



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 24th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JAMAL (Qatar)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 19: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

UN-UP/1981

DAC 4/1981

UN Doc. A/36/SR.24

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 19: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/C.4/36/L.18)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Question of Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, Montserrat, the Cayman Islands and the Turks and Caicos Islands (A/C.4/36/L.14 and A/C.4/36/L.21)

Question of Guam (A/C.4/36/L.16 and A/C.4/36/L.22)

Question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (A/C.4/36/L.15)

1. Mr. BOLE (Fiji), introducing the amendment in document A/C.4/36/L.21, said that draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 contained some fundamental principles relating to the responsibility of Member States of the United Nations to facilitate the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. That responsibility, which was embodied in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and other resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to the question of decolonization, implied that Member States, including the administering Powers, recognized the fundamental and inalienable right of dependent peoples to determine their own destiny.
2. Accordingly, in the past, the Committee had traditionally adopted resolutions on that question by consensus.
3. It was therefore unfortunate that, because its wording departed from that normally used by the Committee, draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 had introduced an element of controversy. That was all the more regrettable because most of the members of the Committee genuinely desired that those island countries covered by the draft resolution should smoothly proceed to their chosen destiny, and they believed that efforts should be made to prevent the introduction of elements that could jeopardize the fulfilment of the aspirations of the peoples of those countries.
4. Bearing that in mind, he proposed that the text of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 should be replaced by the amendment in document A/C.4/36/L.21. That amendment took into account not only the procedure normally followed by the Committee, which consisted in adopting its resolutions by consensus, and the obligation of Member States to facilitate the process of decolonization, but also the decision taken on that subject by the Committee at the preceding session of the General Assembly. In that regard, it should be remembered that during the consideration of the question of military bases taken up in the

/...

(Mr. Bole, Fiji)

context of the report of the Visiting Mission to the Turks and Caicos Islands, the Committee had decided, by a considerable majority, to adopt the following wording: "The presence of military bases could constitute a factor impeding the implementation of the Declaration".

5. Besides, General Assembly resolution 35/21 on the island countries under review contained no provision concerning the question of military bases and it did not seem that the situation in those Territories had changed so as to necessitate such a reference in the draft resolution currently under consideration. Furthermore, the documentation on that question before the Committee did not suggest that those facilities were standing in the way of self-determination.

6. Since it was customary for his delegation to co-sponsor resolutions on small Territories, Fiji would have also joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 if that draft had reflected a balanced and realistic perspective of the situation in the Territories concerned. However, it would whole-heartedly support the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus if paragraph 5 was replaced by the amendment in document A/C.4/36/L.21. Consequently, his delegation commended the amendment to the members of the Committee for consideration and support.

7. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic), introducing draft resolutions A/C.4/36/L.14, A/C.4/36/L.15 and A/C.4/36/L.16, said that those drafts reflected the consensus reached in the Special Committee. In addition, they contained broad principles generally accepted by all Member States and were the result of intense efforts and informal consultations in which all parties had participated in a spirit of co-operation. Draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16 in particular was the fruit of the consensus reached by the Special Committee on the basis of a proposal submitted by interested countries.

8. Consequently, on behalf of the sponsors of the three draft resolutions, he appealed to members of the Committee to show a spirit of co-operation and adopt those draft resolutions without a vote and without amendment.

9. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since an amendment (A/C.4/36/L.21) had been proposed to draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14, his delegation believed it essential to confirm its position regarding the question of military bases and facilities in colonial Territories. That position was fully in line with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, in particular, General Assembly resolution 35/118. In that resolution, the Assembly had opposed all military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in the Territories under colonial and racist domination because they constituted an obstacle to the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In addition, the General Assembly had requested Member States to intensify their efforts with a view to securing the immediate withdrawal by the colonial Powers of their military bases and installations.

/...

(Mr. Lozinsky, USSR)

10. However, the documents prepared by the Secretariat of the United Nations indicated that the colonial Powers continued to intensify their military activities in those Territories. The presence of those bases bore witness to the desire of those Powers to perpetuate their colonial or neo-colonial domination in such Territories.

11. Those installations should therefore be removed as a matter of urgency so as to allow the peoples of colonial Territories to exercise freely their right to self-determination and to accede to independence.

12. In that regard, it should be remembered that the position of principle adopted by the United Nations had just been confirmed anew by the adoption by the Fourth Committee of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 in which the General Assembly had called upon South Africa and the colonial Powers concerned to end their military activities in Namibia and other colonial Territories and to eliminate the military bases in accordance with the provisions of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

13. Paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 had been carefully considered by the Sub-Committee on Small Territories of the Committee on Decolonization. The text of the paragraph was the result of a compromise reached during consultations in which the delegation of Fiji, one of the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.4/36/L.21, had taken part.

14. It seemed odd that, after the compromise text had been found generally satisfactory, an attempt should now be made to reconsider it so as to take account of the views of one delegation, which had taken part in the consultations.

15. Obviously a compromise text could never satisfy all delegations. In such cases, delegations could always enter reservations on a text which had been adopted by consensus, as some had done in the case of other resolutions adopted on the same question. His own delegation was not entirely satisfied with the proposed text; however, it intended to support the results of the Special Committee's efforts.

16. His delegation trusted that the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.4/36/L.21 would not press it and that draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 would be adopted without a vote.

17. Mr. NGUYEN THUONG (Viet Nam), referring to paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 and paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16, said that foreign military bases in the colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories were solely for the benefit of the administering Powers which had installed them; certain administering Powers even used them as a pretext for denying the people of the Territories their right of self-determination and for perpetuating their domination.

18. As history had shown, in particular in Viet Nam, foreign bases had served, and could still serve, as a bridgehead for aggression against countries adjacent

/...

(Mr. Nguyen Thuong, Viet Nam)

to the Territories; their presence was also an obstacle to friendly and co-operative relations between the independent Territories and neighbouring States.

19. The presence of military bases could not be defended on the grounds of alleged economic benefits for the Territories concerned. An economy based solely on the presence of foreign military installations was not a healthy economy and would not prepare the people of the Territories for independence. Guam was a typical example.

20. In the view of his delegation, amendments A/C.4/36/L.21 and L.22 did not improve draft resolutions A/C.4/36/L.14 and L.16; on the contrary, they made them ambiguous and gave the erroneous impression that certain bases did not impede implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

21. No exception could be made for so-called minor military installations: it would suffice to mention the installation at Diego García in the Indian Ocean, which had become a large modern base constituting a serious threat to the security of the States of the region. If the right of self-determination had been properly respected, the Territory would long ago have been handed over to Mauritius which had always claimed it.

22. His delegation found draft resolutions A/C.4/36/L.14 and L.16 generally satisfactory, but they might have been drafted more clearly: it should have been affirmed that the presence of the bases was a major obstacle to implementation of the Declaration and that they should be removed, so that the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories could exercise their right of self-determination. His delegation was therefore unable to accept the amendments in documents A/C.4/36/L.21 and L.22 which were a retrograde step, particularly in respect of General Assembly resolution A/35/118. However, in a spirit of conciliation, his delegation would support the consensus reached in the Special Committee on draft resolutions A/C.4/36/L.14 and L.16, provided they were not weakened by any amendment.

23. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, said that he was prepared to support the amendments to the draft resolutions on the small British Territories and Guam (A/C.4/36/L.14 and L.16) contained in documents A/C.4/36/L.21 and L.22 respectively. If the Committee was to continue adopting its draft resolutions on the small Territories by consensus, it would have to keep to the traditional, carefully balanced drafting of previous years on the question of military bases. The Committee had confirmed that point of view in opting for the maintenance of the traditional consensus in that field. No consensus would be reached at the present session without the proposed amendments.

24. Mr. CHAN (Australia) supported the amendment proposed in document A/C.4/36/L.21. The Committee had been adopting resolutions on the British small Territories by consensus for years. The practice was that the Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories prepared a draft for consideration, approval and transmission to the Committee. It would have been desirable to follow the

/...

(Mr. Chan, Australia)

same procedure at the present session, since it had proved satisfactory and met the interests of the people of the Territories in question. However, a small number of countries had departed from the normal procedure by unilaterally submitting draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14. Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, which concerned military bases and other installations, was totally unacceptable, but the wording proposed in document A/C.4/36/L.21 was consistent with past resolutions adopted on the subject. The previous year the Committee had adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution on military bases on the Turks and Caicos Islands, similar to the amendment proposed in document A/C.4/36/L.21. It was to be hoped that the Committee would adopt the amendment in order to return to the practice of adopting resolutions on small Territories by consensus.

25. Mr. RASON (Madagascar) said that many delegations could not support either paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 or the new version proposed in document A/C.4/36/L.21. He accordingly proposed the following wording as a compromise: "5. Recalls its relevant resolutions concerning military bases in Non-Self-Governing Territories and endorses the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee on this matter;".

26. While not a member of the Special Committee, Madagascar believed that the proposal had the merit of not repeating the two versions proposed, namely, the drafts prepared by the Special Committee in the current year and the past year, and of taking account of all previous resolutions and recommendations concerning military bases in particular. It would also enable the Special Committee to produce a single draft the following year which would be acceptable to all delegations. His delegation trusted that the Committee would adopt his proposal in order to reach agreement on a text which could be adopted by consensus. Otherwise, rule 131 of the rules of procedure of the Committee would have to be invoked.

27. Miss LUCAS (New Zealand) said that her delegation supported the amendment proposed in document A/C.4/36/L.21. It had been the long-standing practice of the Committee to adopt resolutions and decisions on small Non-Self-Governing Territories by consensus, as the Committee's objectives in respect of those Territories were, on the whole, non-controversial. But that approach was threatened because of the inclusion for the first time of a paragraph on military bases - namely, paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14; its wording was unacceptable not only to the administering Power but also to delegations like her own which expected the Committee to adopt an objective approach to the question of small Territories.

28. In its omnibus resolutions on the British Caribbean Territories in previous years, the Committee had made no references to military bases because of the situation in the Turks and Caicos Islands and Bermuda. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 had therefore broken with the tradition of the Committee. Moreover, the language on military bases in paragraph 5 was also a departure from the consensus language on military bases traditionally accepted by the Committee in respect of other Territories. The assertion that military bases in the Turks and Caicos Islands and Bermuda constituted an impediment to the implementation of
/...

(Miss Lucas, New Zealand)

the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in those Territories was without foundation, because there was no evidence to suggest that the presence of military bases in either Territory was impeding its progress towards self-determination; nor had the people of those Territories expressed any concerns in that regard. Her delegation therefore supported the proposed amendment (A/C.4/36/L.21), which was objective and in conformity with the language that the Committee had adopted in the past.

29. Mr. MUTHANA (Democratic Yemen) said, with respect to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution before the Committee, that his country had not really attained independence until the last of the British soldiers stationed there in military bases had been withdrawn. In a spirit of consensus, his delegation could accept the amendment proposed by the delegation of Madagascar. By adopting it, the Committee would prove that it had confidence in the Special Committee.

30. Mr. GARCIA ALMEIDA (Cuba) said, with respect to the Fijian amendment to paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14, that it was difficult to justify a text simply because it had been previously adopted by the Committee. The various resolutions adopted by the United Nations, especially with respect to decolonization, evolved according to the situation. As a member of the Special Committee, his country had made it a point to reflect those realities, which were expressed, for example, in the resolution adopted the previous year on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

31. His delegation had participated in the Special Committee's deliberations on small Territories, especially with respect to military bases which constituted impediments to the implementation of the Declaration. After nearly four months of fruitless discussions, the non-aligned members of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories had requested Cuba, as the current Chairman of the non-aligned movement, to undertake consultations with member countries in order to break the deadlock. The outcome of those consultations was precisely the text that certain countries wanted to amend. Although that text was far from reflecting the point of view of the non-aligned countries - which, at their Havana summit conference, had clearly indicated their unequivocal opposition to the presence of military bases in the Non-Self-Governing Territories - it was balanced enough to harmonize the viewpoints of the majority of delegations. It was therefore pointless to reopen the debate on that question. His delegation therefore requested the representatives of Fiji and Madagascar to withdraw their amendments.

32. With respect to the decision taken the previous year concerning the Turks and Caicos Islands, he reminded the representative of Fiji that, at the time, the Australian delegation had introduced its amendment on a procedural irregularity. It was also interesting to note that, during the current session, the Australian representative had not submitted a draft resolution as the Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories.

/...

33. Mr. SANGSOMSAK (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that draft resolutions A/C.4/36/L.14 and L.16 reflected the position of his delegation on the question of military bases in the small Non-Self-Governing Territories. Moreover, they were in line with United Nations resolutions and with the consensus reached by the members of the Special Committee to the effect that bases and other military facilities impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. His country could not accept the amendments proposed in documents A/C.4/36/L.21 and L.22 but it was willing to support the amendment proposed by the delegation of Madagascar to paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14.

34. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Sri Lanka) said that, as his country was not a member of the Special Committee, it had not taken part in the consultations which had been held before the presentation of draft resolutions A/C.4/36/L.14 and L.21. It seemed to his delegation, however, that the Committee should approach the problem not only in a spirit of compromise, but also by trying to make the text reflect what must be considered as a political reality.

35. His country had always supported the principle of the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples even in situations where there were bases and other military facilities. His country was proud that today there was not a single foreign military facility on its territory; that constituted a key element of its policy of non-alignment.

36. He reminded the Committee that, together with the Special Committee, it was responsible for the political, economic and social future of the peoples of small Non-Self-Governing Territories. Although, on the whole, his delegation had no objection to draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14, it was not satisfied with the wording of paragraph 5, where it is stated that the presence of military bases in colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories "constitutes a factor impeding the implementation of the Declaration". Some parts of Sri Lanka had been under colonial domination since 1505 and the country as a whole had been placed under British administration from 1918 to 1948. When it had become independent in 1948, there had been British military installations on its territory, in particular a very important naval base at Trincomalee. But the presence of those bases had in no way impeded the accession of the people of Sri Lanka to independence. It was only in 1956 that the Government of Sri Lanka and the British authorities had concluded an agreement for the gradual phasing out of British military installations.

37. It was interesting to note that the representative of Democratic Yemen had said in contrast, that his country had not been able to attain its independence as long as there had been British soldiers on its territory. The Committee should therefore adopt a resolution which was in conformity with world realities.

38. Paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 was not satisfactory, in so far as it implied that the presence of military bases in colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories constituted per se a factor impeding the implementation of the Declaration. In the experience of Sri Lanka, such was not the case. The new

/...

(Mr. Kanakaratne, Sri Lanka)

text proposed in document A/C.4/36/L.21 was much more suitable, as it simply recognized that the presence of military bases and other installations could impede the implementation of the Declaration while reaffirming that the presence of military bases should not prevent the peoples of the Territories concerned from exercising their right to self-determination and independence. There was therefore no incompatibility between that amendment and the general objective of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14.

39. It might be borne in mind that one new State which had just become a member of the international community had been a small Territory on which there had been military installations. Since that Territory had become independent, it had requested that the installations in question should be maintained in order to ensure its security and protection. The Committee should therefore bear in mind that, while in a number of cases the presence of military bases in small Non-Self-Governing Territories could impede the implementation of the Declaration, in other cases, the situation was different. In any event, it was up to the people of the Territory concerned to take the final decision on the issue and not for the General Assembly, the Fourth Committee or even the Security Council. His delegation hoped that the amendment in document A/C.4/36/L.21 would be adopted in a spirit of consensus.

40. Mr. BOLE (Fiji) said that draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16 contained a number of important elements which his delegation fully supported. In his opinion, the political, social and economic development of Guam should be pursued in consultation with the people of the Territory so that they could exercise their right to self-determination in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

41. His delegation nevertheless considered the wording of paragraph 7 of the draft to be unacceptable, as the presence of military bases did not necessarily constitute a factor impeding decolonization, unless the peoples concerned should themselves decide otherwise. Moreover, the wording of that paragraph differed from texts which had received broad support in the Committee in previous years. Throughout the discussions and consultations which had taken place on the issue in the Sub-Committee on Small Territories and in the Special Committee, his delegation had indicated its preference for the text of the consensus of previous years, which was reproduced in the amendments (A/C.4/36/L.21 and L.22). It therefore gave its full support to document A/C.4/36/L.22.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 120 of the rules of procedure, the amendment proposed by the representative of Madagascar could not be considered or put to the vote, as its text had not been circulated to the Committee. Accordingly, consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 and the two amendments thereto would be postponed until the following meeting.

43. Mr. TOMA (Samoa), introducing the amendment in document A/C.4/36/L.22 to draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16, said that the purpose of the amendment was to restore the traditional consensus language which had been adopted by the Fourth Committee in previous years, so that the draft resolution itself might be adopted without a vote.

/...

(Mr. Toma, Samoa)

44. The language of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution was not acceptable to all delegations, as it clearly implied that military bases per se constituted a factor impeding self-determination. Such an assertion was far too categorical. His delegation considered that such bases did not necessarily constitute an impediment and that such an assertion was completely unjustified in the case of Guam, whose people had expressed themselves on the subject through their representatives to the United States House of Representatives. The General Assembly would be going against the wishes of the people of Guam if it adopted the draft resolution in its current form.

45. In the past, the Committee had adopted a more flexible position, when it had recognized that those bases could constitute an impediment and when it had reaffirmed its strong conviction that the presence of military bases in Guam should not prevent the people of the Territory from exercising their right to self-determination. The sponsors of the amendment therefore proposed that the Fourth Committee should revert to the language of the consensus adopted in previous years.

46. Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Special Committee had adopted a draft resolution on Guam which was similar to those on other Territories in which there were military bases. The Soviet Union had already explained its position on the Territories administered by the United Kingdom. Its position on Guam was identical, but the situation there was even more serious than in the other Territories because the United States military bases dominated the whole of political and economic life and thus dictated the fate of the Territory and its inhabitants; indeed, they occupied one third of that small Territory.

47. He regretted the attitude of those who contended that the elimination of such bases was not an urgent problem or that the inhabitants welcomed their presence; in that connexion, he reminded the Committee of comments which had been made by officials in Guam and which were included in the report of the Special Committee's Visiting Mission in 1979 (A/AC.109/L.1345).

48. The Guam senators had told the members of the Mission that they had been unable to understand why the United Nations had not sent representatives during the 1976 referendum (in fact, the United Nations had not been asked to visit the Territory at that time), that they were frequently ill-informed regarding the functions and role of the Organization concerning Guam and had not received the texts of the resolutions adopted on the issue; they had asked the Visiting Mission whether they had any rights over the resources of the Territory. One senator had informed the Mission that a delegation from the eighth session of the Guam Legislature, which had wanted to visit the United Nations, had been victimized by manoeuvres designed to discredit it. He had complained about the policy of the United States Department of State and had asked whether the United Nations had any influence on the United States Government.

49. A meeting had been held with a group of persons who opposed the draft constitution and who had been waging a political informational campaign regarding

/...

(Mr. Lozinsky, USSR)

the different constitutional options, as the people had not been properly informed regarding the referendum. The group had considered that the draft constitution would have the effect of perpetuating the colonial structures of Guam and its economic dependence on military bases and tourism.

50. His delegation considered that Guam was a typical example of a territory where the presence of military bases clearly impeded economic and political development and where the administering Power was attempting by every possible means to perpetuate a situation of dependency.

51. The activities of the United Nations to assist all Non-Self-Governing Territories to achieve their independence must be strengthened. On the question of Guam, the administering Power was under an obligation to stimulate development and to build up the economy of the island so that its inhabitants could become self-sufficient. It must also dismantle the military bases which it had installed on the Territory.

52. Mr. NGUYEN THUONG (Viet Nam) said that the comments his delegation had made on draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 also applied to draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16, on the question of Guam. However, he reserved the right to speak later on that question.

53. Mr. BA (Senegal) reaffirmed his support for General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. He was pleased to note that during the past year the administering Powers had agreed to admit visiting missions from the Special Committee to the Territories under their administration; that spirit of open-mindedness and co-operation between the parties was reflected in the relevant chapters of the report submitted to the Fourth Committee by the Special Committee.

54. He hoped that the spirit of compromise which had prevailed at previous sessions and which had enabled the General Assembly to adopt texts by consensus would be maintained. However, he believed that the amendment proposed by the representative of Madagascar might cause confusion and confrontation, since the decisions taken by the Special Committee in 1980 and those it had taken in 1981 seemed to be contradictory in many respects so far as the question of military bases was concerned.

55. Out of concern for a realistic and balanced approach and in a spirit of compromise, his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.4/36/L.14 and A/C.4/36/L.16 as a whole, with the amendments proposed in documents A/C.4/36/L.21 and A/C.4/36/L.22, of which it had become a sponsor. The amendments would, in its view, reduce the possible areas of confrontation between the parties concerned and help to promote the spirit which had always guided the work of the Committee.

56. Mr. KALINA (Czechoslovakia) said that, although his delegation had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16 on the question of Guam, it would have preferred a stronger text that was closer to his country's position and more

/...

(Mr. Kalina, Czechoslovakia)

in keeping with the spirit of United Nations resolutions on decolonization. However, in a spirit of conciliation, his delegation had accepted the wording of the compromise text worked out on the initiative of the non-aligned countries that were members of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories.

57. The draft resolution on Guam, particularly paragraph 7, fully reflected the consensus reached by the members of the Special Committee. His delegation therefore hoped that the sponsors of amendment A/C.4/36/L.22 would withdraw it and that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution without a vote, thus confirming the consensus that had emerged in the Special Committee.

58. Mr. CHAN (Australia) said that his delegation supported amendment A/C.4/36/L.22 to the draft resolution on the question of Guam.

59. He noted that the procedure traditionally followed by the Committee in connexion with the draft resolutions on that question had not been adhered to at the current session, since the text of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16 relating to Guam had been submitted by a small number of countries without proper consultation. Such a departure from established procedure was regrettable, for it introduced a divisive element.

60. His delegation could not accept the wording of paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. Amendment A/C.4/36/L.22, on the other hand, contained a reference to military bases which was fully in accordance with the Committee's earlier decision on that question, taken by consensus.

61. His delegation therefore urged the Committee to adopt amendment A/C.4/36/L.22, so that it might revert to the established procedure of adopting draft resolutions on small Territories by consensus.

62. Miss LUCAS (New Zealand) said that earlier in the meeting her delegation had expressed reservations on the wording of certain provisions of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.14 relating to military bases. It had similar reservations with regard to draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16, paragraph 7, which implied that the presence of military bases necessarily constituted a factor impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. As the representatives of Samoa and Sri Lanka had pointed out, such a categorical assertion was totally unjustified.

63. Her delegation did not believe that the change in the wording of the paragraph on military bases in any way served the Committee's purposes with regard to Guam. That was why it was supporting amendment A/C.4/36/L.22, which proposed the replacement of paragraph 7 on military bases by a paragraph whose wording was more in keeping with the resolutions that the Committee had adopted by consensus in previous years.

64. Mr. FADHLI (Democratic Yemen) said he must reaffirm that the presence of military bases in all colonial and Non-Self-Governing Territories constituted a factor impeding the implementation of the Declaration. He therefore proposed

/...

(Mr. Fadhli, Democratic Yemen)

that in the amendment to draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16 the last part of the text, beginning with the words "recognizes that the presence of military bases could constitute", should be replaced by the words "and endorses the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee on this matter".

65. Mr. SEZAKI (Japan) said that his delegation had followed very attentively the deliberations of the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee on the question of Guam. As one of the island's closest neighbours, Japan acknowledged that the United States was endeavouring to promote the well-being of the people of the Territory, in close collaboration with its democratically elected leaders.

66. In previous years, the Committee had adopted its draft resolutions on the question of Guam by consensus. At the current session, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16 were unfortunately deviating from the wording adopted by consensus in 1980; in the view of his delegation, there was absolutely no reason for doing so, since no change had taken place in Guam since the adoption of the resolution on the question by the Committee at the preceding session.

67. The wording of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution on Guam, which stated that the presence of military bases constituted a factor impeding the implementation of the Declaration, was much too sweeping and was contrary to historical fact, as the representative of Sri Lanka had said at the current meeting. Japan had therefore joined in sponsoring amendment A/C.4/36/L.22, which would replace that controversial paragraph by the one that had been included in the consensus draft resolution on the question adopted by the Committee in 1980.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with rule 120 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee would continue its consideration of the subamendment to amendment A/C.4/36/L.22 submitted by the representative of Democratic Yemen, and of draft resolution A/C.4/36/L.16 and the amendment to it, at its next meeting. Meanwhile, he thanked all members for their co-operation and their valuable contribution to the work of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.