

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



**1500th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 20 December 1966,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS\*

	Page		Page
Agenda item 13:		Agenda item 65:	
Report of the Trusteeship Council ( <u>concluded</u> )		Question of South West Africa: report of the	
Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . .		Special Committee on the Situation with re-	
		gard to the Implementation of the Declara-	
Agenda item 23:		tion on the Granting of Independence to	
Implementation of the Declaration on the		Colonial Countries and Peoples ( <u>concluded</u> )	
Granting of Independence to Colonial Coun-		Hearing of petitioners	
tries and Peoples: report of the Special		Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . .	
Committee on the Situation with regard to			
the Implementation of the Declaration on		Agenda item 26:	
the Granting of Independence to Colonial		Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons: report	
Countries and Peoples ( <u>concluded</u> )		of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation	
French Somaliland		Committee on Disarmament ( <u>concluded</u> ) . . .	19
Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . .			
Ifni, Spanish Sahara and Equatorial Guinea			
Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . .		President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAQ	
Territories not considered separately		(Afghanistan).	
Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . .			
Agenda items 64 and 71		AGENDA ITEM 13	
Information from Non-Self-Governing Terri-		Report of the Trusteeship Council ( <u>concluded</u> )**	
tories transmitted under Article 73 e of the		REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6624)	
Charter of the United Nations:		AGENDA ITEM 23	
(a) Report of the Secretary-General;		Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of	
(b) Report of the Special Committee on the		Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:	
Situation with regard to the Implementa-		report of the Special Committee on the Situation with	
tion of the Declaration on the Granting of		regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on	
Independence to Colonial Countries and		the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries	
Peoples		and Peoples ( <u>concluded</u> )***	
Offers by Member States of study and train-	1	FRENCH SOMALILAND	
ing facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-		REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6583)	
Governing Territories: report of the Secre-		IFNI, SPANISH SAHARA AND EQUATORIAL GUINEA	
tary-General		REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6623)	
Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . .		TERRITORIES NOT CONSIDERED SEPARATELY	
Agenda items 66 and 68:		REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6628)	
Special educational and training programmes		AGENDA ITEMS 64 AND 71	
for South West Africa: report of the Secre-		Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories	
tary-General		transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of	
Special training programme for Territories		the United Nations:	
under Portuguese administration: report of		(a) Report of the Secretary-General;	
the Secretary-General		(b) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation	
Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . .		with regard to the Implementation of the Declara-	
Agenda item 70:		tion on the Granting of Independence to Colonial	
Question of Oman:		Countries and Peoples	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the		Offers by Member States of study and training facilities	
Situation with regard to the Implementa-		for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories:	
tion of the Declaration on the Granting of		report of the Secretary-General	
Independence to Colonial Countries and		REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6626)	
Peoples;			
(b) Report of the Secretary-General			
Report of the Fourth Committee . . . . .			

\*The revised version of the proceedings incorporates document A/PV.1500/Add.1 (additional explanations of vote).

\*\*Resumed from the 1450th meeting.  
\*\*\*Resumed from the 1492nd meeting.

## AGENDA ITEMS 66 AND 68

Special educational and training programmes for South West Africa: report of the Secretary-General

Special training programme for Territories under Portuguese administration: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6625)

## AGENDA ITEM 70

Question of Oman:

(c) 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;

(b) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6622)

## AGENDA ITEM 65

Question of South West Africa: 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 (concluded)\*

## HEARING OF PETITIONERS

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6458/ADD.1)

*Mr. Esfandiary (Iran), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee, presented the reports of that Committee and then spoke as follows:*

1. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: The first report [A/6624] concerns the report of the Trusteeship Council, which the Fourth Committee took up under agenda item 13. In this report, the Fourth Committee recommends that the General Assembly adopt two draft resolutions, one concerning the Trust Territory of Nauru and the other concerning Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea [*ibid.*, para. 17, draft resolutions I and II].

2. The second report [A/6583] concerns the question of French Somaliland, which the Fourth Committee took up under agenda item 23. In this report, the Fourth Committee recommends that the General Assembly adopt a draft resolution on French Somaliland [*ibid.*, para. 11].

3. The third report [A/6623] concerns Ifni, Spanish Sahara and Equatorial Guinea, also under agenda item 23. Two draft resolutions are recommended for adoption by the General Assembly [*ibid.*, para. 20].

4. The fourth report [A/6628] concerns the Territories not considered separately, which the Fourth Committee also took up under item 23. In this report, the Fourth Committee recommends that the General Assembly adopt two draft resolutions [*ibid.*, para. 20], one concerning Gibraltar and the other concerning American Samoa, Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Dominica, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Guam, Mauritius, Montserrat, New Hebrides, Niue, Pitcairn, St. Helena, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Solomon Islands,

Tokelau Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and the United States Virgin Islands.

5. I wish also to draw attention to the consensus adopted by the Fourth Committee concerning the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) [*ibid.*, para. 13]. It was the understanding of the Committee that the General Assembly might wish to approve this consensus.

6. The fifth report [A/6626] concerns agenda items 64 and 71. Two draft resolutions concerning these items [*ibid.*, para. 9] were adopted unanimously by the Fourth Committee.

7. The sixth report [A/6625], concerns the special educational and training programmes for South West Africa and for Territories under Portuguese administration, which the Fourth Committee took up under agenda items 66 and 68. The Fourth Committee adopted three draft resolutions on these items [*ibid.*, para. 13]. The first draft resolution concerns the question of a consolidation and an integration of these two training programmes and of the United Nations educational and training programmes for South Africans. The second resolution deals with the special educational training programmes for South West Africa. The third draft resolution concerns the special training programmes for territories under Portuguese administration.

8. Finally, the last report of the Fourth Committee [A/6622] concerns the question of Oman, which the Fourth Committee took up under item 70. The draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for its adoption is set out in paragraph 9 of that report.

9. I also have the honour of presenting to the General Assembly for its consideration the report of the Fourth Committee on the hearing of a petitioner concerning the question of South West Africa [A/6458/Add.1]. As Members are aware, the Fourth Committee previously submitted a report to the General Assembly on the hearing of petitioners [A/6458] during the consideration by the Assembly of item 65. At its 1451st plenary meeting, on 26 October 1966, the General Assembly took note of that report.

10. At the concluding meeting of the Fourth Committee [1679th meeting], the Chairman informed the Committee of the receipt of a further request for a hearing, submitted by the Reverend Mr. Michael Scott. After discussion, the Committee decided that, in view of the gravity of the matters raised in the petitioner's communication, the request contained therein should be granted and the petitioner heard at the same meeting. The Committee accordingly heard the petitioner and, having regard to the importance of the information furnished by him, it decided that an account of this hearing should be brought to the attention of the General Assembly.

11. In the evidence which he submitted to the Committee, the petitioner drew particular attention to stringent measures announced by the South African Government for the ejection of a large number of African families from their present location in Windhoek and their forcible transfer to another location. He recalled in this connexion that a previous attempt in 1959 to displace these African families had resulted in serious disturbances and that all sub-

\*Resumed from the 1471st meeting.

sequent attempts had been unsuccessful. According to the petitioner, these new steps, coming after the recent discussions of the General Assembly concerning the termination of South Africa's Mandate in relation to South West Africa, had resulted in an explosive situation. Furthermore, the petitioner brought to the notice of the Committee the fact that a number of prominent African political leaders had been arrested in the Territory by the South African Government. He also referred to other developments which pointed to an intensification of repressive activities against the African population.

12. Following the hearing of the petitioner, some members expressed their grave concern with respect to the deteriorating situation in the Territory of South West Africa, in particular at the recent press reports concerning measures carried out by the Government of South Africa in that Territory which, in their view, constituted acts of oppression. They expressed the feeling that these measures represented a violation of the authority assumed by the United Nations under the terms of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), of 27 October 1966, and, accordingly, should be denounced by the United Nations.

13. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Committee decided that, in addition to submitting a report to the plenary, its Chairman should bring the evidence submitted by the petitioner to the attention of the chairmen of the Committee of Twenty-four and the *Ad Hoc* Committee on South West Africa, for appropriate action at the earliest opportunity.

14. In view of the extremely grave and deteriorating situation in the Territory of South West Africa, I wish to commend the present report to the attention of the General Assembly for any action which it may consider appropriate.

*Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fourth Committee.*

15. The PRESIDENT: Interventions will be limited to explanations of vote. The General Assembly will now consider the report of the Fourth Committee concerning the report of the Trusteeship Council. The recommendations of the Fourth Committee are contained in the report [A/6624, para. 17].

16. Mr. SHAW (Australia): I should like to make a few remarks on the two draft resolutions concerning the Trust Territory of Nauru and New Guinea and the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Papua [A/6224, para. 17]. I do not propose to speak at length on this item, nor in detail on the two draft resolutions which are recommended by the Fourth Committee. The Australian representatives have given the fullest possible background information to the Committee of Twenty-four, to the Trusteeship Council, and to the Fourth Committee on the Trust Territories involved, and to the Committee of Twenty-four and the Fourth Committee on the Territory of Papua. Australian representatives have also expressed at length the views of the Australian Government on these Territories in all the bodies which I have mentioned.

17. With regard to the Trust Territory of Nauru, we must simply point out that here the United Nations

has to face up to the problem of the application of the principle of self-determination to very small entities. In the case of Nauru, we are dealing with a small island, some twelve miles in circumference, with an indigenous population of about 2,800 people, and situated so far off in the Pacific Ocean that its nearest neighbour, which is an even smaller island, is almost 200 miles away.

18. As far as the living standards of the indigenous people of Nauru are concerned, because of the phosphate deposits on the island, the people there already enjoy a per capita income that is amongst the highest in the world and higher than that of the people of Australia. The financial future of the Nauruan people has been assured through the investment of large sums of money on their behalf which will realize for them an annual income of several millions of dollars in perpetuity.

19. So we can say that there is no poverty and there is no insecurity on that island of Nauru, and the material needs of the people are fully met. They already have a large measure of self-government; the question of their independence is at present under consideration by the Australian Government. But I would suggest that independence for an island so situated and for a population of the size I have described is an involved question which demands its own particular solution.

20. The situation in the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Australian Non-Self-Governing Territory of Papua is different. Despite the difference in international legal status, those two Territories are joined in an administrative union to form the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. Subject only to the will of the people as it is expressed through their representative institutions, they seem destined to emerge together as a nation with great future.

21. Turning now to draft resolution II [A/6624, para. 17], I would emphasize again, as the Australian representative in the Fourth Committee [1676th meeting] has already done at length, that this draft resolution is not in accord with the facts as they exist. Those facts have been explained many times in the various organs of the United Nations, and particularly in the Fourth Committee last week. The terms of this draft resolution bear witness to the unwillingness of the Committee to accept the facts of the situation, and that unwillingness cannot contribute to the furtherance of United Nations principles and interests in the Territories concerned.

22. The facts of the situation in Papua and New Guinea are that in that Territory, which has a population of about 2 million indigenous people and some 30,000 non-indigenous, there is peace and progress. All the freedoms are there—freedom of speech, freedom of the Press, freedom of political association, freedom of association in trade unions and similar groupings. As is the case in Australia itself, and indeed throughout all the Territories under Australian control, there is not one single political prisoner.

23. The last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 (a) of this draft resolution on Papua and New Guinea speak about discriminatory practices. But as we have explained at some length, racial dis-

crimination in Papua and New Guinea has been outlawed. Over a period of years, the whole body of legislation applicable to those Territories has been examined and, where necessary, amended to remove any section from any law which suggests discrimination. My delegation quoted in full to the Fourth Committee last week the law outlawing racial discrimination, and I shall simply quote again section 3 (d) which declares illegal "any course of conduct which distinguishes between persons or classes of persons of different races or colours which may reasonably be expected to result in mental distress or suffering by a person or a member of that class of persons".

24. Yet, in spite of that situation in the Territory, we have in the draft resolution contained in the report of the Fourth Committee such statements as those appearing in the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 (b). Now, no one would assert that, if one searches for them, instances of discrimination by ignorant or thoughtless people could not be found in New Guinea, as indeed they can be found in any country in the world. But the sections of the draft resolution to which I have referred overlook the fact that not only is racial discrimination outlawed in the Territory, but it is abhorrent to the minds of most of the people living and working there. Anyone who has visited Papua and New Guinea could testify to the degree of co-operation between the races there, which would be difficult to find elsewhere in the world in similar circumstances. People are working together in the Territory, in mutual confidence and respect, for the economic and social development of that country, an enterprise which, I might remark, is costing the Australian Government about \$90 million a year in freely given non-repayable grant aid.

25. Our third point of criticism of draft resolution II relates to the references in operative paragraph 4 regarding the political situation—references which again we find incorrect, both in fact and in implication. May we simply point out to the Assembly that, in Papua and New Guinea, there is already a common electoral roll upon which the names of all people qualified to vote are inscribed, regardless of race, colour, creed or any other factor. The roll is compiled on the basis of one man—or one woman—one vote. On the basis of universal adult suffrage, under that common roll there have been elections in which the voters have expressed a free choice for the candidates of their preference. From those elections based on the principle of one man, one vote and a free choice, a House of Assembly has been created in which there is an elected indigenous majority. At the request of the people themselves, legislation has recently been enacted to provide for the extension of the membership of that parliament from sixty-four to ninety-four members, of whom eighty-four will be elected. As an interim measure, and at the request of the people themselves, ten will be nominated because they are the heads of vital Government departments.

26. There is no recognition at all of those facts in the draft resolution now before us. There is indeed a denial of them which, I fear, will not only astonish but outrage the people of the Territory to which this draft resolution relates.

27. As to the question of independence referred to in the draft resolution, let me once again repeat the

policy of the Australian Government as stated on 7 July of this year by the Minister of Territories in these words: "The Government's basic policy for Papua and New Guinea is self-determination." This means that, if they wish to do so, the people of the Territory are free to terminate their present Territory status and take independent status. It is so that the wishes of the people may be expressed in that direction, or in any other direction which they may choose, that the Parliament of New Guinea has been created, on the basis, I repeat, of one man, one vote, a common roll, and a freedom of choice of candidates. That is the way, and indeed the only practical way, in which the wishes of a people can be expressed in a country like New Guinea, divided as it is into some thousands of different tribes separated by some hundreds of different languages, and isolated from one another by custom and by the nature of the country in which they live.

28. Finally, let me remark on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution which "further calls upon the administering Power to refrain from utilizing the Territories for military activities incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations". The administering Power is not utilizing the Territories for military activities incompatible with the United Nations Charter. The defence preparations which are being made in the Territories are to protect the rights of the people there to determine their future in their own way and in their own time in accordance with their own wishes, and to do so free from fear from within and free from coercion and pressure from without. We would be failing in our duty if we did not make those defence preparations, the purpose of which is fully understood and accepted by the people of the Territories.

29. To sum up because this draft resolution on Papua and New Guinea is wrong at so many points, both in fact and in implication, my delegation will vote against it. It will also vote against the draft resolution relating to the Trust Territory of Nauru.

30. Because of the significance which the Australian Government attaches to these two draft resolutions, I would ask, Mr. President, that you take a roll-call or recorded vote on both draft resolution I and draft resolution II and that you take separate votes on paragraphs 4 and 5 of draft resolution II, relating to Papua and New Guinea.

31. The PRESIDENT: I shall first put to the vote draft resolution I [A/6624, para. 17], concerning the Trust Territory of Nauru. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nica-

ragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, United States of America, Venezuela.

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 85 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions.*

32. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II [A/6624, para. 17] relates to the question of Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea. Separate recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 4 and 5. The General Assembly will now vote on operative paragraph 4.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela.

*Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution II was adopted by 70 votes to 16, with 28 abstentions.*

33. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution II.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Re-

public, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, Belgium, Canada, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Madagascar, Maldives Islands, Mexico, Paraguay, Philippines, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela.

*Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution II was adopted by 71 votes to 16, with 25 abstentions.<sup>1/</sup>*

34. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on draft resolution II as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden.

*Draft resolution II, as a whole, was adopted by 81 votes to 8, with 24 abstentions.*

<sup>1/</sup> The representative of China subsequently called the attention of the Secretariat to the fact that he had voted against operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution II, but his vote had not been recorded.



35. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to agenda item 23, and to the 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. The general discussion on item 23 was completed on 13 December by the adoption of resolution 2189 (XXI).

36. Consequently, the General Assembly must now pronounce itself on the draft resolution of the Fourth Committee concerning French Somaliland [A/6583, para. 11]; on the draft resolutions concerning Ifni, Spanish Sahara and Equatorial Guinea [A/6623, para. 20]; and on the draft resolutions on Territories which were not considered separately [A/6628, para. 19].

37. I shall first call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on the various draft resolutions relating to the item we are now considering. The Assembly will vote on the draft resolutions in the order in which they were presented by the Committee. After the voting is concluded, I shall call upon those representatives who desire to explain their votes after the voting.

38. As these items have been considered in detail in the Committee, and because of the limited time available for the Assembly to complete the work of its twenty-first session, I should like to request representatives to make their interventions as brief as possible.

39. Mr. KAYUKWA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (translated from French): At the 1664th and 1666th meetings of the Fourth Committee, my delegation had the opportunity to explain at considerable length its position on the draft resolution (A/6583, para. 11) which we are now considering. We said in particular that we would reserve our position on operative paragraph 4, although we intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. Logically, therefore, this is how our vote should have been cast. However, it so happened that, inadvertently thinking that the vote was on the draft resolution as a whole, when it was in fact on paragraph 4, my delegation voted in favour of this paragraph. Consequently, we reserved the right to point out that mistake and to correct it in the General Assembly. This is what we are doing and in so doing we wish to apologize if we raised false hopes or misled some delegations by making them think that we supported paragraph 4.

40. Having said that, I should now like, very brief as the President has requested, to make my delegation's position on the draft resolution now before us clearer still. My delegation's vote will be prompted by two considerations, namely, the desire to consider the facts of the situation and the desire to uphold principles.

41. What are the facts of the case in so-called French Somaliland? The facts are as follows.

42. Firstly, we are dealing with a country whose geographic situation and ethnic composition give rise, rightly or wrongly, to claims and disputes on the part of neighbouring countries.

43. Secondly, we are dealing with an administering Power whose views on decolonization are based on complete respect for the principle of self-determina-

tion, and whose courage in living up to those principles throughout the history of decolonization can hardly be questioned.

44. Thirdly, we are faced with the fact that the administering Power has already started the process of decolonization and self-determination by proclaiming that a referendum on the political future of the Territory will be held next year.

45. Finally, we are also faced with the fact that some uneasiness seems to be felt concerning the present political conditions, mainly because of the unrest and the fact that, in order to maintain law and order, some people have been deprived of their freedom or even, we must admit, forced to leave the Territory.

46. Taking all these factors into consideration, my delegation feels that it must strongly affirm the principle of self-determination for the Territory, in keeping with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and at the same time recognize the competence of the United Nations in the matter. Again, we must judge in strict fairness France's efforts to implement the above resolution in so-called French Somaliland.

47. Furthermore, my delegation must draw the attention of the administering Power to the concern felt by some Members of the United Nations as a result of the encumbrance which present political conditions may place on the freedom of expression during the referendum.

48. Finally, my delegation would like to stress that, in the interest of the cause of decolonization in the Territory, we earnestly desire to see the greatest possible voluntary co-operation between the administering Power and the United Nations, or, failing that, between it and the Organization of African Unity, since we are firmly convinced that such co-operation would only further enhance the prestige of the administering Power.

49. My delegation felt that it was necessary to reaffirm the principles of self-determination and the competence of the United Nations, and we also felt that it was worth while to bring to the attention of the administering Power the concern of all Member States—a concern which is, moreover, shared by the administering Power itself—to ensure that self-determination is achieved as quickly as possible.

50. These are the reasons why the provisions of the draft resolution relating to these points were supported by my delegation, although we would have preferred some changes in the wording in some of them which would have improved the text.

51. With regard to the United Nations presence, my delegation has indicated that it would have preferred the voluntary co-operation of the administering Power. We must admit that the provision relating to the United Nations presence does little to encourage such voluntary co-operation which we all desire and indeed it seems to imply some kind of imposition. This attitude was unnecessary for many Members present here to accede to independence, and it understandably affects the honour of a delegation whose country—unlike some others which refuse to accept their full responsibility for certain Territories under their rule, or refuse to recognize the right of the

people under their care to self-determination—can be proud of its record in the matter of decolonization.

52. Consequently, that co-operation, because it is imposed, has been refused by the administering Power itself, and as a result my delegation considers the paragraph in question worthless since it cannot be implemented. However, we continue to believe that, in spite of everything, such co-operation is desirable, although we are not convinced that the absence of the United Nations will necessarily prejudice the normal course of the referendum.

53. For this reason, my delegation abstained in the vote in the Fourth Committee on paragraph 4 of the draft resolution in question, and we also intend to abstain in the General Assembly if a separate vote is requested on that paragraph.

54. In conclusion, I should like to say once again that when my delegation voted for operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution in the Committee, it did so inadvertently.

55. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the next speaker, I should like to repeat that these items have been considered in detail in the Committee, and the time at the disposal of the Assembly is very limited, and I already have eleven speakers on my list. At this stage statements should be confined to explanations of votes. Perhaps there may be some difficulty in defining to everybody's satisfaction what an explanation of vote is, but the purpose of an explanation of vote is very clear. I would seek the co-operation of representatives in limiting their statements to explanations of votes, in conformity with their own decision.

56. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) (translated from Spanish): The Assembly in plenary meeting is about to vote on three draft resolutions of direct interest to Spain. They are recommended by the Fourth Committee and relate to problems of decolonization in Equatorial Guinea, the Spanish Sahara, Ifni and Gibraltar.

57. At this point I should like to explain my vote on the first two draft resolutions (A/6623, para. 20), and I would ask you to bear this in mind, Mr. President, since I shall be explaining two votes and not one. Moreover, my explanation of vote may be of interest since I shall speak as official representative of the responsible Government. I shall do so as clearly as possible.

58. I shall begin with Equatorial Guinea, which comprises the former provinces of Río Muni and Fernando Póo. As representatives will remember, a United Nations mission visited Equatorial Guinea at the invitation of Spain last summer.

59. From this rostrum Mr. Collier, Chairman of the Special Committee, a few days ago warmly praised Spain's gesture, the hospitality offered to the visitors and the absolute freedom they had enjoyed in carrying out their mission. The mission presented a detailed report (A/6300/Rev.1, chap. IX and X) which the Special Committee examined and approved.

60. In my delegation's view, this informative document, which in my sincere and respectful opinion is a mixture of accuracy and error, like any human

endeavour, contains a suggestion, a political initiative of special significance and probably—certainly, one might say—of great potential. The initiative proposed the convening of a constitutional conference at which all sectors of Guinean public opinion would be represented. The conference would discuss, with the greatest freedom and the greatest responsibility, all problems relating to the decolonization of Equatorial Guinea.

61. No sooner had the Spanish Government studied the report of the visiting Sub-Committee than it accepted the idea of a conference. On 10 December the representative of Spain, Mr. Pinies, in accordance with instructions which I, as leader of the Spanish delegation, had given him, informed the Committee that our Government had decided to convene a constitutional conference early in 1967 to which all sectors of public opinion in the Territory could and should send representatives.

62. In our view, the decolonization of Equatorial Guinea was thus set in motion in an irreproachable and definite manner. The Guinean people was thus given the decisive opportunity to consider itself master of its own destiny, the sole shaper of its own future, both as regards the great problems of self-determination and the lesser and secondary problems that derive therefrom.

63. In voting on draft resolution II, my delegation felt that the logical reaction to the Spanish Government's very concrete proposals would be to do nothing which might directly or indirectly imply interference with, or limitation or conditioning of, the free choice that the people of Equatorial Guinea is to have in deciding what is best for it, what it believes best helps it fulfil its ideals.

64. In short, the people must have absolute freedom of choice throughout the debates and decisions of the constitutional conference. As we thought and still think that the draft resolution does not sufficiently take into account this fundamental principle of the sovereign conference, we abstained when a vote was taken.

65. I trust the Assembly will do me the justice of considering that our abstention is based on integrity of judgement and sincerity.

66. I should add something more regarding Equatorial Guinea, as my statement may be of some interest. For the Spanish Government—and I ask all representatives to note this—anything involving interference in the constitutional conference, anything that might prejudice or predetermine the conference's decisions is, as I have stated, to be avoided, because it would detract from the unrestricted choice of the political and social forces of the Guinean people. It is for the people alone to say "yes" to this, "no" to that, and "perhaps" to something else. That is what "self-determination" means.

67. You may rest assured that if the people of Guinea, through the conference, with complete freedom of decision, opts for independence, Spain will scrupulously abide by the recommendations of the United Nations to speed up the country's special preparation so that independence may become a reality as soon as possible.

68. To this end, and in keeping with my delegation's offer in the Fourth Committee, Spain will convene the constitutional conference to which I referred early in 1967. Representatives of the autonomous authorities and the different political and social sectors comprising the community of Equatorial Guinea will be present and the decisions taken will be communicated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

69. From the constitutional conference so often mentioned will emerge—at least this is foreseeable—changes in the political structures which will permit the people of Equatorial Guinea, and it alone, without interference of any kind, to accede freely to independence. Spain offers all the necessary assistance in the completion of that process so that Guinea can confirm its full international personality, to be crowned at the appropriate time by admission to the United Nations as a full Member. From that moment, in accordance with the Charter, the United Nations will be the greatest and most effective guarantor of its territorial integrity.

70. This, no more and no less, is what we wish to say concerning the draft resolution adopted by the Fourth Committee concerning Equatorial Guinea. These were the comments we wished to make concerning the machinery and provisions recommended in the draft resolution which, as we see it, do not assist in the decolonization of the territory. This was why Spain abstained in the vote.

71. I should now like to explain our vote on draft resolution I, concerning Ifni and Spanish Sahara. Here too, as in the case of Equatorial Guinea, I shall say, if I may, that all—including the sponsors of the draft resolution—who voted in favour of the draft as well as the delegation of Spain, which voted against, are interpreting the same melody but with a different instrumentation. Recalling the words written many years ago, in the days of my youth, by a great Spanish political figure, I would say that we are all in agreement with the cardinal criterion, but disagree on the means.

72. The cardinal criterion is that Spanish Sahara must be decolonized through self-determination. The means refer to the road or roads that we shall follow to achieve that goal.

73. My Government believed that the decolonization process could be preceded by an official United Nations visit to the territory as was done in the case of Fernando Poo and Rio Muni. This was proposed in the Fourth Committee by the Permanent Deputy Representative of Spain, who said:

"My delegation is prepared to open talks with the Secretary-General with a view to designating a commission to be sent to Spanish Sahara. The commission would observe the situation in the territory at first hand and objectively and could reach a judgement in the matter, thus confirming the sincerity of Spain in respect of decolonization. The visitors would have had no direct interest in Spanish Sahara and represent no territorial ambitions; they would, in other words, be a group of impartial and disinterested persons. They would assess the realities and characteristics of the territory, which would enable them to see what has been achieved by Spain, learn

its future plans and ascertain the genuine desire for decolonization, as well as the desires of the indigenous inhabitants of the Sahara in respect of their future, which will, in due time, be manifested through the process of self-determination."<sup>2/</sup>

74. So far as the vote is concerned, the situation as we see it is similar to that I described in connexion with Guinea. For the second time—and I believe that the Assembly will accept my words at their true value—Spain has invited the United Nations to visit a Non-Self-Governing Territory under its administration. Could there be greater sincerity or a greater desire to co-operate? Would it not seem reasonable to have awaited the completion of this visit so that the Organization, directly, without prejudice and preconceived ideas, would have obtained the essential information on Spanish Sahara and its very special circumstances? Should we not have waited until the visiting Sub-Committee had drafted its report, and the latter had been discussed, in order to obtain the necessary information?

75. You will agree that a State which opens wide the doors of its Non-Self-Governing Territories in order that the United Nations may observe and study them must be sadly surprised to see that this friendly and wide-ranging initiative is countered by a draft resolution in which we find a lack of confidence and expressions of manifest distrust. The dignity of nations is not a vain concept. Were Spain not determined to decolonize Equatorial Guinea, would it have suggested a United Nations visit to the territory? Were it not its intention to apply the principle of self-determination to the Sahara in order to decolonize it, would Spain have suggested that the United Nations should see at first hand the actual situation of the Sahara? No one could believe that. These are the basic reasons for, and the real meaning of, our negative vote in the Fourth Committee.

76. The vote does not imply the slightest reconsideration of our decisions regarding decolonization. On the contrary, it upholds and confirms the assurances we have given that the principle of self-determination will be applied freely, justly and properly in Spanish Sahara. Because that is our goal, we ask that nothing that might disturb, confuse or give rise to tension should be introduced into the process.

77. There were to be no conditions placed on the United Nations visit, but this meant no one was to be subject to conditions, neither the United Nations nor the inviting Power. The atmosphere was to be dispassionate, unprejudiced, free of preconceived attitudes. This, I believe, explains our position, justifies our vote, and indicates its significance. I repeat: we are in full agreement with the sponsors of the draft resolution regarding the essential criteria; we disagree on the means.

78. As to the Territory of Ifni, what can I tell you that would not be a repetition of familiar statements? Bilateral negotiations could perfectly well solve the problem, taking into account the interests of the population. The method advocated in the draft resolution is, in our view, much more confusing and less effective.

<sup>2/</sup> This statement was made at the 1660th meeting of the Fourth Committee, the records of which are published in summary form.



79. I shall not labour the point because the Assembly is anxious to close the session; in this, Mr. President, all delegations are with you. Before I leave the rostrum, I wish to ask for a separate vote on the words "in consultation with the Governments of Mauritania and Morocco and any other interested party" in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution I on Ifni and Spanish Sahara. We ask for this because this is something without precedent in the United Nations and its application would result in great complications, as all representatives who have studied the matter know.

80. We have just adopted an admirable draft resolution on French Somaliland (A/6583, para. 11). In that draft resolution, concerning a Territory whose neighbours, Somalia and Ethiopia, have expressed a keen interest, nothing is said of the need to consult them. We have just adopted that draft resolution. But in the draft resolution on Spanish Sahara there is this suggestion. We consider it unfair. I mention this technical reason as an addition to the more substantial objection I referred to earlier.

81. Mr. NSANZE (Burundi) (translated from French): My country, although the youngest of the world's republics, is called upon to align itself with those States which history may describe as champions of total independence and the complete severing of relationships based on force.

82. Nature, which has situated Burundi at the crossroads of Africa, history, which has included it in the enslaved human community, and the human race, which has welcomed it into its ranks, make it necessary for my delegation to support all resolutions advocating the liberation of peoples still subjected to colonial domination. Consequently, my statement will deal with the first eight items on our agenda.

83. The above reasons clearly indicate that our newly formed republic cannot shirk its liberating duty. The right of peoples to self-determination derives from man's very essence. In other words, the existence of any people as a group of human beings automatically implies that they should enjoy political independence. The sole fact of a people's existence justifies its natural claim to political rights and its fundamental aspiration to sovereignty. Its level of intellectual attainment is of no importance, neither are its geographical dimensions, nor even the size of its population.

84. Economic rights are equally inherent in human nature. The designs of colonial domination may be summed up as follows: "To colonize is to enter into a relationship with new countries in order to profit from the various resources of those countries and to develop them in the national interest ...",<sup>3/</sup> referring of course to the national interest of the colonizing Power. I am quoting from Mérignhac's Précis de législation et d'économie coloniales.

85. Thus, to impose a colonial system on any people is equivalent to demanding human status while at the same time denying it. This is the explosive contradiction inherent in the colonialist dogma.

86. Any denial of the radical right to independence must be expunged from the annals of human history,

whether the denial is perpetuated by other Powers or by the trio which is dominating southern Africa, the bastion of colonialism in Africa: I am speaking here of Lisbon, which is practising the classical kind of colonization backed by its own rhetoric; of Pretoria, with its ritual formulas of systematized dehumanization embodied in apartheid; and of Salisbury, with its cult of colonial revival, characterized by the Machiavellian collusion between London and Salisbury.

87. It is for these reasons that my country must align itself with those who are fighting for the triumph of law and the freedom of peoples.

88. I wish to thank the President for his patience and kindness and the Members of the Assembly for their attention.

89. Mr. OWONO (Cameroon) (translated from French): The Cameroonian delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions in the report of the Fourth Committee concerning agenda item 23.

90. We have already clearly explained our position with regard to the draft resolutions which we have approved as a whole, and we should like to reaffirm that position in the plenary meeting. I should have liked to conclude there, but I think that the statement just made by the representative of Spain makes it necessary for me on this occasion to clarify a few details we mentioned in the Fourth Committee [1665th meeting] concerning Equatorial Guinea.

91. I too noted with pleasure that Spain will comply with the recommendation of the Special Committee to hold a conference before independence to deal with the ways and means of transferring sovereignty to the indigenous people of that Territory.

92. As the representative of Spain remarked a few moments ago, it is natural that the Spanish Government should have reservations on some of the recommendations. In our opinion, a selective choice of these recommendations would not be in keeping with the goodwill shown by Spain as regards the dispatch of the Special Committee's representatives to the Territory. If Spain accepts some of these recommendations and rejects others—this was the reason why it abstained in the Fourth Committee and will again abstain here in a few moments' time—my delegation would like to request some clarification concerning what we regarded as being the very basis of Spanish policy, a policy on which Spain was congratulated by the Special Committee, the Fourth Committee, the representatives of Cameroon and the African Governments for the understanding it has shown in this matter.

93. In the Fourth Committee, the Cameroonian delegation expressed its fear and apprehension that the attitude of the Spanish Government might reopen the issue of the Fundamental Law of 1963 which was approved by a referendum and which endorsed the unity of the Territory. I am happy to learn that the Spanish Government is prepared to accept the verdict of the people, which will emerge from the conference, but our doubts are justified by the fact that our request for clarification has not been answered, that is, our request for an assurance that the results of the conference will not reopen the question of territorial integrity, which is an accomplished fact. Our fears

<sup>3/</sup> A. Mérignhac, Précis de législation et d'économie coloniales, Paris, Société du Recueil Sirey, edit., 1912, p. 205.

have been justified by the fact that in Madrid itself the President of the local autonomous government pointed out, as had the Special Committee, that there is an active minority which are the spokesmen for the interests of Spanish residents in the Territory. We are not unduly concerned about these spokesmen for the interests of Spanish residents, in view of the support of the Spanish Government which has been embodied in a Fundamental Law recognizing the unity of the country.

94. But if these assurances are not given in the Fourth Committee and if we are told here that we must simply accept all the decisions of the conference, we still have the right in the plenary meeting to ask ourselves whether our misgivings are not founded and whether the position of the Bubis of Fernando Póo and the Spanish colony on the island—what the Special Committee called foreign interests—might not, as was stated by the President of the government council in Madrid, alter the very purpose of the Fundamental Law and the reason for which all the delegations have congratulated the Spanish Government.

95. I am not expecting any further clarification on this point. I consider that, if the constitutional conference simply reflects the wishes of the people, and only the people and their interests, there can be no doubt that this will be consistent with territorial unity. The reservations I am now making and the doubts which I express from this rostrum arise from the fact that I have not heard an affirmative answer to the effect that no eventuality of this kind will result from the conference.

96. My delegation reserves the right to reopen this issue at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly if our present doubts prove to be well-founded.

97. I should like to conclude by joining in congratulating Spain, as we have always done. That country has good relations with my own; the Cameroonian delegation is entitled to tell Spain here that we have hailed all the steps taken to decolonize its neighbouring Territories. However, precisely because of the friendship between our two countries, whenever we think a step does not go far enough, or is not sufficiently objective, we are entitled to say that the idea of territorial integrity is one of the factors that must condition all other steps leading to independence.

98. When the Spanish representative said just now that Equatorial Guinea would itself be able to safeguard its territorial integrity only when it became a Member of the United Nations, my delegation does not feel that this in any way reflected upon the unity of the Territory; on the contrary, we assume that this means that the Territory is independent as a unit and that ipso facto the Spanish Government will cease to safeguard its integrity and sovereignty because it will have become a Member of the United Nations. Those are the conclusions we have drawn from the Spanish representative's statement on this subject. I venture to hope that we have not misunderstood him, and that this was precisely what he meant.

99. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on the various draft resolutions before it. Recorded votes have been requested and will be taken on all the proposals before the Assembly under agenda item 23.

100. I invite the Assembly to turn its attention first to the draft resolution concerning French Somaliland [A/6583, para. 11]. I would draw the attention of the Assembly to the financial implications of the draft resolution [A/6600]. A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. If there is no objection, I shall put that paragraph to the vote first.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Portugal, South Africa.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta.

*Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 72 votes to 2, with 39 abstentions.<sup>4/</sup>*

101. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution [A/6583, para. 11] as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast,<sup>3/</sup><sup>5/</sup> Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore,

<sup>4/</sup> The delegation of the Ivory Coast subsequently stated that it wished to be recorded as having abstained in the vote on paragraph 4 [see below, para. 137].

<sup>5/</sup> The delegation of the Ivory Coast subsequently stated that it wished to be recorded as having abstained in the vote on the draft resolution [see below, para. 137].

Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Portugal.

*Abstaining:* Austria, Belgium, Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, Gabon, Haiti, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Netherlands, Niger, Senegal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta.

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 95 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions.*

102. The PRESIDENT: Several delegations have asked to speak in explanation of vote. I propose, with the approval of the Assembly, to have all explanations of vote after the voting.

103. The Assembly will now turn to the two draft resolutions recommended by the Fourth Committee on Ifni, Spanish Sahara and Equatorial Guinea [A/6623, para. 20]. I would draw the attention of the Assembly to the reports of the Fifth Committee on the financial implications of these draft resolutions [A/6608 and A/6607].

104. Draft resolution I refers to the question of Ifni and Spanish Sahara. A separate recorded vote has been requested on the phrase "in consultation with the Governments of Mauritania and Morocco and any other interested party" in operative paragraph 4. The Assembly will now vote on that phrase.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Portugal, South Africa, Spain.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Somalia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

*The phrase "in consultation with the Governments of Mauritania and Morocco and any other interested party" in operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 75 votes to 3, with 37 abstentions.*

105. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution I as a whole [A/6623, para. 20].

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, 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 Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Portugal, Spain.

*Abstaining:* Belgium, Dominican Republic, France, Honduras, Mexico, South Africa, United States of America, Uruguay.

*Draft resolution I as a whole was adopted by 105 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.*

106. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution II [A/6623, para. 20] which concerns the question of Equatorial Guinea.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* 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 (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of

Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* France, Mexico, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Draft resolution II was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

107. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the two draft resolutions concerning territories not considered separately by the Committee [A/6628, para. 19].

108. I put to the vote first draft resolution I.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Belgium, <sup>6/</sup> Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, Mexico, Mongolia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 101 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.*

109. The PRESIDENT: We now come to the vote on draft resolution II. A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 thereof, and if there is no objection I shall put it to the vote.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho,

Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Laos, Madagascar, Maldives Islands, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela.

*Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution II was adopted by 72 votes to 18, with 27 abstentions.*

110. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution II as a whole.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Maldives Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Draft resolution II as a whole was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.*

111. The PRESIDENT: May I now invite Members of the Assembly to turn their attention to a consensus adopted by the Fourth Committee, concerning the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) [A/6628, para. 13]. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly approves this consensus.

<sup>6/</sup> The delegation of Belgium subsequently informed the Chairman that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.



*The General Assembly approved the consensus adopted by the Fourth Committee.*

*Mr. Pazhwak (Afghanistan) resumed the Chair.*

112. The PRESIDENT: We still have requests from some representatives to speak in explanation of vote after the vote. The list before me consists of ten speakers in explanation of vote. I have already drawn the attention of Members to the limited time we have at our disposal. I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation to the representatives of Somalia, Ethiopia, Morocco and Mauritania, who have agreed to refrain from speaking, although they are on the list for explanations of vote, on the understanding that their statements will appear in full in the verbatim record as they are submitted to the Secretariat in writing. This encourages me to appeal to all other Members whose names are on the list to try to find it possible to agree to this understanding also. In case some of them do not, then I would appeal to them, as has been decided by the Assembly, to limit their explanations of vote to explanation of their votes and to refrain from any observations that may not be a part of the explanation of votes and which might make it necessary for any other representative to exercise his right of reply.

113. Therefore, in the light of the considerations I have mentioned, and if I hear no objection, I shall take it that the other representatives also agree to that arrangement, namely, that they shall refrain from speaking and that when they submit their statements in writing to the Secretariat, those statements will appear in full in the verbatim record.

114. If the representative of Spain, as I understand, does not agree to this, then I would appeal to him, as I have already done, to please confine himself to his remarks in explanation of vote only.

115. If any other speakers do not agree to this arrangement, I will call on them when they request me to do so. However, I do want to express my gratitude to the four delegations who have so agreed, and would also appreciate it if others were to refrain from speaking.

116. I call on the representative of Spain in explanation of vote.

117. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) (translated from Spanish): I very much regret that I must once more take up the time of the Assembly, but there is no help for it if three draft resolutions of direct interest to Spain are put to the vote at the same time at the same meeting. In the circumstances I have to say a few words in explanation of our vote.

118. Spain voted for the resolution on Gibraltar adopted by the Fourth Committee, and has again voted for it in this General Assembly, because it considers that it contains constructive elements. In fact, it calls for greater speed in the decolonization of Gibraltar, in co-operation with Spain, and recalls the consensus adopted by the Committee of Twenty-four on 16 October 1964 and ratified by the General Assembly in resolution 2070 (XX).

119. That consensus invited Spain and the United Kingdom to reach a negotiated solution of the problem of Gibraltar, bearing in mind resolution 1514 (XV).

As representatives will remember, paragraph 6 of that resolution stipulates that disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the United Nations Charter.

120. The resolution we have just voted on also requests that the process of decolonization of Gibraltar should not be delayed or hindered, asserting the General Assembly's competence and thus reaffirming the item's political and colonial character and excluding the possibility of the question of Gibraltar being removed from the political sphere and referred to an international tribunal.

121. The resolution, lastly, calls on Spain and the United Kingdom, in their negotiations, to take into account the interests of the people, a thing which my country requested in the Committee of Twenty-four in 1963, and which was stated in the same words in the consensus of the Committee of Twenty-four in 1964.

122. For Spain, the inhabitants of Gibraltar have interests that Spain fully respects. In the Fourth Committee my delegation said: "(a) Both countries should undertake without delay to negotiate a statute designed to protect the interests of the residents of Gibraltar once the Territory's colonial situation has been resolved. This statute would be registered with the United Nations; (b) If Spain and the United Kingdom are unable to agree on the statute, the Spanish Government is prepared to submit for the consideration and eventual approval of the Secretary-General of the United Nations a draft statute for the inhabitants of Gibraltar in which all the rights enjoyed by any human society are recognized, save the right to dispose of a piece of Spanish territory, such action being contrary to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), paragraph 6 of which calls for respect for the territorial integrity and national unity of colonized countries."<sup>1/</sup>

123. I must admit—as the Spanish delegation explained in the Fourth Committee—that during the six months of Spanish-British negotiations, the United Kingdom has said nothing to Spain regarding the interests of the Gibraltarians that are to be protected once the Rock is decolonized. It has limited itself to discussing with us legal titles dating back to 1713, as well as other titles which, according to Great Britain, were supposedly acquired at the end of the last century over a Spanish territory adjacent to Gibraltar.

124. The first time we heard any concrete and specific mention of the interests of the Gibraltarians or what those interests might be was from a petitioner from Gibraltar last Saturday (1679th meeting) in the Fourth Committee. In explaining the claims of those he represents, the petitioner gave us the impression that he had faith only in the protection offered by Great Britain and that he did not have the slightest confidence in the United Nations guarantee offered by Spain to be the spokesman for and protector of Gibraltarians' interests. In fact, the petitioner was not simply defending his own interests, which would have been logical and acceptable; he was also defending the perpetuation of Britain's sovereign control over the military base of Gibraltar.

<sup>1/</sup> General Assembly, *Official Records*, XXIst session, Fourth Committee, 1671st meeting, para. 27.

125. I hope that the negotiations based on the consensus of the Committee of Twenty-four, on General Assembly resolution 2070 (XX), and on the resolution we have just adopted will enable Spain and the United Kingdom, in accordance with the proposals of Spain, within the period of time stipulated in that last resolution, and with the assistance of the Secretary-General, to find a negotiated solution to end Gibraltar's colonial status as the United Nations has requested since 1964.

126. Before I leave the rostrum, I should like to say that I express my best wishes for an early solution of the problem of the Falkland Islands, with regard to which the people of Argentina, which has historical title and legal and human arguments justifying its claim, awaits a decision that will re-establish the rule of justice in that Territory, whose sovereignty must return to Argentina without undue delay.

127. The PRESIDENT: I have been informed by the representatives of Italy, the United States of America, Ecuador and Mexico that they are in agreement with the understanding that I announced on behalf of the other delegations which kindly agreed to my request.

128. The only speaker now on the list is the representative of the United Kingdom, on whom I now call.

129. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I should have been happy to respond to the appeal which you made to all of us, but since the representative of Spain has spoken on this subject of direct concern to my country I would wish very shortly to explain why my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution this morning.

130. In the remarkable debate on Gibraltar which took place in the Fourth Committee there was one issue and one conclusion of outstanding importance, and it was that conclusion which enabled my delegation to vote for the resolution. It was simply this: that it is essential to take account of the wishes of the people.

131. We warmly welcome the virtual unanimity of the Fourth Committee in support of that basic principle and the unanimity which we have seen today. We are glad that the Spanish delegation has accepted that that principle must be written into the resolution. The insistence that this vital principle must be regarded and respected was right and necessary. It was right and necessary, for Article 73 of the Charter lays it down that the interests of the inhabitants must be paramount. With this principle of the Charter in mind I have only three other things to say, very briefly.

132. First, we are delighted that the amendment was proposed and accepted, because we could never agree that decolonization would mean the incorporation of Gibraltar into Spain against the wishes of the people. With the amendment, the resolution is absolutely clear on that point.

133. Secondly, nothing can prejudice in any way the question of the type of decolonization which would best fit the circumstances of Gibraltar. Nor does the resolution itself prejudice that question.

134. Thirdly, I state our readiness to continue the negotiations, with every wish and intention of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion.

135. For those reasons we were glad to vote for the resolution.

136. The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to the next item, I call on the representative of the Ivory Coast.

137. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): I have asked to speak on my delegation's behalf in order to correct the vote cast by my delegation on the draft resolution concerning French Somaliland. As may be easily seen in the Fourth Committee's report (A/6583, para. 10), my delegation abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 4 and on the text as a whole. Now, when the vote was taken here, the Ivory Coast delegation did not take part in the vote on paragraph 4 and voted in favour of the text as a whole. I should like to repeat what we said in the Fourth Committee [1666th meeting], namely, that, in our opinion, United Nations intervention in this matter is inadvisable and we feel that such a resolution is unnecessary.

138. Consequently, we would like it to be placed on record that the Ivory Coast delegation abstains as regards both operative paragraph 4 and the text as a whole.

139. The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to the next item, I should like to make an announcement relating to agenda item 23.

140. I have been informed by the Secretary-General that he has received a letter from the Permanent Representative of Denmark concerning that country's participation in the work of the Committee of Twenty-four. With the permission of the Members of the Assembly, I shall read the text of that letter:

"Upon instructions from my Government I have the honour to inform you that Denmark has decided to withdraw from the Special Committee on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

"As you will be aware, Mr. Secretary-General, the Danish Government has always taken great interest in the colonial problems and has, within its capabilities, devoted great efforts to the furtherance of the process of decolonization. The decision taken by my Government does in no way affect its position on these matters.

"I should be grateful if you would be so good as to bring the text of this letter to the attention of the President of the General Assembly as soon as possible."

141. As a result of Denmark's withdrawal from the Committee of Twenty-four, I nominate Finland to fill that vacancy.

142. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly agrees to appoint Finland a member of the Special Committee.

*It was so decided.*

143. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania): On behalf of my own delegation and, indeed, as Vice-Chairman of the Committee of Twenty-four for the year 1966, I want to express our appreciation to the delegation of Denmark for its effective participation in the deliberations of the Committee on decolonization. Indeed, it will not be an exaggeration if I say that Denmark took a keen interest in the problems of decolonization. Thus, it participated in our meetings

in Africa through the participation of the Permanent Representative of Denmark. It participated also in the work of the sub-committee which visited Equatorial Guinea—a visit whose outcome was approved a few minutes ago by this Assembly.

144. We therefore hope that the representative of Denmark will convey our remarks to his Government. We hope also that Denmark will continue to support decolonization with the same vigour it showed in participation in the work of the Committee of Twenty-four.

145. May I also take this opportunity to welcome Finland to the membership of the Committee of Twenty-four. Indeed we, as the Tanzanian delegation, look forward to the participation of Finland in the Committee's work.

146. Mr. President, as I am unlikely to take the floor again during the present Assembly, I want also to express to you our appreciation for the excellent manner in which you have conducted this session. Certainly, you deserve our appreciation and, indeed, our respect.

147. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up agenda items 64 and 71. The Fourth Committee recommends two draft resolutions for adoption by the Assembly [A/6626, para. 9].

148. Since draft resolution I was adopted unanimously in the Fourth Committee, may I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it unanimously?

*Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.*

149. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II was also adopted unanimously by the Fourth Committee. May I consider that the General Assembly also adopts it unanimously?

*Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.*

150. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to agenda items 66 and 68. There are three draft resolutions recommended by the Fourth Committee [A/6625, para. 13]. We shall now proceed to vote on them.

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 112 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

*Draft resolution II was adopted by 112 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

*Draft resolution III was adopted by 112 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

151. The PRESIDENT: We come now to agenda item 70. I put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee [A/6622, para. 9].

152. A roll-call vote had been requested by the delegation of Saudi Arabia, but he has agreed to a recorded vote of the kind we have taken on other items, and I thank him.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho,

Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

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

*Abstaining:* Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iran, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Peru, Sierra Leone, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 70 votes to 18, with 28 abstentions.*

153. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Iran for explanation of vote.

154. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran): Mr. President, heeding your appeal, I shall not repeat the position of my Government on the question of Oman, which is already stated in the records of this Assembly. I should like, however, merely to say that, if a separate vote had been taken on operative paragraph 5, my delegation would have voted in favour.

155. The PRESIDENT: That concludes our consideration of agenda item 70. The next item before the Assembly is item 65, on the question of South West Africa. In this connexion the Fourth Committee submitted a further report relating to the hearing of petitioners (A/6458/Add.1). Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Assembly takes note of that report of the Fourth Committee.

*The Assembly took note of the report of the Fourth Committee.*

156. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly is also seized of a draft resolution submitted by a number of Member States [A/L.511 and Add.1].

157. Mr. ARKHURST (Ghana): Once again during its current session the General Assembly has before it the question of South West Africa. The second consideration of this item has been necessitated by recent political developments in that Territory. As the report of the Fourth Committee on the subject indicates, the matter has been given some consideration in that Committee. The delegation of Ghana, however, feels that it has a duty, not only to the indigenous population of South West Africa but also to this Organization, to make a few comments during the debate on the item of South West Africa in the General Assembly.

158. It will be recalled that the question of South West Africa was taken up by the General Assembly at several plenary meetings at the beginning of this session in order to enable the United Nations to pronounce itself unequivocally on the question of the Mandate under which South West Africa was administered

by the Government of South Africa. After long debates and negotiations on the matter, the General Assembly, at its 1454th plenary meeting on 27 October 1966, decided that the Mandate conferred on His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa was terminated and that South Africa had no other right to administer the Territory, and that henceforth South West Africa came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The extent to which that decision represented the conscience of mankind and the common will of this world Organization can be inferred from the overwhelming vote by which that decision of the General Assembly was taken.

159. Although it was not possible to create an Administering Authority for the Territory of South West Africa simultaneously with the decision to terminate South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa, it is the view of my delegation that the decision arrived at, as reflected in resolution 2145 (XXI), constitutes the reality of the political situation in the United Nations regarding that Territory. We cannot deny that a legal vacuum has been created but we are firm in our belief that the United Nations will find an immediate and practical solution for this temporary hiatus regarding the administration of the Territory. Be that as it may, my delegation feels that any political consideration of the Territory of South West Africa should be undertaken at the present time within the context of the letter of resolution 2145 (XXI). In operative paragraph 4 of this resolution we read:

"henceforth South West Africa comes under the direct responsibility of the United Nations",

and operative paragraph 5 states:

"The General Assembly

"Resolves that in these circumstances the United Nations must discharge those responsibilities with respect to South West Africa."

160. Those words indicate clearly that the United Nations has assumed certain responsibilities and is bound to discharge those responsibilities. Any problem arising out of the Territory must, therefore, be given due consideration by the United Nations on the basis of the responsibilities it has assumed under its resolution 2145 (XXI).

161. The General Assembly will observe that certain information has been provided on this Territory which gives cause for grave concern as it indicates a contemptuous flouting of the decision of this Assembly by the racist Government of South Africa. According to this information, the Government of South Africa, which no longer has any right in the Territory, announced on 30 November 1966 that regulations would be devised for the transfer of the residents of the old native location at Windhoek to a new location at Katutura. It will be recalled that the indigenous inhabitants who are to be affected by these regulations have always opposed such a mass transfer of population, even as far back as 1959 when it was first attempted. The insistence of South Africa's administration on its policy of removing the indigenous inhabitants led to disturbances in December 1959 in which eleven Africans were killed and many others injured. Since then the South West Africans have consistently opposed removal of their

population, because of their opposition to the extension of apartheid to their country. They are still opposed to that policy.

162. We are further informed that, on 1 December 1966, three SWAPO leaders were arrested under the Suppression of Communism Act. They are Mr. Nathaniel Maxuiriri, Mr. John Ja Otto and Mr. Jason Matumbulua. Another SWAPO leader, Mr. Toivo Ja Toivo, was arrested earlier in September this year by the South African police and is reportedly being held under the 180-day detention provision of the same Act.

163. Since our time for the consideration of this question is short, I will not dwell at length on the other illegal acts which have been perpetrated by the South African Government in South West Africa since the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI). Suffice it to say that the extension of the policy of apartheid to South West Africa and the arbitrary arrest and detention of law-abiding indigenous people by the Government of South Africa in South West Africa are clear violations of the letter and spirit not only of the Charter of the United Nations but also of resolution 2145 (XXI).

164. The delegation of Ghana would like to go on record once again to confirm the incontestable fact that the Pretoria régime no longer enjoys the Mandate by which it has administered South West Africa. Its entitlement and rights under that Mandate were terminated by the United Nations on 27 October 1966, and its present activities in the Territory are, therefore, manifestly unlawful. That is even more true when it is considered that operative paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) calls upon the Government of South Africa to refrain and desist from any acts, constitutional, administrative, political or otherwise, which will in any manner whatsoever alter or tend to alter the present international status of South West Africa. In our view the Pretoria régime has clearly violated that clause of the resolution, and the United Nations must be quick to reach a decision on how best such illegal acts may be avoided in the future.

165. In our opinion, South Africa must again be reminded of its duty to co-operate with the United Nations and to desist from taking such political or other action in the Territory of South West Africa as can lead only to clashes with the indigenous inhabitants, as well as make inevitable a head-on collision with the United Nations.

166. As far as the decision to remove the inhabitants of the Windhoek location to Katutura and the arbitrary arrests and detention of political leaders are concerned, we in Ghana have no hesitation at all in condemning these illegal acts of the Government of South Africa as criminal and inhumane.

167. Representatives will observe that a draft resolution [A/L.511 and Add.1] on this question, co-sponsored by a number of Afro-Asian countries, has been submitted. I now take this opportunity to announce certain revisions to this draft.

168. In the last paragraph of the preamble and in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part of the draft



resolution, the words "illegal acts" have now been substituted for the words "acts of aggression".

169. In view of the short time that the General Assembly has at its disposal, and the fact that many delegations have explained to the co-sponsors that they have not had enough time to study the matter and to seek instructions from their various Governments, I have been authorized by the co-sponsors to state that we shall not press our draft resolution to a vote at this time, on the understanding that this draft resolution and all the records of discussions on the matter will be referred to the Committee of Twenty-four with a view to their making recommendations to the special session of the General Assembly in April 1967. We trust that this arrangement will suit the convenience of the Assembly.

170. Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): One of the most important decisions taken by the General Assembly at its current session was undoubtedly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966. Under the terms of that resolution the General Assembly, conscious of its obligations to the people suffering under colonial domination anywhere and, in particular, in South West Africa, and acting within the terms of the Charter and in conformity with its almost universally recognized competence, terminated the Mandate conferred upon His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa. Under the same historic resolution, the General Assembly also declared that South Africa had no other right to administer the Territory and that South West Africa henceforth came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. What is more important, the General Assembly resolved—and I should like to emphasize the word "resolved"—to discharge those responsibilities with respect to South West Africa.

171. Paragraph 7 of resolution 2145 (XXI) called upon the Government of South Africa:

"... forthwith to refrain and desist from any action, constitutional, administrative, political or otherwise, which will in any manner whatsoever alter or tend to alter the present international status of South West Africa."

172. The response of the racists of South Africa to this call of the world community has been predictably negative and defiant. South Africa's response was to extend to the Territory all its hideous policies of apartheid and racial discrimination in various fields of social intercourse. The last of the series of such acts was the appointment of the notorious Odendaal Commission.

173. The General Assembly, as was to be expected reacted very strongly to the recommendations of the Odendaal Commission and declared, in its resolution 2074 (XX), that:

"... any attempt to partition the Territory or to take any unilateral action, directly or indirectly, preparatory thereto constitutes a violation of the Mandate and of resolution 1514 (XV)."

174. The provisional summary record of the 1679th meeting of the Fourth Committee, however, contains some very disturbing information. We find therein that the South African Government has formulated

plans to remove, by force if necessary, the entire African community from its location at Windhoek to a new location in Katutura. It will be recalled that a similar move by the South African Government in 1959 led to violent opposition by the Africans, eleven of whom died and many of whom were injured during the disturbances that followed. Despite all efforts by local and South African officials by persuasion, offers of compensation and various forms of pressure, to secure their removal to Katutura, thousands of Africans and some Coloureds remained in the old location. The present plans of the South African Government are conclusive evidence of its determination to go ahead with the implementation of the Odendaal Commission report, thus once again demonstrating its utter contempt for the world Organization.

175. My delegation, along with many others, has submitted a draft resolution to this Assembly [A/L.511 and Add.1]. The draft resolution seeks to give voice to the grave concern which the sponsors feel about the reports of the latest actions of the South African Government. These actions, coming as they do after the momentous resolution adopted less than two months ago, must be regarded as being illegal and invalid, since that Government has been deprived of any locus standi whatever in the Territory of South West Africa. The General Assembly, in its resolution 2145 (XXI), has assumed a very grave responsibility in full awareness of all the implications involved.

176. The time has now come—as it was bound to come sooner or later—to assert the authority of the United Nations. As a first step towards discharging these responsibilities, the least the General Assembly can do is to denounce these illegal acts committed by South Africa in South West Africa.

177. That is what the sponsors of the present draft resolution call upon the Assembly to do. However, as was explained by the representative of Ghana, we have been approached by many of our friends with a request not to press the draft resolution to a vote. We have been assured that they agree in principle with the ideas contained in it, but would require more time to consult their Governments to obtain the necessary instructions in order to be able to support it. The sponsors are also aware that the General Assembly is to meet in a special session to consider the question not later than April 1967. Furthermore, the Committee of Twenty-four is fully competent to deal with this matter. In the circumstances, the sponsors have decided not to press the draft resolution to a vote.

178. Mr. Mathys BOTHA (South Africa): In connexion with draft resolution A/L.511 on the question of South West Africa presently before the Assembly, I wish to express my delegation's surprise that the Fourth Committee at its 1679th meeting decided to reopen the question of South West Africa, particularly as it was not on the Fourth Committee's agenda for the current session.

179. The General Assembly decided on 23 September 1966 that item 65 should be discussed in plenary meetings, on the understanding that the petitioners requesting to speak on this item would be heard by the Fourth Committee, which would submit a report on such hearings to the plenary before the latter concluded its consideration of the item. That was duly

done and the report of the Fourth Committee on petitioners [A/6458] was prepared and transmitted to the plenary, where the General Assembly took note of it on 26 October 1966. This, as announced by the Chairman of the Fourth Committee at its 1605th meeting, disposed of the item.

180. Yet as a result of allegations made on 17 December 1966 in the Fourth Committee on a matter which was not on the agenda of that Committee, by a petitioner who is not a South West African but a professional agitator, recently deported by the Government of one of the co-sponsors of the present draft resolution, we now have before us this draft resolution which inter alia denounces the South African Government for what is alleged to be acts of aggression—now amended to read "illegal acts"—committed in South West Africa.

181. The South African delegation has on many occasions in the United Nations, and also at the International Court of Justice in The Hague, demonstrated that the statements of petitioners relating to conditions in South West Africa are wholly unreliable. In fact, I wish to stress that, over the years, these allegations have been of such an unreliable nature that the Counsel for the Applicant States in the South West Africa case declined to call any of these petitioners as witnesses and admitted in open court that the "Applicants have not relied upon the accuracy of statements in such petitions".

182. At the 1679th meeting of the Fourth Committee, the petitioner heard by the Committee alleged that the reported transfer of residents of the old township in Windhoek to the new one at Katutura would cause an explosive situation, thus necessitating the presence of the United Nations in the Territory. It may be mentioned here that the South West Africa administration has made available in Katutura living quarters complete with all modern facilities for the inhabitants of the old township, as the unhygienic conditions and the resultant social evils in the old township are a serious hazard to the health not only of the population of the old location, but of the whole community in Windhoek.

183. As opposed to the slum conditions in the present area, the township of Katutura has been well planned, with modern brick houses on spacious lots. Provision is made for schools, churches, homes for the elderly, institutions for the care of the crippled, business houses, a post office, a bank, a clinic, a sports stadium, tennis courts, a children's playground, ambulance and bus services and numerous other facilities. No expense is being spared in providing these facilities in the interests of the inhabitants.

184. For the sponsors of the present draft resolution to consider a reported proposed removal of residents from unhygienic living quarters in this slum area to modern hygienic ones as an act of aggression—or, now, an illegal act—on the part of my Government is therefore not only a travesty of the truth, but completely uncalled for and irresponsible.

185. I have noted the amendment presented by the representative of Ghana to substitute the words "illegal act" for "act of aggression". In this connexion, the representatives will all be aware of the serious connotation attached to the words "act of aggression"

and of the many unsuccessful attempts made within the United Nations over the years to reach an adequate definition of the term "act of aggression". Even though this term has now been deleted from the draft resolution, my delegation nevertheless would like to warn against last-minute manoeuvres to rush through the General Assembly, without proper consideration, a resolution alleging illegal acts by my Government without adducing any facts and without allowing proper and detailed discussion.

186. With regard to the second operative paragraph, my delegation is not aware of any development in South West Africa which requires the attention of the Security Council. For these reasons, my delegation would have voted against this draft resolution had it been put to a vote.

187. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) (translated from French): In response to the President's appeal, I shall be extremely brief. First of all, I should like to announce that Senegal has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution which we are discussing at present. Next, I should like to say that the reasons which prompted our delegation to submit this draft resolution so hastily have already been mentioned by the speakers who have preceded me, with the exception of the advocate of apartheid, who has distorted the truth. I do not propose, therefore, to repeat those reasons. I wish merely to emphasize that the illegal and criminal acts committed by the apartheid Government in South West Africa are part and parcel of the inexorable execution of the Odendaal plan, with which we are all familiar. The shift of populations has begun specifically in implementation of this plan. This is a phenomenon which is well known in South Africa and nothing that has been said by the apartheid representative in our midst can change that fact.

188. South Africa's rebellion against the United Nations is more than obvious, and has only been confirmed since the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI) on 27 October 1966 during the present session of the General Assembly. The latest acts brought to the Assembly's attention are merely a continuation of the ferocious policy of repression, the purpose of which is to present the United Nations with a fait accompli before the Special Committee, which has been set up, can make its recommendations to the General Assembly scheduled to meet in special session next April.

189. I have asked to speak mainly to confirm that my delegation would also prefer no vote to be taken on this draft resolution, for the reasons which have already been put forward and which I shall not repeat. But I should also like to request that this document and the records of the debate should be transmitted to the Special Committee of Fourteen which the President himself has appointed, so that it may set to work immediately. Its function is not to rest on laurels which do not yet exist, but to make recommendations as rapidly as possible so that, when we meet here again in April, we shall have before us specific and, we hope, constructive recommendations.

190. The PRESIDENT: The Secretariat has taken note of the revisions proposed to draft resolution A/L.511 and Add.1. It is my understanding that the sponsors of this draft resolution do not wish to press the draft resolution, as revised, to a vote. If the

General Assembly has no objection, the relevant records of the Fourth Committee and of the General Assembly in plenary session will be transmitted to the Committee of Twenty-four for further consideration.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 26

Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (concluded)

191. The PRESIDENT: I should like at this stage to refer once again to agenda item 26 concerning the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In paragraph 2 of resolution 2153 B (XXI) of 17 November 1966, the General Assembly requested:

"... immediately to set up a preparatory committee, widely representative of the non-nuclear-weapon States, to make appropriate arrangements for convening the conference and to consider the question of association of nuclear States with the work of the conference and report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session."

192. I mentioned at the plenary meeting yesterday [1499th meeting] that I had engaged in consultations on the membership of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States and that I would inform the members of the Assembly as soon as possible.

193. After extensive consultations with all sections of the membership, I announce the composition of this Committee. The Preparatory Committee for the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States will be composed of: Chile, Dahomey, Kenya, Kuwait, Malaysia, Malta, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Spain, United Republic of Tanzania.

*The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.*

\*

\* \*

*The delegations of Ecuador, Ethiopia, Italy, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Somalia and United States of America, which wished to place on record their statements in explanation of vote, did not have an opportunity to do so. In consultation with the President of the General Assembly, it was agreed that the statements should be incorporated in the verbatim record (see supra paras. 112 and 127), and they appear below.*

Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (translated from Spanish): My delegation was unable to explain its vote in the Fourth Committee and I should now like to state for the record how we understand some of the terms used in the draft resolution on Gibraltar (A/6628, para. 20). The fundamental principles I wish to restate were put forward before this problem was included in the Assembly's agenda. In 1953 I argued on behalf of my delegation that Article 73 of the Charter should be interpreted as meaning that Non-Self-Governing Territories are incomplete States possessing only two of the three elements of statehood—people and

territory—and that the administering Powers are bound to lead them to self-government whereby they achieve definitive statehood.

My delegation believes that the Charter establishes a people-territory relationship and that the administering Powers exercise no right over the Territory beyond that of simple administration. We have accordingly maintained from the beginning of our consideration of the colonial problem that the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories are the masters of their Territory, not the administering Powers. We have used this argument to rebut the colonialists' contention that colonial matters are within the domestic jurisdiction of the administering Powers.

The concept of "people" has not been defined but the Preamble of the Charter speaks of "we the peoples of the United Nations". Article 1 speaks of the "self-determination of peoples" and Article 73 (a) refers to respect for the culture of the peoples of the Territories. This indicates that the word people is used in the sociological sense of cultural unit and not in the demographic sense of human agglomeration.

With regard to the people of Gibraltar I should like to mention the following facts:

(1) Gibraltar was always Spanish Territory: since 1300 it has had its own municipal administration and in 1704 it had 5,000 Spanish inhabitants.

(2) On 4 August 1704, as a consequence of a civil war to determine the successor of Charles II, Gibraltar was taken by an Anglo-Dutch fleet. The 1958 edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica says: "The capture was made, as the war was being fought, in the interest of Charles, Archduke of Austria, but Sir George Rooke, the British Admiral, on his own responsibility, caused the British flag to be hoisted and took possession in the name of Queen Anne, whose government ratified the occupation."<sup>8/</sup> It follows that this was not a war which under the international law of those times could have created rights, according to certain opinions which we respect but do not share. It was an arbitrary personal act undertaken by Admiral Rooke during the course of a civil war.

(3) Article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht only ceded the city, the port, and the fortifications but not that part of the Territory upon which England later installed the people whose descendants now call for political self-determination.

(4) The report of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs published in April 1965 in London by Her Majesty's Stationery Office says:

"When the British captured Gibraltar in 1704 almost the entire Spanish population left the town and settled in the neighbouring countryside. The present population began to establish themselves in Gibraltar from 1727 onwards and consisted of time expired British, Genoese and other foreign elements. There was further an influx of Genoese refugees from the Napoleonic wars. By this time the population was predominantly of Genoese origin, although it contained British, Maltese, Moroccans and Portuguese as well!"<sup>2/</sup>

<sup>8/</sup> Quoted in English by the speaker.

<sup>2/</sup> Gibraltar—Recent differences with Spain, 1965. London, H.M. Stationery Office, Cmd. 2632 (quoted in English by the speaker).

I shall not try to assail the opinions of others which I respect but I wish to state that for these reasons my delegation cannot accept the validity of a Treaty which has an illegal basis and which in the opinion of my delegation is null and void ab initio; and that we consider that this matter should be settled by the peaceful means mentioned in the Charter and that in any case the population of Gibraltar should be granted all the rights held by national minorities living on the Territory of another State.

Mr. Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): I thank you for the opportunity to explain the position of my Government with regard to the recommendation of the Fourth Committee on this item concerning so-called French Somaliland. [A/6583, para. 11.]

In deference to your wish, Mr. President, that we make our explanations of vote as brief as possible, I shall make mine very brief indeed, and will not go into the well-known details regarding my country's special and genuine interest in this question of the future of a territory so closely interrelated to our own. My delegation has had occasion to present its views on many occasions, both here and in all other organs where this item has been under consideration.

Let me say first of all that my delegation is happy to note that the report of the Fourth Committee is in broad agreement with the resolution which the Third Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity passed not so long ago. We are particularly happy that due recognition has been given to the role and effort of the Organization of African Unity in the reference made to that organization's resolution in paragraph 4 of the preamble of the present draft resolution.

My explanation of vote will deal with two specific points of the Fourth Committee.

The first has to do with the title "French Somaliland (Djibouti)". This is a name for the territory which has been accepted by the Fourth Committee as the best of possible compromises. The Organization of African Unity, in its resolution referred to above, agreed on calling the territory "so-called French Somaliland (Djibouti)", and we would have preferred that name as it takes all aspects into account.

We have always made reservations in the past on the name "French Somaliland", as used by the Committee of Twenty-four, because not only is it a name invented by colonialism but also, like all colonial characterization, it is one which is full of questionable motives, carrying within it a number of implications and pre-suppositions to which my Government cannot subscribe. For this reason, we make our reservation now, as we have done before, on the name given to this item.

As regards operative paragraph 4, dealing with a United Nations presence, my delegation wishes to state in the most categorical terms that we support the principle of a United Nations presence as we have indeed always supported it in the past. We do not contest the desirability and usefulness of a United Nations presence in colonial territories emerging to independence and we acknowledge the vital role

that the United Nations has played and continues to play in the process of decolonization.

When considering the question of a United Nations presence in relation to the referendum that is going to be held soon in the so-called Territory of French Somaliland, we find that there is an important consideration of time and timeliness which needs to be weighed most carefully lest, by insisting on a United Nations presence in this particular case and at this particular stage, we inadvertently hamper or retard the very process of decolonization that we all want to see expedited.

I may perhaps recall in this connexion that the question of a United Nations presence was raised at the recent African Summit Conference and that, after consideration, the Heads of State and Government did not insist on a United Nations presence and this request did not appear in the final resolution adopted by the Summit Conference.

Moreover, this is a referendum which has been called on the initiative of the administering Power, with a fixed date of before July 1967 and with part of the preparation well under way. My delegation feels, therefore, that under these circumstances, when things are moving in the right direction, we should avoid posing any precondition of United Nations presence with respect to this welcome initiative which should be allowed to take its course unretarded, unhampered and undisturbed. Indeed, had the United Nations posed its presence as a precondition in the case of other colonial territories we would not have today so many independent States in both the African and the Asian groups.

In the view of my delegation, operative paragraph 4, as it now stands, of the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee [A/6583, para. 11] could lend itself to misunderstanding and misinterpretation and this is the reason why my delegation has chosen to abstain from voting on it.

Mr. VINCI (Italy): We wish to explain very briefly our vote on resolution I on Ifni and Spanish Sahara contained in the report of the Fourth Committee [A/6623, para. 20].

When the Committee of Twenty-four adopted its resolution on Ifni and Spanish Sahara on 13 November 1966 the Italian delegation stated that the draft gave rise to certain misgivings in that it did not place enough emphasis on the necessity of ascertaining the views and safeguarding the interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the Territories.

The present resolution, with its more repeated references to other parties, confirms our misgivings and we wish to reserve our position on this point.

The Italian delegation welcomes the statement made by the representative of Spain on 7 December in the Fourth Committee with regard to the sending of a visiting mission to Spanish Sahara with the purpose to make a first hand, objective survey of the situation in the Territory.

We would have hoped that the terms of reference of the mission might have been more concise and without prejudice to the outcome of the visit to the Territory.



The Committee of Twenty-four should, in our view, examine the report of the mission when it returns from the Territory and submit recommendations on the further steps to be taken in order to secure the free exercise by the inhabitants of their right to self-determination.

We are confident, however, that nothing in the present resolution will prevent the Spanish Government from confirming the acceptance of a United Nations visiting mission and of extending to it, as on other occasions, its full co-operation.

We wish, in conclusion, to express once more the hope that the decolonization of Ifni and the Spanish Sahara will not be a factor of dissension but rather a factor of conciliation and an element of peace and stability in the area, and that it will further the co-operation and understanding among all parties concerned.

Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) (translated from French): My delegation would like to join with all those delegations which have warmly congratulated the Afro-Asian group on its constant efforts to find the best solutions to the numerous and frequently very complex problems raised by decolonization.

My delegation would like in particular to thank the Chairman of the Afro-Asian group, Mr. Khanachatt, and all those who have devoted so much effort and so much time to the question of so-called Spanish Sahara. As everyone knows, this question is of the greatest importance to my country.

My delegation by no means wishes to detract from the positive aspects of the resolution [A/6623, para. 20, draft resolution I] which the General Assembly has just adopted and for which my delegation voted. Although this resolution is the result of a painstaking compromise between conflicting views, it contains many constructive elements.

My delegation would like to stress—and I request that this be included in the record of this meeting—that the resolution we have just adopted does not bring out with sufficient clarity one of the essential aspects of the question of so-called Spanish Sahara. Indeed, while neighbouring countries have an interest in the matter by virtue of their geographical position, we for our part can claim that, so far as the sovereignty of so-called Spanish Sahara is concerned, Mauritania is the only country involved. The resolution should have made that fact more plain.

In this connexion we should like to recall and confirm the statements made by Mauritanian spokesmen and the Mauritanian delegation on this subject in the Committee of Twenty-four, in the Fourth Committee and in the General Assembly. My delegation quite rightly expected to see that mentioned in this resolution. The fact that Morocco has been mentioned in this resolution in connexion with the Sahara by no means implies that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania recognizes that it has any rights whatsoever over this region. We regard Morocco simply as a country bordering on so-called Spanish Sahara which has an interest in the fate of this region by virtue of that fact alone.

Furthermore, Mr. President, so-called Spanish Sahara and Ifni are two entirely different regions.

These geographically separate areas create problems of a fundamentally different nature. They should, therefore, for the sake of clarity in the debate on each one, be dealt with in two separate resolutions. That is why my delegation would like to express some reservations concerning the inclusion of Sahara and Ifni in the same resolution. My delegation notes that Ifni and so-called Spanish Sahara are clearly separated in the body of the resolution we have just adopted. But we consider that it would have been more logical, simpler, and hence clearer to deal with Ifni and so-called Spanish Sahara in two separate resolutions.

Furthermore, the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania is in favour of the honest and democratic application of the principle of self-determination to the indigenous population of so-called Spanish Sahara.

While earnestly desiring that all the indigenous inhabitants of so-called Spanish Sahara will be able to participate in the proposed consultation, my delegation would like to draw attention today to the danger which might arise from a misinterpretation of operative paragraph 4 (a) of the resolution we have just adopted.

My delegation considers that operative paragraph 4 (a) of this resolution refers exclusively to the few indigenous inhabitants of so-called Spanish Sahara who have no commitment towards a foreign country. I am referring to the indigenous inhabitants of so-called Spanish Sahara who, for one reason or another, are temporarily living away from home. Operative paragraph 4 (a) of the resolution can and must, rationally speaking, apply to them and to them alone.

Mr. PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Both in the Fourth Committee and in the Assembly, the Mexican delegation abstained from voting on the resolutions referring to the territories under Spanish administration (A/6623, para. 20) and Gibraltar (A/6628, para. 20).

We wish to state for the record that our abstention, which was due solely to special reasons of a bilateral diplomatic nature, does not imply any disagreement with the contents of those resolutions regarding matters within the competence of the Fourth Committee.

Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) (translated from French): After the vote which has just taken place on the question of Spanish Sahara and Ifni, I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to clarify our position on the subject of the resolution [A/6623, paragraph 20, draft resolution I] which has just been unanimously adopted by the General Assembly, with the exception of Portugal and Spain.

First of all, I should like to thank the Afro-Asian countries and Yugoslavia which were the sponsors of this resolution, and all those who supported them. The commendable efforts expended, sometimes in the face of difficulties, on preparing this resolution emphasize beyond all doubt the great importance which countries cherishing freedom, justice and peace attach to the sacred right of peoples to free themselves from colonial domination and to exercise fully their natural sovereignty over their own territory.

My delegation believes that these efforts—the expression of an awareness which has become firmly rooted in international opinion—will not be in vain,

and that the administering Power, despite the negative vote of its delegation, will in the end co-operate sincerely with the United Nations and agree to put into practice the pertinent General Assembly resolutions, thus, I hope, proving its indisputable goodwill in the matter of decolonization. This is a matter of law and justice, but it is also a matter of political wisdom. I venture to hope that the continuing colonial situation, which has unfortunately remained unchanged for ten years, that is, since Morocco gained its independence, will finally change so that the Moroccan territories may be liberated from colonialism. We still desire a settlement between the two countries concerned, a settlement conducive to ending the Moroccan-Spanish territorial dispute, the existence of which cannot be denied. However, if such a settlement cannot be reached, my delegation considers that the administering Power should, at the very least, agree to the decolonization of Sahara and Ifni, in accordance with its obligations under the Charter and in execution of resolution 1514 (XV) as well as the not less relevant resolutions specifically relating to this matter which have already been adopted by the United Nations. Moreover, no colonial Power has the right to shirk its duty to emancipate the Territories under its administration or to rest content with simply making promises which have no practical application.

In the case with which we are concerned, the Spanish delegation, in voting against this resolution, gave us serious grounds for concern about Spain's true intentions with regard to decolonization in those Territories whose populations have made known their grievances and their anxieties about their country's future through qualified petitioners. We are particularly worried because, as everyone knows, the Government of His Majesty the King of Morocco has assumed the responsibility of agreeing that so-called Spanish Sahara, which is still, whatever one may say, a Territory seized from Morocco, may free itself from colonialism by application of the principle of self-determination.

By agreeing to adopt this new attitude concerning the means by which our Territories are to be liberated, we were anxious to side with a large number of countries which consider that the process of decolonization could have no more appropriate framework than that laid down by the General Assembly of the United Nations itself in adopting resolution 1514 (XV).

In a letter to the Secretary-General, dated 10 September 1966, did not the administering Power welcome this new attitude and announce that it had decided to implement resolution 2072 (XX) which was adopted by the General Assembly on 16 December 1965?

We cannot, therefore, but be perplexed by the negative vote of the Spanish delegation on the resolution just adopted. It is, after all, a particularly moderate text in which remarkable concessions have been made to the administering Power. No regret or disapproval has been expressed with regard to its colonial policy which, nevertheless, leaves a great deal to be desired. In submitting the draft resolution, the sponsors were, above all, motivated by the desire to see this serious colonial problem settled under the best possible conditions and to ensure that, through the presence of United Nations, no complications would be allowed to

impede the free exercise of the indigenous population's right to freedom and self-determination.

Nevertheless, my delegation hopes that, when the Spanish Government has considered the measures decided upon, it will realize how much it is to Spain's advantage to co-operate fully with the United Nations in implementing that resolution. We believe, or at least hope, that the full implementation of the resolution will help to solve a serious problem which has been hanging in the air for some years, and will thus put an end to a colonial situation through the effective presence of the United Nations in the Territory of so-called Spanish Sahara, and also through the co-operation of the two parties most directly concerned, that is to say, Morocco and the administering Power.

I should like to say here and now that, although my delegation voted in favour of the text, it entered some reservations regarding the reference made in the operative paragraph of the resolution to a party which we feel is not and should not be directly concerned.

In the light of what was said in the Fourth Committee when the vote was taken on the question of Spanish Sahara and Ifni, I should also like to make it clear that my delegation considers the end of colonialism to be a major necessity for all peace-loving and freedom-loving nations, and that the continuation of any form of foreign domination in any part of the world represents a danger for international peace and security, and Spanish colonialism in the Spanish Sahara and Ifni is no exception to this.

I should like to quote the fourth and seventh preambular paragraphs of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution 1514 (XV)), which solemnly proclaims this truth in the following terms:

"Aware of the increasing conflicts resulting from the denial of or impediments in the way of the freedom of such peoples, which constitute a serious threat to world peace,

"Convinced that the continued existence of colonialism prevents the development of international economic co-operation, impedes the social, cultural and economic development of dependent peoples and militates against the United Nations ideal of universal peace".

We therefore firmly believe that the liberation of these Moroccan regions will be particularly beneficial for the peace and security of the region as a whole. It will also help very much to further progress, understanding and co-operation between States; three principles on which my country's policy is based.

Consequently, my delegation cannot understand how any country, especially one which declares itself to be anti-colonialist and even demonstrates this attitude from time to time in a spectacular fashion, can imagine that the requirements of its own security are incompatible with the sacred principle of the right of a colonized territory to free itself and determine its own future.

Thus we can only express our amazement at these paradoxes. For our part, we believe that what is now known as the security of a country, rather than adapt-

ing itself to an outmoded colonial presence, should be based on ideas of law and justice and on the primacy of the moral and material interests of a population which is defending a just cause in struggling to free itself from colonial domination.

It is my delegation's opinion that the new interest now being shown in the question of Spanish Sahara and Ifni should have expressed itself as an attitude of support and understanding of an inalienable and sacred right, instead of impatience at the idea of the General Assembly's resolutions being implemented. In this matter we therefore believe that political wisdom requires us to avoid creating false problems and that we should, above all, be guided by the wishes of the people concerned.

Finally, I should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that some representatives, in their explanations of vote in the Fourth Committee, appeared to lay a great deal of stress on the transhumance of the nomads of the Spanish Sahara, perhaps for the purpose of showing their new interest in this matter. I believe that we should not exaggerate this state of affairs, not use it as an argument. In this connexion we must make it clear that, contrary to the impression which the administering Power was trying to create, there are other people besides nomads. There is also a settled urban population. The town of Aioum, with about 20,000 inhabitants, and Villa Cisneros, with about 10,000, are clear proof of the existence of a working population which should not be overlooked.

The petitioners who, on behalf of that population, contributed to the work of the Fourth Committee during its consideration of this item gave clear evidence of their political maturity and their competence.

It is true that part of the population is still nomadic, but the areas over which they move are fairly limited; the route the nomads traditionally follow with their livestock takes them either northwards as far as the River Draa or southwards. We can therefore say advisedly that the nomadic inhabitants of the Spanish Sahara do not move in the neighbouring region of Tindouf, since their pastoral life, in normal times, depends on the existence of pastures and the moderate climate of the Atlantic zone. They obviously find none of these things in the eastern regions, which are nothing but desert and lie outside their traditional nomadic area.

Before I conclude, I wish to make it clear that, even though my delegation voted in favour of this resolution and expressed its appreciation to all those who contributed to its preparation, this does not mean that my country's views coincide entirely with some of the paragraphs. Indeed, we feel that it would have been better to avoid introducing factors which, in our opinion, are irrelevant to the question. The only parties involved are the people themselves and the two States which, each in its own way, are bound by obligations based either on the political and historical realities of this Territory, or on a colonial situation which the United Nations is trying to change in an orderly and peaceful way.

In any case, my delegation wishes to emphasize Morocco's desire to co-operate fully and sincerely

in implementing this resolution which we regard, in spite of everything, as a practical working instrument.

Mr. NUR (Somalia): My delegation has supported the resolution on French Somaliland [A/6583, para. 11] as it reaffirms the right of the people of French Somaliland to self-determination and independence and also outlines the modalities which would enable the people of the Territory to achieve their political aspirations.

With regard to the safeguards for the fairness of the referendum, my delegation is glad to note the emphasis which the resolution lays on these requirements. Although the resolution does not specifically enumerate these safeguards, as we would have preferred, it does emphasize the need for free expression of the will of the people in full respect for their fundamental human rights and freedom. Furthermore, the resolution underlines the need for a "proper political climate" so that the referendum can be conducted "on an entirely free and democratic basis".

What my delegation regards as a proper climate was outlined by my Prime Minister in this Assembly on 18 October. He called for the people of French Somaliland to be given the right to form and adhere to political organizations of their own choosing; for political detainees to be released; and for all citizens who had been exiled from the Territory to be allowed to return without fear of retribution, and of course, to be allowed to participate in the referendum.

We attach the greatest importance to operative paragraph 4 requesting a United Nations presence before and during the referendum. Indeed my delegation was gratified to note that in the Fourth Committee an overwhelming majority voted in favour of the paragraph. We regret, however, that some of our African sister nations found it necessary to abstain on it. As was made clear by several speakers in the debate in the Fourth Committee, the purpose of the paragraph is not to offend the sensibilities or to question the sincerity of the French Government. These are by no means the issues at stake: the matter is simply one of decolonization.

The sole aim of operative paragraph 4—and in fact of the whole resolution—as my delegation understands it, is to show the interest and concern of the United Nations in the execution of the referendum in such a manner that the doubts and criticisms and, above all, the dangerous political tensions created by the 1958 referendum in the Territory should not be repeated.

Within the next few weeks essential decisions regarding the referendum will have to be taken which will profoundly influence its outcome. It should be acknowledged that a United Nations participation in the preparation of the referendum is, therefore, in the interest of all, including the administering Power. The same is true of the actual holding of the referendum.

Finally, my delegation wishes to reiterate that we consider it neither necessary nor proper to introduce at this stage a modification in the designation of the territory by adding the name of the capital, Djibouti, in brackets, after the name French Somaliland. The internationally accepted nomenclature of the territory is "The French Coast of the Somalis" or in short "French Somaliland".

In the view of my delegation no outside organ, including the United Nations, is entitled to change or modify the name of the Territory. This is exclusively the right of the people, and action on the part of any other body in this respect is tantamount to an undue interference in the affairs of the people of the territory. If the people of French Somaliland wish to change the name of their Territory they will no doubt do so after having gained independence.

In conclusion, it is the hope of my Government that the Government of France will respond to the provisions of this resolution in the spirit in which they have been formulated.

Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America): Mr. President, the United States delegation abstained on draft resolution II on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in the smaller territories [A/6628, para. 19]. We of course share its main ob-

jectives, but we found it difficult to accept some of the preambular paragraphs and several operative paragraphs.

In particular, we have reservations about the portions of the fourth preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 4 which concern the establishment of military installations. My delegation knows of nothing in the United Nations Charter which in any way abridges the right of a Member nation to establish and maintain military installations deemed essential for security. I might also refer to the fact that this question of military bases came under discussion in the First Committee during this session, and that the Assembly subsequently adopted a proposal to refer this matter to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament for study. My delegation spoke in detail on this subject in the Committee, and our views, together with those of other delegations, are to be made available to the Disarmament Conference for its study.