

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**1398th
 PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 16 December 1965,
 at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 23:	
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports 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 (continued)	
Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland	
Report of the Fourth Committee	1
Territories not considered separately	
Report of the Fourth Committee	
Agenda item 24:	
Report of the United Nations Representative for the Supervision of the Elections in the Cook Islands	
Report of the Fourth Committee	

this report. This recommendation is based on the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General [A/5958], submitted to the General Assembly pursuant to operative paragraph 5 of the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 2 November 1964, and endorsed by the Special Committee.

3. The second report [A/6154], deals with the Fourth Committee's consideration of the Cook Islands. Under this item the Committee considered the report of the United Nations Representative for the Supervision of the Elections in the Cook Islands, on the elections which took place on 20 April 1965, and the reports of the Special Committee contained in A/5800/Rev.1, chapter XV, ¹/ and A/6000/Rev.1, chapter VIII.

4. The report of the United Nations Representative [A/5962 and Corr.1] is submitted to the General Assembly pursuant to resolution 2005 (XIX), adopted on 18 February 1965. The draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee is contained in paragraph 13 of its report.

5. The third report [A/6160] deals with the Fourth Committee's consideration of forty-one territories. The Fourth Committee adopted eight draft resolutions concerning these territories. The draft resolutions recommended for adoption by the General Assembly are contained in paragraph 50 of the report. In this connexion, I should like to draw the special attention of the General Assembly to the following points which are contained in this report. The Assembly will note that the Fourth Committee has taken a decision on the question of nomenclature concerning the territory of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). Secondly, with relation to the territory of British Guiana, a statement was made by the Chairman of the Fourth Committee at the 1583rd meeting on 10 December 1965, and this statement is contained in paragraph 42 of the report.

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

6. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In accordance with the decision which the Assembly has just taken, I would recall that statements must be confined to explanations of vote.

7. Since the general debate on item 23 has been concluded, we shall resume our discussion of this item in relation to the Territories which have already been studied by the Fourth Committee and on which it has submitted draft resolutions. The drafts refer to Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland [A/6106, para. 11] and the Territories which were not considered

¹/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex No. 8 (part I).

President: Mr. Amintore FANFANI (Italy).

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports 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 (continued)*

BASUTOLAND, BECHUANALAND AND SWAZILAND

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6106)

TERRITORIES NOT CONSIDERED SEPARATELY

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6160)

AGENDA ITEM 24

Report of the United Nations Representative for the Supervision of the Elections in the Cook Islands

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/6154)

Mr. Natwar Singh (India), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee, presented the reports of that Committee and then spoke as follows.

1. Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for its consideration three reports of the Fourth Committee.

2. The first report [A/6106] deals with the territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland. The Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 11 of

*Resumed from 1390th meeting.

individually [A/6160, para. 50]. At the same time, we shall take up agenda item 24 concerning the Cook Islands, on which the Fourth Committee has also submitted a draft resolution [A/6154, para. 13].

8. As these questions have been examined in detail in the Fourth Committee, and because of the limited time remaining for the General Assembly's twentieth session, I would now request representatives to make their statements as brief as possible.

9. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): Paragraph 42 of the Fourth Committee's report (agenda item 23 [A/6160]), dealing with British Guiana, reads as follows:

"42. At the 1583rd meeting, on 10 December, on the proposal of the representative of Mexico, the Chairman made the following statement which the Committee decided without objection to include in its report to the General Assembly:

"At this stage of our deliberations, we should like to take note of the discussions which are now taking place between the Governments of the United Kingdom, Venezuela and British Guiana, and which are a continuation of those agreed upon in 1962. These discussions are in accordance with the statement of the Chairman of the Special Political Committee contained in document A/5313, which the General Assembly took note of at its 1191st plenary meeting." "

10. As the paragraph I have just read out indicates, the Fourth Committee decided, without objection, to include this statement in its report to the General Assembly. I would therefore respectfully request that, in view of the paragraph I have quoted from the Fourth Committee's report, the General Assembly should likewise take note of this statement by the Chairman of the Fourth Committee.

11. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The request of the Venezuelan representative has been put before the Assembly. If there are no objections, I shall consider that the Assembly takes note of paragraph 42 of the Fourth Committee's report [A/6160].

It was so decided.

12. Mr. LORCA (Chile) (translated from Spanish): The delegation of Chile has studied with the utmost interest draft resolutions I to VIII, referred to us by the Fourth Committee in its report [A/6160, para. 50].

13. We should like to take this opportunity to explain the vote we shall cast on some of these resolutions; we have already stated our views on the others in the Fourth Committee.

14. My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution II, concerning Mauritius, and will do so again. However, we should like to state our position concerning the fifth preambular paragraph. The real cause for the concern expressed in the paragraph is not, we feel, the possibility that a military base, or any other type of installation, might be established in the Territory. What worries us is the possibility that, for one reason or another, there might be a violation of a United Nations resolution, more specifically resolution 1514 (XV), operative paragraph 6.

15. The same notion reappears in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, and there it is couched

in terms acceptable to my delegation. In view of this, my delegation gave its support to the draft and will do so again.

16. Concerning draft resolution III, which deals with the Territories of Fernando Póo and Río Muni, I should like to comment, in particular, on operative paragraph 2. My delegation voted in favour of this paragraph and will do so again on the understanding that, as it is now worded, it will not in any way prevent the autonomous Government and the people of Equatorial Guinea from freely exercising their sovereign right to request independence at such time as they deem fit, since this right has already been granted to them by the administering Power.

17. We would venture to recall the statements made to that effect by the representative of Spain, on several occasions, in the Fourth Committee. These statements were corroborated by Mr. Bonifacio Ondo Edu, the President of the autonomous Governing Council of Equatorial Guinea, when he stated in the Committee [1550th meeting] that his people were steadily advancing towards their independence, which had been guaranteed by Spain.

18. My delegation would also have very much welcomed some mention in the draft resolution of the efforts made by the administering Power to implement the General Assembly's resolutions concerning decolonization. This is a fact that cannot be disregarded and my delegation wishes to emphasize it.

19. Nevertheless, as I have already stated previously, the delegation of Chile voted for these draft resolutions, and will support them again, in accordance with our invariable policy on these questions, namely to do our utmost to help the colonial peoples struggling to attain their independence. These peoples can always count on our unconditional support and assistance.

20. Lastly, I should like to say a few words concerning the question of Oman, on which a vote is about to be taken. My delegation did not take part in the general debate on this topic. However, it did so at the eighteenth session, when we had an opportunity to state clearly our position on this issue.

21. As regards the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman,^{2/} we should like to take this opportunity to thank the representatives of Afghanistan, Costa Rica, Nepal, Nigeria and Senegal for the excellent document they have submitted, which shows the interest and effort they have devoted to this important subject. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Oman, which had to work under difficult conditions, since it was not even allowed to visit the Territory, makes it clear that the problem is still very complex, whether it is viewed as an international, a domestic or a colonial problem. This can be seen from paragraphs 621, 645, 646, 693 and 695 of the report, to mention only a few.

22. In our view there are indications which suggest that this might be a question of a colonial nature, though the indications are not sufficiently clear for my delegation to be able to speak with any authority on the substance of the problem. Nevertheless, we hope to be able to do so when the Special Committee of

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex No. 16, document A/5846.

Twenty-four takes up the question. In any event, these doubts make it impossible for my delegation to vote in favour of operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, and this would seem to involve paragraph 7 as well. If these paragraphs are voted on separately, Chile will abstain.

23. We must admit that we would also have liked to support the proposals of the Special *Ad Hoc* Committee on Oman to the effect that the parties should hold talks with a view to co-operating towards the prompt fulfilment of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Oman for economic and social advancement. We would also have supported the establishment of a committee of good offices. In the view of my delegation, these measures could well have been mentioned in the draft resolution.

24. Apart from such reservations and abstentions, the delegation of Chile will support the draft resolution. We consider, as we have already said, that the situation is not clear and that to leave it as it is would merely perpetuate the dangers it entails, with the serious result that, in the long run, the people of the Territory would be the ones to suffer serious detriment.

25. Mr. VEGA GOMEZ (El Salvador) (translated from Spanish): The delegation of El Salvador, for which I have the honour to speak, would like to make some brief comments in explanation of the vote we are about to hold on draft resolutions I to VIII adopted by the Fourth Committee [A/6160, para. 50].

26. My delegation has closely and carefully followed the statements made on the subject by all parties concerned, during the discussions in the Fourth Committee. There is no doubt that these statements reflect a sincere concern that is being felt generally.

27. In keeping with its national traditions, El Salvador is an ardent champion of the independence and freedom of peoples. Consequently, ever since joining the United Nations as a founding Member, it has given its whole-hearted support to any measure designed to secure independence for colonial peoples, many of whom, after obtaining their freedom, have helped to swell the ranks of our international Organizations, to the great satisfaction of all free men.

28. We are sure that it will not be long before this fruitful trend reaches completion. This is perhaps not the moment to discuss history, although in actual fact all of us here are making history. But it is pleasant and deeply satisfying to look back on past events and contemplate the progress made in a cause that is so dear to mankind.

29. I have to say, then, that in keeping with these sentiments and with our traditions my delegation will, generally speaking, vote in favour of these resolutions. However, I should like to say that as regards draft resolution III on Equatorial Guinea, my delegation listened with great pleasure to the statement made by the representative of Spain in the Fourth Committee, at its 1570th meeting held on Friday 26 November, in which he said that his country was ready to grant independence to Fernando P6o and Rfo Muni,

30. My delegation has faith in the utterances of the representative of Spain. It has no reason to doubt them and therefore, if operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution III on this Territory should be put to the vote separately, the position of my delegation will be to abstain on this paragraph. We shall, of course, vote in favour of the draft as a whole.

31. Mr. MARIN VANEGAS (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): As in the Fourth Committee, the delegation of Colombia would now like to state its position on draft resolution III, concerning Equatorial Guinea and, specifically, on operative paragraph 2.

32. The President of the autonomous government of Equatorial Guinea was quite clear on this point when he stated in the Fourth Committee [1550th meeting] "We felt it necessary and advisable for our people to pass through a period of preparation prior to absolute independence".

33. The delegation of Spain has repeatedly stated that its Government is willing to grant absolute independence to Equatorial Guinea when the people and the autonomous government of that country so wish. This means that both sides agree that it is for the indigenous population and the autonomous government of the Territory to set the final date for their full independence by such means as they deem appropriate, when they see fit, as the culminating point in an advanced process of decolonization.

34. In our opinion, the statement contained in operative paragraph 2 is a retrograde step in regard to the prerogatives and rights gained by the people of Equatorial Guinea, since the country is now in a position to set the date of its independence when it deems fit. If this paragraph is adopted it could be construed as meaning that the United Nations, ignoring the agreements existing between Spain and the colonial territory, was proposing to take the retrograde step of leaving it entirely to the administering Power to specify the date for the completion of the decolonization process. This consideration alone makes it impossible for my delegation to sanction such a possibility with its vote.

35. We also think that it would have been right and proper for the United Nations to express its appreciation to the Spanish Government for the exemplary manner in which it is implementing General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in this respect. For these reasons we now request a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution on Equatorial Guinea.

36. With regard to the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) my delegation was a sponsor, in the Fourth Committee, of the document which subsequently became draft resolution I in the Committee's report [A/6160, para. 50], and we therefore feel it our duty to explain the position we adopted then and hold now.

37. In accordance with Colombia's anti-colonialist tradition, as repeatedly affirmed ever since the United Nations came into being, we have unhesitatingly supported, within the bounds prescribed by the Charter, any measure designed to safeguard the right of peoples to freedom and independence. My delegation regards the problem we are now considering as of very special interest to us, since it has to do with a matter pertaining to the American continent.

38. In the debate in the Fourth Committee, the historical, political, juridical and economic basis underlying the sovereign rights of the Argentine Republic to the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) was made abundantly clear. We have no doubt whatsoever as to the justice and legitimacy of Argentina's claims to this part of its territory, which it has made insistently, openly and unceasingly. We were consistent when we pointed out in the Fourth Committee that the problem has its origin in an act of force, perpetrated in 1833 against part of the territory which Argentina had owned since 1810, and this act of force alone gave rise to the abnormal situation in which the territories are now placed. The colonial status thus imposed still persists in defiance of the wishes of all the Latin American nations.

39. The inter-American system, and more specifically the charter of the Organization of American States, quite clearly establishes, in article 17, that territorial acquisitions gained by force are illegal:

"The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. No territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized."

40. Despite the fact that the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) have the status of a colony, we consider that they are territory severed from another State and are therefore a geographical region on which the status of colony was imposed by force, in disregard of the legitimate claims of the Argentine Republic.

41. The particular case of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) is covered by paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 (XV), which provides that:

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

42. My delegation believes that the case should be considered in the light of that paragraph. If this sound principle were not applied, we should be establishing the rule that might is always right in international relations, and that would unquestionably tend to undermine the very foundations of the international community.

43. Peace, the paramount objective of the United Nations, will be safeguarded so long as the parties to a dispute are prepared to talk with each other, to state their respective viewpoints and to listen to the viewpoints of others, with the firm resolve to seek and find satisfactory and just solutions. This is the only system, the only course which we can follow if we wish to preserve peace and friendly relations among peoples. To refuse to follow this course would be to rely on force to settle disputes, in disregard to reason and right.

44. It is for that reason that we welcome the recommendation contained in the document in question, since it invites the two Governments to begin negotiations through the diplomatic channel with a view to finding

a prompt, just and peaceful solution fully consonant with the high and sacred mission of the United Nations.

45. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): As I did in the Fourth Committee, I wish to state here in unequivocal terms the meaning and motivation of Venezuela's vote on draft resolution VII, contained in the report of the Fourth Committee [A/6160, para. 50], concerning British Guiana.

46. In the first place, I wish solemnly to confirm that Venezuela has always supported and continues to support the independence of British Guiana. Venezuela is not deviating in any way from its traditional and immutable position in defence of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

47. That is evident, not from my words, but from Venezuela's votes and statements in the United Nations throughout its twenty years of existence. Many countries, including some of the sponsors of the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee, have had Venezuela's vote and support in this forum from the beginnings of their struggle for independence. Our position, I repeat, has not changed and will not change.

48. Secondly, I wish to confirm that Venezuela has at no time made its support for the independence of British Guiana conditional upon the prior settlement of its claim to part of that Territory, which is the subject of conversations between the Governments of the United Kingdom, Venezuela and British Guiana continued from those held in 1962. That position too, remains unchanged.

49. Thirdly, Venezuela wishes to state, once again, that it maintains its claim intact, since it relates to inalienable and absolute rights which it cannot renounce. Venezuela's claim and the basis for that claim have been put on record in various statements made in the United Nations. The conversations between the Governments of the United Kingdom, Venezuela and British Guiana are one stage in the procedure agreed upon by the parties, and noted by the Assembly [see 1191st meeting, para. 38].

50. In view of the foregoing it was reasonable to expect that some mention of the existence of the Venezuelan claim would be made in the draft resolution enshrining the forthcoming independence of British Guiana. Owing to the complete omission of such a reference from the draft resolution, Venezuela, much to its regret, is unable to support it, and it will therefore abstain from the vote on it.

51. Lastly, my delegation requests that the vote on draft resolution VII concerning British Guiana be taken by roll-call.

52. Mr. GIMENEZ MELO (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): Paragraph 16 of the report of the Fourth Committee [A/6160] on the chapters concerning Territories not considered separately, contains the following:

"At the 1560th meeting, on 18 November, the Committee decided, without objection, that the following nomenclature concerning the Territory

in question should be used in all United Nations documents:

"(a) In all languages other than Spanish, the Territories should be called 'Falkland Islands (Malvinas)';

"(b) In the Spanish language, the Territory should be called the 'Islas Malvinas (Falkland Islands)'."

53. Accordingly, I respectfully request that the General Assembly take note of that decision by the Fourth Committee.

54. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of Argentina has made a request. If there are no objections, I shall conclude that the Assembly takes note of paragraph 16 of the Fourth Committee's report [A/6160].

It was so decided.

55. Mr. VIZCAINO LEAL (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): In the vote in the Fourth Committee on draft resolution A/C.4/L.807 and Add.1-3 concerning the Territories of Fernando Póo and Río Muni (Equatorial Guinea), my delegation abstained from the vote on operative paragraph 2 for the reasons given during the explanation of its vote and supported the text which is now contained as draft resolution III in the report of the Fourth Committee [A/6160, para. 50].

56. Further consideration of that paragraph in relation to the actual state of affairs in that Territory confirms my delegation's view that it is unnecessary and out of place to request the administering Power to set the earliest possible date for independence after consulting the people on the basis of universal suffrage under the supervision of the United Nations.

57. We consider that the Territory of Equatorial Guinea is well on the way to self-determination and also that it has its own provisional government whose objective is to achieve complete independence.

58. As a number of delegations have already pointed out, the President of the autonomous government of Guinea has himself stated that the date for independence will be set by the people themselves, who in our opinion are alone qualified to decide on their own fate. This is in line with the statement by the administering Power that it is prepared to grant independence to the Territory whenever the inhabitants request it.

59. Accordingly, my delegation associates itself with the Colombian delegation in requesting a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution on Equatorial Guinea, since we intend to abstain on that paragraph, as we did in the Fourth Committee. However, we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

60. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): It is with a feeling of regret that the delegation of Ghana has once again asked for the floor in order to make a few comments on the draft resolution on the question of the Cook Islands recommended by the Fourth Committee to the General Assembly [A/6154, para. 13]. Our intention is not to burden this Assembly with further debate on the subject but to express our reservations on certain operative paragraphs of the draft resolution.

61. My statement on 8 December 1965 [1579th meeting] in the Fourth Committee, which has been issued as a Committee document [A/C.4/662 and Corr.1], speaks for itself as far as our detailed arguments are concerned, and any attempt to restate them *in toto* would be unnecessary and a waste of time. However, we are still convinced that there can be no other meaningful way of judging the present constitutional status of the Cook Islands, or any other territory for that matter, without examining in detail the constitution under which it functions. This is a logical procedure which cannot be rejected as a mere academic exercise.

62. Our main objection is with regard to operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, which seek to state that the Cook Islands under their present Constitution, have attained full internal self-government and are in control of their internal affairs.

63. The profoundly disturbing element in this draft resolution is the recommendation that the General Assembly renounce its rights under Article 73 e of the Charter to be provided with information on the Cook Islands. It is the view of my delegation that, before the Assembly can take such a position on this matter, we ought to satisfy ourselves that the objectives of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV) have been fulfilled with regard to the Cook Islands.

64. Let me reiterate that there is no dispute about whether the Cook Islands have made a choice of their own in complete freedom. I believe that all members are agreed on this. The only point in dispute, therefore, is the political status of the Cook Islands. In this respect, I have had occasion in the Fourth Committee to point out the serious anomaly in the appointment of the High Commissioner of the Cook Islands in a dual capacity: as the representative of the Head of State and as the representative of the Government of New Zealand. I supported my argument with the recorded views of New Zealand constitutional experts and the United Nations Representative for the Supervision of the Elections in the Cook Islands, both of whom advised against the combination of both roles in a single office.

65. During our discussions in the Fourth Committee the representative of New Zealand also agreed with me that this was an anomaly. In fact he said—and I quote from the summary record of the Fourth Committee of 13 December 1965:

"It was not a technically perfect arrangement that the High Commissioner was both the Head of State and the representative of the New Zealand Government, but a similar situation had existed in New Zealand itself until 1939 and it had been made to work."^{3/}

Therefore the New Zealand delegation agreed that the Constitution contained serious anomalies but naturally sought to minimize the limitations inherent in those anomalies.

66. I also pointed out many other provisions in the present Constitution which would logically inhibit the development of a sense of responsibility in the Cook Islands' Premier and his Government. It is the view of

^{3/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Fourth Committee, 1579th meeting, para. 30.

my delegation, therefore, that we cannot vote for operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of this draft resolution, because of these limitations. We further believe that, in view of the checks and balances in the Constitution, it would be imprudent for this Assembly to say that the Territory has attained full self-government and is in control of its internal affairs, even before the Cook Islanders have had enough chance to try out their Constitution. This does not mean—and I want to be very clear on this point—that we regard the Cook Islands as still a colonial Territory. That would be totally untrue. We are merely guarding against the recognition by the General Assembly that the objectives of its resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV) have been fulfilled, when there is doubt.

67. It will be recalled by those representatives who helped with the draft resolution that reference was made originally to General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV). Then, many of us had second thoughts and such a reference was eliminated. A vote for paragraph 5 of the present draft resolution would therefore include, all over again, through the back door, the reference to resolution 1541 (XV). In fact, it was in consideration of this vital point that the inclusion of paragraph 6 of the present draft resolution was made necessary.

68. The draft resolution before us smacks of inconsistency and should be examined more carefully by representatives in this Assembly. Perhaps this situation is not so astonishing when one becomes familiar with the combinations and permutations under which the present draft resolution was born. Operative paragraphs 5 and 6 are not, in truth, complementary. We should either renounce our responsibilities or maintain them. We cannot have our cake and eat it.

69. To refrain from a hasty conclusion on the matter would not necessarily mean that the Cook Islands is still a colonial territory. My delegation would be happier if operative paragraphs 4 and 5 were not included in the draft resolution, for they only seek to judge, in haste, what should be subject to logical examination and the honour of time.

70. Allow me, therefore, Mr. President, to make a plea. The Cook Islands may be a small country of only 20,000 inhabitants but we should be careful not to establish a precedent, by our own vote, which others would be delighted to seek to apply in other colonial territories, such as Angola, Mozambique, so-called Portuguese Guinea, and a host of other territories still under colonial domination.

71. There is a very strong feeling among us that an operative paragraph should be included which would reaffirm the responsibilities of the General Assembly under resolution 1514 (XV) and its obligations towards the Cook Islands. Therefore, the intention of the majority of delegations is clear. Those which supported the present paragraph 6 were convinced that the process of decolonization had not yet run its full course. Therefore, let us not tie our hands by approving operative paragraphs 4 and 5; we might have a better and more congenial opportunity in the future to make such a judgement in unity. It is precisely for these reasons that my delegation has thought fit to reserve its position on the draft resolution before us.

72. In conclusion, I wish to state that our present attitude towards these two paragraphs is objective and is motivated only by good faith towards the Cook Islanders and subjugated people everywhere. If we desire anything else for the people of the Cook Islands by our present course of action, it is only a greater measure of freedom and self-government for those people. These are goals to which all Members of the United Nations are dedicated.

73. We should like once more to express the high esteem in which we have held, and still hold, the New Zealand Government for its unparalleled co-operation with the United Nations concerning this Territory. We hope that that example of co-operation will be adopted by other Administering Powers in their colonies.

74. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (translated from French): Iran's position on colonialism has always been very clear. Without going back very far, I shall say simply this: faithful to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)—a Declaration of which Iran is proud to have been one of the most active architects—we shall continue to struggle with all our might against colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. We shall not abandon the fight until all the Territories under colonial domination have gained full independence.

75. However, with regard to paragraphs 3 and 4 of draft resolution V [A/6160, para. 50], relating to twenty-six Territories which were not examined separately, we do not believe that this is a purely colonial matter. These paragraphs provide for action which would be undertaken in the name of peoples who have not yet achieved independence.

76. The question of bases can only be decided by the countries concerned in accordance with their national interests as they see them. We do not have the right to prejudge their decision. As far as Iran is concerned, I can reaffirm here that it has never granted foreign Powers the right to maintain bases and does not intend to allow the establishment of such bases in the future. However, since the twenty-six Territories referred to in draft resolution V have not gained their independence, it cannot be said that the elimination of bases is a prerequisite for their accession to sovereignty. Whether bases are to be maintained or eliminated must be decided by the peoples themselves, once they have become independent.

77. This is the reason why my delegation will vote against paragraph 3 of this draft resolution and will abstain on paragraph 4. It is naturally understood that we approve the draft resolution as a whole and will vote in favour of it.

78. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I had honestly hoped that there would be no need for me to explain the vote of my delegation on the draft resolution [A/6154, para. 13] on the Cook Islands, but the statement just made by the representative of Ghana leaves me no alternative but to make certain things very clear.

79. The position of the Liberian Government with regard to dependent countries fighting for their liberation and freedom in accordance with their wishes cannot be called into question, and that is specifically

why the Liberian delegation will support paragraphs 4 and 5 of this draft resolution.

80. It is neither for the Liberian delegation nor for my Government to determine what kind of constitution any Member should have; it is for the people concerned to decide upon the kind of constitution under which they wish to live.

81. Referring to the explanation given by the representative of New Zealand of the "anomalies", as he called them, in the Constitution, the representative of Ghana gave a portion of the reply made by the representative of New Zealand but he did not indicate to the Assembly that the representative of New Zealand had said that it was the will of the people that the head of the Cook Islands—the Governor—should appear in the present form and that this Governor should be in the position of representing the Cook Islanders, New Zealand and the United Kingdom Government; this was the wish of the people themselves. They had carefully considered it and found that, at this particular time, it was in their best interests. It is not for the representative of Ghana or for the representative of Liberia to tell them whom they should choose to represent them.

82. The representative of Ghana referred to the question of the two paragraphs not being in harmony with each other. These paragraphs state:

"4. Notes that the Constitution of the Cook Islands came into force on 4 August 1965, from which date the Cook Islanders have had control of their internal affairs and of their future;

"5. Considers that since the Cook Islands have attained full internal self-government, the transmission of information in respect of the Cook Islands under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations is no longer necessary;"

83. If one paragraph states that the Cook Islanders have control over their internal affairs and over their future, I am sure that it is not a contradiction to say that they do have internal self-government. In accordance with precedents in the United Nations, when this stage is reached, information ceases to be given because the administering Power is no longer responsible. If I were the Prime Minister and in charge of my Government, I am sure that I would not permit any person or any Government to transmit any further information as regards my territory, because my country could have become autonomous and it could have chosen for itself, in accordance with the principle laid down by the United Nations, to associate itself as an autonomous territory.

84. I am glad that the representative of Ghana did not refer to the fact that the people of the Cook Islands held their elections and decided their future under United Nations supervision. I should like to draw this to the attention of the Assembly so that when these two paragraphs are put to the vote they will, in simple words, "give the devil his due".

85. Mr. HEREDIA BONETTI (Dominican Republic) (translated from Spanish): My delegation, like some which have spoken earlier, has serious reservations regarding some aspects of draft resolutions I-VIII

contained in the report of the Fourth Committee [A/6160, para. 50].

86. Before going into detail on the points which my delegation regards as unclear and at variance with its opinions and judgement, I should like to reaffirm that my country and Government have never been and can never be advocates of colonialism or similar practices. On the contrary, since our nation owes its existence to the struggle against such systems, it has a constant—and indeed growing—sympathy for the efforts made by peoples seeking independence.

87. With regard to Equatorial Guinea, we consider that the reference in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution III on the subject is out of place, and if the request by Colombia and Guatemala for a separate vote on paragraph 2 is approved we will abstain on these paragraphs, since we accept, and have no reason to question, the statements made by the Spanish delegation on behalf of its Government to the effect that it is ready and willing to grant independence to the Territories of Fernando Póo and Río Muni when their inhabitants decide that this should be done.

88. The fact that no mention is made of Venezuela's claim in respect of the Territory of British Guiana leads us to make a similar observation. While we welcome British Guiana's forthcoming independence gladly, we shall abstain from the vote on draft resolution VII contained in the report of the Fourth Committee, because we consider that Venezuela's claim should be mentioned.

89. We repeat that we have great sympathy for the cause of British Guiana's independence and express the hope that it will be attained in the near future.

90. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Ghana in the exercise of his right of reply.

91. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I should like to exercise my right of reply as regards what the representative of Liberia just stated to the Assembly.

92. I have made our case crystal clear and shall not engage in a debate with the Liberian representative here this evening. I merely wish to correct two impressions that the representative of Liberia gave when referring to what I had said previously. The representative said, *inter alia*, that it was the wish of the Cook Islanders to choose the person they now have as High Commissioner in his capacity as the representative of the Cook Islanders, of the New Zealand Government, and, I believe she added, of the Head of State.

93. I merely wish to point out to the Assembly that I never denied this fact. The Cook Islanders have chosen a High Commissioner and my delegation certainly is not seeking to impose its will on them. I merely referred to the fact that the combination of two roles in a single office was inadvisable and that the New Zealand constitutional expert had advised against it.

94. The United Nations Representative for the Supervision of the Elections in the Cook Islands stated in black and white that this was inadvisable. What is more, I quoted from the text of the summary records of the Fourth Committee regarding what the New Zealand

representative had said—that it was a technical anomaly.

95. Secondly, the representative of Liberia referred to the portion of my statement in which I said that certain paragraphs were not complementary or in harmony. She proceeded then to read operative paragraphs 4 and 5 to prove otherwise. In order to keep the record straight, I should like to re-read that portion of my statement which she misquoted. I said:

"Perhaps this situation is not so astonishing when one becomes familiar with the combinations and permutations under which the present draft resolution was born. Operative paragraphs 5 and 6 are not, in truth, complementary."

96. It would therefore be clear that I referred not to operative paragraphs 4 and 5, but to operative paragraphs 5 and 6. Operative paragraph 5 states:

"Considers that since the Cook Islands have attained full internal self-government, the transmission of information in respect of the Cook Islands under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations is no longer necessary."

Operative paragraph 6 states:

"Reaffirms the responsibility of the United Nations under General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) to assist the people of the Cook Islands in the eventual achievement of full independence, if they so wish, at a future date."

97. Our intention is not to impose our will on the Cook Islanders. The United Nations General Assembly elected its own representative to supervise the elections; a report has been produced [A/5962 and Corr.1] and it is stated quite clearly in that report that it is for the General Assembly to use its judgement as to what has transpired in the Cook Islands. The Ghana delegation is not questioning the integrity of the United Nations representative, nor the New Zealand delegation here. We are merely subjecting the situation in the Cook Islands to logical examination.

98. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I should like to take this opportunity to apologize to the representative of Ghana if I previously understood him to say paragraphs 4 and 5. If he refers to paragraphs 5 and 6, I still feel that these are two different matters in a way, for one refers to dissemination of information, which, I feel, would be in harmony with resolution 1541 (XV). But 1514 (XV) leaves an opportunity open that, in a case where a people chooses at a particular time to associate itself with an independent State, it shall be allowed to opt for complete independence, if in the future it should decide to do so.

99. If this is true, we accept it, and the principle of resolution 1514 (XV) would apply if they decide to opt for complete independence. I am sure there would be no objection by the Members of the United Nations to lending whatever co-operation this body can give to help these people attain this end: namely, financial, economic and technical assistance; I think there should be no objection to this.

100. Moreover, if my delegation accepted the reference to resolution 1514 (XV) in this draft resolution in paragraph 6, it was with the understanding that

everyone understood that resolution 1541 (XV) provided for the right of people to choose complete independence in the future should they so desire. This, I felt, was somewhat of a compromise, and I think it was understood, and I do not believe it should have been referred to by the representative of Ghana. He has the right, nevertheless, to do what he wishes, and I do not object; but these are two distinct things—two opportunities open to the people of the Cook Islands. I do not think that the General Assembly would want it to be understood that because they have chosen to associate themselves with New Zealand they should not have the opportunity to opt for complete independence in the future if they so desire.

101. What my delegation supports is the will of the people to determine their own future, and this is why the representative of Liberia is supporting this draft resolution.

102. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Assembly will vote on the various draft resolutions submitted by the Fourth Committee.

103. I now put to the vote the draft resolution concerning Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland (item 23) [A/6106, para. 11].

The draft resolution was adopted by 86 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

104. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall now take up the draft resolution concerning the Cook Islands (item 24) [A/6154, para. 13]. Separate roll-call votes have been requested on paragraphs 4 and 5.

105. I now put paragraph 4 to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Iceland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras.

Against: Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Hungary.

Abstaining: Senegal, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 77 votes to 16, with 14 abstentions.

106. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put paragraph 5 to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Cuba, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, China, Costa Rica.

Against: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Hungary, Kenya, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo (Brazzaville).

Abstaining: Dahomey, France, Guatemala, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Algeria, Argentina, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of).

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 66 votes to 19, with 21 abstentions.

107. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Dominican Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark,

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, Ghana, Hungary, Kenya, Mongolia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Somalia,

South Africa, Sudan, Syria, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Algeria, Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 78 votes to none, with 29 abstentions.

108. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Assembly will now vote on the eight draft resolutions relating to the Territories which were not considered separately (item 23) [A/6160, para. 50].

109. I now put draft resolution I to the vote. A roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Brazil, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, 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, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia.

→ *Draft resolution I was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.*

110. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put draft resolution II to the vote.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

111. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall now take up draft resolution III. A separate roll-call vote on paragraph 2 has been requested.

112. I now put paragraph 2 to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Afghanistan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Bolivia, Colombia, Portugal, Spain.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 77 votes to 4, with 26 abstentions.

113. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put draft resolution III as a whole to the vote.

Draft resolution III as a whole was adopted by 103 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

114. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put draft resolution IV to the vote.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 90 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions.

115. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall now vote on draft resolution V. A separate roll-call vote on paragraphs 3 and 4 has been requested.

116. I now put paragraph 3 to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Japan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jamaica.

Against: Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia,

Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy.

Abstaining: Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mexico, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Senegal, Togo, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, Honduras, Israel, Ivory Coast.

117. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): There are forty-eight votes in favour, thirty-three against and twenty-four abstentions. As it did not obtain the required two-thirds majority, paragraph 3 is not adopted.

118. I call upon the representative of the USSR on a point of order.

119. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I should like to ask you, Mr. President, on what rule of procedure you based your announcement that the proposal on which we have just voted was not adopted.

120. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): My statement that a two-thirds majority was required was based on my interpretation of Article 18 (2) of the Charter and on the complete text of item 23, now before the Assembly. The records of the United Nations concerning this item support my view that the General Assembly has always treated this question as an important one, and consequently, under rule 86 of the rules of procedure, each part of the item has to be considered as an important question.

121. Of course, if the representative of the Soviet Union sees fit to state that in his Government's opinion this is not an important question, he may do so and challenge my decision. Only a simple majority is needed to overrule the President's decision that this is an important question.

122. In this connexion, I would point out that during the seventeenth session the then President, the distinguished and well-known statesman Mr. Zafrulla Khan, now a judge of the International Court of Justice, ruled that this item was an important question, and his decision was not challenged.

123. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Rule 85 of the rules of procedure, which refers to the two-thirds majority, reads:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting. These questions shall include: recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, the election of the non-permanent members of the Security Council, the election of the members of the Economic and Social Council, the election of members of the Trusteeship Council in accordance with paragraph 1 c of Article 86 of the Charter, the admission of new Members to the United Nations, the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership, the expulsion of Members, questions relating to the operation of the Trusteeship System, and budgetary questions."

124. Even from the purely formal standpoint, the question of Non-Self-Governing Territories is not included in the list of questions I have read out requiring a two-thirds majority.

125. Therefore, I believe that, in accordance with rule 87 of the rules of procedure, we should take a decision on whether this question requires a simple majority or a two-thirds majority for adoption.

126. Rule 87 states:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on questions other than those provided for in rule 85, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the Members present and voting."

127. On the basis of that rule, I would ask you to put the following question: which majority is required for the vote which has just taken place—a simple majority or a two-thirds majority?

128. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The decision I made was on a question relating to peace-keeping.

129. I now ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether he is appealing against my decision, because in that case, I repeat, I am prepared—in fact it is my duty—to submit the matter to the Assembly for a decision as to what majority is required.

130. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I formally move the suspension of the plenary meeting to enable delegations, and in particular the USSR delegation, to hold consultations on this matter.

131. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): As you have just heard, the representative of the Soviet Union has asked for a suspension of the meeting and it is my duty to submit the matter to the Assembly.

132. I call upon the representative of India on a point of order.

133. Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India): I have asked for the floor merely to ask for a clarification from the representative of the Soviet Union. Has he asked for an adjournment of this meeting or a suspension?

134. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union to clarify the point.

135. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): So that there may be no misunderstanding, I move the adjournment of the meeting, that is, that we should end the meeting now.

136. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): It only remains for me to ask the members of the Assembly to vote on the USSR proposal to adjourn the meeting.

A vote was taken.

137. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The proposal to suspend the meeting is rejected by 53 votes to 34, with 16 abstentions.

138. I give the floor to the representative of Algeria on a point of order.

139. Mr. LAIDI (Algeria) (translated from French): I think that when the representative of the Soviet Union came to the rostrum for the second time, he asked for the meeting to be adjourned. In giving us the result of the vote, Mr. President, you spoke of a suspension. I should merely like this to be made clear and to ask for the meeting to be suspended.

140. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): When announcing the result I did speak of a suspension.

141. Mr. LAIDI (Algeria) (translated from French): I apologize for pressing the matter, Mr. President, in fact, you spoke of a suspension and, if my understanding is correct, the Soviet Union representative had asked that the debate should be ended and that the meeting should be adjourned, not suspended. I think this involves a difference in terminology. I am now asking for a suspension.

142. Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India): The representative of the Soviet Union had asked for an adjournment. My delegation was not clear whether he had asked for an adjournment or a suspension. Therefore I asked for a clarification. The representative of the Soviet Union made it clear that he was asking for an adjournment. We have had a vote, and we know the result of the vote. In view of this, my delegation would like to ask for a suspension of this meeting for forty-five minutes.

143. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of India has asked us to suspend the meeting for forty-five minutes; I therefore submit the matter to the Assembly.

144. I give the floor to the representative of Kuwait on a point of order.

145. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait): On a point of order. Rule 90 of the rules of procedure provides:

"After the President has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting."

That being the case, I wonder whether anyone of those proposals was receivable. I have no objection to a provisional suspension for half-an-hour, but may I move formally that the General Assembly continue the voting on the other draft resolutions and leave the one which is the object of this discussion for later consideration?

146. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of Kuwait, if I understand him correctly, is concerned about the order of our proceedings and the possibility of continuing the discussion. We have before us, however, a specific proposal by the representative of India asking that the meeting be suspended for forty-five minutes. I put that proposal to the vote.

The proposal was rejected by 54 votes to 40, with 9 abstentions.

147. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of the Soviet Union has appealed against the President's ruling that a two-thirds majority is required for the vote on the question under discussion

as being an important question, according to decisions taken hitherto. You know the rule in such matters: a vote must be taken immediately, without debate.

148. I put to the vote the appeal made by the USSR representative.

The appeal was rejected by 56 votes to 30, with 9 abstentions.

149. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall revert to the vote on draft resolution V.

150. I put to the vote operative paragraph 4, on which, I would remind you, a roll-call vote has been requested.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

Colombia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon.

Against: Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China.

Abstaining: Finland, Gabon, Iran, Israel, Ivory Coast, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Senegal, Togo, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile.

The result of the vote was 48 in favour and 37 against, with 19 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 4, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, was rejected.

151. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I put to the vote draft resolution V, as a whole, as amended.

Draft resolution V, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 91 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

152. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Assembly will vote next on draft resolution VI. Meanwhile the representative of Liberia has asked to speak, and I give her the floor.

153. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): Like the delegation of Liberia, there are many delegations that would not choose to challenge the ruling of the President, but may I ask you kindly, Mr. President, to tell us in advance what resolutions you consider will require a two-thirds majority.

154. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I have told the representative of Liberia on which precedent I based my ruling. Following that ruling, there was a discussion. An appeal was made to the Assembly, which has itself given a ruling. I have nothing further to say on the matter; all I have to say is that I now refer to the decision made by the Assembly on this matter.

155. As a matter of courtesy, I gave the floor to the representative of Liberia contrary to the rules of procedure, because she is a lady; the discussion is now closed.

156. I put draft resolution VI to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

Israel, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

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

Against: None.

Abstaining: Mongolia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 96 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

157. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put draft resolution VII to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

Somalia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Da-

homey, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone.

Against: None.

Abstaining: South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

158. I now put draft resolution VIII to the vote. A separate roll-call vote has been requested for the words "and, to this end, to enter into negotiations on the problems relating to sovereignty presented by these two Territories" in paragraph 2. Representatives who are in favour of retaining those words should vote "yes".

The vote was taken by roll-call.

The Dominican Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Iran, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Cameroon, Central African Republic.

Against: Portugal, Spain.

Abstaining: Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark.

*The words in question were adopted by 33 votes to 2, with 69 abstentions.**

*The delegations of Iraq and Jordan subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished their countries to be included in the list of those voting for the words in question.

159. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put paragraph 2 to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic.

Against: Portugal, Spain.

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

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 99 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

160. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I shall now put draft resolution VIII as a whole to the vote. The representative of Morocco has requested a roll-call vote.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

Bolivia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium.

Against: Portugal, Spain.

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

Draft resolution VIII as a whole was adopted by 100 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

161. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The fifteen-Power draft resolution [A/L.476] and the amendments thereto submitted by Somalia [A/L.477] will be considered at a later date. I would ask representatives to consult the Journal on the subject.

162. I shall now call upon the representatives who have asked to speak in explanation of their vote.

163. Mr. GIMENEZ MELO (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): The United Nations General Assembly has today solemnly approved draft resolution I of the Fourth Committee [A/6160, para. 50], which invites the United Kingdom Government and my Government to proceed with their bilateral negotiations with a view to finding a solution to the problem of sovereignty over the Islas Malvinas (Falkland Islands).

164. In accordance with its traditional adherence to the principle of the peaceful solution of conflicts, Argentina reaffirms here and now in the plenary meeting of the Assembly that it accepts that invitation. Consequently, my Government, as already announced in the Fourth Committee, will establish contact with the United Kingdom Government so that the first exchange of notes on this question can be followed by effective negotiation leading to a solution of the problem.

165. My Government is convinced that the ties of friendship which, apart from the question of the Islas Malvinas (Falkland Islands), have traditionally linked our countries, will ensure that the necessary atmosphere for a just and realistic solution of the problem will prevail in the negotiations.

166. It is in this spirit and with this hope that the Argentine Government, on behalf of a people which, while peace-loving, is highly sensitive with regard to its sovereign rights, accepts the invitation extended to it today by ninety-four States Members of the United Nations.

167. Mr. BROWN (United Kingdom): My delegation wishes briefly to acknowledge the cordial and friendly terms in which the representative of Argentina has just spoken.

168. As my delegation stated in the discussion of this item in the Fourth Committee [1558th meeting], my Government has welcomed the suggestion of the Argentine Government that our two Governments should hold talks on the question of the Falkland Islands, and we have asked the Argentine Government to suggest topics for such talks, bearing in mind our well-known reservations regarding sovereignty and the need to respect the wishes and the interests of the people of the Falkland Islands. It is because of this reservation and the phraseology used in parts of the resolution which has just been adopted that my delegation abstained in the vote. My delegation fully explained its abstention in the Fourth Committee, and I reaffirm that abstention now.

169. Finally, with regard to the decision of the Fourth Committee contained in its report before us [A/6160], which was taken note of by the Assembly this afternoon, on the question of the terminology to be used in describing the Falkland Islands in United Nations documents, my delegation wishes to reaffirm that this decision cannot affect either British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands or the correct name of the territory. My delegation hopes that the talks suggested by the Argentine Government will prove valuable and productive.

170. I should like also to refer very briefly to the statement made by the representative of Venezuela, who spoke in similarly courteous terms earlier this afternoon on the question of the frontier between Venezuela and British Guiana. My delegation wishes to reaffirm the full statement of my Government's position in this matter which we made in the Fourth Committee.

171. Mr. MEDINA (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): Unquestionably, one of the most fortunate advances in public international law in recent years has been the advent of new independent States without the traumatic experience of bloody revolutions.

172. It is likewise evident that the United Nations has contributed in no small measure to the disappearance of the warlike ways of past ages through repeated efforts whose beneficial results do great credit to contemporary civilization. Ample evidence of this is to be found in the numerous measures adopted in a variety of cases to promote, to assist in a practical manner, and to champion the desire for freedom on the part of all peoples throughout the world, and particularly the many resolutions of the General Assembly, which in the noblest terms assert high standards consonant with the nature and dignity of man, from resolution 1514 (XV) down to the resolutions just adopted at this twentieth regular session.

173. My delegation has always given its sincere support and backing to the policy of opposing colonialism, and with a firmness that leaves no room for doubt, it has rejected any formula that might directly or indirectly be regarded as calculated in any way to delay the attainment of complete freedom in any territory.

174. In this respect Colombia can point with pride to a clear and unswerving line of conduct in all its activities on the world scene, and to its role as one of the States which signed the Charter at San Francisco.

175. At present, my country is happy to share the view of the majority in this Assembly concerning the granting of independence to territories which are still non-self-governing. Thus, with regard to one of the specific cases with which it has been concerned these days—the question of British Guiana, as dealt with in draft resolution VII [A/6160, para. 50]—the purpose of my delegation's statement is not to express opposition to the fact mentioned in that document, namely that the Territory will attain its independence on 26 May 1966. On the contrary, my delegation regards it as a fortunate event for the Americas and for the free world. It hopes that nothing will prevent that event from taking place and it here and now extends brotherly greetings to the new State in anticipation

of beneficial and friendly relations based on co-operation between them.

176. We therefore have no objection to the basic ideas contained in that draft resolution. Indeed, we should like to stress the importance of operative paragraph 4, which appeals to the political parties to resolve existing differences so that by mutual agreement the precious boon of independence which their homeland is to enjoy can produce its best results in an atmosphere of national peace and unity. It is inconceivable that the nations solemnly and irrevocably pledged here to the cause of world peace should remain indifferent to the distressing spectacle of bloodshed and tension, with an undertone of violence which not infrequently flares up from the embers of racial discrimination, trade union disputes and partisan conflicts still smoldering since the 1964 elections.

177. While it is far from our intention to challenge in any way the right of the conflicting parties or groups to settle their domestic differences as they see fit, and we have no desire to scrutinize from the outside the causes of those differences, we should like to see them settled; it is our duty to state this, and we are confident that none of the parties concerned, whatever the conflict dividing them, will regard this as constituting undue interference in their private affairs.

178. In the light of all these considerations, my delegation would have voted in favour of this draft resolution; but, as it stated in the Fourth Committee when this matter was being discussed, it was surprised to note an obvious lacuna in the text, which compelled it to abstain as it did, namely the omission of an explicit reference to the long-standing difference between Venezuela and the United Kingdom regarding the boundaries of a part of the Territory known as British Guiana, or to the negotiations on this subject.

179. Such a reference would be perfectly in keeping with the terms of operative paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 (XV), bearing in mind the Venezuelan claim that its territorial integrity has been violated. We have always upheld firmly but with the utmost circumspection Venezuela's right to advance its claims, though that does not imply that we take a stand either for or against them.

180. But to remain silent on this point could be tantamount to a tacit refusal to admit the possibility of a violation of the claimant's territorial integrity. To ignore the problem at this time could lead to misinterpretation of the General Assembly's views and might even be taken to imply the existence of a presumption that there is no case to be made out in connexion with the territorial integrity issue. This argument is strengthened when we examine the background of this question, as summarized in a clear and orderly fashion by the Venezuelan representative in the Fourth Committee, and especially the records which show that the General Assembly itself has taken note of the disagreement.

181. In view of the importance of this matter we feel that we should stress it and list the occasions on which it has been brought up: for example, in the Fourth Committee, at the 1302nd meeting (sixteenth session); in the Special Political Committee, at the 348th meet-

ing (seventeenth session); in the General Assembly, at the 1,191st meeting (seventeenth session); in the Committee on Twenty-four, at the 389th meeting held in June 1963; in the General Assembly, during the general debate, at the meetings held on 1 October 1963, 8 December 1964 and 6 October 1965. Moreover, on a number of occasions there have been arrangements and negotiations through the diplomatic channel with a view to ending the dispute between the Governments of the United Kingdom and Venezuela, with the intervention of representatives of British Guiana, as in the present instance.

182. We should therefore ask ourselves why, when the Assembly is thoroughly informed on the question, now that the independence of Guiana is approaching, it is ignoring the matter, notwithstanding the earnest request of Venezuela. A refusal in these circumstances does little credit to the impartiality of treatment which the United Nations owes to the case.

183. Moreover, the position of Venezuela has been most praiseworthy, and its statement guaranteeing that it will raise no obstacle to the steady advance of British Guiana towards independence most generous. The recent words of the Venezuelan representative in the debate in the Special Committee indicate as much. The summary record of his statement contains the following paragraph:

"In conclusion, his delegation wishes to place explicitly on record the fact that what he has just said did not in any way alter his country's position on the problem of the frontiers between Venezuela and the Territory of British Guiana. The Venezuelan position had been set forth in full by Mr. Sosa Rodríguez, who, upon addressing the Special Committee when it had first taken up the question of British Guiana, had quoted his own statement of 22 February 1962 in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly. The speaker referred members of the Committee to that statement, and declared that Venezuela had never taken the position that the independence of British Guiana was conditional upon prior settlement of the frontier problem." [A/5800/Rev.1, chap. VII, para. 176.]

184. In a speech on 7 December of this year in the Fourth Committee, the Venezuelan representative reaffirmed the foregoing in words to the effect that his country was not in any way opposed to the independence of British Guiana.

185. The request of Venezuela—which the majority of the Latin American countries supported—for the addition to the draft resolution which the Assembly has just studied of a reference to its frontier problem and the negotiations for its solution did not, in our opinion, imply any call for the deferment of British Guiana's independence. Hence its introduction in the text of the draft resolution would have done no harm whatever as far as its main substance is concerned. On the contrary, it would have afforded an excellent opportunity of strengthening the bonds between all Member States and, far from impeding the endeavour to hasten and make effective British Guiana's independence, it would have helped to bring about the approval of the resolution by an almost unanimous affirmative vote.

186. My delegation makes this statement, motivated not only by the sense of continental solidarity which of course we feel, and not merely through affection for our brothers in Venezuela, with whom we are united in history through the genius of Bolívar, the Liberator, but above all because of an all-embracing desire for total collaboration among all freedom-loving countries which pays no heed to theories which give even the slightest weight to ethnic or geographical differences. For we maintain that an easy-going attitude in these matters leads dangerously close to a situation in which ambition or greed prevail.

187. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) (translated from Spanish): I feel I must explain, as briefly as I can, our position in regard to the voting which has just taken place and our request for separate votes on certain paragraphs.

188. I should like first to refer to the separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution III on Equatorial Guinea (A/6160, para. 50). If representatives examine it carefully, the resolution can be reduced to two specific proposals: one, that the principle of self-determination should be applied in Equatorial Guinea, and the other, that Spain should be requested to fix a possible or probable date for the declaration of independence of Equatorial Guinea.

189. In all sincerity we consider that these two requests are superfluous. The first because the principle of self-determination, which we are asked to apply, has been in process of application in Equatorial Guinea for approximately two years now. As a result there is in existence in that country an autonomous General Council, alongside which a whole political-administrative structure has been created under the banner of self-determination. The second request is even more surprising—that in operative paragraph 2, on which the Spanish delegation requested a separate vote.

190. Since an autonomous régime exists there and the principle of self-determination has been in operation for almost two years, how can we fix dates? Is it not clear, and more than clear, that such a purpose and such a decision to fix dates are entirely matters for the Guinean people? If it were not so, for what purpose would the Guineans want self-government?

191. It was for the reasons I have just pointed out that we asked for a separate vote. And I must add that it seems to me to be unfair, after the advent of an autonomous régime in Equatorial Guinea and after the authoritative declaration which the President of the Guinean government, Mr. Ondó Edu, made in a fine speech in this Assembly, that the draft resolution did not even contain any allusion to the present situation and that this new and important status granted to Guinea, through Spain's initiative, has not been recognized by even a single word. These are the reasons which prompted us to ask for a separate vote in connexion with the draft resolution concerning Equatorial Guinea.

192. My delegation now wishes to make a few brief remarks concerning draft resolution VIII (A/6160, para. 50) on the question of Ifni and Spanish Sahara which has just been adopted by the Assembly. The Territories appear in one and the same resolution,

as we all know, although they are separate geographical entities.

193. Spain has no doubt whatever concerning its rights of every kind in those Territories, and has said and says again that preparatory work of great importance is being undertaken there so that it may be possible to apply the policy of decolonization, as it is understood by the United Nations and as it has been defined by the Special Committee known as the Committee of Twenty-four. Spanish intentions in this matter could hardly be suspect when, as is known, we ourselves are the victims of a colonial problem at home, which we wish to solve in accordance with the decisions of this Organization.

194. We have stated on various occasions and we now repeat: we are not asking for anything which we are not prepared to give ourselves, and on the other hand, nothing can be demanded from us which is refused us.

195. At the 1318th plenary meeting, held on 21 January 1965, while commenting on two resolutions adopted by the Special Committee—on Equatorial Guinea and on Ifni and Spanish Sahara—I said, inter alia:

"The Committee's resolutions to which I have referred are receiving and will receive the full attention of the Government of Spain. We are working, quietly but unremittingly, towards the establishment of those conditions which the nature of things demands as the minimum for the achievement of satisfactory results. The Committee and the Assembly will be notified of these matters in due course." [1318th meeting, para. 33.]

196. Representatives will recall that at the meeting which the Special Committee held on 16 October 1964, it adopted the resolution on Ifni and Spanish Sahara which appears in chapter IX, paragraph 112, of the Special Committee's report [A/6800/Rev.1]. The Special Committee examined the question thoroughly, and my delegation had the opportunity to set forth its point of view and to place its rights on record. Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that the Special Committee had discussed this question in 1963.

197. And what is happening now? What discussion of these two Territories has there been in the Fourth Committee? Absolutely none.

198. The Assembly is aware that the representative of Morocco made certain reservations—as he was perfectly entitled to do. My delegation replied with the usual and necessary counter-reservations. The delegation of Mauritania, likewise in exercise of its right, also expressed reservations concerning Spanish Sahara. Again my delegation set forth its counter-reservations. The representatives of Morocco and Mauritania spoke several times concerning what they consider to be their respective rights. I realize that it was rather a question of spelling out their interests for the benefit of the Committee, but the latter had no opportunity to debate the question fully.

199. It is only fair to observe that the Chairman of the Fourth Committee was prepared at the time to suggest a date for full and proper discussion, but the representatives of Tanzania and Liberia, particularly the lady representing the latter country, said that in their view such a debate would serve no purpose and

requested that their statements should be placed on record. My delegation said nothing and accepted the Committee's judgement, namely that there should be no debate.

200. Nor has the question been discussed in the plenary meeting of the Assembly. Consequently, we would have found it perfectly logical to confine ourselves to adopting the resolution of the Special Committee, because that is what we have been doing with all its decisions, although it will surprise nobody if we say that we are not very happy about some of the terms used and cannot accept them. But that was not what happened; and now here we have operative paragraph 2 of resolution VIII which we regard as altogether unacceptable, because it is tantamount to stating a conclusion without having considered or clarified the facts of the matter, adopting a resolution without previous debate, and arriving at a judgement without consideration of the underlying reasons which amply justify our rights or which might explain the rights which other countries may assert. This is contrary to justice and therefore cannot be accepted, and we would like to state categorically that, so far as we are concerned, we wash our hands of it.

201. After discussions in the Special Committee through 1963 and 1964, a resolution was adopted by 20 votes to none, with 3 abstentions. And that, I repeat, was after a thorough discussion of the item for two sessions in the Special Committee.

202. After the representative of Spain had explained the matter in the Fourth Committee (1570th meeting) much as I am now doing, the final words of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution VIII on which we have just voted were put to the vote. It reads as follows: "... and, to this end, to enter into negotiations on the problems relating to sovereignty presented by these two Territories."

203. This question was never discussed in the Fourth Committee and has never been discussed in the plenary meeting of the Assembly. The result of the separate vote on the words in question in the Fourth Committee was 35 to 2, with 55 abstentions. In the vote just taken on those same final words of operative paragraph 2, the result was 33 to 2, with 69 abstentions.

204. I do not think that these mass abstentions will have come as a surprise to the Assembly. How could any other result have been expected when the many implications of the words had not been examined previously and very thoroughly, as they should have been. The result is that out of 117 countries represented in the United Nations, 33 approved the words; the others did not subscribe to them. In the light of those results, what moral and political significance can the words still have?

205. All we ask with regard to the process of decolonization in Ifni and the Sahara is that you have confidence in us and allow us to pursue the proper course, taking the utmost care as regards time-limits and exercising due caution in applying the methods called for by the realities of the situation, and without being tempted by any dangerous *ad hoc* arrangements. I am certain that all those here present, and particularly those representing the African continent, understand me perfectly and know

deep down that my words are motivated by sincere convictions and sound reasoning.

206. So much for my explanation of the attitude taken by the Spanish delegation for technical reasons, for reasons of strict and proper procedure, against the inclusion of wording of which neither the Fourth Committee nor the Assembly have had an opportunity to discuss up to this moment.

207. I should like to conclude by addressing a few cordial remarks from the bottom of my heart as a Spaniard to the great Argentine people, who will appreciate their sincerity. The problem of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) is one which stirs their patriotic feelings. They know very well how much we sympathize with them and how much we would like the restoration of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) to the great southern Republic to be added to the store of prosperity and greatness which we pray will be theirs in future.

208. Finally, what shall I say about the position of Venezuela on draft resolution VII concerning British Guiana? Remember that Venezuela's main argument stems directly in its legal, historical and sentimental aspects from its Spanish heritage. What Venezuela is claiming for its own is what it inherited from Spain. When it became independent, it was taken for granted that all it had received and inherited from Spain belonged to Venezuela. That is the truth of the matter. We as Spaniards—specifically, my delegation in the name of Spain—would like to see British Guiana independent and hope that independence will come soon. However, we trust that in the process the sacred historic rights of Venezuela will not be violated; on the contrary, let us all treat those rights with the utmost respect.

209. To be candid, the record of the Venezuelan delegation, and of Venezuela in this instance, in all areas, but especially in that of decolonization, is one of the most outstanding. It would be a grave injustice to deny that Venezuela is in the vanguard of those providing enthusiastic support for the peoples of Africa and Asia who have struggled and are still struggling for freedom and independence.

210. At this time when Venezuela is laying claim to what is very much its own on every conceivable ground, without harming anyone, without prejudicing in any way the sacred interests of others, Spain would have liked the world to recall for a moment the magnificent, indeed, glorious contribution of Venezuela to the activities of the United Nations, and particularly to the problems of decolonization.

211. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) (translated from French): My delegation would like to make some comments in explanation of its vote on the resolution which the General Assembly has just adopted by 100 votes to 2 (those of Spain and Portugal), with 4 abstentions. As you know, Morocco was not a co-sponsor of this draft resolution although it is directly concerned, in the same way as Spain is concerned with Gibraltar, and Argentina with the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). We therefore did not consider it necessary to be a co-sponsor of this text, and we wish to pay a tribute to our brothers and friends in the Afro-Asian Group who have been kind enough to study this colonial

problem with the closest attention and particular interest, and who demonstrated their interest by submitting this draft resolution to the Fourth Committee.

212. In my delegation's view, this shows that the colonial problems facing the world, whether in Africa, America or Asia, are still a subject of concern and interest to all peoples who cherish justice and freedom and who are devoted to the cause of decolonization.

213. But my delegation feels bound to express some surprise at the explanations just given by the representative of Spain; I can say this all the more frankly because my country maintains excellent relations with Spain, and because ever since we regained our independence we have made strenuous and continuous efforts to solve outstanding problems bound up with the decolonization of the whole of our national territory. We know that when Spain recognized the independence of Morocco and agreed to restore some of its territories, a problem arose concerning those of our territories which have remained under foreign occupation. Since that time, we have never lost confidence in the value of negotiation and in the sincerity of our Spanish negotiating partners. We believe that the question of negotiation in regard to such problems can never be left out of a debate of any kind, even a debate which Morocco did not initiate and has not wished to make acrimonious by sensational statements. But at the same time, representatives will recognize, as we do, that justice and common sense require that colonial problems should be settled, through negotiation or any other means, since the essential point is for the advocates of colonialism, or at least what is left of it on our territory, to realize that the age in which we live is incompatible with any kind of foreign domination.

214. I should also like to say how much I welcome the words spoken just now by the representative of Spain recalling his very encouraging words during the General Assembly meeting of 21 January 1965 [1318th meeting] regarding the resolutions adopted by the Special Committee, including one relating to the territories claimed by Morocco.

215. However, there is one point on which I am forced to dwell briefly. I am bound to express Morocco's disagreement with the claims that Ifni and Spanish Sahara are two separate geographical entities. In the case before us, this is partially true in the sense that Ifni and Spanish Sahara are geographically separated, but in actual fact, and taking into account all the geographical, historical, cultural and legal factors, they are integral parts of a single national territory. It is in this sense that I would interpret the Special Committee's intentions and that a draft resolution relating to these two parts of our national territory has been submitted [draft resolution VIII].

216. We maintain—and I am merely repeating what I said the other day in the Fourth Committee [1583rd meeting]—that the process of colonization which Morocco experienced at the beginning of this century and which continued until the 1930's involved the occupation of this territory as an integral part of Morocco.

217. Representatives may know that after being given the status of a Protectorate, Morocco was no longer able to exercise sovereign authority, as an independent State, over the whole of its national territory. The Powers administering Morocco and controlling Moroccan national territory occasionally took arbitrary action which cut Morocco off from certain parts of its territory, and that is exactly what happened in the case of the Territories at present administered by Spain.

218. We therefore oppose any ideas of trying to separate the future of these Territories, which we maintain form an integral part of Morocco's national territory.

219. The representative of Spain referred incidentally to the abstention of a great number of delegations in the vote on a part of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. We realize that many delegations did not have an opportunity to study this problem in depth; but we must also state that an abstention is not an expression of opposition, and it must not be thought that an abstention on a particular point means opposition to the views expressed in it. Furthermore, I know from information which has come to me personally that many delegations abstained in error; they have told me so. It would therefore be wrong to set too much store by these abstentions. The fact remains that the draft resolution was adopted by the almost unanimous vote of members present and voting, and that is the most important point in the eyes of the General Assembly.

220. Before concluding, I should also like, in this spirit of negotiation, to remind members of the Assembly that since its independence, Morocco has constantly brought this question before the competent bodies.

221. It is therefore not a new question for the Assembly, because since 1956 the Fourth Committee has regularly considered the existence of this colonial problem, which is one of special concern to Morocco. But Morocco has so far never pressed to the full the advantage which its links of friendship and solidarity give it with many delegations present here so as to have the question included on the General Assembly's agenda, the particular reason being that we have always had confidence in our friendship and in the promises which we have repeatedly received, and have always agreed, with renewed confidence, that this problem should be resolved by negotiation between the two countries concerned, namely, Morocco and Spain.

222. I should also like to remind the Assembly that the Special Committee has been studying this problem in detail since 1963, as is clear from its documents for 1963 and 1964, which I presume all Members of the Assembly have noted; they have been circulated and are available to all.

223. With regard to the opinion expressed by Spain, which we welcomed with sympathy and interest, I should like to quote a passage from the 213th meeting of the Special Committee held on 18 September 1963. In his statement, the Spanish representative said:

"The members of the Committee will have had an opportunity, through the Press, to become familiar

with the very important conferences which are being held during recent months between the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Spain and Morocco, the Information Ministers of the two countries and, what is more important, the journey of the Vice-Premier of the Spanish Government, Mr. Muñoz Grandes, and the conference last June between His Excellency the Head of the Spanish State and His Majesty the King of Morocco at Barajas. This Committee will, therefore, easily realize that these countries, so inextricably linked by a common history, by bonds of brotherhood, have at times had their minor differences, but these differences have been in the process of settlement for some time. It is precisely to that effect that the favourable environment has been created, in which not only territorial problems [I stress the 'territorial problems'] "can be discussed, but those which we would call the administrative—even the judicial powers of the respective countries—are being studied in the spirit of frank understanding and good relations. In such an atmosphere in these and in later conversations we shall continue to clarify various existing problems. Therefore, my delegation believes that the Committee will fully realize the desirability of promoting this propitious atmosphere, which is one that will enable us to settle all the pending problems. My delegation wishes to repeat, once again, its decision to continue along this path, which we believe will lead us, as we have indicated previously, to the culmination of negotiations."

Again I stress the phrase "to the culmination of negotiations".

224. At the 215th meeting of the Special Committee, after hearing the representatives of Spain and Morocco, the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Sori Coulibaly, concluded by expressing what he felt to be the consensus of opinion, which he had drawn up in agreement with the members of the Committee. This is what the Chairman of the Special Committee felt to be the consensus:

"I have no further speakers on this item of the agenda, but I have been informed that the Special Committee, after hearing the statement made on Ifni and Spanish Sahara by the representatives of the Spanish Government, the Government of Morocco and the Government of Mauritania, feels that it does not have sufficient time to pursue the general debate on the situation obtaining in these two Territories. The Committee has noted that the representative of Spain, in his statement, recalled the declaration to the effect that his Government had committed itself to respect the principle of self-determination by the peoples under its administration. The Committee has also taken note of the fact that negotiations are under way between the Spanish Government and the Government of Morocco with a view of finding a peaceful settlement to the dispute dividing them and discussing the future of these two Territories."

225. This means that the members of the General Assembly, who have certainly had an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the documents of the Committee of Twenty-four, one of the most important bodies of the General Assembly, should not regard this as a new problem for the Assembly any more than it is for its members. It is a problem of long

standing. It is true that for a number of years the Spanish Government would not agree to provide information on the colonial Territories which it administers as Non-Self-Governing Territories. But when it finally decided to do so, four or five years ago, I recall that all the members of the General Assembly, in the Fourth Committee, welcomed this gesture of goodwill made by the Spanish Government in a spirit of co-operation with the United Nations. We believe that this process should continue, but we also believe that it should be continued at a certain logical rate, in accordance with the process of decolonization proceeding in other parts of the world.

226. I should also like to recall, still in connexion with this explanation, that during the meetings of the Special Committee in 1964, at its 284th meeting held on 30 September 1964, the Spanish representative stated:

"As regards the other territories included in the item we are now discussing"—Spanish Sahara and Ifni—"and concerning whose situation we made a detailed statement last year, a careful perusal of document A/AC.109/71, containing the letter from the Permanent Representative of Spain mentioned earlier, in our view, furnishes all the necessary elements of judgement which, from the point of view of doctrine and conduct, might be of interest to the members of this Committee. And in order to help to clarify the matter further, I must point out that, in our view, the best means for the solution of the existing problems between the two countries"—I emphasize "the two countries"—"is that of direct negotiation if those countries, as it is so in this particular case, really want to come to an understanding."

"This is the spirit of Spain and we have given continued proof of this fact. As an eloquent example, may I refer to our excellent relations with Morocco. They were left open to very wide horizons on the occasion of the unforgettable interview between King Hassan II and the Head of the Spanish State in May 1963, and were confirmed by the visit to Rabat of our Foreign Minister, Mr. Castiella, in July 1964."

"All this leads us to hope and expect satisfactory development for all the problems that concern Moroccans and Spaniards. We stated last year, and we have repeated this on different occasions, that the climate of good friendship that governed the official interviews between Spaniards and Moroccans, and which gave rise to relations of true friendship, will no doubt enable us to solve, in the spirit of understanding and mutual confidence, the pending disputes. This attitude of being prepared for a dialogue is permanent in Spain and the basis of its conduct in the field of foreign policy."

227. This goodwill repeatedly shown by Spain in the Special Committee has always been reciprocated by Morocco. I think that we have shown by actions and views which speak for themselves the desire of the Moroccan people, of His Majesty the King of Morocco and his Government, to leave no stone unturned in order to stamp the relations between Morocco and Spain with the seal of friendship, brotherhood and co-operation, as should be the case.

228. Since the representative of Spain made the statement I have had the pleasure of partially quoting, the Assembly may recall from press reports that our Head of State also went to Spain this year and had the opportunity of meeting H.E. Generalissimo Franco, the Head of the Spanish State. As a result of our economic, cultural, political and social relations, we have demonstrated our goodwill and our desire to co-operate closely with Spain, and to resolve the problems pending between our two countries in an atmosphere of friendship, co-operation and mutual understanding of the interests involved. We cannot therefore agree that goodwill or good intentions have only been shown by one side. Morocco has always tried to show, by practical gestures and by its conduct, that its one desire and its principal concern is to solve all the outstanding problems with Spain in an atmosphere of friendship and brotherhood. In speaking of outstanding problems, I am thinking primarily of the very important territorial dispute between our two countries, which we are trying to solve peacefully by all the means at our disposal.

229. I must also state that Morocco has never sought to initiate a debate on the substance of the question now before the General Assembly. We have always been anxious—and this is the considered policy of the Moroccan Government—that this outstanding territorial dispute with Spain should be settled through bilateral negotiations outside international forums and international bodies, and I am bound to say that the present discussion, and the adoption of a resolution by the General Assembly, is not Morocco's doing. It results from the general awareness, in the Afro-Asian family of countries and in all parts of the world, of the need to solve all colonial problems; and when a colonial problem is raised—in particular a problem which affects us directly and profoundly—we cannot treat it with indifference. We are compelled to agree to a discussion even if we did not want one, and I shall conclude on this note, by saying that Morocco has not sought to initiate a substantive debate on this question and has always wanted the problems of sovereignty arising in respect of the Moroccan Territories administered by Spain to be solved through direct negotiations between the two countries. But as soon as Morocco does take the initiative in opening a substantive debate on the question of the Territories administered by Spain, then it will immediately assume all its responsibilities and make all the necessary arrangements to have this item include on the Assembly's agenda.

230. At present we are dealing with items considered by the Special Committee which are of concern to the Afro-Asian world and to all countries devoted to the cause of decolonization. We believe that our role is limited to active, fruitful and positive participation designed to help towards the solution of this problem. We have no desire whatsoever to create a conflict with our Spanish friends in an international forum. What we do want is to have the problem settled, through force of circumstances, through the pressure of the international conscience, and in accordance with the concept of justice and humanity which inspires all the peoples of the world, on a just and equitable basis in keeping with the moral, political and material

interests of the people concerned, as well as with the legitimate rights of the country which I have the honour to represent here. Those rights have been effectively and permanently exercised for more than a thousand years over these Territories, which have been administered by Spain for the very short space of forty or fifty years, but which are an integral part of our national territory.

231. Mr. REDONDO GOMEZ (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): In accordance with its tradition of supporting the aspirations of colonial peoples to freedom and independence, the Costa Rican delegation voted in favour of draft resolution III [A/6160, para. 50] concerning Spanish Equatorial Guinea.

232. In keeping with the most elementary principles of justice, my delegation would also like to place on record its appreciation of the co-operation of the Spanish Government with a view to bringing to fruition as soon as possible the noble aspirations of the people of Spanish Guinea.

233. With that country on the threshold of freedom, my delegation is joyfully preparing to greet it as another member of the great Spanish-speaking community on which the values of eternal Spain have left their indelible hall-mark.

234. Spanish Guinea will be an excellent means of helping the Spanish-American peoples to acquire a proper understanding of the peoples of the African continent; for with the virtues it has inherited from the magnificent cultural past of Spain it will surely be the ideal spokesman for our hopes for a better world.

235. With regard to the question of the independence of British Guiana, my delegation made it very clear during the debate in the Fourth Committee that it was in no circumstances opposed to allowing the people of that colony to enjoy the fruits of freedom. On the contrary, we rejoiced then and we rejoice now at the prospect that it will join the little band of American States. However, we were compelled to abstain in the vote on draft resolution VII [A/6160, para. 50] in view of the fact that Venezuela was not given an opportunity to place on record the existence of a frontier or territorial dispute. Our position is the same here.

236. Lastly, my delegation is deeply gratified by the support given by this Assembly to the cause of our sister republic, Argentina; and we offer our warmest congratulations.

237. Mr. LICHTVELD (Netherlands): With regard to British Guiana, which is to become Guyana shortly—without an adjective—I wish to say the following: when, in a large harmonious family, a new member is about to be born, it is especially the next-of-kin who is interested and happy about the approaching event. Without questioning whether the new infant will be a boy or a girl, or even twins, they are felicitous about the happy outcome of the act of overcoming the pains of birth and the dangers of entering our world and its life full of vicissitudes.

238. In the case of Guyana, which is about to be born as an independent nation, and which will achieve this status on 26 May 1966, the Kingdom of the Netherlands rightfully considers itself to be one of the next-of-kin

because of the fact that Surinam, one of the three partners of the Kingdom, is a neighbouring country of Guyana, with whom it has shared many centuries of common colonial history and many actual interests and problems. It is for this reason that my delegation wants to be among the very first to congratulate Guyana on the approaching event and to express its satisfaction at the happy outcome of the long internal struggle which its people had to wage in order to overcome the many dangers and difficulties on the long road to full independence. Surinam can only wish that the new independent nation on its western flank will fully develop and grow prosperous to our common benefit, adding its share to the cultural, social and economic welfare not only of the Guyanese region but of the entire hemisphere and the whole world of free nations. In addition, we who, in our Kingdom, have been fortunate enough to find a way of freely associating the former metropolitan country with its two decolonized partners into a trinity of co-equal and free components, want to compliment the United Kingdom, which again proved its wisdom in granting independence to one of its former dependencies. Once more, our heartfelt congratulations to the originators and the beneficiaries of this conspicuous feat of political evolution.

239. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): My Government has been heartened by the great interest shown in the Cook Islands case and by the fairmindedness and objectivity of the overwhelming majority of delegations. We did not seek the expression of appreciation in the resolution approved this afternoon, because we regard this Organization as the most effective element in promoting decolonization and we therefore extend our co-operation as a matter of course. We are, nevertheless, encouraged by this generous expression. It may encourage others too.

240. It is perhaps no easy thing for representatives from former colonies now seated in this Organization as the representatives of independent States, to accept that a dependent people may wish to choose a status for itself other than full, sovereign independence. Nevertheless, in the Fourth Committee debate on the Cook Islands, as had been the case in the Committee of Twenty-four, speaker after speaker recognized that, in the process of self-determination, the will of the people is paramount and cannot be ignored. This has been, we believe, an interesting experiment in the exercise of self-determination by a small territory. It is rightly regarded as neither usual nor normal that a colonial people voluntarily decide to restrict its sovereignty, even if, as in this case, it retains the right to resume that sovereignty. But when it does so under conditions of complete freedom and in full knowledge of the implications, the choice must be respected. That most delegations have been prepared to accept this is an answer to those who have accused the United Nations as a whole of wishing to foist on colonial peoples its own view of the status to which they should be aspiring. The dictatorial or doctrinaire approach, the new paternalism, is, as some revealing votes today demonstrated, confined to a quite unrepresentative minority. Often this fact is permitted to be obscured. May I record what I believe to be true: that in this case, if it had not been for the courage, ability and tenacity of the representative of Liberia, the great majority of Members of the United Nations

might have been denied the opportunity of registering their true opinions. Thus this lady not only advanced the cause of the people of the Cook Islands, but she added to the prestige of the United Nations itself.

241. New Zealand supported the paragraphs of this resolution as it now stands because we felt that they met the requirements of the situation. We voted for operative paragraph 6, for example, because of the specific context provided by the Constitution of the Cook Islands and the alignment of the terms of this paragraph with those of the Constitution. The Constitution which the Cook Islanders drew up provides for the people to move, if they so wish to do in the future, through clearly defined and democratic processes into any practicable status, including, of course, sovereign independence. The operation of this constitutional machinery is solely responsive, quite properly, to the will of the majority of the people of the Cook Islands. It is for the people of the Cook Islands to set the machinery of self-determination in motion again, and similarly, it is for them to determine, what role may be played by outside agencies in discussions about changing their political status. In accordance with the requirements of the Constitution, the text of the draft resolution was transmitted to the Premier of the Cook Islands, Mr. Albert Henry. He is gratified by the terms of the resolution and is happy to know that if it is the wish of the duly constituted Government of the Cook Islands, the United Nations holds itself ready to help in any future move towards changing the status of the Cook Islands. He is particularly pleased, given the problems of economic development facing his people, with the hopeful note in the final paragraph—that the United Nations Development Programme and the specialized agencies will endeavour to contribute in every way possible to the development and strengthening of the economy of his country.

242. On that note, an expression of pleasure from a former colonial people at the role which has been played and may be played in the future by this Organization in their development, I conclude.

243. Mr. MARQUES SERE (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): My delegation had an opportunity to explain its position on the various Territories referred to in draft resolutions I to VIII [A/6160, para. 50] in the course of the debate in the Fourth Committee, and previously, in the Special Committee.

244. However, it would like once again to explain its vote on draft resolution VII just adopted concerning British Guiana because this is probably the last time the General Assembly will deal with the item before British Guiana becomes an independent State.

245. As we stated in the Committee, we should like to say first that the date of British Guiana's accession to independence will be a day of special significance and rejoicing for all Latin America because it will mean that another portion of American Territory has attained independence, thus continuing a process initiated over a century and a half ago whose completion has been a process initiated over a century and a half ago whose completion has been unjustifiably delayed.

246. Together with many other Latin American countries, we have tried hard—and indeed for that very reason we asked the Fourth Committee to postpone the vote on this draft resolution—to produce a draft which would be acceptable to the sponsors. We sought some formula which, while not delaying the Territory's independence by a single hour, would recognize the existence of a problem involving a territorial dispute over a part of the Territory of British Guiana in which our sister country Venezuela has a stake.

247. In the draft resolution we have just adopted there is not a word about this. The statement read by the Chairman of the Fourth Committee, and noted by the Assembly, has partially rectified that omission. The Latin American delegations wanted to rectify it, but in a more detailed way: in other words, they wanted to ensure that when a resolution as important as that on British Guiana was adopted, the problem would not be disregarded. As a matter of simple logic affecting the continuity of the work of the United Nations, some reference should have been made to it so that the omission would not be interpreted as a decision of the Assembly.

248. The dispute will not cease to exist merely because it is not mentioned in the resolution. This kind of problem is a millstone round the neck of a small country on the threshold of independence, if we do not try to work out at least the beginning of a just and peaceful solution, ruling out the use of force. That was the purpose of our efforts, without prejudice to the merits of the case made by the parties, which anyway we are not competent to decide. Our refusal to prejudge the case is something we should like to impress upon the new State now about to attain independence, which should find in the rule of law and the peaceful settlement of disputes its greatest safeguard.

249. The statement of which the General Assembly took note made it possible for us to vote for this draft resolution with more reassurance; since it reserves the rights claimed by a Member State, it does not delay the long-awaited independence of British Guiana by a single day, and it creates no new problem for the State about to become independent.

250. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): In view of the late hour, I shall be brief. During the discussion in the Fourth Committee of the draft resolution on Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland, the USSR delegation made a number of reservations regarding the establishment of a voluntary fund. I wish to reaffirm the position taken by my delegation in the Fourth Committee.

251. The USSR delegation abstained on the question of Gibraltar. It also explained in the Fourth Committee why it abstained, and I should like to reaffirm its position on this question.

252. With regard to the Cook Islands, the USSR delegation voted against operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the resolution. We gave the reasons for our vote in the Fourth Committee, and now reaffirm our position on these paragraphs.

253. Considering that paragraph 6 refers to the responsibility of the United Nations under General

Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) to assist the people of the Cook Islands in the eventual achievement of full independence at a future date, the USSR delegation abstained in the vote on the resolution as a whole.

254. Finally, we must express our disagreement with the way in which the President conducted the voting on operative paragraph 3 of the resolution on twenty-six colonial Territories [A/6160, paragraph 50, draft resolution V]. The practice in the United Nations has been that when there is a vote requiring a two-thirds majority the President draws the attention of the Assembly to that fact. This the President failed to do.

255. Since during the voting a new factor arose on which some delegations expressed a wish to comment, it was the President's duty to allow them to speak. This, too, he failed to do, although they had a legitimate right to speak. We wish to express our disagreement with the way in which the President handled this matter.

256. Mr. O'HARA (United States of America): I shall do my best to set a pattern of brevity, realizing that the hour is late and that we are all fatigued.

257. My delegation is gratified that draft resolution V [A/6160] was adopted without operative paragraphs 3 and 4 and it is pleased that it was therefore able to vote in favour of the resolution.

258. I must point out, however, that, in voting for this resolution, my delegation did so with certain reservations, specifically with respect to preambular paragraph 4 and operative paragraphs 1 and 2, which refer to resolutions and reports concerning some of which my delegation has earlier expressed its reservations.

259. Operative paragraph 2, moreover, does not take into account the particular circumstances obtaining in some of these small territories and does not recognize recent political advances and constitutional developments which have taken place in them.

260. With respect to operative paragraph 5, I should like to note simply that it is up to each administering Power to decide whether to receive visiting missions in its territory, a fact which the wording of the paragraph seems to recognize.

261. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia): In so far as concerns draft resolution V which relates, be it noted, to twenty-six territories—which prevented the expression of attitudes with regard to individual territories—the vote of my delegation is to be construed as relating, in general, only to the main principles involved. In particular, it is not in any way an endorsement of the most significant sections of the resolution in relation to the two Australian territories mentioned, in connexion with which, of course, the attitude of my delegation must in principle and generally be one of abstention, while at particular points, which have been fully explained in the Committee of Twenty-four, it would have had to be one of opposition in separate voting.

262. Mr. ADAN (Somalia): My delegation did not participate in the voting on the resolution dealing with Ifni and Spanish Sahara for the following reasons.

The Government and people of the Republic of Somalia are unreservedly committed to the noble principle of self-determination, as enshrined in the United Nations Charter and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

263. The provisions of the resolution of Ifni and Spanish Sahara invoked resolution 1514 (XV) in calling for the liberation of these two territories. As far as this goes, my delegation has no reservations. However, my delegation does not consider the latter half of operative paragraph 2, which calls for negotiations on the problems relating to sovereignty, as strictly in keeping with the letter and spirit of that Declaration, the underlying principle of which is the right of peoples to decide their own future.

264. My delegation appreciates that in certain isolated cases problems of sovereignty exist and that Ifni and Spanish Sahara may well be among those isolated cases. My delegation, however, considers that any problem of decolonization which has to be dealt with under resolution 1514 (XV) presupposes that the principle of self-determination will be taken into account.

265. In conclusion, my delegation hopes that Ifni and Spanish Sahara will be freed from colonial domination to the satisfaction of the parties concerned and with full regard paid to the wishes of the peoples of those territories.

266. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (translated from Spanish): In exercise of its right of reply, my delegation would

like to point out once again that it is not anxious to open a debate on Ifni and Sahara, despite the efforts just made by the representative of Morocco to do so.

267. I personally took part in the discussions to which he referred, and that is why I asked to speak. There is a ready reply to all he has said, but my delegation would like to point out that it is inadmissible to quote part of a statement and omit other parts. Any statement constitutes a coherent whole. The decision referred to by the Moroccan representative as the consensus reached in 1963 was not a consensus at all. All the Committee did was to note the fact that it did not have time to finalize its decision. That decision was adopted on 16 October 1964.

268. I do not wish to tax your patience, Mr. President, or that of the representatives here present, but to argue now that those who did not support the words relating to problems of sovereignty were in error when they cast their vote does not, we feel, speak very highly for the members who have voted in that way on two occasions: in the Fourth Committee and in this Assembly.

269. I wish to reiterate all that was said by the chairman of my delegation, Mr. Aznar, and once again to protest against the citing of a context bearing no relation to the decisions of the Special Committee and the discussions of the Fourth Committee. Their judgement was upheld by 70 votes. When all is said and done, this fact is incontrovertible.

The meeting rose at 8.25 p.m.