

2124th meeting

Monday, 2 December 1974, at 10.50 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Buyantyn DASHTSEREN (Mongolia).

A/C.4/SR.2124

AGENDA ITEMS 13, 23, 64, 69 AND 12, 70 AND 71*

Agenda item 13 (*continued*)
(A/9604, A/9727, A/C.4/L.1074)

Agenda item 23 (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (*continued*) (A/9623 (parts I-IV and VI), A/9623/Add.4 (parts I and II), A/9623/Add.5 (parts I-V), A/9623/Add.6 (parts I and II), A/9654, A/9655, A/9714, A/9715, A/9736, A/9771, A/9802, A/9814, A/9821, A/9824, A/9861, A/C.4/L.1071)

Agenda item 64 (*continued*) (A/9623/Add.7, A/9867)

Agenda items 69 and 12 (*continued*) (A/9603 (chap. VI, sect. F), A/9623 (part VII), A/9638 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1, A/9638/Add.2-5, A/9830)

Agenda item 70 (*continued*)
(A/9845, A/C.4/L.1070, A/C.4/L.1075)

Agenda item 71 (*continued*) (A/9877)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. BRUNO (Uruguay) expressed his satisfaction with the various chapters of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and congratulated the Rapporteur of the Special Committee, Mr. Arteaga, on his work.

2. Referring to agenda item 23 and, in particular, to the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), he said that, in considering the question (see A/9623/Add.6 (part II), chap. XXVI), the Special Committee had taken into account the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions, especially resolution 3163 (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973 and its operative paragraph 11, and resolution 3160 (XXVIII) of the same date, calling upon the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to proceed without delay with the negotiations necessary to put an end to the existing colonial situation. In a letter to the Secretary-General dated 22 August 1974 (*ibid.*, annex II), the representative of Argentina had indicated that contacts had been established between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom and his delegation was glad to note that fact.

3. The United Nations Charter was not merely an instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security, but a system for arriving at a just solution to international problems, particularly those deriving from colonialism.

4. When the General Assembly had considered the draft declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, subsequently adopted as resolution 1514 (XV), the Latin American countries, in line with their anti-colonialist tradition, had supported the draft, but had insisted that a distinction should be made between the granting of independence and the principle of territorial integrity, a prin-

ciple deeply rooted in Latin American jurisprudence; the Latin American countries categorically condemned aggression and territorial annexation resulting from aggression. It was self-evident that the principle of self-determination could not be distorted for purposes of legitimizing *de facto* situations; that would be tantamount to supporting the right of the more powerful and attributing legality to acts of violence contrary to law. In implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the aim should be to protect the inalienable interests of the countries which, throughout history, had seen their legitimate rights usurped, part of their territory dismembered with no justification other than the right of the more powerful. When the Charter was being drafted, the Uruguayan delegation had proposed an amendment to the proposals formulated at Dumbarton Oaks for the establishment of an international organization, mentioning the maintenance of the political independence and territorial integrity of all Member States.¹ The amendment had been adopted and, in a different form, had served as a basis for the text of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. Consequently, the principle of self-determination must be co-ordinated with other recognized principles, such as that of territorial integrity, which had equal juridical weight, and subordinated to those other principles.

5. The dispute concerning the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) affected all of Latin America, which stood by Argentina in its legitimate aspirations based on historical fact. Argentina should be able to exercise sovereignty over the territory of the islands, which were situated within the area of its continental shelf and in proximity to the coasts of Patagonia. The problem was basically a colonial issue and its solution should be negotiated. The Uruguayan delegation was confident that the United Kingdom, which had been one of the first States to accept the process of decolonization, would continue to respond to appeals that it continue negotiations with the Argentine Government and that those negotiations would proceed in a constructive spirit.

6. To the extent possible, Uruguay had persevered in good faith in its efforts to build a world ruled by law. The paramount consideration should be respect for the principle of the equality of States before the law and the seeking of legal, that is, peaceful solutions to international conflicts. His delegation had no doubt that in the case of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), the United Kingdom would accelerate the process of negotiation with Argentina in strict conformity with the spirit and letter of the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

7. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia), speaking on agenda item 23, said that his Government welcomed the involvement of the United Nations in the process of guiding the people of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands towards the full exercise of their right to self-determination in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the relevant General Assembly resolutions, including resolution 1514 (XV). The year 1974 had been important in the process of self-determination and decolonization of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, largely as a result of the Visiting Mission which had come to the Territory in August. The Australian Government was grateful to the representatives of the Ivory Coast, Indonesia and Trinidad and Tobago.

* For the title of each item, see "Agenda" on page ix.

¹ United Nations Conference on International Organization, doc. 2, G/7 (a)(I).

the members of the Mission, and to the Secretariat officials who had accompanied them, for the contribution they had made to identifying policies which aimed to promote the interests and development of the Cocos Islanders. Recognizing its obligations as the administering Power, Australia would take into account all the valuable recommendations made by the Visiting Mission (see A/9623/Add.5 (part II), chap. XX, annex, paras. 199-217).

8. It was true that in the first years after Australia had assumed responsibility for the Cocos (Keeling) Islands—that is, after 1955—very little had been done to change the political and social circumstances of the people of the Territory. That was partly due to the special difficulties the Cocos (Keeling) community had presented and to Australia's preoccupation at the time with its responsibilities towards Papua New Guinea, whose more complex and more important problems had been given a higher priority than those of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands.

9. He wished to stress, at the outset, the particular circumstances of the Territory. There were extremely close relations between the Islanders and the Clunies-Ross family, which went back over 100 years. The Cocos community had lived in relative isolation from the rest of the world throughout that period and there was an extraordinary degree of interdependence between it and the Clunies-Ross estate. The community looked upon Mr. Clunies-Ross, as it had on his predecessors, as its leader and principal contact with the outside world. It was the impression of the Australian delegation that on the whole, the community was contented. It was basically conservative in outlook and was not at present receptive to change. However, Mr. Clunies-Ross, in recent discussions with the Prime Minister of Australia and the Special Minister of State, had acknowledged the need for change and had undertaken to encourage the community, with the help of the Australian Government, to work out an identity separate from that of the Clunies-Ross estate, and the Visiting Mission had recommended that steps be taken as soon as possible to effect that disengagement (*ibid.*, para. 206).

10. For its part, the Australian Government was aware of the situation and was trying to determine what changes should be introduced, in close consultation with the Cocos (Keeling) community, whose interests it had at heart, and with Mr. Clunies-Ross. In the early years, there had been some changes only in the fields of education and health. More recently, it had been decided to introduce administrative and judicial reforms in accordance with the recommendations of the United Nations Visiting Mission. Now, after consultation, the following changes would be sought. A suitably agreed area of land on Home Island would be vested in the Home Island community, as a corporate entity; that would help to establish the community's own identity separate from that of the Clunies-Ross estate. A local government authority would be established, with legal and formal status, to manage the affairs of the community; it would be composed only of members elected for a specific period. All future Australian government contracts with the Clunies-Ross estate would provide for direct payment of appropriate sums in Australian currency to the Cocos (Keeling) community; it was intended to establish a separate Cocos (Keeling) community fund for that purpose, to be administered by the community for its sole benefit; further details would be worked out in the near future in consultation with the community. The use of token money would be discontinued and replaced by Australian currency, due account being taken of the complexities involved. Measures would be taken to issue local ordinances and establish better facilities for the administration of justice. Health and education services would be extended. Rates of pay and employment conditions on the Cocos (Keeling) Islands would be progressively aligned with Australian practice and the conventions of the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

Provisions would be introduced to permit freedom of movement for members of the community. Steps would be taken to grant Australian citizenship to Cocos Islanders who wished to apply for it.

11. The Australian Government believed that the United Nations would welcome those changes, which would have to be explained carefully and developed in consultation with the community. The establishment of an independent status for the community, separate from that of the Clunies-Ross estate, would have to be accompanied by a widespread extension of education and the development of political awareness. Once that was done, it would be easier to introduce reforms. The Australian Government intended to do so with the help of the United Nations and the information material made available through it.

12. The Australian Government felt that the full exercise of democratic local self-government was an essential preliminary step in fostering the growth of the political awareness which would be needed if the community was to make a meaningful judgement on its ultimate political status. The Australian Government intended that such status should be determined with full regard to the freely expressed wishes of the inhabitants and in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions.

13. The Australian Government also recognized the desirability of diversifying the economy of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands in order to improve its long-term viability and to reduce its present dependence on copra. In that context, the Australian Government regarded the proposal to establish a quarantine station, which had the strong support of the Cocos (Keeling) community, as an important development. The Government had wanted to obtain the views of the Visiting Mission on that proposal. Apparently, the Mission felt strongly that steps should be taken to ensure that the establishment of the station would be of direct economic benefit to the people of Home Island.

14. The Australian Government would be guided by that consideration and, in setting the terms of contracts for the station, would use them as a means of building up an independent community fund in Australian currency to be administered by the community for its own direct benefit. The station would also bring new employment opportunities, new technical skills and a new awareness of links with the outside world. The possibility of developing a regional role for the station would also be carefully studied. The Australian Government intended also to continue to explore other means of diversifying the economy of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands and would not hesitate to enlist the assistance of the United Nations in that undertaking. The Australian Government would continue to co-operate with the United Nations through the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee and would report regularly on the latest developments. It was prepared to welcome further visiting missions and sincerely hoped that such co-operation would continue to provide an effective demonstration of the practical role that the United Nations could play in the process of decolonization.

15. Mr. KOUAMÉ (Ivory Coast), speaking on agenda item 23, pointed out that his country attached great importance to the decolonization of micro-territories that were not yet independent. Such an attitude was based on its awareness of the complexity of determining the political status of such territories and the future of their peoples.

16. There was no denying the manifold difficulties facing such territories because of the extremely limited conditions of existence and viability arising from their smallness, isolation, the poverty of their soil and their tiny population. Such territories, whose surface area varied between 14 square kilometres and 300 square kilometres and whose populations

varied between 600 and 60,000 inhabitants were for the most part isolated in the middle of vast seas, cut off from the rest of the world and almost inaccessible. Their economies were often based on unstable activities such as tourism or land deals or on a single resource such as the growing of coconuts or trading in copra. In that respect, his delegation welcomed the Special Committee's new method of work. Through the sending of visiting missions to such territories, it was able to understand the reality and complexity of the problems which must be taken into account in any action by the United Nations.

17. Those precepts did not in any way alter his Government's attitude towards the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination. No one could question the application of that principle to the inhabitants of small Territories. Their choice must be respected and administering Powers must not hesitate to bring about the rapid development of the populations concerned and the normal evolution of their societies.

18. The Ivory Coast had provided the Chairman for the Special Committee's Visiting Mission to the Cocos (Keeling) Islands and therefore attached special importance to the problem. The Territory of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, under Australian administration, consisted of 27 tiny islands with a total area of about 14 square kilometres. They were isolated in the midst of the Indian Ocean and had a population of about 654 inhabitants under the complete control of a single man, Mr. Clunies-Ross, a British citizen and owner of a copra plantation. Only two of the islands were inhabited.

19. The members of the Mission were struck by the evil effects that isolation could have on the political, economic, social and cultural development of the people. The simplicity of existing institutions, the attachment of the Malay community to Mr. Clunies-Ross and his estate, and the special role played by Mr. Clunies-Ross in the public affairs of the indigenous community were due to the fact that the population of the island was cut off from the outside world that did not know any other way of life. Thus, the Malay community had agreed for years to be under the control of a group of headmen composed of nine members, all appointed by Mr. Clunies-Ross and his manager, Mr. Dixon, both of whom had overriding votes in any decision to be taken.

20. The economy of the Territory was based on copra and was under the control of Mr. Clunies-Ross, who had the sole responsibility for the economic, social and cultural life of the inhabitants. There was no social legislation or compulsory education.

21. Although the Malay community appeared to accept such conditions of life, the Mission had reached the conclusion that prompt action should be taken in the Territory by the Australian Government in order to allow the population to develop normally. It appeared essential that Australia should initiate a process of education which would enable the Malay community to understand its rights, obligations and interests and to assume greater responsibilities. The administering Power should also take steps to separate the affairs of the Clunies-Ross estate from those of the public administration of the Territory.

22. In that respect, his delegation wished to reiterate its thanks to the Australian authorities who had already announced their willingness to accept and to apply the conclusions and recommendations contained in the Visiting Mission's report (*ibid.*, paras. 199-217).

23. His delegation also wished to express once again its confidence in Australia, which had often given evidence of genuine co-operation with the United Nations in the field of decolonization; the Ivory Coast was aware of the difficulties facing the administering Power and felt that the United Na-

tions should help it to overcome them. Moreover, the sending of other visiting missions to the Territory would allow the United Nations to obtain a first-hand account of the peoples' development and also to reinforce the action of the Australian Government.

24. Finally, he pointed out several errors in document A/9623/Add.5 (part II): in footnote 3, the document referred to should be A/9604 instead of A/9624; in paragraphs 28, 31, 205 and 209 of the annex it should be stated that the Cocos (Keeling) Islands Act covered the period 1955-1973 and not the period 1955-1966. In paragraph 207 it would be better to speak of "feudal-type relationship". Those errors would be corrected by the Secretariat before the document appeared under symbol A/9623/Rev.1.

25. Mr. SIDIK (Indonesia) said that his country was a member of the Special Committee and its position was well known; the relevant decisions and resolutions of the Special Committee reflected that position.

26. Referring to agenda items 69 and 12, he pointed out that the role of the specialized agencies and other international institutions, within their respective spheres of competence, was of the utmost importance in giving moral and material assistance to the peoples of the colonial Territories and their national liberation movements. In that respect, his delegation noted with satisfaction the progress that had been made through the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the close co-operation with a number of organizations in the United Nations system. Mention should also be made of the activities of the Bureau for Placement and Education of African Refugees, established by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the ILO, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). His delegation wished to express publicly its sincere appreciation to those agencies and organizations that co-operated in varying degrees with the United Nations in efforts to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. At its 988th meeting, on 13 November 1974, the Special Committee had adopted a resolution of which Indonesia was a sponsor² and it was to be hoped that the Fourth Committee would adopt a similar resolution.

27. Turning to agenda item 23 and matters relating to the smaller Territories, he expressed his delegation's belief that the attitude and action of the United Nations should primarily be guided by Article 73 of the Charter, which laid down the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of those Territories were paramount.

28. In addition to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, there was General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), which spelt out three choices for the Non-Self-Governing Territory: emergence as a sovereign independent State; free association with an independent State; integration with an independent State. For the people of smaller Territories to be fully aware of the choices open to them, the administering Power should organize a programme of political education explaining the advantages and disadvantages of each choice.

29. He outlined the obligations assumed by administering Powers under the United Nations Charter and then referred to the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Cocos (Keeling) Islands (A/9623/Add.5 (part II), chap. XX, annex), a Mission in which Indonesia had participated. Since several delegations had already made statements on the situation in

² A/AC.109/L.986.

the Territory, his delegation would merely say that it had been particularly gratified to learn of the administering Power's determination to introduce certain democratic changes. As the Visiting Mission had noted, the process of political education and democratization had not advanced as far as seemed desirable. Of course, as the representative of the administering Power had observed, the relative isolation of the community had contributed to its peculiar social and economic structure and had also made it difficult to introduce the changes required to prepare the Territory for decolonization. It was gratifying to note that the administering Power was now prepared to take steps to bring about the essential changes, and in particular to reduce the power of the Clunies-Ross family over the lives of the population. The representative of Australia had correctly characterized those changes as necessary if questions of human rights, standards of education, freedom of movement, currency, wages and work conditions were to be satisfactorily resolved. The steps being taken by the Australian Government, particularly with regard to local self-government and economic diversification, would enable the inhabitants of the Territory to advance towards the exercise of the inalienable rights guaranteed in the Charter and in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

30. In conclusion, he noted the close co-operation which the Government of Australia had accorded to the Visiting Mission, both during its preparations for the visit and during the journey itself; Indonesia was happy to have been able to make a modest contribution to one of the essential objectives of the United Nations—decolonization.

31. Mr. LASSE (Trinidad and Tobago), speaking on agenda item 23, said that the Committee should have more time to consider the smaller Territories and suggested that at each session, certain Territories—for example, those on which the Committee had received reports from Visiting Missions—should be given special consideration.

32. Turning to the question of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, to which a Visiting Mission had been sent, he said that the Mission, of which his delegation had been a member, had been able to identify some of the major problems of the Territory, particularly the preponderance of the Clunies-Ross family and the isolation of the Territory. However, according to General Assembly resolution 3157 (XXVIII), questions of territorial size and geographical isolation should not delay self-determination. Owing to the control on the political, economic and social life of the entire community exerted by the owner of the Clunies-Ross estate, the people seemed to have been deprived of their right freely to express their aspirations regarding their future. His delegation had had an opportunity to observe at first hand some of the complex problems confronting a small Territory and it believed that the United Nations should give serious consideration to the problem of the smaller Territories, with a view to formulating adequate measures which would bring about a satisfactory solution of their future political status.

33. As was demonstrated by the examples of Australia in the case of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands and of Papua New Guinea, and that of New Zealand in the case of Niue, the co-operation of the administering Power was necessary to bring about a smooth process of decolonization. It was encouraging to note that the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States had declared their willingness to co-operate with the Special Committee.

34. His delegation, which had participated in the Visiting Mission to Niue in 1972, wished to express its joyful satisfaction with the people's exercise of their right to self-determination; a substantial majority had voted in favour of self-government in free association with New Zealand on the basis of the Constitution and the Niue Constitution Act, 1974.

35. In regard to the Territories of Bermuda, the United States Virgin Islands, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Montserrat and the Turks and Caicos Islands, his delegation was concerned to see that because of their small size those Territories had not received adequate attention, and in that connexion he drew attention to some of the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2157 (XXVIII).

36. In the case of Bermuda, his delegation had mentioned to the Special Committee that not enough had been done to diversify the economy, since it was totally dependent on tourism and international finance. At the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the representative of the administering Power had pointed out (2065th meeting) that his Government could not interfere in the management of the Territory's economic affairs. The position taken by the administering Power was inconsistent with paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 3157 (XXVIII), which called upon the administering Powers concerned to take all possible steps to diversify the economies of the Territories under their administration. In the view of his delegation, the Administering Authority had the power to intervene decisively in all spheres of activity in Bermuda.

37. Turning to General Assembly resolution 3117 (XXVIII), which reaffirmed the solemn obligation of the administering Powers under the Charter of the United Nations to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Territories under their administration and to protect the human and natural resources of those Territories against abuses, his delegation was surprised that certain administering Powers had not followed the example of Australia and New Zealand, which had been able to prepare the Territories they administered for self-determination and independence. His delegation would support any draft resolution which would place emphasis on solving the problems which were obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

38. As to Belize, his delegation noted that the population, which had been estimated at 130,000 in 1973, had opted for independence, as the Premier had announced on 9 September 1973. The Territory had become a member of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) on 1 May 1974.

39. His delegation had listened with interest to the statement made by the Deputy Premier of Belize at the 2122nd meeting, and it considered that the international community should help to find ways of eliminating the obstacles that prevented that Territory's accession to independence. It was for the United Nations to see to it that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was duly applied in the Territory of Belize.

Mr. Sidik (Indonesia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

40. Mr. LECOMPT (France) said that in his statement to the General Assembly on 23 September 1974 (2238th plenary meeting), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic had welcomed the development in the situation in the Portuguese Overseas Territories and had pointed out that France, which had been one of the first Powers to foster self-determination for many countries, was currently completing its own endeavours in the field of decolonization by preparing, with the agreement of the freely elected leaders of the Comoros, the accession to independence of those Islands. He had added that the French delegation would, at the proper time, be pleased to give further information, which would emerge from the bill providing for a referendum in the Comoros. At the previous session of the General Assembly (2264th meeting), the French delegation had explained the content and significance of the joint declaration on the accession of the Comoro Archipelago to independence, signed at Paris on 15 June 1973 by the Minister for Overseas Depart-

ments and Territories and the President of the Government of the Comoros.³ His delegation had emphasized that in that declaration the French Government had affirmed the Comoros' wish for independence and had undertaken to organize a referendum among the peoples of the archipelago at a time to be fixed by common agreement, but not later than five years from that time. Pursuant to those decisions, President Ahmed Abdallah had announced that his Government wished the referendum to be held before the end of 1974. In response to that request, the French Government had drafted a bill to organize a referendum in the Comoros. The Act passed on 15 November 1974 by the Parliament defined the machinery for the ballot and made it clear that Parliament, under the Constitution, would decide on the follow-up action to that consultation whose date had been set for 22 December 1974 by a joint agreement between the French Government and the Government of the Comoro Archipelago. In the event of a positive response from the electorate, the process leading to independence could be carried out. In that connexion, the French Government and the Comorian authorities had undertaken to ensure that the rights and interests of regional entities would be protected.

41. The French Government, aware of its responsibilities, would contribute to building the new State and would endeavour to strengthen the friendship and co-operation between the two parties. The peoples and leaders of the Comoros Archipelago knew that France would spare no effort to ensure that the future of the Territory was established on firm foundations. France would be prepared to provide the Comoros Archipelago with any assistance its leaders might need.

42. Mr. ZABARAH (Yemen), referring to agenda item 23, said the question of the small Territories was of particular importance. Their often limited land space and their isolation should not be an obstacle to their accession to independence: imperialism, in all its forms, must be eliminated from those Territories.

43. The co-operative attitude of some administering Powers was encouraging; indeed, Australia and New Zealand had set the Territories administered by them on the path to achieving self-determination and independence, and it was to be hoped that the other colonial Powers would soon follow their example.

44. In that connexion, his delegation hoped that Spain, for example, would agree to co-operate with respect to Spanish Sahara. In the case of the Territories long occupied by a foreign Power, it would moreover be proper for the United Nations to determine what relationship had existed with other Territories before the colonialization. Yemen supported Morocco and Mauritania in their dispute with Spain. The request for a ruling on the case of Spanish Sahara addressed by those two countries to the international Court of Justice (see A/9771 and 2251st plenary meeting) was the legal means that would bring an end to that dispute. It went without saying that the colonial Power should take no measure in the region concerned before the International Court of Justice had given its ruling.

45. Yemen reaffirmed its solidarity with Morocco and Mauritania with respect to their claims on Spanish Sahara.

46. Mr. AL-BEIHI (Democratic Yemen) said that the question of the small Territories was as important as any other question included in the agenda of the Committee. At a time when colonialism was collapsing, exploitation and oppression were being eliminated, progress and socialism were on the rise and the struggle of peoples was being intensified through national liberation movements, some Territories were still under the yoke of imperialists, who were usurping all their rights.

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 23 (A/9023/Rev.1)*, chap. XI, annex, appendix II.

47. Niue and Papua New Guinea, however, with their limited resources, must be regarded as examples, since their Territories would be achieving independence.

48. Democratic Yemen unreservedly condemned the policy of the imperialists and firmly supported the peoples struggling to achieve self-determination and independence.

49. His delegation believed that Spain, which was linked to the Arab countries by many historical ties, should spare no effort to hasten the decolonization of Spanish Sahara. His delegation, which supported Morocco and Mauritania in that dispute, hoped that the International Court of Justice would soon hand down its opinion and that effective measures would be taken.

50. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) pointed out that his delegation had, on several occasions, stated that the freedom of the small Territories and the right of peoples to self-determination were principles laid down in the United Nations Charter which was binding on each State Member of the United Nations. The administering Powers could not therefore claim that some of those small Territories could not achieve independence. His delegation strongly urged them to create the conditions necessary for the establishment of ties between those Territories and the United Nations through, for example, visiting missions, as the Special Committee had suggested. That was the only way of assisting the peoples concerned to achieve freedom and to decide their future. In that connexion, he wished to pay a tribute to the Special Committee and, in particular, its Chairman, Mr. Salim, for the efforts which they had undertaken to that end.

51. His delegation was gratified at the developments in Papua New Guinea and Niue, as explained by the representatives of the Governments of those two Territories at the 2118th and 2119th meetings. It congratulated the administering Powers concerned for the positive measures they had taken.

52. The problem of Western Sahara—in which all the Arab countries had a special interest—was one of the most important, owing to its complexity and its special circumstances, namely, the need to eliminate imperialism and to re-establish territorial integrity in that region. The parties concerned were centuries-old friends and he was convinced that Spain, in the light of the role which it had played in defence of the just Arab cause, would respond to the appeal made at the Arab Summit Conference, held at Rabat from 26 to 29 October 1974, and would agree to the proposal by Morocco (see A/9771) and Mauritania (see 2251st plenary meeting) to request the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. The United Nations had, in various resolutions, attempted to lay the foundation for a solution by requesting Spain to take measures with a view to ending its occupation and to commence negotiations with all parties concerned. However, no positive result had been obtained. Another method should therefore be attempted by requesting an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice to determine to whom the Territory had belonged before the Spanish occupation. In that connexion, he emphasized the role of the International Court of Justice in the settlement of legal disputes, as the Secretary-General had pointed out in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization (A/9601/Add.1). Recourse to the International Court of Justice was, it appeared, the best and most just method, which should enable the General Assembly, at its next session, to find a solution aimed at eliminating imperialism from Western Sahara.

53. Regarding the question of Gibraltar, his delegation supported the request of Spain for the resumption of negotiations with the United Kingdom in order to re-establish Spain's territorial integrity.

54. With respect to the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), he supported, for the reasons he had just explained, the request of Argentina for the continuation of negotiations with the United Kingdom.

55. Finally, he pointed out that peace and prosperity for peoples was achieved through their self-determination and the liquidation of imperialism, as laid down in the United Nations Charter.

56. Mr. CAMARA (Senegal) said that, under agenda item 23, the Committee had taken up the consideration of the case of a group of colonies of the traditional type where, for the most part, the administering Powers refused to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

57. First, with respect to Western Sahara, the so-called Spanish Sahara, he pointed out that after four years, during which Spain had opposed the implementation of United Nations resolutions, that State had finally decided to organize the referendum requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 3162 (XXVIII), but at a date to be set. In the meantime, Morocco and Mauritania had reached an agreement on a single position, but had divergent views on the root of the problem because they each felt that the Territory had originally belonged to their country. The fact remained, however, that Western Sahara could not be regarded as Spanish territory and Spain had never made such a claim. Under the circumstances, the Committee should be able to assist the African countries concerned in finding a solution, even one of waiting, which would respect both the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the possible rights that a given country might have over a territory under foreign domination. For its part, his delegation regarded the decolonization of that Territory as a pressing necessity. Since there was a conflict of right between the African States concerned and the colonizing Power, it seemed highly desirable for the General Assembly to request the opinion of the International Court of Justice, which must determine whether there had been a rightful owner of Western Sahara before its occupation by Spain. In the case in question, the rightful owners, before the colonial era, of the so-called Spanish Sahara should be able to obtain the opinion of the International Court of Justice before the Assembly took up the problem. His delegation believed that the ideal solution would be for Mauritania, Morocco and Spain to propose jointly that the General Assembly, through the Fourth Committee, request an advisory opinion from the Court. Failing that, the Committee should itself take such an initiative.

58. The Special Committee intended to take up, at its next session, the question of the so-called French Somaliland, or French Territory of the Afars and the Issas. However, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity had decided at its eleventh session, held at Mogadiscio in June 1974, to request the French Government to end the repression in French Somaliland, characterized by arbitrary sentencing, deportations and the system of electrified barbed wire and mine fields and to encourage and support morally and materially the struggle of the people of French Somaliland for the achievement of national independence.

59. Chapter XIV of the report of the Special Committee brought to light, for example, irregularities in the electoral campaign in the latest elections, the size of the French expeditionary force, which was said to comprise 20,000 men, the expulsion of 30,000 Somalis and the detention of 11,000 others, continued repression and rigorous control of the entire indigenous population, etc. It was hard to doubt the truth of that information, which had almost all been reported by the

French newspaper *Le Monde*, where it had been mentioned, *inter alia*, that a double barrier 14.5 kilometres long, bristling with barbed wire and watch-towers and riddled with mines, separated Djibouti from the rest of a territory with theoretical borders. There were many attempts to cross the barrier and the local newspaper, *Le Réveil de Djibouti*, periodically reported on its victims. The same newspaper, in an article published on 19 July 1974, had stated that France was strengthening its military potential in Djibouti, using as a pretext the forthcoming reopening of the Suez Canal and the activity of the Soviet navy in the Indian Ocean.

60. The French Government remained deaf to the national demands of Somalis in Djibouti and claimed that the people of the territory had indicated their desire to remain French on several occasions. His delegation felt that the Organization should bring greater pressure to bear on the French Government to respect the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

61. The President of Somalia and the President of Senegal had recently declared, in a joint communiqué, that détente could not have a world-wide effect until colonialism, *apartheid* and *zionism*, *inter alia*, had been eradicated. They had decided to support "any initiative for complete independence in the Seychelles, São Tomé and Príncipe, as well as the Comoro Archipelago and the French Territory of the Afars and the Issas". Their position accorded with that of OAU and should immediately be reflected in the draft resolutions of the Fourth Committee.

62. Turning to the case of the Comoro Archipelago, he recalled that the Mouvement de libération nationale des Comores (MOLINACO), recognized by OAU, had carried on the unequal struggle against the Union démocratique comorienne, of Mr. Ahmed Abdallah, and had further proved itself as the motivating force behind the national awakening in the Archipelago. That struggle had led the parties in the Comoro Archipelago to enter into a coalition to demand independence. However, MOLINACO had been forced to withdraw its support for the coalition because of the deals and manoeuvres directed against it on account of its opposition to any referendum and of its support of direct independence.

63. On the French side, difficulties had been created and artificially maintained over a long period and independence had been refused or discouraged, while the division of the Islands on the basis of their special features had been advocated. However, the French law which had just been adopted provided for the unity of the Archipelago, a global vote for the consultation of the populations of the four islands and reaffirmation of the right to independence of those islands, a position which had been confirmed by Mr. Olivier Stirn, the Minister for Overseas Department and Territories. For his part, the President of the Government of the Comoro Archipelago had stated that he would like to maintain bonds of friendship with France when the Territory became independent. That statement implied that further difficulties had arisen on the French side and France should take steps to ensure that the referendum was sincere.

64. In the resolution adopted at its 982nd meeting, on 6 September 1974 (see A/9623/Add.4 (part II), chap. XI, para. 11), the Special Committee had taken note with interest of the important statement made by the French Government on 26 August 1974 concerning the consultation on the independence of the Comoro Archipelago and had asked the French Government to take the necessary measures for the return of Comorian political leaders and other Comorians to their country. In that respect, a leader of MOLINACO had returned to his country and was working with Mr. Abdallah's party. Finally, the Special Committee had asked the administering Power to allow it to send a visiting mission to the Archipelago.

65. OAU, at its eleventh Assembly of heads of State and Government, held at Mogadiscio in June 1974, had recommended that Member States do everything possible at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly to ensure the rapid implementation of resolution 3161 (XXVIII) on the Comoro Archipelago.

66. Turning to the case of the Seychelles, he recalled that the administering Power had decided to grant independence to the people and had promised to convene a constitutional conference in London in 1974 in order to determine the modalities whereby the Seychelles was to proceed to independence. The Chief Minister of the Government of the Seychelles had also stated that every effort would be made to work as closely as possible with the opposition towards national unification. Within the framework of its decisions, the Special Committee, in the resolution adopted at its 978th meeting, on 28 August 1974 (see A/9623/Add.4 (part I), chap. X, para. 11), had requested the Government of the United Kingdom to take all the necessary steps to facilitate the Territory's accession to independence without delay, in accordance with the express wish of the people of the Territory, and had requested—in the meantime—that a United Nations visiting mission be sent to the Seychelles. The Chief Minister had for a long time favoured maintaining the *status quo*, apparently because of the Territory's isolation and lack of economic development. His party had carried on a hard fight against the Seychelles People's Unified Party (SPUP). Apart from total independence, the latter included in its programme the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean and the return of the three islands incorporated into the "British Indian Ocean Territory". The administering Power had reacted to those claims by setting up an unfair electoral system in the Seychelles, which had considerably favoured the party in power, the Seychelles Democratic Party. During the elections in April 1974, rightly denounced by SPUP as a masquerade, the government party had obtained 13 seats with 21,800 or 52.4 per cent of the votes, while SPUP, with 19,000 or 47.6 per cent of the votes, had been allotted only two seats, which had given rise subsequently to violent outbursts.

67. However, his delegation welcomed the positive change in the attitude of the Chief Minister since the beginning of 1974. He had participated in the eleventh Assembly of Heads of States and Government of OAU at Mogadiscio in June 1974, which had laid special emphasis on the need to unite the two liberation movements in the Seychelles. The African States would pursue their action to ensure that, once unity was achieved, it would give rise to the best conditions for the accession of the Seychelles to independence.

68. Turning to the question of the other small Territories, his delegation said that the Committee had rightly welcomed the remarkable efforts made by Australia and New Zealand to guarantee the exercise of the right of self-determination in the territories of Papua New Guinea and Niue. His delegation supported the conclusions of the Special Committee and hoped that 1975 would see independence in Papua New Guinea and that the self-government acquired by Niue would be respected and broadened so that it could constantly improve and even change its status.

69. Turning to agenda item 64, he noted that, in its resolution of 29 August (see A/9623/Add.7, chap. XXIX, para. 7), the Special Committee had deplored the fact that certain Member States responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories had stopped, or refrained from, providing information, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, and his delegation requested those Member States to improve their co-operation with the Special Committee.

70. Returning to agenda item 23, he noted that the majority of the other Territories were generally speaking remotely

situated, small and surrounded by seas. They had a small population, limited resources and a low level of development, sometimes due to the negligence or selfishness of the administering Power.

71. However, as stated by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 2118th meeting, the populations of all Territories still under domination were always proud of their own identity, and that should be the first element to be taken into consideration in the task of decolonization entrusted to the Special Committee and the administering Powers.

72. Although the ways in which they achieved independence or self-government might differ, the people should always be in a position to express their true wishes without pressure and outside influence. His delegation felt that solutions other than independence should be the exception and it should be clearly stated that the status accorded under such solutions could be changed in accordance with the will of the people.

73. In colonial history, there had been too many entirely artificial situations cleverly presented as indicative of the wishes of the people. That was why his delegation firmly believed that the first and natural vocation of all Non-Self-Governing Territories was independence and why it could never altogether accept the fact that Territories which fulfilled the minimum conditions for independence should opt for a different status. It therefore invited the members of the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee to consider such cases very carefully.

74. In conclusion, he appealed to Member States that were still administering Territories to honour fully the noble ideals embodied in the solemn Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Those ideals were questioned less and less frequently in the world and ennobled those who subscribed to them and applied them. What was more, by freeing the Non-Self-Governing Territories under their domination, Member States, which were often big Powers, would escape the censure they might deserve on grounds of justice, equality and international morality from the small countries of which they had formally sometimes been the metropolis.

75. Mr. MORETON (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he wished to make a few comments on the statement on Gibraltar made by the representative of Spain at the Committee's 2117th meeting on 25 November. As was shown by the various proposals made by Spain regarding the future of Gibraltar, whose separate identity and aspirations Spain recognized, the Territory was in some way different. And it wished to remain different. The attitude of successive Spanish Governments towards Gibraltar was misguided for two reasons. First, it was paradoxical that, at a time when nations were becoming increasingly interdependent, small communities and local feelings were reasserting themselves, perhaps as a reaction against the constant trend towards centralization of power which was characteristic of the twentieth century. Gibraltar had its own identity; it could and did operate its own government very efficiently. Furthermore, the world had changed since the signing of the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. The representative of Spain had stated that that Treaty said nothing about the wishes of the populations concerned. While that was true, it was one of the characteristics of that period that populations were rarely consulted.

76. Like the representative of Morocco, who had spoken at the 2117th meeting, he had been struck by the attempts of the representative of Spain to justify self-determination for Spanish Sahara while excluding that principle in the case of Gibraltar—a principle which was the very essence of the United Nations. In effect, Spain was asking the United Kingdom to disregard the freely and repeatedly expressed wishes

of the people of Gibraltar. The United Kingdom would not be true to itself or to the United Nations Charter if it subscribed to that proposal.

77. The representative of Spain, at the same meeting, had described the population of Gibraltar as "prefabricated". How many years did it take for a "prefabricated" population to become indigenous? He was also surprised at the allegation by the representative of Spain that, by enacting the 1969 Gibraltar Constitution, the United Kingdom had disregarded General Assembly resolutions. In the preamble to that Constitution, the Government of the United Kingdom had pledged to the people of Gibraltar never to enter into any agreement under which they would pass under the sovereignty of another State against their freely and democratically expressed wishes. That pledge was wholly consistent with his Government's obligations under Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter. He reaffirmed that, if the people of Gibraltar one day decided, freely and democratically, to become part of Spain, the United Kingdom would not stand in their way. However, they had not yet so decided, and as long as they wished to remain under British sovereignty, the United Kingdom would regard it as its duty to support and sustain them in the face of the restrictions imposed against them. He added that the enactment of the 1969 Constitution was not a challenge to either Spain or General Assembly resolution 2429 (XXIII). He recalled that the United Kingdom, in entering into talks with the Spanish Government in March 1968, had tried to explain in detail the provisions of the proposed Constitution, which had finally been negotiated with all sections of political representation in Gibraltar in July 1968. Spain had unfortunately declined to listen to those explanations on the ground that the Gibraltar Constitution was only a secondary matter. Yet, it had subsequently described as unfriendly the discussions which had taken place between the United Kingdom Government and the representatives of Gibraltar concerning the Constitution and had increased the already severe restrictions on communications between Spain and Gibraltar, thus driving the two communities even farther apart.

78. It had been alleged that the United Kingdom was more concerned with promoting "its imperial strategy" than with responding to the wishes of the people of Gibraltar. In that connexion, he recalled that the ratio between native Gibraltarians and British military servicemen was 10 to 1, that an impartial Commonwealth team of observers had established that the 1967 referendum had been conducted fairly, impartially and democratically and that, on that occasion, 12,138 Gibraltarians had voted to maintain the links with the United Kingdom, while 44 had voted in favour of the Spanish proposals involving the extension of Spanish sovereignty to Gibraltar. It was clear, therefore, that the Gibraltarians still did not wish to join Spain, and if the Spanish Government doubted that, the United Kingdom would be happy to have a Spanish mission visit Gibraltar to conduct a survey on the question.

79. He also recalled that in 1966 the Spanish Government had put forward proposals whereby Gibraltar would have passed under Spanish sovereignty and the United Kingdom would have been permitted to retain a military base on the peninsula.⁴ If the United Kingdom had wished to maintain a base in that part of the world, it would have agreed to that proposal, ignoring the wishes of the Gibraltarians. However, it had not done so, and he reaffirmed that the wishes of the Gibraltarians themselves continued to be the prime concern of his Government. It was essential for that fact to be grasped if talks were to make progress.

⁴ For a summary of the Spanish proposals, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first session, Fourth Committee, 1671st meeting, para. 7.*

80. Referring to the Spain representative's observation that the United Kingdom had not negotiated seriously with the Spanish Government over the past year, he said that his country had always felt that formal and substantive negotiations between the two Governments would be premature until the gap between the parties concerned had been narrowed. It was for that reason that at the 2077th meeting his delegation had expressed a very explicit reservation—which he quoted—with regard to the draft consensus adopted by the Committee at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly.⁵ He further recalled that the United Kingdom had indeed resumed negotiations with the Spanish Government in May 1974. He wished to make a few comments on the conclusions which the representative of Spain had drawn from those negotiations and referred to in his statement. The representative of Spain had admitted that, because of the restrictions imposed by the Spanish Government, it was sometimes difficult and even dangerous for pilots to land at Gibraltar airport. He appeared to accept that situation with complete equanimity, in the interests of reaffirming the principle of territorial sovereignty. Naturally, the United Kingdom Government did not share those views. The restrictions imposed were potentially dangerous in themselves, although they in no way affected the operations of the British military aircraft; it was civil aircraft which were affected. Moreover, the restrictions bred hostility and suspicion among the Gibraltarians with regard to the intentions of the Spanish Government. If the United Kingdom Government had asked for the restrictions to be relaxed, it was because it did not believe that either the British people or the Gibraltarians took kindly to coercion and because it felt that a reduction in tension was an essential preliminary to serious negotiations.

81. The representative of Spain had also said that the actions of the United Kingdom were reminiscent of those of other countries which had resorted to *post facto* legislative changes to justify their actions internationally. He simply wished to emphasize in that connexion that people with their backs to the wall tended to react sharply to pressure. He appealed to the Spanish Government to recognize that, as long as Gibraltar was subject to the numerous restrictions tending to cut it off from the Spanish land mass, its political and economic development would run counter to that of Spain.

82. In conclusion, he said that his Government sincerely wished to continue the dialogue with Spain and to take advantage of any possibility of making progress towards a solution. In that connexion, he reaffirmed that the United Kingdom still wished to take part in negotiations with Spain on the future of Gibraltar, subject to the provisos which he had just mentioned. He welcomed the fact that Spain was paying greater attention than in the past to the need to take account of the views of the Gibraltarians themselves. That was the only way to create a climate for a solution acceptable to all concerned. Consequently, he welcomed with satisfaction the statement by the representative of Spain on the need to safeguard the interests of the Gibraltarians, but in the view of his country the wishes of the people were an integral part of their interests.

83. Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he wished to make a few comments on the statement which the representative of the United Kingdom had just made. The question of Gibraltar was distinct from all the other questions considered by the Committee, which had evolved a philosophy on decolonization based on territorial integrity. Gibraltar was a "rock", a military, air and naval base, and that ruled out the application to it of the principle of self-determination. In response to one of the arguments put

⁵ For the text, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 23, document A/9417, para. 39, draft consensus II.*

forward by the representative of the United Kingdom, he stressed that the people of Gibraltar would cease to be "pre-fabricated" on the day when Gibraltar ceased to be a military base. He also stated that the question of the Sahara, a Territory whose previously nomadic population was now sedentary, had nothing to do with the question of Gibraltar, a naval base.

84. He recalled that the United Kingdom, by an Order in Council promulgated after 1969, had decided unilaterally not to transfer sovereignty over Gibraltar to Spain against the wishes of the Gibraltarians. Spain, of course, respected the Gibraltarians and wished to safeguard their interests, but the

decision with regard to the future of the Spanish Territory of Gibraltar was not theirs to make.

85. He reserved the right to revert to the question later.

86. Mr. DE GUILHEM DE LATAILLADE (France) made a brief statement in exercise of his right of reply.

87. The CHAIRMAN announced that draft resolutions should be submitted as soon as possible so as to enable the Committee to complete its work by Friday, 6 December.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

2125th meeting

Tuesday, 3 December 1974, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Buyantyn DASHTSEREN (Mongolia).

A/C.4/SR.2125

AGENDA ITEMS 13, 23, 64, 69 AND 12, 70 AND 71*

Agenda item 13 (*continued*)
(A/9604, A/9727, A/C.4/L.1074)

Agenda item 23 (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (*continued*) (A/9623 (parts I-IV and VI), A/9623/Add.4 (parts I and II), A/9623/Add.5 (parts I-V), A/9623/Add.6 (parts I and II), A/9654, A/9655, A/9714, A/9715, A/9736, A/9771, A/9802, A/9814, A/9821, A/9824, A/9861, A/C.4/L.1071)

Agenda item 64 (*continued*)
(A/9623/Add.7, A/9867 and Add.1)

Agenda items 69 and 12 (*continued*) (A/9603 (chap. VI, sect. F), A/9623 (part VII), A/9638 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1, A/9638/Add.2-5, A/9830)

Agenda item 70 (*continued*)
(A/9845, A/C.4/L.1070, A/C.4/L.1075)

Agenda item 71 (*continued*) (A/9877)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. SHAKAR (Bahrain), referring to agenda item 23, said that his delegation firmly supported the eradication of colonialism and considered that conditions had become favourable for the liberation of all the remaining colonial Territories. The administering Powers had a duty to co-operate fully with the United Nations in implementing the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and those of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

2. The specific case of so-called Spanish Sahara was still of concern to all African States and to peace-loving countries throughout the world. It was, indeed, regrettable that, despite United Nations resolutions, the foreign domination of that Territory had not yet been brought to an end. Measures must therefore be taken to speed up the final stage of decolonization. Although the United Nations had repeatedly called upon the administering Power to conduct a referendum under United Nations supervision in order to enable the people of the Territory to exercise their right to self-determination, that

development had not yet taken place. New conditions had since been created which rendered the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions even more difficult.

3. The age-old friendship between Spain and the Arab world, which the latter wished to preserve, required the adoption of a peaceful and just solution. To that end, priority should be given to negotiations between Spain, Morocco and Mauritania. His delegation noted with satisfaction the agreement reached between Morocco and Mauritania to submit the question to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion. His delegation called upon Spain to reach agreement with the other parties concerned regarding the submission of the matter to the Court and thus strengthen its friendship and co-operation with the other countries of the region. The progress of colonial Territories towards independence was inexorable; Spain should heed the examples recently set by Portugal, New Zealand and Australia.

4. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on agenda items 13 and 23, said that, while the eradication of colonial systems in the small Non-Self-Governing Territories was of no less importance than in larger Territories, the different circumstances of each Territory necessitated individual solutions. The overriding factor was that the inhabitants of each Territory should decide their own future and the type of government they wished to establish. In that context, he wished to examine the political developments that had taken place in some of those Territories in the light of the important steps taken by the administering Powers.

5. He wished to thank the Governments of Australia and New Zealand for their co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in fulfilment of their responsibilities as administering Powers. With the determination of the peoples of the Territories themselves and the guiding hand of the administering Power, the great difficulties in achieving the goal set forth in the Charter in relation to some of the Territories concerned could be solved.

6. He also wished to thank the United Kingdom for the positive step that it had taken in discharging its position of hostility and in expressing its desire to co-operate with the Special Committee. His delegation noted that, in the same spirit, the United Kingdom had accepted a United Nations Visiting Mission to the Gilbert and Ellice Islands. He trusted that the same co-operation would be extended to the Special

* For the title of each item, see "Agenda" on page ix.