. The Committee was now very fortunate in having before it a draft resolution which seemed on the whole

to be reasonable in substance and in tone. In particular, the French delegation considered it wise to recall the international character of the question of South West Africa, for South Africa was bound by a mandate the execution of which should be supervised by the United Nations, as had been formally stated in the 1950 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.^{1/} The soundest basis for any action was thus the fact that South Africa was bound by the international obligations that it had undertaken. Although apparently it had never contested that fact in principle, it was only too true that it had never drawn from it the consequences that could rightly have been expected. From that point of view, however, the draft resolution gave South Africa a last chance to break the deadlock which it had itself created and to return to the path of international co-operation.

27. Nor could anyone fail to approve of reaffirming the inalienable rights of South West Africa. Nevertheless, the French delegation would have preferred the right to self-determination to be cited instead of the right to independence and national sovereignty, for the former right had precedence over and governed the others. That wording would have conformed more closely to the Charter and would thus have stressed a principle of universal value which, in other parts of the world, represented the sole basis for the peaceful solution of very delicate problems.

28. The French delegation also had some reservations concerning certain passages of the draft, especially the third preambular paragraph, which recalled an Assembly resolution for which France had not been able to vote. If that paragraph was put to the vote separately, the French delegation would vote against it. On the other hand, it would vote in favour of the amendments submitted by the United States delegation (A/C.4/L.756).

29. With regard to the incorporation of the words "mutatis mutandis" in operative paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution, it did not seem appreciably to alter the meaning of the text.

30. Subject to those reservations, the French delegation was in favour of the joint draft resolution, and its affirmative vote would have a quadruple significance. In the first place, the French delegation wished to stress once again the international character of the mandate conferred upon South Africa with respect to South West Africa, a Territory to which Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter did not apply; secondly, it reaffirmed its categorical opposition to all doctrines of racial discrimination, which had never met with any response among the French people; thirdly, it wished to place on record the fact that it shared the concern and anxiety of the sponsors of the draft resolution, and particularly those with whom it was bound by special ties of culture, thought and co-operation; and fourthly, the French delegation's vote would constitute an appeal to South Africa, whose pioneer people had also fought for their independence in the past and had participated in two world wars in the struggle for freedom against imperialism and, in particular, in the struggle against Hitlerite racialism in the Second World War. By a kind of tragic historical paradox, the founders of South Africa had included victims of religious discrimination, the French Protestants who had emigrated as a result of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. It was to be hoped that their descendants would

remember the persecution which had caused their ancestors to flee and would pay more heed than others to the horrors of all discrimination.

31. The French delegation was deeply convinced that the future of the southern part of the African continent did not lie in violence against any person or against any sector of the population, white or black. It hoped that South Africa would understand that its own short-term and long-term interest lay in taking advantage of the opportunity for co-operation once again offered it by the international community.

32. Those were the reasons why France would vote for the draft resolution.

33. Mr. BARATA (Portugal) said that his delegation had carefully studied the views expressed during the debate and was aware that the joint draft resolution should be regarded primarily as an effort to reconcile the widely divergent opinions held in the Committee. Some of the ideas expressed in the draft, if studied objectively, could no doubt contribute to reaching an acceptable solution of the problem of South West Africa. Nevertheless, the Portuguese delegation still had considerable doubts on certain points. In particular, it thought that, after the visit of two members of the Special Committee to the Territory and in the absence of further information on that subject, there were serious grounds for questioning the reliability of the assertion in the last preambular paragraph. Similarly, and setting aside for the time being the more general question of the legality of such a provision, the Portuguese delegation considered that the course of events in the past year in no way justified the terms of operative paragraph 2.

34. For those reasons and because it also had misgivings concerning other parts of the draft resolution, the Portuguese delegation would abstain from voting on it. Nevertheless, if some of the provisions concerning which it had the strongest reservations, and specifically the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2, were put to the vote separately the Portuguese delegation would vote against them.

35. Mr. NEMOTO (Japan) said that his delegation had had the privilege of participating in the preparation of the original joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.754. He was convinced that, in preparing that draft resolution, the sponsors had taken into account not only their own points of view, but also those of other delegations. As the revised joint draft resolution was substantially the same as the original, the Japanese delegation would vote in favour of the revised text, and it associated itself with the representatives of Somalia, Guinea, Indonesia and India in the hope that the draft would be adopted unanimously.

36. With regard to the United States amendments (A/C.4/L.756), the Japanese delegation could accept the first amendment, but would be obliged to abstain from voting on the second.

37. Mr. FOURIE (South Africa) said that, consistent with South Africa's position in regard to the sub judice rule, his delegation would not take part in the vote and would not attempt to analyse the provisions of the joint draft resolution that was before the Committee.

38. He would in passing draw attention to two points which related to the visit of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee to South West Africa. In the last preambular paragraph, the sponsors of the draft resolution asserted that "the continuance

^{1/} International status of South West Africa, Advisory Opinion; I.C.J. Reports 1950, p.128.

of the critical situation in South West Africa constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security", and in operative paragraph 7 (b) they referred to the use of the Territory of South West Africa as "a base, for internal or external purposes, for the accumulation of arms or armed forces". What he would like to know was whether those two passages of the draft resolution constituted a repudiation of the conclusions of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee.

39. Mr. PUDLAK (Czechoslovakia), recalling his country's anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist stand and the solidarity of the Czechoslovak people with the peoples struggling for their freedom, said that his delegation would welcome any resolution which was intended to put an end to the situation that had arisen in South West Africa as a result of the racial policy being pursued by the South African Government in that Territory in violation of the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The situation in South West Africa was especially intolerable because peoples who had shown their desire for independence by fighting German imperialism had for forty years lived under the colonial yoke of another country. Not content with doing nothing to liberate the peoples entrusted to it by the Mandate, the South African Government, under the auspices of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), was remilitarizing the Territory.

40. Because, in the past, the South African Government had always refused to comply with the resolutions on South West Africa adopted by the United Nations, the Czechoslovak delegation had no illusions about the fate in store for the new resolution. The adoption of the resolution would, however, be a new landmark in the history of South West Africa and would help the Territory along the road to independence.

41. His delegation thought that the wording of operative paragraph 6 of the joint draft resolution was too vague and could be interpreted in too many different ways. If the sponsors of the draft resolution really wanted the proposed measures to be effective, those measures should be taken by the Security Council. For that reason, his delegation would have preferred the Polish and Soviet Union amendments (A/C.4/L.755) to be maintained.

42. The United States amendments (A/C.5/L.756) dealt with a question of substance and not of form, and their adoption would weaken the draft resolution. His delegation would therefore vote against them.

43. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Ceylon) said that his delegation was glad to be one of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution. The proposed text was moderate and should be supported by all delegations which wanted United Nations resolutions to be respected and which desired an improvement in the position of the United Nations as the successor to the League of Nations. His delegation hoped that the South African Government would agree to comply with the new resolution, thus obviating the need for the Organization to adopt any other measures.

44. Mr. WALL (United Kingdom) congratulated the sponsors of the joint draft resolution on having produced a text which successfully reflected most of the views expressed in the Committee. In the opinion of his delegation, the draft was a constructive attempt to move forward. He had, however, some important reservations about the text.

45. He recalled, first of all, that his delegation had been unable to support resolution 1702 (XVI) and had voted against resolution 1761 (XVII), both of which were recalled in the preamble of the draft resolution. His delegation's attitude towards the draft resolution as a whole was without prejudice to the reservations which it had expressed about those two resolutions and which it still considered to be valid.

46. He acknowledged that the terms used in the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, concerning a threat to international peace, represented the feelings of many members of the Committee about the situation in the Territory and that similar terms had been employed in the past to express the same feelings. His delegation, however, had the strongest reservations about that paragraph. As it had said at a previous meeting, it considered that the situation in South West Africa was serious, but it wished to repeat that that situation was a straightforward case of the oppression of one race by another, which denied that race its basic rights. That was a tragic situation in itself, but it did not, in the opinion of the United Kingdom delegation, constitute a threat to international peace. For those reasons, his delegation strongly supported the first amendment submitted by the United States delegation (A/C.4/L.756, para. 1).

47. In operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, which referred to certain inalienable rights and reaffirmed operative paragraph 1 of resolution 1702 (XVI), he thought it would have been preferable to mention the principle of self-determination, which was a more fundamental principle. His delegation had made it clear in the general debate that it was not yet possible to see any further than the self-determination of the people of South West Africa. It believed that the population of the Territory should be able to exercise self-determination, but it did not think that there was any way of foretelling the choice of the people concerned. It would therefore have been preferable if operative paragraph 1 had been limited to the question of self-determination—the goal which all the members of the Committee wanted the people of South West Africa to attain. His delegation was sure that the sponsors of the draft resolution had considered that point; it therefore did not intend to propose a formal amendment but wanted its position to be known.

48. With regard to operative paragraph 2 and the proposal by the United States delegation that the word "Condemns" should be replaced by the words "Deeply deplores", he recalled that during the general debate his delegation had condemned the Government of South Africa for its racial policy in South West Africa. That was not, however, the same thing as condemning the South African Government for failing to implement a resolution which the United Kingdom itself had been unable to support. His delegation therefore supported the amendment to that paragraph proposed by the United States delegation.

49. In connexion with operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, his delegation assumed that the tasks assigned to the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI), either directly as in paragraph 3 or indirectly as in paragraph 5, would be carried out in consultation with the South African Government, for his delegation could see no hope of progress without such co-operation. As a member of that Special Committee, the United Kingdom delegation wished to recall the conditions which governed its participation in that Committee's work and which had

been stated at the 1066th plenary meeting when resolution 1654 (XVI) had been adopted.

50. Finally, with regard to operative paragraph 8, he recalled that he had explained at the 1380th meeting the precise nature of the defence agreement between the United Kingdom and South Africa: the arms which the United Kingdom had supplied to that country could not be regarded as suitable for internal security duties. That was a perfectly clear position, and his delegation therefore considered that, in view of their nature, the arms supplied by the United Kingdom to South Africa could not be regarded as contrary to the spirit of operative paragraph 8.

51. His delegation had examined in detail some of the points in the joint draft resolution which it would have liked to be put differently. It thought, however, that the proposed text was, on the whole, a constructive attempt to find a solution to the difficult problem of South West Africa. Consequently, subject to the reservations just made, it was prepared to vote for the draft resolution.

52. Mr. LAMANI (Albania) said that his delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution, which it regarded as a new landmark on the road leading to the independence of South West Africa.

53. As it had explained in its statement in the general debate (1380th meeting), the Albanian delegation felt that it was the duty of the United Nations at the present time, after sixteen years of fruitless waiting, to adopt extremely energetic measures to compel the South African Government to withdraw its forces from South West Africa. That was the only way to establish conditions which would permit the population of the Territory to decide its future freely.

54. His delegation was compelled to state that operative paragraph 6 of the joint draft resolution did not meet the requirements of the Charter. In its present form the text lent itself to different interpretations, a situation which might have ominous consequences. For that reason his delegation could not support that paragraph.

55. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) noted that although the joint draft resolution was not entirely in accord with the views of his delegation, it reflected the situation satisfactorily. The wording might have been improved if the viewpoints expressed in the various paragraphs had been presented more explicitly, and particularly if, as the Soviet Union representative had proposed, the Security Council had been specifically mentioned. However, in view of the explanation by the sponsors of the draft resolution that the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI) would be authorized to appeal to the Security Council under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1702 (XVI), his delegation would not press that point.

56. His delegation hoped that the Secretary-General, in whatever the measures he might be able to take concerning a United Nations presence in the Territory, would give due consideration to the viewpoints expressed on that point in the Committee.

57. As for operative paragraph 8 of the draft, his delegation again would have preferred a more clearly worded text. In that connexion, he took note of the United Kingdom representative's statement that his country would supply South Africa only with the type of armaments intended for maritime warfare, for the purpose of defending the Atlantic sea routes.

58. His delegation would vote against the amendments proposed by the United States delegation (A/C.4/L.756) if they were not withdrawn.

59. As for the remarks made by some representatives concerning the last preambular paragraph, he said that nobody could deny that the situation in South West Africa constituted a threat to international peace and security. The Pretoria communiqué could not be invoked on that point, and it was the Mandatory Power's attitude which was the source of that situation.

60. Lastly, concerning operative paragraph 2, he regretted that the United Kingdom delegation did not agree to condemn the South African Government for its refusal to co-operate with the United Nations. In view of all the past efforts which had been in vain, his delegation felt that the Committee could not do anything else but condemn the South African Government for its attitude.

61. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote first on the draft resolution concerning petitions and communications relating to the Territory of South West Africa, which was included in the report of the Special Committee for South West Africa (A/5212, annex XIII).

There being no objection, the draft resolution (A/5212, annex XIII) was adopted.

62. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States amendments (A/C.4/L.756) to the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.754/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1).

The first amendment (A/C.4/L.756, para.1) was rejected by 57 votes to 24, with 14 abstentions.

The second amendment (A/C.4/L.756, para.2) was rejected by 64 votes to 17, with 17 abstentions.

63. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.754/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1) as a whole.

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

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

In favour: Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Portugal.

Present and not voting: South Africa.

The draft resolution (A/C.4/L.754/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1) was adopted by 96 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

64. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it regarded it as constructive and as pointing to an opportunity for positive action on the part of the United Nations. His delegation would be pleased if the South African Government implemented the new text and it strongly urged it to do so in order that a better future might at last be opened for the people of South West Africa. The reservations which his delegation had expressed at the 1388th meeting concerning the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 had led it to submit two amendments; he thanked the sponsors for having considered those amendments, but regretted that the amendments had not been included in the draft resolution.

65. His delegation wished to congratulate the sponsors of the draft resolution for their diligent, able and responsible work. Because their text took into account to a very large degree the various viewpoints expressed

by the members of the Committee, it had been adopted almost unanimously. He trusted that that fact would not fail to produce a deep impression on the South African Government.

66. Mr. RIFAI (Jordan) noted that the Committee had rarely shown such unanimity on the question of South West Africa. Even a delegation which ordinarily voted against the majority had simply abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. He hoped that the South African Government would take account of that unanimity in its subsequent decisions concerning South West Africa.

67. Mr. YOMEKPE (Ghana) informed the Committee that several delegations, including his own, had prepared a draft resolution (A/C.4/L.757) concerning the dissolution of the Special Committee for South West Africa, the functions of which were not assigned to the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI).

68. The CHAIRMAN said that that draft resolution would be considered at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.