

2063rd meeting

Monday, 19 November 1973, at 3.25 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2063

AGENDA ITEM 72

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*)*
(A/9023/Add.1, A/9061, A/C.4/L.1038, A/C.4/L.1039)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.1038, A/C.4/L.1039)

1. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on behalf of all the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1038, said that the draft resolution was by and large a reflection of resolution 2945 (XXVII), adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session. In reiterating most of the elements of the previous resolution, the sponsors had wished to stress the point that what had brought the matter to an impasse was the unwillingness of some Members to implement those provisions fully. It was essential that the United Nations resolutions with regard to Southern Rhodesia should be scrupulously complied with, above all by the administering Power, which continued to accept responsibility for Southern Rhodesia.

2. Both in the preamble and in the operative part of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1038, the principle of no independence before majority rule was once again reaffirmed. The sponsors considered that to be a crucial point and they would censure any attempt on the part of the administering Power to amend it. Any negotiations by the United Kingdom Government with the illegal Smith régime which did not respect that principle would be an insult to the independent African States and an affront to the international community. By rejecting the proposals for a settlement agreed upon between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Smith régime,¹ the people of Zimbabwe had indicated in no uncertain manner that they would never yield. It was therefore the hope of the sponsors of the draft resolution that the United Kingdom would break off its contacts or negotiations with the Smith régime, since they ran counter to the resolutions of the General Assembly and the aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe.

3. The sponsors were particularly disappointed by the attitude displayed by the United Kingdom, not only in its failure to comply with the General Assembly resolutions but also in its lack of co-operation 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. Such behaviour cast doubts upon its good faith with regard to the problem of Southern Rhodesia.

4. He drew attention to the importance of operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, concerning assistance to the people of Zimbabwe. The liberation movements had already demonstrated that they were determined to continue the struggle, no matter what sacrifices might be required of them, until Zimbabwe was free from all foreign domination. That being so, the least that the international community could do was to extend to those people all the necessary moral and material assistance to reduce the degree of their sacrifice.

5. In conclusion, he announced that the delegations of Egypt, the Gambia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Somalia, the United Arab Emirates and Upper Volta had joined the sponsors. He hoped that draft resolution A/C.4/L.1038 would command the broadest possible support among the members of the Committee.

6. Mr. ZIMBA (Zambia), speaking on behalf of the leaders of the national liberation movements of Zimbabwe and all the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1039, pointed out that the draft resolution was not very different from resolution 2946 (XXVII), adopted at the preceding session of the General Assembly. In preparing the draft resolution, the sponsors had taken into consideration all that had been said in the general debate and had come to the conclusion that the measures envisaged in Security Council resolution 253 (1968) and General Assembly resolution 2946 (XXVII) had not been effective enough to bring down the Smith régime. It was with that in mind that in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution the sponsors condemned the failure of the United Kingdom to take effective action against the illegal racist régime. The treatment that the United Kingdom gave to Smith and his collaborators was not such as befitted a rebel. For example, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, the United Kingdom delegation always voted against the draft resolutions or abstained, as did also the United States of America.

7. In operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1039, certain Powers, particularly South Africa and Portugal, were condemned for violating the resolutions of the United Nations; in operative paragraph 3 the countries which failed to respect the sanctions imposed by the Security Council were condemned, in particular the United States, which was in a better position than other countries to apply the sanctions against the Smith régime. In addition, the sponsors thought that if those countries would prevent emigration to Southern Rhodesia, that would do a great deal to help bring down the rebel régime. Furthermore, in view of the situation in Southern Rhodesia, various measures to bring down the régime were requested of the Security Council in operative paragraphs 7 and 8.

8. In conclusion, he announced that the delegations of Egypt, the Gambia, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Arab

* Resumed from the 2060th meeting.

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10405.

Emirates and Upper Volta had joined the sponsors. He hoped that draft resolution A/C.4/L.1039 would command the broadest possible support among the members of the Committee.

9. Mr. AL-HADDAD (Yemen) observed that year after year the General Assembly studied the question of Southern Rhodesia and year after year condemned the racist minority régime. His country, which was a sponsor of the two draft resolutions which had just been submitted (A/C.4/L.1038 and A/C.4/L.1039), had always been firmly on the side of the people of Zimbabwe and had supported all the draft resolutions on the item. They had, however, proved to have little effect, since they did not provide for any mandatory action.

10. The United Kingdom, the administering Power, had abandoned its responsibilities towards the people of Zimbabwe, in violation of the United Nations resolutions. It had done nothing to prevent the persecution of the people of Zimbabwe or to guarantee majority rule and, even worse, it had opened a dialogue with Ian Smith, all of which was highly deplorable.

11. There were still more than 28 million people living under the colonial yoke. With that fact in mind, his delegation reaffirmed its solidarity with the people of Zimbabwe and supported its just struggle for independence. He hoped that draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1038 and A/C.4/L.1039 would gain the unanimous support of the Committee.

Organization of work

12. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to chapter XXIX of the Special Committee's report (A/9023/Add.7), relating to item 69. He also announced that the Australian delegation had informed him that a Minister of the Government of the Territory of Papua New Guinea, of which Australia was an administering Power, would be able to address the Committee on 30 November in connexion with the proclamation of the autonomous Government of that Territory on 1 December 1973. That being so, it might be useful for the Committee to consider separately the latest report of the Commonwealth of Australia on its administration of Papua New Guinea, communicated by the Trusteeship Council under agenda item 13 (A/9244). He added that both the President of the Trusteeship Council and the Chairman of the Special Committee agreed to that procedure.

13. Mr. REFADI (Libyan Arab Republic) asked whether there was to be a special meeting to consider the item concerning Papua New Guinea.

14. The CHAIRMAN replied that the Committee would not hold a special meeting but would begin its debate on item 13 on 30 November. In the absence of any objections, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the suggestion.

It was so decided.

15. Mr. ARAIM (Iraq) asked whether there would be a general debate on all the remaining items taken together, after which the draft resolutions on each item would be taken up separately, or whether there would be a general debate on each of the items separately.

16. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in order to expedite the work of the Committee and in accordance with the plans that the Committee had made, efforts should be made to complete the general debate on all the items taken together on Saturday, 24 November, if possible, so that the Committee could begin to consider the draft resolutions on Monday, 26 November. He requested delegations which intended to submit draft resolutions on those items to do so as soon as possible and representatives who wished to speak on the various draft resolutions to do so when each draft resolution was considered separately, rather than making a statement on each item in the general debate. He also suggested that the list of speakers in the general debate on the remaining items should be closed at midday on 20 November.

17. In the absence of any objections, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that procedure.

It was so decided.

18. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-ÅHMAN (Sweden) observed that a governmental delegation from Niue would be arriving in New York at the end of the following week. She asked whether the Committee would already have concluded its discussion of the question of Niue by the time the delegation arrived.

19. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the fact that the Committee had established plans for the accomplishment of its work did not mean that it could not preserve a certain degree of flexibility. The Committee would of course hear the governmental delegation from Niue when it arrived in New York.

20. Mr. REFADI (Libyan Arab Republic) asked whether it was to be understood from the Chairman's reply to the representative of Sweden that the discussion on Niue and the Tokelau Islands under item 23 would be postponed until the Committee had dealt with all the other matters.

21. The CHAIRMAN replied that that would not be so. He pointed out, however, that the Committee was master of its own procedure and could make any changes that it might wish.

22. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked when the Committee would vote on the draft resolutions concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia (A/C.4/L.1038 and A/C.4/L.1039).

23. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would consider the two draft resolutions at its meeting on the following day and that, if time permitted, it could vote upon them at the same meeting.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.