

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly
FORTY-FIFTH SESSION
Official Records

FOURTH COMMITTEE
7th meeting
held on
Monday, 15 October 1990
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 7th MEETING

Chairman:

Mr. ADOUKI

(Congo)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

AGENDA ITEM 111: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

AGENDA ITEM 113: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM 114: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

AGENDA ITEM 115: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

Hearing of petitioners

REQUEST FOR HEARING

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/45/SR.7
31 October 1990
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

12P. 90-56264 2773S (E)

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/45/23 (Parts V and VI), A/AC.109/1015 and Corr.1, A/AC.109/1016 and Corr.1, A/AC.109/1017-1021, 1023 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/AC.109/1024-1036, 1041 and Corr.1, A/AC.109/1044 and 1048 and Corr.1/Rev.1)

AGENDA ITEM 111: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (A/45/559)

AGENDA ITEM 113: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (A/45/3 (Chaps. I and VI, sect. D), A/45/23 (Part V), A/45/309, A/AC.109/L.1740, E/1990/72)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (A/45/3 (Chaps. I and VI, sect. D))

AGENDA ITEM 114: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA (A/45/553)

AGENDA ITEM 115: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (A/45/560)

1. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking as Rapporteur 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, introduced the chapters of the Special Committee's report on agenda items 18, 111 and 113 in document A/45/23 (Parts V and VI).
2. The Special Committee, pursuant to the requests in paragraph 11 (a) and (d) of General Assembly resolution 44/101 of 11 December 1989, had once again carefully reviewed the situation in the Territories concerned, as well as other related questions, and had adopted a number of recommendations and proposals.
3. The Special Committee reaffirmed its position that it was the responsibility of the administering Powers to create such conditions in those Territories as would enable their peoples to exercise, freely and without external interference, their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and that the population itself must in the last analysis determine its future political status.
4. The Special Committee urged the administering Powers to take measures to strengthen and diversify the economies of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and once again stressed the importance of sending visiting missions to facilitate the speedy implementation of the Declaration with respect to those Territories.
5. The Special Committee expressed the hope that France and the United Kingdom, as administering Powers which had not participated in its consolidation of the

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

problems of the Territories under their administration during the current year, would rethink their position.

6. The Special Committee requested the organizations of the United Nations system to render, or continue to render, all possible moral and material assistance to the colonial peoples, bearing in mind that such assistance should not only meet their immediate needs but also create conditions for development after they had exercised their right to self-determination and independence.

7. The Special Committee felt that the organizations concerned should initiate or broaden contacts and co-operation with the colonial peoples and the administering Powers in order to intensify programmes of assistance and urged the executive heads of those organizations to submit to their governing and legislative organs concrete proposals for the full implementation of the relevant United Nations decisions. The Special Committee noted with grave concern the extensive links and collaboration between the apartheid régime of South Africa and certain countries in the political, diplomatic, economic, nuclear, military and other fields, and the growing military and nuclear co-operation between racist Pretoria and Israel, and it condemned those links and collaboration.

8. In respect of information transmitted by the administering Powers to the Secretary-General in accordance with Article 73 a of the Charter of the United Nations, the Special Committee requested the administering Powers concerned to transmit or to continue to transmit such information to the Secretary-General.

9. Those and other specific recommendations were included in the draft resolutions and decisions set out in the chapters of the Special Committee's report.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/C.4/45/2 and Add.1-5, A/C.4/45/4 and A/C.4/45/6)

Question of New Caledonia

Hearing of petitioners

10. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had granted requests for hearing concerning New Caledonia and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in documents A/C.4/45/2 and Add.1-5 and A/C.4/45/4.

11. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Temaru (Front de libération de Polynésie) took a place at the petitioners' table.

12. Mr. TEMARU (Front de libération de Polynésie) said that, thanks to the efforts of the United Nations, the Kanak people had succeeded in getting the question of their rights and freedoms included in the agenda of the international community through the work of the Special Committee on decolonization. As a result of the Matignon Agreement, the Kanak people would very soon be able to administer their own country in freedom and full independence.

(Mr. Tamaru)

13. Speaking of the exploitation of Caledonian natural resources by France, he noted that the strengthening of French domination of the economy of the Kanak people was being furthered by the determination to maintain a system of colonial domination based on financial constraints and supported by various forms of blackmail, including public menaces.

14. With regard to the various decisions adopted by the United Nations on the question of the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and in particular General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the Kanak people were fully entitled to preserve their natural resources for their own direct benefit. As one example of French interference in the Caledonian economy he cited the exploitation of the 200-mile economic zone for fishing. France had expropriated that vast zone, owned by Polynesia, to the detriment of the development of one of the most basic sectors of New Caledonia's economy.

15. Referring to the catastrophic balance-of-payments situation in New Caledonia, he said that France had deprived the Kanak people of the opportunity to control all the factors of their economic development. In accordance with existing legislation, all foreign affairs, communications, currency, credit, and other sectors, were under the control of the French State, and in such circumstances no country could pursue any kind of serious economic policy.

16. Yet another important problem was the continuation of French nuclear testing in the South Pacific. When Algeria had become independent, France had transferred its nuclear tests from the Sahara to the South Pacific without any consultation with the French people. It had carried out more than 40 tests in the atmosphere and more than 100 underground explosions, which had caused ecological damage to New Caledonia and a good part of the planet. Recent analyses of the chemical composition of groundwater near the test site refuted the argument that those tests were not dangerous.

17. In conclusion, he said that the Kanak people would be grateful to the Chairman and the members of the Fourth Committee if they would once again include Polynesia in the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, a list from which it had been arbitrarily excluded by the French Government on the grounds that New Caledonia had been given political autonomy.

18. On behalf of the Polynesian and Kanak people, he welcomed the decision of the United Nations to proclaim the 1990s the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism and renewed its request that Polynesia should be reinserted in the list of Territories to be decolonized, a list which already included New Caledonia.

19. Mr. Tamaru withdrew.

20. At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. Winslow (Montreal University) took a place at the petitioners' table.

21. Ms. WINSLOW (Montreal University) raised the issue of sustainable development in New Caledonia and the consequences thereof for the future self-determination of the Territory. Kanak demands for independence presupposed cultural recognition as

(Ms. Winslow)

much as political and economic autonomy. For socio-economic change in the Territory to be achieved, a native wisdom and knowledge must be drawn upon not only at the grass-roots level, but at the national-policy level as well.

22. The dispossession of the Kanaks of their right to land in New Caledonia had followed a classic pattern of colonial expansion and the development of unequal socio-economic relations that permitted the exploitation of labour, land and natural resources. The Matignon Agreement imposed Western management models and measures of success upon the Kanaks. The indigenous population was regarded in the Agreement as a "special" social category with "special" problems deserving "special" treatment and guidance in the pursuit of development. The objective situation of the Kanaks was ignored, and the structure of inequality was validated by attributing its causes to deficiencies which were assumed to be inherent in Kanak society. If the fundamental rules of economic development were to be set by France and based on Western models, there was a risk of dislocating not only the structure of production, trade and consumption but also the patterns of traditional authority, custom and culture.

23. The proposed development of mining and forestry under the Matignon Agreement would only lead to increased environmental destruction and depletion of the Territory's bio-asset base. It would seem that the southern province, which contained 70 per cent of New Caledonia's European and immigrant population, was benefiting the most from the Matignon Agreement. That province contained two thirds of the labour force, most of the management personnel and almost all of the Territory's private capital.

24. If private capital did not invest in the Kanak provinces, there was little hope for sustained economic development. For example, the average aid per capita for the South Pacific region was \$US 244, whereas New Caledonia received \$US 1,592 in aid per capita, in other words six times the regional average. That meant that the Territory was more heavily dependent on outside aid than other Territories. The situation was compounded by the fact that virtually the sole source of aid to New Caledonia was France; that posed a serious threat to the future self-determination of the Territory. In order to be sustainable, any form of development must incorporate local experience. Traditional structures existed in the Kanak community that could promote a dialogue to resolve the problems of the Kanak and non-Kanak population.

25. A wide gap existed between the Kanaks and the other ethnic communities in the Territory with regard to education. Statistical data showed that the Kanaks had the lowest level of education and the lowest percentage of high-school graduates.

26. She had had the opportunity to attend two regional seminars held in observance of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Those seminars had shown that the powers and the budget of the Special Committee should be increased so that an extensive study could be made of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories and its findings could be distributed world wide. The populations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories should make their views known to the international community and

(Ms. Winslow)

familiarize the inhabitants of the remaining colonies with the activities of the United Nations.

27. The administering Powers should be encouraged to establish the necessary conditions to enable the peoples under their jurisdiction to gain political and economic independence in accordance with the principles of the United Nations. That included the transmission of information to the Special Committee in accordance with Article 73 g of the Charter of the United Nations.

28. The economic development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories towards self-reliance and reduced economic dependence on external sources would require the creation of specific programmes aimed at guiding them in that direction. The administering Power should be called upon to act in close consultation with the legitimate representatives of the Territory in order to prevent the activities of foreign economic interests that might impede the self-determination process, thus ensuring that New Caledonia was protected from any activities that could jeopardize its economy and compromise its environment.

29. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu) asked whether the activities of foreign economic interests had a perceptible impact on the decolonization process in the South Pacific region, particularly in New Caledonia.

30. Ms. WINSLOW (Montreal University) said her reply depended upon how the term "foreign economic interests" was interpreted. If it referred to France's role in shaping a future New Caledonia, the answer was very clear. If, however, it referred to the role of foreign economic interests in the decolonization process, those interests were more concerned with using the resources of the country to reap maximum profits for themselves than with creating the infrastructure necessary to ensure long-term, sustainable and economically sound development.

31. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu) said that he was expecting to hear an answer to the question whether the activities of foreign economic interests fostered or impeded the decolonization process.

32. Ms. WINSLOW (Montreal University) said that the type and volume of the aid given to New Caledonia seriously impeded the self-determination process. Such aid came primarily from one source, and made the country heavily dependent upon that source.

33. Furthermore, in the absence of private capital investments in the northern and island provinces, which would promote a diversification of the economy, it was difficult to imagine the Territory achieving any kind of independence by 1998, because all development activity would depend upon the allocation of State resources. That being the case, New Caledonia's future was not particularly bright. Moreover, not every activity of private enterprise should be welcomed. For example, the mining of nickel by transnational corporations was carried out irrationally from the ecological point of view: the profits reaped were taken out of the country and were not used to develop the Territory. The main goal must be to ensure the country's dynamic, sustained growth, while bearing ecological needs

(Ms. Winslow)

in mind and protecting the cultural traditions of the people of New Caledonia. Broader consultation with the indigenous population and the elaboration of completely new approaches designed to involve the population in the country's development activities must serve as the basis for that process.

34. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea), pointing out that the French authorities had recently assisted the Kanaks in acquiring a mine but had not provided the necessary technical know-how, asked whether the administering Power would use that fact in the future to argue that the Kanaks were incapable of administering their own land.

35. Ms. WINSLOW (Montreal University) said that the acquisition of control of the mines was of great significance since the mining industry was an important source of revenue, but it must not be forgotten that only 10 per cent of the assets had been transferred to the Kanaks, an amount clearly insufficient to ensure their development. Furthermore, it was necessary to seek other more rational development models based on the exploitation of other kinds of resources. It was also necessary to obtain an answer to the question whether the profits from the remaining 90 per cent of the assets of the mining industry would be used in the interests of the local population.

36. Ms. Winslow withdrew.

37. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea) said that he wished to put a question to Mr. Temaru (Front de libération de Polynésie).

38. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Temaru (Front de libération de Polynésie) again took a place at the petitioners' table.

39. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea) said that it was widely argued that French legislation protected the interests of the population of Non-Self-Governing Territories, including New Caledonia, with respect to the attainment of self-determination. He would like to know Mr. Temaru's opinion as to whether the French Constitution worked in the interests of the Kanaks and was applicable to other dependent Territories.

40. Mr. TEMARU (Front de libération de Polynésie) said that the French Constitution provided for the right to self-determination of all the dependent Territories of France. Nevertheless, the petitions concerning the organization of a referendum in New Caledonia addressed to the Government of France in 1986 and 1989 had so far remained unanswered.

41. Mr. LACROIX (France), speaking on a point of order, requested that Mr. Temaru should confine himself to the matters on the agenda.

42. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea) asked whether the Committee had any grounds to believe that New Caledonia would be able to secure its independence within the framework of the legislative system and Constitution of France.

43. Mr. TEMARU (Front de libération de Polynésie) said that the French Constitution recognized that right.

/...

44. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea) said that he wanted to understand Mr. Temaru's position correctly, for New Caledonia was included in the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories and its delegation had come to take part in the work of the Committee on the ground that under French law New Caledonia could not secure self-determination in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

45. Mr. TEMARU (Front de libération de Polynésie) said that the people of New Caledonia could not exercise their right to self-determination because the French Government was doing everything possible to prevent it. He did not see any possibility that by 1999 the Kanak people would achieve control over the economy of their own country.

46. Mr. Temaru withdrew.

47. At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. Winslow (Montreal University) again took a place at the petitioners' table.

48. Mr. BUGOTU (Solomon Islands) asked Ms. Winslow whether she thought that in eight years' time the people of New Caledonia would be able to take over the administration of their country.

49. Ms. WINSLOW (Montreal University) said that, notwithstanding the forecasts that by 1998 the Kanaks would make up 52 to 53 per cent of the electorate, real assessments put the figure at 43.6 per cent. Furthermore, there were difficulties with regard to the definition of voter qualification and the question of the necessity of holding elections.

50. The Prime Minister of France had expressed the hope that New Caledonia would remain in the French Republic. Accordingly, it was hardly possible to believe that France would deliberately pursue a policy designed to achieve the self-sufficiency which was a necessary condition of independence.

51. Mr. BUGOTU (Solomon Islands) asked Ms. Winslow whether she agreed that the Matignon Agreement was designed to achieve the independence of New Caledonia.

52. Ms. WINSLOW (Montreal University) said that the Matignon Agreement was not designed to achieve the decolonization of New Caledonia but was merely an agreement on a truce between the local population and the French authorities. Moreover, it was no guarantee of the sustained development which was necessary for the attainment of independence.

53. Mr. O'BRIEN (New Zealand) asked Ms. Winslow to comment on the effectiveness of the programme for the training of managerial personnel set up under the Matignon Agreement.

54. Ms. WINSLOW (Montreal University) said that, during the recruitment of persons to receive training under the programme, great difficulties had arisen in connection with their qualifications. A second problem was that trainees in the programme were required to spend a few months in the Territory in order to gain

(Ms. Winslow)

practical experience of all the events taking place there and to take a direct part in its development.

55. Ms. Winslow withdrew.

56. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Uregel (Front uni de libération Kanak) took a place at the petitioners' table.

57. Mr. UREGEL (Front uni de libération Kanak) said that the Matignon Agreement constituted a threat to the transition of the Kanak people to independence. The Rocard plan did not guarantee Kanak independence, and the French Government was seeking for political reasons to implement the plan at any cost in order to maintain a French presence in New Caledonia and in the South Pacific region. To that end it was seeking to have New Caledonia recognized as a State having associative status with respect to France.

58. The Front de libération nationale kanak socialiste (FLNKS) believed that the Rocard plan did not guarantee satisfaction of the basic demand of the Kanak people and FLNKS was opposed to the division of the country, for that would be effected without regard to the cultural characteristics of the regions where the Kanaks lived. Nor did it accept the composition of the proposed electoral body, for it would guarantee supporters of the anti-independence movement a majority of 64 per cent in the voting on the question of self-determination in 1998.

59. Although FLNKS recognized that the Matignon Agreement did not guarantee Kanak independence, it was mobilizing regional and international efforts in support of the 10-year Rocard plan, an action which in the end played into the hands of the colonial Government, the Rassemblement pour la Calédonie dans la République (RPCR), and certain countries of the region which enjoyed privileged relations with France. At a time when the policy of Mr. Michel Rocard, an advocate of the Matignon Agreement, was being subjected to increasing criticism and when it was quite possible that Prime Minister Rocard would renounce his own plan before 1998, FLNKS should change its attitude to the Agreement. It was illogical and dangerous from the standpoint of the struggle of the Kanak people for FLNKS to petition international bodies, including the relevant bodies of the United Nations itself, in order to secure their support on the issue of Kanak independence and at the same time for it to approve the Rocard plan, which did not guarantee the independence of the Kanak people.

60. The position of FULK remained unchanged. It advocated the independence of the Kanak people, condemned the Matignon Agreement and supported the proposal of FLNKS to review the text of the Agreement in order to ensure guarantees for the independence of the Kanak people, particularly with regard to the electorate and the timetable for implementing the plan.

61. Lastly, he pointed out that the Kanak people had made a choice in favour of the independence of New Caledonia. FULK was prepared to co-operate with any other members of FLNKS that had signed the Matignon Agreement for the purpose of drawing up a new general strategy for achieving independence in order to prevent the implementation of the 10-year plan of French colonialism.

62. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea) said that many of the rapid changes linked to the forthcoming unification of Europe in 1992 were very positive. At the same time, the question arose whether the interests of the "third world" countries would suffer as a result of the shifting of attention and resources to Europe. He wondered how Mr. Uregei viewed that process.

63. Mr. UREGEI (Front uni de libération kanak) said that, in his opinion, in 1992 his country would be subjected to colonial exploitation not by one State but rather by 12. New investments would be made on the basis of the free movement of labour and capital and new structures impeding the accession of New Caledonia to independence would come about. The Kanaks were told that the basic principles of decolonization, which had brought freedom to the African colonies, did not apply to New Caledonia. France had done nothing to ensure the self-determination of the Kanak people throughout the long years of their struggle for independence. Furthermore, mass immigration into the Territory had brought about a situation in which the Kanaks had become a minority in their own country, after which a referendum was being proposed to them. Nothing was being done to improve the social situation of the Kanaks either.

64. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea) asked whether the results of the elections in France in 1991 or 1992 would affect prospects for New Caledonia's accession to independence and self-determination.

65. Mr. UREGEI (Front uni de libération kanak) said that no one knew who would be elected in France in 1993 and what policy would be followed by the new Government. The 10-year Rocard plan had been enacted as legislation and, although it was impossible to predict whether it would be supported by a parliamentary majority in the future, the possibility that it might be repealed by a new parliament could not be excluded.

66. Mr. Uregei withdrew.

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

67. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should hear a petitioner on the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

68. Ms. BONEPARTH (United States of America), explaining her Government's position, said that the Committee was not the appropriate forum for discussing the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and pointed out, in particular, that in accordance with the Charter and established practice, all the functions relating to the Territory were carried out by the Security Council with the assistance of the Trusteeship Council. Accordingly, she objected to the Committee's discussion of the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the hearing of petitioners in that regard.

69. Mr. HARKIN (United Kingdom) said that he supported the view expressed by the representative of the United States and pointed out that the question of that Trust Territory was within the competence of the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council, not the General Assembly.

70. Mr. LACROIX (France) said that he supported the statements made by the previous speakers with regard to the consideration of the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

71. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Scheiner (National Mobilization for Survival) took a place at the petitioners' table.

72. Mr. SCHEINER (National Mobilization for Survival) said that his views were also shared by the War Resisters International and the International Nuclear-Free and Independent Pacific Movement.

73. For the past 30 years, the United Nations, through its tireless and effective work, had achieved great success in helping 59 Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories achieve independence. Nevertheless, the overall task had not yet been completed.

74. The answer to the question asked by the Prime Minister of Vanuatu and repeated by the Palauans as to why their region must be a site for testing nuclear devices, particularly at a time when the cold war had ended, was clear and ugly: the United States Government wanted to maintain the possibility of basing nuclear warships and planes in strategically situated Palau.

75. If the United States had removed the provision from the Compact of Free Association permitting the storage of nuclear warheads on the islands, the voters of Palau would have approved the Compact when it had been first presented.

76. After Palau had again rejected the Compact, the United States had arbitrarily assumed the right to intervene in Palauan affairs under the current Trusteeship Agreement. The Government of Palau was permitted to communicate with the United Nations and other Governments only with the approval of the United States State Department.

77. After Palauan officials, the Guam Legislature, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas and the United States Congress had protested, the United States Government had retreated slightly from its position. Nevertheless, the threat of direct rule from Washington remained and the United States Government seemed prepared to maintain Trusteeship under tight control indefinitely. One excuse for the reassertion of control by the United States was that funds had been mismanaged in Palau. In that regard, he referred to a scandal involving an electric power plant that had resulted in an enormous debt.

78. He cited the example of Panama, where the United States, in spite of a treaty that it had signed on phasing out its military control in the Panama Canal Zone, had invaded that country and he pointed to a similar situation in Palau where the facade of Palauan self-rule had disappeared when the wishes of the United States military had not been followed. It was the responsibility of the United Nations to protect the people of Palau and Panama - just as in the case of the people of

(Mr. Scheiner)

Kuwait. He also hoped that the United Nations would defend Palau's sovereignty and help the Palauan people implement their right to true self-determination.

79. Mr. Scheiner withdrew.

REQUEST FOR HEARING

80. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee of the receipt of communication A/C.4/45/2/Add.6, containing a request for a hearing on the question of New Caledonia under agenda item 18. He suggested that, in accordance with the usual practice, the communication should be circulated as a Committee document for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

81. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.