

60. With regard to the statement made by the representative of Nigeria, he repeated that Japan would endeavour to find alternative sources of supply for the primary commodities it imported from southern Africa and that it would buy the

goods it needed from other African countries provided that those countries could supply it with such goods.

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*

## 2114th meeting

Tuesday, 19 November 1974, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Buyantyn DASHTSEREN (Mongolia).

A/C.4/SR.2114

### AGENDA ITEM 68

**Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa (continued) (A/9623 (part V))**

#### GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. Mr. MONTTOYA (Peru) said that chapter IV 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 (A/9623 (part V)) showed that colonialist régimes created the most favourable conditions for the activities of foreign economic interests. That fact contributed to the maintenance of colonialism and encouraged the pursuit of discriminatory racist policies that made it possible to obtain cheap labour; in other words, at the same time as they were exploiting the natural resources of the colonial Territories, the colonialist régimes were also exploiting the human resources of those Territories.

2. Since the interests of foreign businesses operating in the colonial Territories were contrary to those of the peoples of those Territories, and since their activities impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, his delegation believed that it was most important to draw the attention of the Committee to the establishment of the information and research centre on multinational corporations<sup>1</sup> proposed by the Group of Eminent Persons to Study the Impact of Multinational Corporations on Development and on International Relations, established by Economic and Social Council resolution 1721 (LIII). The purpose of that centre was to study the activities of multinational corporations operating in the Territories under colonial domination in order to determine to what extent their practices and policies helped to maintain colonialism and racial discrimination. Finally, his Government, in accordance with its independent policy, would vote in favour of any proposal that sought the elimination of the activities of foreign economic interests which were impeding the work of decolonization.

3. Mr. LOPES DA FONSECA (Portugal) referred to the wide range of dangers and threats which foreign economic and other interests posed for decolonization but expressed his country's view that foreign corporations could assist in the development of an under-developed country if they acted honestly and sincerely, respected the rights and interests of

the peoples from whom they obtained their profits, worked in close co-operation with the host country and submitted themselves to the natural control of its Government, fulfilled their social obligations and, in short, if they did not attempt to transform the host country into an exploited country. For that reason, there should be no opposition *in limine* to the contribution of an international corporation; however, special care must be taken with respect to the terms regulating its presence and activities.

4. Foreign economic interests should be integrated into the general national planning of the authentic Government of the people and should be submitted to an economic discipline. Otherwise, they would become a most efficient instrument of neo-colonialism, detrimental to the independence of the peoples, as were colonialism, racism, *apartheid* and zionism. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal, Mr. Mário Soares, had emphasized at the current session of the General Assembly (2239th plenary meeting) that Portugal rejected all forms of neo-colonialism.

5. Portugal was determined to observe strictly the principles he had enunciated and to follow a policy of special co-operation with the new State of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and all the other Territories under Portuguese administration which would soon be independent. Even though it meant sacrifices for its economy, Portugal would follow that policy of special co-operation within the context of mutual respect, as had been clearly stated in the agreement between Portugal and the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO), signed at Lusaka on 7 September 1974 (A/9769, annex I) and the agreements between Portugal and the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (BAIGC), signed at Algiers on 26 August 1974, and as would be stated in the agreements to be signed with the other liberation movements and future Governments. With respect to other countries wishing to establish agreements on mutual aid and co-operation with Portugal or with Portuguese enterprises, his country welcomed all steps leading to a genuine co-operation, free of conditions, which respected the rights and interests of all peoples.

6. Finally, he offered his delegation's congratulations to the representative of Sierra Leone in her capacity as Chairman of Sub-Committee I of the Special Committee.

7. Mr. MORETON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had carefully studied chapter IV of the Special Committee's report and believed that it contained a number of generalizations which reflected opinions and preconceptions that his delegation did not share. For example, conclusion No. 11 stated that the Special Committee also found that the financial and technological participation of certain members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in the exploitation of the colonial Territories was tantamount to strengthening the oppressive minority racist régimes in southern Africa (*ibid.*, para. 6). Even if the remainder of the

<sup>1</sup> See Economic and Social Council resolution 1908 (LVII), paragraph 6.

sentence were true, there was no need to refer to membership of NATO, a defensive organization of freedom-loving States created because of a threat, and he believed that it was mentioned in that context for purposes of mere propaganda, which, in the view of his delegation, did not add to the report's credibility.

8. With respect to Southern Rhodesia, he was gratified to see from appendix III of the annex to chapter IV that there were no longer any British firms operating in Rhodesia. It was, however, disappointing that oversimplifications and inaccuracies, which had been pointed out by his delegation the year before, were again reproduced in the current report. British companies and individuals had had economic and financial interests in Rhodesia before the imposition of sanctions and, while they still owned them, they did not control them because of provisions by the illegal régime, as indicated in appendix III, which also acknowledged that the régime prevented the repatriation of profits to the United Kingdom. In that context, the representative of the Soviet Union had referred at the preceding meeting to manoeuvres designed to mislead international opinion and had appeared to imply that the United Kingdom continued to benefit from and could, if it wished, exercise control over the interests mentioned. That was not the case. The undesirable alternative to continuation of ownership by the United Kingdom without control was the surrender of ownership and assets to the illegal régime.

9. Security Council resolution 253 (1968) stated that Member States and their nationals should not make available to the illegal régime or to any commercial, industrial or public utility undertaking in Southern Rhodesia any funds for investment or any other financial or economic resources. He stated categorically that his Government honoured its obligations under that part of the resolution, as it did under every other part of the mandatory resolutions imposing sanctions. It was also untrue that British companies continued to invest capital in Southern Rhodesia without hindrance. He requested any representative who had evidence to support such an assertion to produce it, so that the allegations could be properly examined.

10. He referred to certain assumptions in the report, mentioned in the debate, and said that one in particular disturbed his delegation. The Special Committee seemed to assume that private foreign investments in the dependent Territories were automatically bad. His delegation did not share that belief, since the matter depended on what controls were imposed on foreign investments by the Governments concerned. The United Kingdom Government would not consent to major investments in its remaining dependent Territories unless they were considered to be advantageous to the economy and development of the Territory concerned. Furthermore, the Governments of the Territories concerned imposed their own restrictions and controls in accordance with their development plans, and they determined the level of taxation and royalties so that revenue could be obtained from the investments and used within the Territories for the benefit of the inhabitants. His delegation believed that it was incontrovertible that private foreign investments could play a useful role in producing more wealth for the country, in the transfer of technology and in assisting backward regions. That had been recognized in a number of United Nations reports.

11. Most of the remaining United Kingdom dependent Territories were very small in size, population and resources, and needed investments. That did not mean that such investments should be uncontrolled. With respect to the charge that a colonial relationship necessarily implied exploitation, he wished to state that the United Kingdom aid programme, amounting to £300 million annually, gave preferential treatment to his country's dependent Territories, and the inhabitants of the smaller remaining Territories had received an

average of £33 *per capita* in 1972/73 in aid disbursements from the British Government.

12. He noted that one section of the report complained that foreign economic interests emphasized export crops. Another section opposed a particular development project which would improve the infrastructure. But, surely, the alternative to investment and development was to condemn a Territory to a subsistence economy, leaving it weak and a prey to external forces. It had been strongly emphasized both in the Committee and in the previous month's general debate in the plenary meetings that there was a need to advance the prosperity and to develop the industries and economies of the developing countries. However, such development often involved new, costly and complex projects demanding financial investments and trained expertise. For that reason, to hope for those changes on the one hand and, on the other, to regard foreign economic investments as a cancer, was contradictory and self-defeating. In short, his delegation rejected the proposition that all foreign economic investments and interests were bad and that they necessarily delayed independence. Exactly the reverse seemed to be the case, since a strong economic base had been a great spur to Territories seeking and acquiring independence. His delegation therefore reserved its position on some of the recommendations in chapter IV of the Special Committee's report, which stemmed from a different philosophy.

13. Mr. SINDAYIGAYA (Burundi) referred to the most important conclusions in chapter IV of the report of the Special Committee (A/9623 (part V)) and said that he believed it was necessary to find concrete solutions divested of any purely rhetorical condemnation. That was not an easy task, since not all Member States respected the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, particularly resolutions 2621 (XXV) and 3117 (XXVIII).

14. In view of the situation of millions of people in the colonial Territories, who were subjected to every kind of adversity as a result of the activities of economic and financial interests, his delegation appealed to those States which, for reasons that were well known, maintained relations with the régimes that practised *apartheid* and racial discrimination to awaken to their responsibility for the tragedy that was unfolding in the Territories under foreign domination and to co-operate more sincerely in the reconstruction of those Territories, for whose destruction they were responsible.

15. History had already recorded many failures in the long search for solutions to the problem. However, there was no cause for discouragement, since the will to work for the cause of justice and peace was stronger than ever.

16. The Republic of Burundi whole-heartedly supported the conclusions of the Special Committee (*ibid.*, para. 6), endorsed the judicious recommendations the Special Committee had made (*ibid.*, para. 7) and, acting as always in conformity with the principles of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU), would give full support to any measures which the General Assembly might adopt to improve the lot of the Territories and peoples under foreign domination.

17. Mr. BALDÉ (Guinea) said that if, 29 years after the end of the Second World War and the establishment of the United Nations, colonial wars continued to plague the international community it was because some of the drafters of the Charter had an interest in what engendered war, namely, the exploitation and oppression of peoples. The fact that in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries all movement had been in one direction, from Europe to the other continents, could help in understanding the implications of economic interests and, consequently, the purpose of the conquests. For the settlers, the era of economic expansion had begun. For the colonial

countries and peoples, the era of expropriation, dependence and the disintegration of the major geopolitical units had begun.

18. After the proclamation and ratification of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and 14 years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which established the right of peoples to determine their own future, there were still those who were deprived of their freedom.

19. In view of the situation prevailing in southern Africa, where *apartheid*, racism and traditional colonialism were practised with the greatest effrontery, the most ingenuous people might also wonder how it was currently possible for a handful of white settlers to perpetuate a régime whose practices were curiously reminiscent of those of the primitive hordes. The reply was to be found in the capitals of arms dealers, since the financiers who had links with Pretoria, Salisbury, Windhoek and Beira were merely the official agents of their Governments or of a body corporate protected by those Governments.

20. The use of the veto against any positive measure relating to *apartheid* and the rebel régime of Ian Smith stemmed from that complicity. The proliferation, in countries hitherto free from any suspicion, of Rhodesian information offices that enjoyed all the powers and prerogatives of an embassy clearly explained the support received by the rebels in exchange for the economic and human potential of Zimbabwe. The policy of moving the indigenous population and relocating it in regions with harsh ecological conditions allowed foreign investors to appropriate mining and agricultural operations illegally so that they could completely exhaust the non-renewable resources of the countries under domination.

21. In their criminal and economically aggressive undertaking in the African Territories under Portuguese domination, the United States and the United Kingdom monopolized the extraction of all natural resources and left the control of all cash crops, trade, banking institutions and transport to the other Western countries, which had been denounced for their active participation in such activities, in contravention of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

22. All were aware of the possible disastrous consequences of promoting single crops, which were a typical instance of commercial cultivation. The drought that was currently wreaking havoc in certain regions of the Sudano-Sahelian zone was due partly to the destruction of the local flora, brought about by the imposition of a given crop as part of the war effort.

23. In Southern Rhodesia, out of more than 300 foreign companies, 195 were from the United Kingdom, 56 from the United States and 50 from South Africa. There again, mining was the preferred sector.

24. In Namibia, the changes introduced in the investment code by the Pretoria authorities to attract new capital would bring in £25 million a year in investments.

25. The activities of foreign economic interests were contributing directly to the perpetuation of colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination. The multinational corporations which had headquarters in the United Kingdom, the United States, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and Belgium, together with Canadian and Swiss capital, were the factors that were strengthening the power of the white minority in southern Africa.

26. The recent discriminatory measures in matters of wages and social security, enacted in southern Africa offered a splendid opportunity of maintaining the labouring masses in a state of chronic illiteracy without any prospect of improvement. Statistics indicated that the monthly wage of some 100,000 miners was approximately 18 French francs.

27. No statement or political speech could change those realities. The only force to be reckoned with was the independence of Africa.

28. What had been said about Africa in the name of democracy and justice applied equally to all the other colonial Territories in the Caribbean and the Pacific, since liberty had no frontiers and belonged to all.

29. Mr. CAMARA (Senegal) stressed the importance of the item under consideration. In his opinion, of the three main ways in which imperialism penetrated and took root, namely military activities, ideological and political activities and economic activities, the latter was the most decisive, important and complex. It was mainly in the economic sphere that the colonial régimes concealed and falsified the truth. For instance, until recently the identity of the companies involved in the construction of the hydroelectric station at Ruacaná in Angola had been kept secret; since 1965, the South African Government had incorporated economic data on Namibia into the information pertaining to South Africa; and few people were aware which countries and companies, in addition to France and the Federal Republic of Germany, had taken part in constructing armaments factories in South Africa. He therefore congratulated the Special Committee on the very comprehensive information it had submitted in chapter IV of its report, which revealed the active co-operation of certain Western Powers with the colonialist and racist régimes of southern Africa, in contravention of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. With the blessing of those countries, the foreign monopolies subject to their jurisdiction were intensifying their exploitation of those Territories, utilizing cheap labour and plundering their natural resources without taking account of the interests of the population and guided solely by their desire for gain.

30. The situation did not appear to have changed in any way during the period under review. The United States, the United Kingdom and South Africa controlled the majority of companies in Angola, but he was confident that the new Portugal would continue to assume its responsibilities in that Territory, until it achieved independence. In Rhodesia, 80 per cent of the mining companies were owned by Western corporations. In Namibia, despite Security Council resolution 283 (1970) and other relevant resolutions, most economic activities, particularly in the extractive and fishing industries, were in the hands of subsidiaries and branches of corporations whose headquarters were in South Africa, the United Kingdom, the United States, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Canada. At the end of 1972, 14 foreign mining companies were conducting operations there and 34 others were engaged in prospecting activities. In 1971 alone, the profits of those companies had amounted to 84 million rand. South Africa, which had the lion's share in that exploitation, had become the greatest economic Power in Africa with the assistance of a number of Western Powers which did not respect the resolutions of the United Nations. The United Kingdom and the United States occupied, respectively, first and second place among the customers and suppliers of South Africa, which, in order to attract investments, had established the highest exportable profit rates in the world for its major projects. A further reason for South African wealth was the exploitation of black labour, which was paid ridiculously low wages in comparison with those received by white workers.

31. He believed that the case of South Africa should be considered more carefully and that new measures should be devised that could not be evaded by the Western Powers which continued to give South Africa assistance and co-operation. General Assembly resolution 3117 (XXVIII) suffered from a number of defects which made it inoperative. He wondered how South Africa, which did not respect international morality, could be expected to direct the assistance and

co-operation it received solely towards its own territory, without extending them to Namibia. The economies of both centuries were closely linked and it was impossible in practice to distinguish between them. Any measure adopted would have to take account of that situation. Although it had no illusions concerning the goodwill of certain Western Powers, his delegation would continue to urge them to comply with their strict obligation. The eleventh Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, held at Mogadiscio in June 1974, had decided to invite States members to blacklist any person, company or institution of those countries which continued to maintain commercial relations with the illegal régime of South Africa and to request the Administrative Secretary-General of OAU to seek methods of imposing economic sanctions on Western countries which continued to trade with the racist régimes of southern Africa. Furthermore, Senegal would continue to place increasing reliance on the liberation movements, since it was convinced that the determinant factor in the essential changes which marked the course of history was the struggle of the peoples. In conclusion, he stressed the need for the United Nations to take effective action in order to accelerate the historical process which was taking place so painfully in that part of southern Africa.

32. Mr. SAM (Ghana) said that it was necessary to repeat the arguments that had been put forward regarding the activities of foreign, economic and other interests in the countries under colonial domination, if only to ensure that, should those interests suffer any serious setbacks, they would not be able to pretend that they had not been given enough warning. No person who had lived with colonialism could deny that the economies of colonial countries were so manipulated as to serve first and foremost the interests of the colonial Powers. The interests of the colonial peoples were always relegated to the background and any benefits they might enjoy were the unintended result of systems consciously promoted to ensure that exploitation took place with as little disturbance as possible. That explained, for example, why in most cases the countries colonized by European Powers had been deprived of facilities for higher education until the time of independence.

33. The activities of foreign interests also fostered a sense of inadequacy among the colonized peoples to the extent that they were sometimes unable to muster the courage to ask to participate in, not to mention control, their own government. As the coffers of the colonial Powers were filled, their ability to suppress the interests and rights of the colonized peoples and to carry out repressive measures was strengthened. In chapter IV of its report, the Special Committee stressed the serious inflationary impact of the activities of foreign economic interests on the economies of colonial countries. When one considered that the European worker received 10 times more than the African worker, the hardships suffered by the African could be better understood. Another problem facing the colonies of Mozambique, Angola, South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia was that of the exploitation of their natural resources. The rate of extraction of their mineral resources, for example, left no room for doubt that, even if independence were achieved within the near future, their minerals would be exhausted within a few additional years.

34. The Special Committee also drew attention in its report to the situation regarding land distribution. In Angola, foreign economic interests controlled over 80 per cent of the area of the Territory. In Zimbabwe, the Land Apportionment Act of 1930 and the Land Tenure Act, 1971 in effect divided the economy in such a way that the Europeans controlled the so-called money sector and the Africans worked in the traditional sector. In Namibia, more than half of the land, including the fertile and mineral-bearing areas, was in the hands of the white minority while the African majority occupied the barren remainder. In South Africa, the whites, who consti-

tuted 20 per cent of the population, controlled 87 per cent of the land. In each of those Territories the indigenous people had been driven from their homes and compelled to live in makeshift accommodation and prison camps, euphemistically called *aldeamentos*, "strategic" or "protected" villages, or Bantustans.

35. The huge profits that had accrued to Portugal from the activities of foreign economic interests had been the main source of financing for its colonial wars. The rebel régime of Ian Smith had been able to postpone its inevitable demise because of the encouragement it had received from the same foreign sources. In Namibia, South Africa's illegal occupation had been sustained with the connivance of those same foreign interests, which also supplied the racist régime with arms.

36. His delegation drew attention to those matters not because it sought to discourage all investments in the colonial Territories, but because it believed that it would be possible for foreign economic interests to organize their activities so as not to encourage salary disparities and discrimination based upon racial considerations, or to promote further repression against the indigenous peoples or to aid and abet colonial policies aimed at denying those peoples their rights to self-determination and independence. Even more reprehensible were the activities of the foreign interests in the Cabora Bassa and Cunene River schemes, which provided a potential excuse for armed intervention by the racist régime of South Africa in the internal affairs of the future independent countries of Mozambique and Angola. The latter had been committed to supplying electricity to the racist régime of South Africa, with all the attendant dangers which that gratuitous commitment might involve. As long as foreign investors refused to shoulder their moral responsibility to ensure the enjoyment by colonial peoples of their human and other rights, his delegation would continue to condemn their activities in colonial countries.

37. Mr. PITA ASTUDILLO (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the United States had not confined his remarks at the preceding meeting to the subject under consideration. Although his delegation did not wish to begin a sterile polemic with the administering Power concerning Puerto Rico, it wished to place on record a number of incontrovertible facts. The Special Committee, in its resolution of 30 August 1973 contained in the report covering its work during 1973, after considering the necessity of furthering the study of all aspects of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) regarding Puerto Rico, had reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination and independence, requested the Government of the United States of America to refrain from taking any measures which might obstruct the full and free exercise of that right, requested its Rapporteur to collect all pertinent information on the question, and decided to keep the question under continuous review.<sup>2</sup> In its resolution 3163 (XXVIII), the General Assembly had on 14 December 1973 approved the report of the Special Committee, thereby endorsing by an overwhelming majority of 104 the resolution on Puerto Rico contained therein.

38. Those facts proved that the arguments of the United States representative were obsolete, since they had been used seven years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and 20 years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 748 (VIII), which the representative of the United States had invoked. He recalled the categorical statement made by the representative of Venezuela at the twenty-eighth session (2062nd meeting), in his capacity as Chairman, in which he had said that it was perfectly proper to

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 23*, chap. I, para. 84.

discuss the question of Puerto Rico in the Committee. In the opinion of his delegation, those arguments proved the relevance of what had been said at the previous meeting.

39. With regard to the electioneering comments made by the representative of the United States, his delegation considered that they were somewhat untimely. The experience of the representative of the United States himself in the matter should make him aware that his Government was in no position to offer advice of that kind to any Member State after the lamentable Watergate episode.

40. Mr. VON UTHMANN (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in exercise of the right of reply with reference to the accusations of the representative of Senegal that his country had been supplying arms to South Africa, said that his Government was prohibited by law from so doing. If the delegation of Senegal was in possession of evidence on the subject, it should submit it. If not, such groundless accusations should not be renewed.

41. Mr. MUKHTAR (Sudan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, contrary to the assertions of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at the preceding meeting to the effect that foreign investment was not against the interests of peoples under colonial domination, such investment was of no benefit whatsoever to the colonial peoples, who had no part in organizing it. The activities of foreign corporations constituted mere pillage, rather than investment. The wages they paid were not sufficient to meet even the most basic needs; they did not allow the African people to live decently. The natural resources of colonial countries were exploited without consideration for the interests of their inhabitants, who were in turn exploited in conditions of slavery.

42. The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany had also maintained that any attempt to use trade for political ends could lead to economic warfare, which would harm the

small countries. In southern Africa, however, there was open war on all fronts against the Africans. The Federal Republic of Germany had the right to defend the situation, but in that case others also had the right to reject its arguments. The truth was that to defend the corporations involved was to defend colonialism. The question under consideration was that of the harmful effects of foreign investment on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Studies by both the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity had shown that the activities of foreign interests were impeding the implementation of that Declaration.

43. Mr. CAMARA (Senegal) said that he was surprised at the statement of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, since in his speech he had attempted to be circumspect. Everyone was aware of the support given to South Africa by the Federal Republic of Germany.

44. He referred to an article published in the *Times* of Zambia, of 14 October 1974, in which it was said that the Federal Republic of Germany gave arms to South Africa, as the previous Portuguese régime had done. The document had been prepared by three nationals of the Federal Republic of Germany, who were liberals and Members of Parliament. That publication gave full details of the number and type of weapons which West Germany was supplying to South Africa.

45. Mr. VON UTHMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his country was aware of the article and that the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Zambia had notified the Government of that country that the content of the article was inaccurate.

46. The CHAIRMAN announced that the debate on agenda item 68 was closed.

*The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.*

## 2115th meeting

Thursday, 21 November 1974, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Buyantyn DASHTSEREN (Mongolia).

A/C.4/SR.2115

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

#### Agenda item 13 (A/9604, A/9727)

Agenda item 23 (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (A/9623 (parts I-IV and VI), A/9623/Add.4 (parts I and II), A/9623/Add.5 (parts I, II and 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)

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

Agenda items 69 and 12 (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 (A/9845)

#### Agenda item 71

### GENERAL DEBATE

1. Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela), Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementa-

tion of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, introduced the chapters of the Special Committee's report relating to agenda items 13, 23, 64, 69 and 12, 70 and 71. He pointed out that, as in previous years, the work programme of the Special Committee had been extremely heavy in 1974. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 3163 (XXVIII) and other pertinent General Assembly resolutions, the Special Committee had given intensified consideration to the problems of decolonization in general and had continued its exchange of views on the smaller Territories.

2. The Special Committee had continued to receive the close co-operation of the administering Powers concerned, in particular Australia, New Zealand and the United States. Furthermore, as a result of changes in its policy concerning colonial questions, the Government of the United Kingdom, which administered most of the Territories still under colonial rule, had decided to extend its co-operation to the Special Committee and had actively participated in its proceedings.

3. From July to September, the Special Committee, having accepted the invitations of the administering Powers concerned, had sent visiting missions to the Cocos (Keeling)

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