

2076th meeting

Wednesday, 5 December 1973, at 11.15 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2076

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued) (A/9023 (parts II and IV), A/9023/Add.4, A/9023/Add.5, A/9023/Add.6, A/9121 and Corr.1, A/9124, A/9176, A/9247, A/9287, A/9330, A/C.4/L.1041, A/C.4/L.1052, A/C.4/L.1062, A/C.4/L.1063)

QUESTION OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS): CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded) (A/C.4/L.1052)

1. Mrs. PINT (Belgium), explaining her delegation's vote before the vote, said that it would abstain on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052.

2. At the twentieth session, after the vote on the draft resolution subsequently adopted as General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX), her delegation had explained that its vote did not mean that it was taking a position on the question of the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (1560th meeting). Consequently, it regretted that operative paragraph 2 took a position in favour of one of the parties to the negotiations; a neutral formula would have reflected better the views of her delegation. Her delegation associated itself with those delegations which had appealed to the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to continue the negotiations. It hoped that the two countries would find a mutually acceptable and satisfactory solution.

3. Her Government appreciated the efforts made by the Government of Argentina, particularly in the matter of aerial communications, to promote the well-being of the population of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

4. Mr. KATSAREAS (Greece) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052. It would, however, have liked a better balanced sixth preambular paragraph, and felt that operative paragraph 2 should have been couched in language more agreeable to the parties concerned.

At the request of the representative of Venezuela, a recorded vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052.

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

In favour: Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian

Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Netherlands, Norway.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052 was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

5. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052 for reasons of principle. His Government deplored the dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom, both friends of France, and hoped that a mutually satisfactory settlement could be found.

6. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052 because it considered that negotiations should be pursued in the case of all decolonization problems. His delegation hoped that the interests and wishes of the inhabitants of the Territory would be taken fully into account in reaching a settlement.

7. Mr. MacKERNAN (Ireland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052 because of its general commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter and because of his country's long association with both countries involved in the dispute. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would prove helpful in promoting an early and friendly resolution of the question of sovereignty and that the welfare and wishes of the population of the Territory would be given adequate consideration.

8. Mr. WALTER (New Zealand) said that his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052 and hoped that negotiations would lead to a settlement of the question

to the satisfaction of both Governments and the inhabitants of the Territory.

9. Mr. DE SOUZA (Jamaica) said that there were sharp differences in the interpretation of the character of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052 and his delegation's vote should not be interpreted as a support for a definition of the resolution as expressed by several representatives. It shared the view that negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom should continue. It had some difficulty with certain parts of the draft resolution and interpreted it as an endorsement of the principle of the continuation of negotiations in order to advance the peaceful settlement of the conflict of sovereignty. There were a number of similar situations, involving sharp differences of view, in the western hemisphere and his delegation's favourable vote on the draft resolution should not be interpreted as prejudicing its position on those cases.

10. Mr. KABBANI (Saudi Arabia) said that, if his delegation had been present, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052.

11. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that, while his delegation was most grateful to the delegations that had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052 and to the Latin American delegations which had sponsored it, it was somewhat disappointed that there had been a number of abstentions, since the draft resolution merely urged Member States to implement the measures envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations for the peaceful settlement of disputes. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be instrumental in enabling his Government and that of the United Kingdom to reach a peaceful and satisfactory settlement which would bring a colonial situation to an end.

12. Mr. SHUHAIBER (Kuwait) said that, had his delegation been present, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052.

13. Mr. MOKHESI (Lesotho) said that, if his delegation had been present at the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1052.

QUESTION OF AMERICAN SAMOA, THE GILBERT AND ELLICE ISLANDS, GUAM, THE NEW HEBRIDES, PITCAIRN, ST. HELENA, THE SEYCHELLES AND THE SOLOMON ISLANDS: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.1062)

14. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Committee) said that under the terms of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062 the General Assembly would, *inter alia*, invite the Secretary-General to pay particular regard to the need to intensify widespread dissemination of information on the process of decolonization in respect of the Territories listed in that document and, in particular, to consider intensifying the activities of the information centres concerned. The General Assembly would also request the Special Committee to give consideration to the dispatch of visiting missions to those Territories, and to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session on the implementation of the resolution.

15. Expenditures that might be incurred in complying with those proposals would be met from the appropriations that would be made available for the over-all programme of work of the Special Committee in 1974; hence no additional budgetary appropriations would be required in the event of their adoption by the General Assembly.

16. Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela) said that his delegation had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062. Its decision to do so was in accordance with its well-known position on small colonial Territories.

17. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that, before voting on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062, his delegation wished to state its position on the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11 concerning nuclear atmospheric testing in the South Pacific.

18. It considered that the paragraphs in question did not fall within the Committee's competence since they concerned disarmament and pollution matters which were the concern of the First Committee and the Special Political Committee respectively. Moreover, as all were aware, those questions had been discussed in recent weeks in the appropriate bodies. Accordingly, his delegation felt that it would not be appropriate for the Fourth Committee to pass judgement on matters with specific political implications and a high degree of technical complexity. His delegation would have been tempted to request a separate vote on those paragraphs, but had not done so because the outcome of the vote in the First Committee at its 1960th meeting on draft resolutions A/C.1/L.651 and A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, calling into question the foreign policy of France, had clearly indicated the true sentiments of the international community on that controversial subject. Nevertheless his delegation objected to the mixing of items, which was not in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. It considered that the subject of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062 had been distorted by the introduction of an extraneous element and would accordingly vote against it.

19. Mr. HINCHCLIFFE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation welcomed the intention of the sponsors in dividing draft resolution A/C.4/L.1048/Rev.1 into two separate draft resolutions (A/C.4/L.1062 and A/C.4/L.1063), reflecting the geographical break-down of the two main groups of Territories considered by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

20. Both drafts repeated a number of features present in General Assembly resolution 2984 (XXVII), against which his delegation had voted. Both deplored, in their preambular part, the "continued refusal" of his Government to co-operate with the Special Committee. It was true, for reasons already adduced, that his delegation had not participated in the discussions of the Special Committee since it had withdrawn from it three years previously. Nevertheless, his delegation had continued to co-operate fully with the United Nations regarding dependent Territories, particularly by providing the most ample information on developments there, not only through transmission of information under Article 73 e of the United Nations Charter but also by supplying, on an informal and

voluntary basis, additional information on constitutional and political developments. His delegation had never declined any invitations to consult the representatives of the Special Committee when asked to do so. For instance, during the past year it had held consultations with the Chairman of the Special Committee on the question of visiting missions and with regard to the Seychelles. His delegation therefore had difficulties with operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062.

21. With regard to the preambular and operative paragraphs concerning visiting missions, his delegation did not believe that such missions were of vital importance as a means of securing information about conditions in Territories administered by the United Kingdom or the views, wishes and aspirations of their people. The Territories were open societies, freely accessible to all, and comprehensively covered by the world press and other media.

22. With regard to operative paragraph 5 and the seventh preambular paragraph, his delegation was obliged to reiterate that, in so far as they were critical of the establishment of military bases and installations in Non-Self-Governing Territories, it must reserve its position on them. There were in fact only a small number of Territories under United Kingdom administration in which there were military installations; their existence was in accordance with the wishes of the people of the Territories concerned and was in no way incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter or General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

23. Turning to the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11, his delegation considered that nuclear testing would more appropriately be discussed in the First Committee. In any case, there was no evidence that those tests had proved harmful to the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories of the United Kingdom in the South Pacific.

24. With regard to operative paragraph 10, he recalled the statement by the United Kingdom representative, Mr. Worsley, at the 2065th meeting and, in particular, his reference to the formal declaration made on the future of the island by the Island Council on 16 June 1968. Mr. Worsley had told the Committee that the declaration still reflected the views of the people of Pitcairn. His delegation wondered what practical purpose such a visiting mission would serve; it would not, however, reject out of hand the call in that paragraph. His delegation had welcomed the greater attention paid by Sub-Committee II of the Special Committee to the smaller dependent Territories and was sure that the people of Pitcairn would have followed accounts of the debates which had taken place in the Sub-Committee.

25. His delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062.

26. Mr. BORDES (Haiti) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062. It had reservations, however, on the subject matter of the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11, which would more properly fall within the competence of the First Committee.

27. Mr. KABBANI (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation would have preferred the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11 to be deleted from the text. It had, however, voted in favour of the draft resolution, on the understanding that no condemnation of the defence policy of France was implied.

28. Mr. TOPANDE-MAKOMBO (Central African Republic) endorsed the reservations expressed by the representative of Haiti. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062.

At the request of the representative of Venezuela, a recorded vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062.

The Federal Republic of Germany, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic.

Against: Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France.

Abstaining: Germany (Federal Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, United States of America, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Gabon.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062 was adopted by 99 votes to 4, with 16 abstentions.

29. Mr. ÖZENER (Turkey), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062. However, for reasons of principle, which it had explained on numerous occasions, his delegation could not agree to the references the draft resolution made to military bases and, consequently, could not approve the relevant chapters of the report of the Special Committee as a whole. His delegation's views on nuclear tests in general, and the specific cases mentioned in the draft resolution in particular, had been made clear repeatedly in appropriate forums both within and outside the United Nations. His delegation favoured the ending of all nuclear tests, but doubted whether the Fourth Committee

was the appropriate body to discuss either the political or the environmental aspects of the problem.

30. His delegation therefore reserved its position on the seventh and eleventh preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraphs 5 and 11.

31. Mr. MacKERNAN (Ireland) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11 introduced extraneous elements into the draft resolution. Although his Government opposed nuclear testing, it felt that the subject should more appropriately be discussed in the First Committee, which at its 1960th meeting adopted two specific draft resolutions on that question. He saw no merit in the Fourth Committee adding to those two texts, which had been adopted after a comprehensive debate.

32. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1063, dealing with Bermuda and the Territories in the Caribbean area.

33. Mr. VLASCEANU (Romania) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062. He wished to stress that one of the fundamental orientations of the foreign policy of the Socialist Republic of Romania consisted in active solidarity with the oppressed peoples against colonial domination, support for those peoples and their liberation movements in the struggle to achieve their inalienable right to control their own destiny and support of the right to self-determination and independence of all colonial peoples. Romania was actively striving for the full implementation, without delay, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, of the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration, adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly (resolution 2621 (XXV)) and of all other relevant United Nations resolutions aimed at eradicating colonialism.

34. In keeping with that position, his delegation fully supported all efforts aimed at hastening the eradication of all vestiges of colonialism. Romania had been among the sponsors of many United Nations resolutions on decolonization and had voted in favour of all such resolutions. However, in view of his Government's well-known position of principle on disarmament, which had been reiterated at the current session of the General Assembly, his delegation would have abstained on the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11 if the vote had been taken paragraph by paragraph. That reservation in no way affected Romania's position on decolonization and its support of the right of all peoples in colonial Territories to self-determination and independence.

35. Mr. YAO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062 and supported all United Nations resolutions relating to the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. His delegation had reservations, however, with regard to the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11, which dealt with a subject that should properly be considered by the First Committee rather than the Fourth Committee.

36. Mr. AQUEREBURU (Togo) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it remained attached to the sacred principle of decolonization. It had strong reservations, however, with regard to the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11 concerning nuclear atmospheric testing, because the First Committee had already discussed and voted on that question.

37. Mr. BOUAZZA (Morocco) said that his delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062 was in keeping with its policy of supporting measures aimed at promoting decolonization. If a separate vote had been taken on the individual paragraphs, his delegation would have abstained on the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11, because the questions they dealt with fell within the purview of the First Committee.

38. Mr. KATSAREAS (Greece) said that his delegation had reservations with regard to operative paragraph 11, which dealt with a matter under consideration in other United Nations bodies.

39. Mr. HAIDER (Pakistan) said that his delegation had already stated at the 1960th meeting of the First Committee the case against the selective prohibition of nuclear tests. If the vote had been taken paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would have taken a stand consistent with its position in the First Committee.

40. His delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1053, A/C.4/L.1042/Rev.1 and A/C.4/L.1056 had it been present at the previous meeting.

41. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062 in conformity with its traditional policy of fostering decolonization. Ever since the establishment of the United Nations, Egypt had consistently condemned colonialism and favoured decolonization. It had been one of the sponsors of the General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and was convinced of the need to implement that resolution. The administering Powers should as soon as possible allow the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to exercise freely their right to self-determination.

42. With regard to the question of nuclear tests, his delegation felt that, although they had harmful effects and should be banned internationally, other Committees were more competent to deal with that question. Those reservations in no way altered his delegation's position in the First Committee and the Special Political Committee.

43. Mr. WALTER (New Zealand) said that his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062 and would support draft resolution A/C.4/L.1063. It wished to reserve its position on those sections of the draft resolutions that dealt with the economies of the Territories concerned, which it regarded as far too sweeping and general in nature; it also had reservations with regard to the way in which the particular problems of individual Territories had again been largely ignored, a fact which ran counter to the trend of recent discussions on small Territories. Nevertheless, it welcomed the decision to divide the text submitted the previous year into two separate draft resolutions.

44. Lastly, in so far as it represented a country in the Pacific area with direct responsibilities for the interests and welfare of some of the colonial peoples in that area, his delegation had no hesitation in supporting the two paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062 referring to nuclear testing.

45. Mr. KOUAMÉ (Ivory Coast) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062 but felt that the question of nuclear tests had political implications and should more appropriately be dealt with by the First Committee. His delegation therefore wished to reserve its position on the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11.

46. Mr. PAQUI (Dahomey) said that his delegation wished to reserve its position on the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062. The question of nuclear testing came within the competence of the First Committee. Dahomey had voted against all nuclear tests when the subject had been discussed. His delegation's position was consistent with the reservations it had expressed on that question on other occasions.

47. Mr. DJIGO (Senegal) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but had reservations with regard to the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 11, for the reasons given by other delegations.

48. Miss DEBENEST (France) said that her delegation wished to reply to a certain delegation which, during the general debate, had made some remarks concerning the French Territories in the Pacific which could not go unchallenged.

49. She recalled that under the terms of the Charter the determination of Non-Self-Governing Territories fell within the competence of the administering Power concerned. Moreover, the Territories in question constitutionally formed part of the French Republic and had repeatedly, through democratic elections, expressed their wish to remain within the Republic.

50. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union favoured the ending of nuclear weapon tests, including underground tests, by all parties everywhere. The USSR had repeatedly introduced specific proposals aimed at settling the question, but unfortunately it had not yet been possible to reach agreement on the matter. In keeping with that position of principle, the Soviet delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions that stressed the urgent need for a cessation of all nuclear tests in the atmosphere and under ground and contained appeals to all the nuclear Powers to discontinue nuclear tests in all environments.

QUESTION OF BERMUDA, THE BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS, THE CAYMAN ISLANDS, MONTserrat, THE TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS AND THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.1063)

51. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representatives of Argentina and Nigeria had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1063.

52. Mr. HINCHCLIFFE (United Kingdom) recalled that at the twenty-sixth session his delegation had been able to abstain in the vote on General Assembly resolution 2869 (XXVI), since it has not referred to the West Indian Associated States, which had attained a large measure of self-government. His delegation was glad to note that draft resolution A/C.4/L.1063 made no reference to them. His delegation had welcomed the constructive approach of many members of the Special Committee and that Committee's more realistic and helpful reports on some of the Territories administered by the United Kingdom. Although his delegation was unable to accept all the conclusions and recommendations of Sub-Committee II of the Special Committee, contained in the relevant chapters of the Special Committee's report (see A/9023/Add.5 and 6), it felt that the report contained many positive elements which it would, as always, study with care.

53. His delegation had difficulties with the paragraphs concerning visiting missions for the reasons he had given when speaking on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1062. It would therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1063.

54. Mr. ISHAN (Nigeria) said that his delegation's position on decolonization was well known. The colonial Powers were denying independence to small Territories on the pretext that the latter were not economically viable; that, however, was a matter for the United Nations to decide. Their real reason was that they wanted to establish military bases for the purpose of intimidating other countries. He read out operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1063, which clearly enunciated his delegation's position with respect to small Territories.

At the request of the representative of Venezuela, a recorded vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1063.

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

In favour: Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel, Italy.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1063 was adopted by 101 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

Organization of work

55. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to certain Territories which fell within the purview of item 23, concerning which certain delegations had made suggestions for action to be taken by the Fourth Committee. They were the Territories of Belize,¹ French Somaliland, Antigua, Dominica,

¹ Formerly known as British Honduras (see A/9023/Add.6, chap. XXVIII, annex, para. 10).

Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent. The Special Committee, in the relevant chapters of its report, had said that it intended to consider the question of those Territories at its next session, subject to any directive it might receive from the General Assembly during the current session. In that regard, it had been suggested that, since there appeared to be no marked wish to take up the question of those Territories at the current session, the Fourth Committee should postpone consideration of them until the twenty-ninth session, when the General Assembly would have received the relevant reports of the Special Committee. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that consideration of the question of those Territories should be deferred to the twenty-ninth session.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

2077th meeting

Thursday, 6 December 1973, at 4.05 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2077 and Corr.1

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (concluded) (A/9023 (parts II and IV), A/9023/Add.4, A/9023/Add.5, A/9023/Add.6, A/9121 and Corr.1, A/9124, A/9176, A/9247, A/9287, A/9330, A/C.4/L.1041, A/C.4/L.1057, A/C.4/L.1058, A/C.4/L.1064)

QUESTION OF THE COMORO ARCHIPELAGO: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.1057, A/C.4/L.1064)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that Nigeria had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1057.

2. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that his delegation would not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1057, and wished in that connexion to clarify its position. In its statement at the 2064th meeting, his delegation had drawn attention to the important developments that had taken place over the past year in Franco-Comorian relations. The elections of 3 December 1972 and the joint declaration of 15 June 1973 (A/9023/Add.4, chap. XI, annex, appendix II) had introduced a profound change. As the French Minister for Foreign Affairs had said in his statement at the 2147th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, during the general debate, France had made great efforts to ensure the harmony of the Comoro Islands with their destiny.

3. The main outlines of the process of change initiated by France were well known. His delegation had hoped that the

Committee would recognize the importance of the new developments and France's desire to co-operate. By respecting the right to self-determination of the Comoro Archipelago and the political aspirations of its inhabitants, and thus implementing the principles contained in the Charter, France had followed a course of action which it had expected the Committee to acknowledge. Could it be claimed that the self-determination of peoples and their freely expressed aspirations were everywhere respected with the same good sense and political determination shown by the French and Comorian Governments?

4. Despite the efforts by various parties to achieve a balanced text, draft resolution A/C.4/L.1057 was totally unacceptable to France. Although the sponsors had stated that they had taken note of the French statement made at the Committee's 2064th meeting, it was as if they had neither heard nor read that statement. How else could his delegation explain the provisions of the draft resolution which gave the impression that nothing had happened in the Comoro Archipelago over the past year and that nothing would happen there unless the United Nations intervened? He deeply regretted that no basis for an agreement had been found regarding the futility of the visiting mission provided for in operative paragraph 6. He also questioned the idea that Member States must assist peoples which had already chosen their destiny in the most democratic manner.

5. He recalled the expressions of goodwill which three members of the Comorian Parliament, including a freely elected Minister, had themselves given during the current session of the General Assembly. Their visit, and the meeting which they had proposed to the secretariat of the