

question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples at plenary meetings starting the following week and that it would be as well if the Fourth Committee could have completed its debate on that item by that time, even if it meant meeting at the week-end.

Requests for hearings

133. The CHAIRMAN informed the members of the Committee that he had received two requests for hearings

on the subject of Spanish Sahara. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed that the requests should be circulated, as usual, as Committee documents and that it would consider them at a later meeting.

*It was so decided.*⁴

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

⁴ The requests were subsequently circulated as documents A/C.4/787/Add.5 and Add.6.

2172nd meeting

Thursday, 20 November 1975, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Famah JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone).

A/C.4/SR.2172

Tribute to the memory of Generalissimo Francisco Franco Bahamonde, Head of the Spanish State

1. The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Committee, expressed regret at the death of Generalissimo Francisco Franco and requested the delegation of Spain to convey her condolences to the family of the deceased and to the Spanish Government and people.

2. Mr. ARTACHO (Spain) thanked the Chairman for her condolences.

Organization of work

3. Mr. ECUA MIKO (Equatorial Guinea), speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the African group of States for the month of November, asked that statements under agenda item 23 concerning the question of Spanish Sahara should be permitted, even though the general debate on agenda items 23, 86, 91 and 12, 92 and 93, taken together, had been concluded at the preceding meeting.

4. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection she would take it that the Committee agreed that further statements could be made concerning the question of Spanish Sahara.

It was so agreed.

AGENDA ITEM 86

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations (continued) (A/10023/Add.9, A/10307, A/C.4/L.1117)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

5. The CHAIRMAN announced that Madagascar and Togo had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1117, concerning agenda item 86.

AGENDA ITEM 93

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (concluded) (A/10329 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.1111)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded)

6. The CHAIRMAN announced that Greece had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1111, concerning agenda item 93, and said that if there was no objection she would take it that the Committee adopted the draft resolution by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1111 was adopted.

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

7. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 93. If there was no objection, she would take it that the Committee authorized the Rapporteur to submit his report directly to the General Assembly.

*It was so decided.*¹

¹ The report was subsequently circulated as document A/10407.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued)
(A/10023 (parts I and II), A/10023/Add.5, A/10023/Add.6 (parts I and II), A/10023/Add.7, A/10023/Add.8 (parts I and III), A/10082, A/10091, A/10095, A/10097, A/10101-S/11707, A/10104, A/10175, A/10300, A/10326-S/11862, A/10337-S/11872, A/C.4/786, A/C.4/787/Add.2, and Add.4-6, A/C.4/789, A/C.4/795-800, A/C.4/804, A/C.4/805, A/C.4/L.1094/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.1096, A/C.4/L.1101, A/C.4/L.1102/Rev.1, A/C.4/L.1109-1116)

QUESTION OF THE SEYCHELLES: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

8. Mr. MWASAKAFYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania) introduced draft resolution A/C.4/L.1114, relating to the question of the Seychelles, and drew attention to the eighth preambular paragraph, which referred to the stated position of the Government of the Seychelles with regard to the islands' territorial integrity, and paragraph 4, which emphasized the responsibility of the United Nations to render all possible assistance to the peoples of the Seychelles in their efforts to consolidate their national independence. The sponsors of the draft resolution hoped that it would be unanimously adopted.

9. The CHAIRMAN announced that Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Madagascar, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo and the United Republic of Cameroon had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1114. Fiji and Malaysia, on the other hand, should be deleted from the list of sponsors.

QUESTION OF THE NEW HEBRIDES, PITCAIRN AND TUVALU: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

10. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of Committee members to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1115, concerning the question of the New Hebrides, Pitcairn and Tuvalu, and announced that Egypt, Iraq, Papua New Guinea and Togo had joined its sponsors.

11. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Committee) said that, according to the Secretary-General's estimate, the cost related to the implementation of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1115 would be met from within the appropriations that would be made available for the over-all programme of work 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 in 1976, and that adoption of the draft resolution would not have additional financial implications.

QUESTION OF THE SOLOMON ISLANDS: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

12. Mr. PAQUI (Dahomey) introduced draft resolution A/C.4/L.1116, relating to the question of the Solomon Islands. In his view it should present no difficulty, since, as indicated in the fifth preambular paragraph, it concerned a

process that was already under way. He drew particular attention to paragraph 3, which requested the administering Power to continue to assist the people of the Solomon Islands towards the achievement of independence, as agreed. The sponsors of the draft resolution hoped that it would be unanimously adopted.

13. The CHAIRMAN announced that Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Fiji, Indonesia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Papua New Guinea and Togo had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1116.

14. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee that the Secretary-General expected that the costs related to the implementation of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1116 would be met from within the appropriations that would be made available for the Special Committee's over-all work in 1976 and that adoption of the draft resolution would not entail additional financial implications.

QUESTION OF BERMUDA, THE BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS, THE CAYMAN ISLANDS AND THE TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded)

15. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Committee) said that, for the reasons already given in connexion with other draft resolutions, it was not expected that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1109, concerning the question of Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands and the Turks and Caicos Islands, would entail additional financial implications.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, she would take it that the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.4/L.1109 by consensus.

The draft resolution was adopted.

17. Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom) said that the local Governments referred to in paragraphs 4 and 6 of the draft resolution just adopted were largely responsible for the economic affairs of the Territories, and indeed for decisions on their political future. His Government believed that independence was a particular form of self-determination and that the inhabitants of the Territories were the final arbiters of their future political status.

QUESTION OF THE TOKELAU ISLANDS: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded)

18. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Committee) noted that for the reasons given in connexion with other draft resolutions, it was not expected that any additional financial implications would be entailed by the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1112, concerning the question of the Tokelau Islands.

19. The CHAIRMAN announced that Egypt, Greece and Thailand had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

20. If there were no objections, she would take it that the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.4/L.1112 by consensus.

The draft resolution was adopted.

QUESTION OF AMERICAN SAMOA, GUAM AND THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*)

21. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Committee) repeated his explanation regarding the costs related to the implementation of the various draft resolutions and said that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1110, concerning American Samoa, Guam and the United States Virgin Islands, was not expected to entail additional financial implications.

QUESTION OF THE COCOS (KEELING) ISLANDS: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT CONSENSUS (*concluded*)

22. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Committee) noted that the adoption of the draft consensus in document A/C.4/L.1113 would not entail any additional financial implications.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, she would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft consensus in document A/C.4/L.1113.

The draft consensus was adopted.

QUESTION OF BELIZE (*continued*): CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

24. Mr. DE ROSENZWEIG DIAZ (Mexico) said that he wished to explain his delegation's purposes in introducing draft resolution A/C.4/L.1102/Rev.1 and the reasons why it would not insist that the draft be put to a vote.

25. As to the first point, Mexico had stated some 20 years earlier, at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly (771st plenary meeting), that it had observed with increasing interest how a neighbouring people had been forming in Belize with its own personality and characteristics. The overriding objective of the draft resolution introduced by his delegation was to facilitate the immediate renewal of negotiations aimed at ensuring the people of Belize the free exercise of the right of self-determination. One of the necessary conditions for accomplishing that goal was faithful observance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which required abstinence from the threat or use of force and a search for a solution to the international dispute concerning the future of Belize through exclusively peaceful means. In preparing the draft resolution, his delegation had also drawn inspiration from the principles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (General Assembly resolution 3082 (XXVIII)), one of the most effective instruments for the defence of the legitimate interests of peoples of the third world.

26. His delegation would be satisfied if the draft resolution remained in the *Official Records of the United Nations* as evidence of an initiative inspired by goodwill and unimpeachable intentions. Those qualities would be particularly apparent if it was borne in mind that Mexico had been, and continued to be, an obviously interested party, both for reasons of close geographical proximity and because of well-known and valid cultural, historical and legal ties.

27. With regard to the second point, his delegation had always believed, and continued to believe, that if a General Assembly resolution on that explosive problem was to offer the best probability of successful negotiations it was indispensable that it should be accepted, or at least not opposed, by the parties most directly interested. Because it had not been possible to fulfil that prerequisite, despite the efforts that had been exerted, his delegation would not request that draft resolution A/C.4/L.1102/Rev.1 be put to the vote.

28. Since draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1094/Rev.1 and A/C.4/L.1096 likewise could not be the subject of consensus by the parties most directly concerned, his delegation regretted that it would be obliged to abstain in the vote on those draft resolutions. It particularly regretted abstaining on the latter, since the concepts reaffirmed in it were among the fundamental principles of Mexico's foreign policy.

29. Mr. JACKSON (Guyana), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of the Bahamas, Barbados, Grenada, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, expressed his deep appreciation of the very sincere efforts made by the Government of Mexico and the Mexican delegation to make an effective contribution to the outcome of the Committee's deliberations on the question of Belize. The constant aim of those efforts had been to promote understanding with a view to achieving a peaceful solution, in accordance with certain fundamental principles applicable to Belize. Referring to the talks and consultations between the delegations on whose behalf he was speaking and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mexico and the Mexican delegation, he said that they had been inspired by a recognition of the need to take account of many interests which were both legitimate and important. Although, unfortunately, it had not been possible to find an appropriate formula, that in no way weakened the determination of the participants to continue the efforts necessary to achieve a just and lasting solution to the question of Belize.

30. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) said that the question of Belize had complex features and that for full consideration of the problem the following essential elements should be taken into account: a process of decolonization, which should take place in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); a territorial dispute between the Governments of Guatemala and the United Kingdom, which was being considered in bilateral talks; the right of a people to decide its own future in exercise of the principle of self-determination; and the fact that the case in question appertained to the Latin American region. Failure to recognize the existence of any of those elements could result in partial pronouncements, with effects which might possibly be counter-productive even for the very people whose rights they sought to reaffirm and consolidate.

31. His delegation reiterated its firm adherence to the principle of self-determination within the framework of the world decolonization process and, in that connexion, he expressed his appreciation of the efforts at conciliation made by the delegation of Mexico. He also expressed his conviction that, in the first place, the case of Belize was a Latin American matter, one that concerned primarily the countries and peoples of the region, which had been the

scene of a harmonious process of decolonization; that aspect should be emphasized, since it must not be forgotten that Latin American pronouncements on the decolonization of the continent antedated even the very formation of the United Nations. Latin America could point with pride to that eminently constructive process of decolonization in order to claim a prior interest in finding a positive and harmonious solution of the matter that would not create unnecessary conflicts and tension in the region, which would be detrimental not only to Latin American unity and solidarity but also to the peoples more directly involved in the case and, certainly, to the people of Belize themselves. Latin America was therefore declaring its first interest to be that the case should not represent a departure from the peaceful tradition of decolonization in Latin America and, to that end, it rejected any outside interference that conspired against the attainment of those objectives, which were fundamental to the community of the region.

32. His delegation would continue its efforts in support of formulas which would constructively combine the various elements involved in such a way as to ensure the full application of the principle of self-determination and guarantee the peaceful settlement of the dispute without detracting from or delaying the right of the people of Belize to self-determination.

33. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation was honoured to introduce draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096, sponsored by 62 Powers. With regard to the question under consideration, it must first be stated that there should be no doubt as to whether or not Belize was a dependent Territory within the meaning of Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations. It was known that the constitutional history of Belize dated back to the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries; subsequently the administering Power, the United Kingdom, had introduced a series of colonial administrative arrangements, which had finally led to the establishment of Belize as a Crown colony.

34. It had been stated in the Committee that the United Nations, and the Fourth Committee in particular, was not competent to deal with the question of Belize, since it was simply a dispute between States. No convincing argument had, however, been advanced to refute the premise that Belize was a dependent Territory and that the principles proclaimed in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) should be fully applied to it. The United Kingdom had stated unequivocally that it did not wish to stay in Belize a moment longer than the Government and the population of the Territory wished. Mr. George Price, the Premier of Belize, supported by Mr. Lindo, Leader of the Opposition in the Belizean Parliament, had also declared at the 2162nd meeting that the people of the Territory were convinced that only a categorical affirmation by the United Nations of their right to self-determination and territorial integrity would permit Belize to go forward to a secure independence.

35. The 62 sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096 were convinced that to deny the Belizeans their rights was to call in question the validity of an established principle of the United Nations. The statement by the Deputy Premier

and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belize before the Committee at the twenty-ninth session (2122nd meeting) to the effect that absorption of the people of Belize by Guatemala would amount to the extinction of Belizean society, which differed in history, tradition and culture from its Latin American neighbours, was a further reason to reject the claims of Guatemala. The Minister for External Relations of Guatemala, speaking in the General Assembly at its 2372nd plenary meeting, on 2 October 1975, had echoed that view when he had recognized that the people of Belize had acquired an identity of their own.

36. It was necessary to emphasize the competence of the Committee to deal with the question of the decolonization of Belize. The validity of that assertion was reinforced by the fact that the proponents of the contrary view had also seen fit to submit a draft resolution (A/C.4/L.1094/Rev.1) to the Committee. That draft resolution did not, however, refer to the decolonization of the Territory and he therefore believed that the Committee would have no hesitation in rejecting it.

37. As a separate aspect of the question of Belize, differences of opinion had arisen between the United Kingdom and Guatemala concerning the validity of certain treaties entered into between them in the middle of the nineteenth century. Those differences represented a threat to the security and integrity of Belize and should be resolved through peaceful negotiations between the parties concerned. At the same time, the resolution of those differences must in no way affect the application to the Territory of the principles of self-determination, independence and territorial integrity.

38. In submitting draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096, the sponsors had in mind not only the expressed desire of the people of Belize to exercise their inalienable rights, but also the duty and responsibility of all Member States to respect and uphold the principles of the United Nations Charter. The sponsors had also resisted any attempt to distort the significance, interpretation and strict application of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Despite the determination of the administering Power to take the necessary steps to grant independence to Belize, the people of the Territory were afraid because of the territorial claims which Guatemala persisted in maintaining. The sponsors of the draft resolution had sought to allay that fear by calling upon all States to respect the right of the people of Belize to self-determination, independence and territorial integrity and to facilitate their attainment of a secure independence.

39. The draft resolution also called upon the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, acting in consultation with the Government of Belize, and upon the Government of Guatemala to pursue urgently negotiations for the resolution of their differences of opinion concerning the future of the Territory. The sponsors had no wish to promote or encourage any confrontation on the question of Belize. The Caribbean countries perceived their destiny as being closely linked with that of Latin America and the accidents of history that had occurred in the past should not be the cause of any division in the region now. His delegation therefore urged all delegations to support the legitimate aspirations of the people of Belize for self-determination, independence and territorial integrity and to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096.

40. Mr. ROSALES (El Salvador) said that it was an honour for his delegation to introduce draft resolution A/C.4/L.1094/Rev.1, which attempted to show the way to a just, appropriate and timely solution of the sensitive question of Belize. Its wording was based on that of General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX) and its second preambular paragraph directly invoked General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), pointing to its objective of putting an end to colonialism everywhere, in all its forms. As was recognized in that same resolution, however, the objective was at the same time limited by other principles, such as the maintenance of the national unity and territorial integrity of Member States. According to the principles of sound hermeneutics, resolution 1514 (XV) should be interpreted in its full context; thus, paragraph 6 protected the territorial integrity of States which were already Members of the United Nations and against which a claim for the granting of independence was made, with a view to preventing such an act from resulting in the plundering of its genuine and legitimate national territory. It was accepted that, in the light of the aforementioned paragraph 6, the General Assembly sought to protect the territorial area of the future independent State; what was not accepted was the premise that, in keeping with the letter and spirit of the resolution, that was its sole objective.

41. One thing that was certain was that there was a real and long-standing legal dispute between two States between which there was a considerable difference in economic and political power—Guatemala and the United Kingdom. Guatemala had not had in the past, and did not currently have, sufficient power to confront The United Kingdom and take possession by force of what legally belonged to it as the successor State and legitimate surrogate of Spain; nor could anyone believe that Guatemala had been wrong in resorting to international legal channels and should, instead, have embarked on a path of violence. The sponsors of the draft resolution did not believe that and therefore advocated negotiation.

42. Guatemala had not raised the question of its right of sovereignty over the Territory of Belize as a piece of legal sophistry in order thereby to create artificially an international legal problem, with the deliberate aim of impeding the honest aspirations and rights of the people of Belize. The legal controversy over title to the Territory was not a recent one. If the matter of title to the Territory was not indeed the core of the question, why had several of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096 attempted, unsuccessfully, to show that the United Kingdom had *ab initio* been the sole legitimate possessor of the Territory? That was such a basic factor that it could not be disregarded in the over-all evaluation of the problem, and it had therefore been included in the draft resolution.

43. Referring to the operative part of the draft resolution, he said that paragraph 1 was a natural consequence of the content of the preamble and that its structure and wording followed the rules of political logic, which proclaimed the path of negotiation to be the best means of solving problems between States. The draft resolution sought and advocated negotiation in its strict and pure sense, leading to a formula for a settlement agreed upon between the parties concerned without any prefabricated or predetermined

solution. Similarly, out of a duty towards elementary justice, the draft resolution included the interests of the Belizean people. Because of the concurrence of interests that were antagonistic in principle but reconcilable in nature, it was wise to disregard those methods of merely mechanical application of principles which overlooked the particular features of specific situations. As was usual in cases of the kind, paragraph 2 requested that the Special Committee and the General Assembly, at its thirty-first session, should be informed of the progress achieved in the negotiations. Taking into account the peculiar circumstances surrounding the question of Belize, the draft resolution indicated the most just and reasonable way to achieve a solution: negotiation between the parties concerned.

44. Finally, he thanked the Government of Mexico for its efforts at conciliation, which had unfortunately not been successful, and he expressed the hope that similar efforts would continue to be made.

45. Mr. BANDARANAYAKE (Sri Lanka) said that the competence of the Committee and the right of the General Assembly to consider the question of Belize or to express views thereon had been challenged. The fact that Belize had been under British colonial domination from 1798 until then was all that was required to qualify the Committee to consider the question of the decolonization of Belize. Any attempt at disregarding such a patently obvious fact was a tactical move calculated to delay the free exercise of dependent peoples of their right to complete independence.

46. Instead of considering the extent to which the administering Power had promoted the application of the process of decolonization in Belize, the debate had focused on the claim of a Member State to the Territory of Belize. The Committee was faced with the unique situation of an administering Power which was fully mindful of its obligations and manifestly eager to terminate its control over a dependent Territory but was being thwarted in giving effect to its intentions by the threat posed by Guatemala to an independent Belize. As the representatives who had appeared before the Committee had demonstrated, however, the people of Belize had unanimously denied Guatemala's claim to sovereignty over the Territory and had expressed a desire not to be integrated with Guatemala and a fear of losing their separate identity if the United Nations recognized Guatemala's claim. Consequently, the Committee was entitled to view Guatemala's claim as an act of belligerence against the territorial integrity of Belize. In fact, the Committee should recognize the merit of the United Kingdom in refusing to give way before Guatemala's threat of force and in discharging its responsibilities towards the people under its administration.

47. In examining the circumstances of Guatemala's claim to sovereignty over Belize, various aspects should be considered. First, it must be determined whether the territory had come under colonial rule and continued in that status. Belize had been under British colonial rule since 1798. Spain's links with the region appeared to derive from a proclamation by Christopher Columbus claiming the territory of Central America for the Spanish crown. That proclamation, however, was hardly sufficient to sustain a claim to a territory which had never been under Spanish

colonial rule. The second aspect to be considered was whether a change of sovereignty which had occurred more than 180 years earlier could deprive a people of the protection of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the commitments undertaken by the United Nations under that resolution, which did not authorize the transfer of peoples from one colonial manifestation to another. Thirdly, it should be considered whether the Territory known as Belize had at any time been part of Guatemalan territory. Guatemala had gained independence from Spain and had become an independent State in 1821; Belize had therefore never been under its sovereignty. Lastly, it was relevant to determine what the status of Belize had been at the time Guatemala had become a State. The evidence showed that Belize had then been a British colony. In the circumstances, his delegation did not believe that the claim to sovereignty on the basis of the domain of Guatemala's former colonizer could be sustained.

48. There was definitive evidence that the Territory of Belize was populated by peoples who had a distinct identity of their own, who had engaged themselves politically in the working of democratic processes, and had exercised effective control over their internal affairs over a period of 11 years, during which six general elections had been held. Furthermore, the people of Belize had expressed a sincere wish to be the sole arbiters of their own destiny. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096, in insisting on a free and independent State of Belize, did not recognize any claim based on ethnic or cultural affinity. They were motivated by a simple desire to honour the obligations which they had voluntarily accepted by reason of their membership in the United Nations and their support for General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). With regard to the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.1102/Rev.1) sponsored by Mexico, which the representative of Mexico did not wish to press to the vote, he appreciated that the intentions of the Mexican delegation were impeccable and was satisfied that the draft represented an attempt to bring about an amicable settlement without in the least detracting from the right of the people of Belize to self-determination.

49. Mr. PAVIĆEVIĆ (Yugoslavia) expressed his delegation's sincere appreciation of the constructive efforts made by Mexico in trying to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the question of the decolonization of Belize, on the basis of the principle of self-determination and independence and respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation also appreciated the Mexican delegation's decision not to press for a vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1102/Rev.1.

50. Mr. SKINNER KLEE (Guatemala) said that during the debate on the question of Belize the same false and specious arguments had been repeated time and again to the effect that neither Spain nor Guatemala had ever exercised sovereignty over the territory of Belize; that Guatemala had not objected to the frontier demarcation made by the United Kingdom; that since Belize had been self-governing for more than a decade it was ready for independence; that the exercise of the right to self-determination had absolute priority over any territorial consideration, and that Guatemala was not listening to the views of the people of Belize.

51. With regard to the first argument, both Spain and Guatemala, at different times and in different ways, had

exercised full sovereignty over the whole and individual parts of the territory of Belize. Since the Committee was not a court of justice it would be inappropriate to submit evidence, title deeds or documents. The main consideration was that sovereignty over the area remained a solid fact and those who attempted to refute it spoke about anachronism in the controversy, as if such a term existed in international law or State practice, or as if anachronism was a valid way of acquiring territory or a source from which a just claim could be derived.

52. With regard to the second argument, the United Kingdom had unilaterally delineated the so-called frontiers of Belize, but neither the use of force nor high-handedness could lend validity to such conduct.

53. As for the granting of independence to Belize, the actual situation was very complex both from the legal and the political standpoints. Guatemala had never objected to the people of Belize having their own institutions but it did consider that any act that radically altered the present situation constituted a violation of international law and practice. Attempts were being made to create a trouble spot in the area and to set up one more State under the aegis of the United Kingdom to serve as a bridgehead for the penetration of foreign economic interests, which, by means of such neo-colonialism, were seeking to obtain a foothold in Central America. Central American nations had been patiently and firmly striving to assert their economic independence and could not permit such penetration through the back door.

54. The contention that self-determination wiped out, side-stepped, superseded, abrogated, invalidated or nullified the right of States to their territorial integrity was dangerous to the stability of the international legal order. There were those who sought to distort the meaning of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), forgetting that the just limits of self-determination were precisely the territorial integrity and national unity of States, as provided in paragraph 6 of that resolution. In the cultural mozaic of Belize, whose uniformity had been alleged in the Committee, there was strong feeling in favour of Guatemala. It should also be recalled that a considerable portion of the population of southern Belize was of Maya-Kekchi extraction, a Guatemalan group which on account of its migratory agricultural activities had never recognized the existence of the artificial frontier. That group was the victim of discrimination and oppression in Belize.

55. Lastly the geographical propinquity of the area, the ties established in spite of underhand attempts to sever them, the Belizean participation in efforts to settle the dispute, and the existence of a Guatemalan population in Belize, provided further irrefutable evidence of the consistently expressed wish of Guatemala to act in accord with the Belizean population.

56. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096 began by using the term "differences of opinion" to describe a typical controversy between States, which was being aired in accordance with international legal procedures. Moreover the sponsors were requiring the Committee to assume powers to which it had no right whatsoever. In stating that "any

proposals... that may emerge from the negotiations" between the administering Power and the Government of Guatemala must be in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of that draft resolution, the sponsors overlooked the fact that the United Nations was an international organization governed by legal rules, and that only such actions as were taken in accordance with those rules were valid. There could be no valid negotiations if an extraneous party—in that case the General Assembly—intervened, assuming rights that it did not possess, telling the parties how to conduct the negotiations and what results they should aim for to the exclusion of others. Among sovereign States action to circumscribe the scope of negotiations could only be taken validly by the States themselves. Consequently any resolution containing such an unlawful provision was devoid of all validity, and the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096 would be an exercise in futility and a violation of the Charter. The draft resolution would lack legal and moral force not only because Guatemala categorically rejected it but also, objectively, because the Committee lacked the competence to adopt it. The Committee was trying to award a disputed territory to one of the parties, namely the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, so that it could pursue its decolonization process in that territory in accordance with its domestic law. Neither the Committee nor the General Assembly could claim the right to dictate the terms for the settlement of a dispute or act as an arbitral tribunal or court of justice. Accordingly Guatemala fully reserved all its rights with respect to the territory of Belize.

57. The adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1096 would have other political implications: namely its effects on the American continent. On that continent a body of legal principles had been built up and was reflected in continental solidarity. Unfortunately there had now been a break in that solidarity. The new Caribbean States had dissociated themselves from the continent and shown a strange lack of understanding of the practice and norms of inter-American law and policy, which they had abandoned to the advantage of the colonial Power. An attempt had been made to distort the issue by means of threatening action on the part of British armed forces, but just as the presence on the American continent of extracontinental military forces had been rejected, Guatemala similarly rejected the attempt made to distort the facts of the dispute, since the new Anglo-Caribbean States were seeking to perpetuate in Belize that disguised form of British colonialism in its veiled attempts to penetrate Central America. The nations of the American continent had fought and would continue to fight, in accordance with legal norms and practices, for the complete eradication of colonialism from the Americas. They therefore repudiated that farce and reaffirmed their solidarity in purpose and principle before the international community.

58. The Government of Guatemala wished to reiterate its wish to settle the controversy by peaceful means as provided by international law and was ready to continue rapidly and effectively to negotiate a solution of the territorial dispute over Belize, but would not submit to ineffectual and invalid rules imposed by those who lacked the authority to impose them.

59. With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.4/L.1102/Rev.1, Guatemala expressed its appreciation of the efforts made by Mexico to arrive at a conciliatory formula.

QUESTION OF FRENCH SOMALILAND (*continued*)

60. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia)* said that his delegation had carefully examined chapter XVI of the report of the Special Committee (A/10023/Add.6 (part II)), dealing with the Territory of the Afars and the Issas, otherwise known as so-called French Somaliland (Djibouti). It had also listened to the presentation made at the 2168th meeting by the representatives of the two liberation movements, namely, the Front de libération de la Côte des Somalis (FLCS) and the Mouvement de libération de Djibouti (MLD), as well as the representative of the Opposition party in Djibouti known as the Ligue populaire africaine (LPA), who, at the same meeting, had been granted a hearing by the Committee as a petitioner. He wished to thank them for their lucid statements, which had helped in no small measure to highlight the complexity of the issue under discussion.

61. His delegation had also followed with great interest the statements made by the representative of the administering Power at the 2168th meeting and the representative of Somalia at the 2170th meeting. It was gratified that the Committee and the United Nations had finally embarked upon a substantive discussion of the question of the French Territory of the Afars and the Issas after a prolonged period of time. A full-fledged debate on the question had previously taken place in the Committee at the twenty-second session, in 1967, after the referendum had been conducted by the administering Power earlier that year.

62. Through that referendum, the people of Djibouti had expressed their desire for a measure of self-government instead of outright independence. Ethiopia had respected the choice made by the people of Djibouti, in the hope that it would eventually lead to total and genuine independence. In the meantime, OAU had been considering the question of Djibouti and had adopted numerous resolutions calling on the administering Power to grant the people of the Territory of the Afars and the Issas the opportunity to exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and independence. The Ethiopian Government, in conformity with one of its major foreign policy objectives, namely the total liberation of the African continent from colonial bondage, had fully participated in the deliberations of OAU on the question of Djibouti and in the formulation of the OAU resolutions. In that connexion, he drew attention to resolution CM/Res.431/Rev.1 (XXV), adopted by the Council of Ministers of OAU at its twenty-fifth ordinary session, held at Kampala from 18 to 25 July 1975 (see A/10297, annex I). He was sure that those members of the Committee who had participated in that session of the Council of Ministers would recall a number of important facts in that connexion. First, the OAU resolution to which he had just referred has been the outcome of intricate negotiations in the Council. Secondly, the resolution had taken fully into account the views expressed at the session

* The statement by the representative of Ethiopia is reproduced *in extenso* in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee later in the meeting.

and, during the negotiations, by the two liberation movements and by LPA. Thirdly, the resolution had taken into account the fundamental policy declaration of the Government of Ethiopia regarding the Territory. In that context, it was important to stress that the Kampala resolution on the Territory differed from all previous OAU resolutions on the subject in one significant respect: for the first time, OAU had formally called upon the two neighbouring countries to renounce any and all claims they might have to the Territory. He therefore wished to draw the Committee's attention to Ethiopia's clearcut and unambiguous policy declaration, as stated by the Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council of Ethiopia:

"The Provisional Military Government does not believe that Ethiopia's policy poses any difficulty to the independence of the Territory of the Afars and the Issas. Whatever historical rights Ethiopia might have had in this area, she recognizes that these are overridden by the right of the people to self-determination and independence. If there is any difficulty with regard to its independence, it should be looked for elsewhere. I should like to make it clear that Ethiopia does not have any legal act or legislation on its books asserting any claim to the Territory. We wonder whether all countries in the region can say the same.

"Ethiopia believes that the future destiny of this Territory should be based on the free choice of the people. If independence is their choice, Ethiopia will accept that, and will be happy to live with an independent neighbour whose sovereignty will be assured by its membership in the Organization of African Unity. Since history, geography and continuous historical interaction have created a mutuality of interests between this Territory and Ethiopia, the preservation of which will no doubt redound in increasing measure to the benefit of both, Ethiopia has every confidence that an independent State in this vital part of the Horn of Africa will recognize her vital interests."

63. Since that policy declaration by Ethiopia had been made prior to the adoption of the OAU resolution, it was evident that the call for renunciation of all claims could apply only to the Territory's other neighbour. For the same reason, paragraph 3 of resolution I of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975, which called upon all States to renounce any claims that they might have to so-called French Somaliland (Djibouti) (see A/10217 and Corr.1, annex I), was also applicable only to the same neighbouring country. A positive and meaningful response to the Kampala and Lima resolutions from that neighbouring country was still awaited. Thus far, matters seemed to indicate that it would not be forthcoming. Over and above the fact that a claim to Djibouti had been written into the Constitution, the Territory's other neighbour had seized every opportunity to underline its ambitions in all forums.

64. Not only had the Committee been given the benefit of a well-orchestrated opening of the discussion on the item at the 2168th meeting, but recent pronouncements by high officials of that State tended to be somewhat at variance

with the announcement by the representative of Somalia at the 2170th meeting. A brief examination of the document before the Committee and of more recent statements by high officials of Somalia offered no grounds for undue optimism. Despite the announcement by the representative of Somalia, some statements which had been cited in chapter XVI of the Special Committee's report (A/10023/Add.6 (part II)) as being the official position of the neighbouring State seemed to inject certain broad qualifications with respect to the independence of the Territory. For example, in the working paper annexed to that chapter of the report there was an account of a statement by the President of the neighbouring country expressing the justified hope "that the population of the Territory would have a genuine opportunity to decide its future in full freedom" (*ibid.*, annex, para. 29). Then the statement went on to add quite innocuously that "after the Territory had become independent, Somalia would be prepared to guarantee French and Ethiopian interests in the area" (*ibid.*, para. 30). Were it not for the inherent contradiction, that generous offer of guarantee might have been joyfully received by the parties whose interests were to be protected. However, the implication of the statement must be abundantly clear to everyone. Guaranteeing other nations' interests presupposed some degree of control of the area in which those interests were to be protected. The remaining parts of the working paper devoted to the position of Somalia—that country's complaint about the illegality of the 1958 and 1967 referendums, the threat of a "reaction from the thousands of refugees from French Somaliland residing in Somalia" (*ibid.*, para. 33), as well as the proffered guarantee, might well be only smoke-screens to conceal the central design of territorial ambition as embodied in its Constitution. Article 1, paragraph 1, of the Somali Constitution declared, *inter alia*: "The Somali people is one and indivisible", while article 6, paragraph 4, provided that "the Somali Republic shall promote, by legal and peaceful means, the union of Somali territories . . .". As long as Somalia retained those constitutional provisions, which made annexation a cardinal principle, his delegation was certain that it was likely to continue employing those stratagems to confuse the real issue in order to achieve the final goal. Therein lay the problem with respect to the realization of a fully independent and sovereign nation of Djibouti and, indeed, to the preservation of peace and tranquillity in the region.

65. The statement by the representative of Somalia at the 2170th meeting had in no way made a significant contribution towards finding an easy solution to the problem. In that statement the representative of Somalia had dwelt at some length on the question of the nomenclature of the Territory. It was common knowledge that Djibouti had been referred to at different times as French Somaliland, the Territory of the Afars and the Issas, and so-called French Somaliland (Djibouti). His delegation was surprised to hear the representative of Somalia introduce a new nomenclature of his own. Despite his correct assertions that the people of the Territory would, on achieving independence, determine the name of the new State, he had christened the Territory, with which he had claimed strong religious, ethnic and cultural affinities, as the "Territory of the Afars and Somalis". Was that attempt at the assimilation of the Issas an ominous indication of what was to come?

66. Stressing his concern for the welfare of the people of Djibouti, the representative of Somalia had gone into great detail to explain the close affinity of the people of the Territory with those in the Republic of Somalia. It had been claimed that the Afars and the Issas were kith and kin with the Somali people. He had reminded the Committee that they were also Sunni Moslems. There again, his information had been selective and partial. The preponderant majority of the people of Djibouti was made up of two ethnic groups, namely, the Afars and the Issas. Despite the claim made in the Committee by the representative of Somalia, four fifths of the Afar people and the majority of the Issa people happened to be Ethiopians. The leaders of both ethnic groups resided in Ethiopia. As to Moslem affinity, Ethiopian followers of Islam outnumbered the entire population of the Somali Democratic Republic by four to one. A significant number of Ethiopian Moslems were also Sunnis. Yet, notwithstanding the common bonds that existed between the people of the Territory and the Ethiopian people, the Ethiopian Government's declaration was positive in that, unlike Somalia, it had unambiguously and forthrightly renounced any claims it might have had to the Territory.

67. His delegation believed that the name proffered by the representative of Somalia was an obvious stratagem aimed at the implementation of article 1 and article 6, paragraph 4, of the Constitution of the Somali Democratic Republic. When the diversionary manoeuvres that had been unfolded at the 2170th meeting were combined with the irredentist provisions in Somali legislation, his delegation wondered how they could be reconciled with the contemporary ethic of the principle of self-determination and national independence.

68. Furthermore, in his statement, the representative of Somalia had chosen to concentrate at length on secondary issues that could not be said to have contributed directly to the retardation of progress towards self-determination and independence of the Territory. He had found it convenient to deal extensively with allegations of electoral misconduct, the erection of barbed wire fences by the administering Power, and the question of deportees from Djibouti. Emphasis on such questions appeared to be a mere confusion of cause and effect. Potential *agents provocateurs* were said to have been infiltrated into Djibouti to register and vote as if they were residents of Djibouti, with a view to making a mockery of the electoral process in the Territory. While the very symbolism of barbed wire fences was disturbing, it was not difficult to see why they had been erected. As far as his delegation knew, no convincing evidence had as yet been presented to show that those who had been expelled from the Territory were *bona fide* citizens of Djibouti. Was it possible therefore that the representative of Somalia had dwelt at length on those issues because he was advocating the infiltration of non-nationals into the Territory in order to achieve a desired political outcome through a change in the existing demographic structure or ratio of Djibouti? Given the points of emphasis in the statement by the representative of Somalia, his delegation wondered whether the real objective of Somalia coincided with the interests of the people of Djibouti, of whose desire for national independence there was no doubt.

69. His delegation had taken due note of the remarks by the representative of Somalia at the 2170th meeting with respect to his Government's apparent renunciation of claims to the Territory, and it thanked him for it. It believed that was a first step in the right direction. It nevertheless held the strong view that that announcement was only an ingenious attempt to sidestep the basic issue and, as such, was seriously misleading. Both the Kampala and Lima resolutions, to which the representative of Somalia had referred in his statement, called upon all States to renounce any claims they might have to Djibouti. Thus far, no such renunciation had been formally declared by the Somali Republic in any forum. Over and above their expansionist constitutional provisions, even after the adoption of the Kampala and Lima resolutions, Somali officials had persisted in making statements to the contrary. One such example was a statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Somalia on 28 August 1975 to the effect that his Government's policy continued to be one of unifying the Territory with his country. The messages which had continued to be thus conveyed through statements to the press and joint communiqués issued in certain capitals were clearly incongruous with the pronouncements at the 2170th meeting. As long as those expansionist aims continued to be articulated by the highest officials of Somalia and as long as the irredentist provisions in that country's Constitution were retained, no one could really be convinced by convenient pronouncements, least of all the people of the Territory. However, if the representative of Somalia were to affirm clearly to the Committee that his statement had the effect of rendering those specific constitutional provisions of his country null and void, then Somalia would have meaningfully responded to the OAU resolution and the one adopted at Lima, which had called on all States to renounce any claims to the Territory. Such a development in the course of the discussion would truly remove the darkest clouds hanging over the future of an independent and sovereign Djibouti and would provide an assurance for the people of the region. In the absence of a clarification by Somalia as to the exact position of its irredentist constitutional provisions, his delegation would, of course, have to draw the only possible conclusion with respect to Somalia's intentions towards the Territory.

70. Ethiopia's concept of self-determination and independence for the people of the Territory was, on the other hand, quite explicit. Ethiopia would support and respect the genuine expression of the aspirations of the population of the Territory. It would, as in the past, continue its good neighbourly co-operative relations with the Territory on the basis of the mutuality of interests which had always existed. Ethiopia believed that, if it were to be genuine, the exercise of the right to self-determination and independence by the people of the Territory must be free from external interference and subversion. Assertions based on ethnic, religious and other affinities, as well as current ambitions or future designs from other quarters, should not be allowed to impede the achievement of national independence by Djibouti.

71. His delegation was disappointed at the lack of co-operation by France with the Special Committee and its refusal to furnish information on the Territory in compliance with Article 73 *e* of the United Nations Charter. Any form of colonialism in the region and any policy of

territorial aggrandizement were matters which Ethiopia strongly opposed. It was therefore with keen interest and a great sense of urgency that his delegation looked forward to the dismantling of the last bastion of French colonialism and the removal of all obstacles to the independence of Djibouti.

72. Ethiopia's consistent role in advancing the cause of the peoples under colonial rule and its long-standing assistance to liberation movements in Africa, to the extent that its limited resources had allowed, were matters of record. As a neighbour of Djibouti, Ethiopia was in duty bound to do all it could to bring about the speedy realization of the genuine aspirations of the people of the Territory. It was sufficient to reaffirm that Ethiopia fully supported the national independence of the Territory and it looked forward to welcoming a sovereign Djibouti into the enlarged family of independent nations. At the same time, his delegation wished to underscore the important point that Ethiopia's position should not be misconstrued by any country, near or far, as a certification for annexationist designs. His delegation hoped that all members of the Committee understood it correctly.

73. Mr. AL-BEHI (Democratic Yemen), noting that the question of French Somaliland was one of the most important items included in the agenda of the Committee, proposed that all previous and future statements on the matter made during the current session, be reproduced *in extenso* in the relevant records of the Committee.

74. Following a discussion in which Mr. SANON (Upper Volta), Mr. AL-BEHI (Democratic Yemen) and Mr. HUSSEIN (Somalia) participated, the CHAIRMAN said that, bearing in mind the financial implications of \$330 per page, she would suggest that all statements on the question of French Somaliland made by the representative of the administering Power and the representatives of Ethiopia and Somalia, as well as the statement made by the representative of Democratic Yemen at the 2171st meeting, should be reproduced *in extenso* in the relevant records of the meetings.

It was so decided.

75. Mr. DAMIS (Italy) said that the statements made by the delegations that had spoken during the first part of the debate on the question of the Territory of the Afars and the Issas had clearly illustrated the various aspects of the problems. His delegation considered that the issues involved were somewhat sensitive. First of all the matter must be considered in the light of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and its principles, which afforded the most effective means of arriving at a solution of the decolonization problems.

76. The comments made by the representative of France at the beginning of the debate on the question (2168th meeting) clearly indicated that the problem of the future of the Territory and its population was being dealt with cautiously and in keeping with the principles he had mentioned. His delegation considered that the statement made by the representative of France as well as the policies of his Government, which had always consulted the wishes of the people concerned, reflected the constructive and

forthright attitude taken by France in dealing with the problem. On the other hand his delegation was also aware of the problems that the question presented for neighbouring countries.

77. No constructive developments would be possible without the co-operation of the political forces in the Territory and of the Governments of neighbouring countries concerned in the question. Italy maintained very friendly relations with those countries and had therefore welcomed the statements of their representatives and their display of moderation. He hoped that that goodwill would be maintained and serve the interests of the peoples of the Territory and, in general, of peace and security in the area.

78. Mr. HUSSEIN (Somalia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of France, referring to the question of so-called French Somaliland (Djibouti), had said at the 2170th meeting that he (the representative of Somalia) had spoken of the past rather than the future of the Territory. While it was true that he had spoken at length of the past of the Territory, for the purpose of exposing with undisputable facts the continued repression and misconduct perpetrated by the administering Power in the Territory, it was not true that he had neglected to speak also of the future of the Territory. That would be quite clear if the statement that he had made were studied again a little more closely.

79. Replying to the representative of Ethiopia, he said he wished to reserve his right to speak at a later stage about the many allegations made by that representative and the way in which the latter had distorted his statement. Meanwhile, he wished first of all to remind the Committee that his statement had been very clear, and not just in his denouncement of what had taken place in the country under French colonialism. Not only had he been able to expose the mishandling of the so-called referendums held in 1958 and 1967 and the so-called elections that had taken place subsequently, including the one held in 1974, but he had also made very clear his Government's future intentions and policy with regard to that Territory. It was quite sufficient to say that the fact that his Government had accepted and had been a party to the resolutions adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, held at Kampala, and the resolution adopted by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lima, on the question of French Somaliland, whereby the Somali Government had renounced any claim to sovereignty over the Territory, was quite clear and beyond dispute. Despite the distorted statements and allegations by which the representative of Ethiopia had tried to convince the Committee, the fact that Somalia had adhered to those resolutions certainly made it abundantly clear that it had no ulterior intentions with regard to the future destiny of French Somaliland.

80. The concerns of the delegation of Ethiopia were quite understandable. In his statement he had tried to avoid any criticism or allegation, either direct or indirect, with regard to Ethiopia. That did not mean that his delegation had no evidence of the kind that he had tried to produce for the Committee with regard to France's mismanagement of the Territory. He could also have produced data and facts concerning interference and mishandling by the Govern-

ment of Ethiopia, which had participated in the gerrymandering of referendums. He had avoided mentioning them because he knew that, both in Ethiopia and Somalia, institutions had been changed, and there was a new spirit of understanding. Very happily, for the first time in history there had been a common declaration by both States whereby they renounced any claim to the Territory and also supported its full independence. He was therefore most astonished to hear the statement by the representative of Ethiopia. Indeed, he had thought for a moment that the French representative had been speaking.

81. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that neither at the OAU Assembly nor at the Lima Conference had a declaration been made by Somalia. A call had been addressed to both Somalia and Ethiopia, but only Ethiopia had made a declaration. The representative of Somalia could not say that both countries had made a declaration.

82. A second point was that, subsequently, the Somali Minister for Foreign Affairs, in an interview published in the Libyan journal *Alfajr-Aljadid* of 28 August 1975, had declared that:

"The policy of the Somali Government has the objective of re-establishing the unity of the Somali people. France is occupying part of our Territory. We want to bring about this unity by peaceful means. In case that does not work, there are other means."

83. He reserved his right to speak again at a later stage on the comments made by the representative of Somalia.

84. Mr. HUSSEIN (Somalia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he wished to make it quite clear that, contrary to what the representative of Ethiopia maintained, the resolutions that had been heard at the international level carried more weight and entailed more obligations than a simple statement by any statesman. Therefore it

should be quite apparent from Somalia's support of the resolutions adopted at Kampala and Lima—and he wished to repeat it again—that Somalia had renounced any claim of sovereignty over French Somaliland and was ready to recognize and support any means by which that Territory could reach full and unconditional independence.

85. Also, it was no mystery that the Somali nation in the latter part of the nineteenth century had been partitioned by both European and African colonialists, including Ethiopia. He was very sorry to raise that question; it had not been his intention to do so, but he had been provoked and felt compelled to mention the matter. With regard to the statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Somalia, the question was not that of French Somaliland, but of other Somalis who were subjugated in Ethiopia, as everyone knew. He had tried to avoid mentioning it in the Committee. But the representative of Ethiopia knew very well that Somalia had already renounced any claim to French Somaliland, and he was not so naive as to think that, in affirming and reaffirming a resolution, there was a commitment on the part of any Government, and having a resolution was firmer than making a statement. What worried the representative of Ethiopia was the fact that over 1 million Somalis were under the subjugation of Ethiopia, not to mention Eritrea and other Territories that Ethiopia had colonized. He reserved his right to raise the question again at a later stage.

86. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta), speaking on a point of order, appealed to the representatives of Somalia and Ethiopia, for the sake of all Africa, to put an end to the discussion and to try to resolve the matter, as Africans, between themselves.

87. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia) said that he would reply at a later stage to the ridiculous assertions regarding Somalia's claim on his country.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

2173rd meeting

Friday, 21 November 1975, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Famah JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone).

A/C.4/SR.2173

AGENDA ITEMS 91 AND 12

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 (*continued*)* (A/10003 (chapter VI), A/10023/Add.5, A/10080 and Add.1-4, A/10319, A/C.4/801, A/C.4/L.1095, A/C.4/L.1119)

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)* (A/10003 (chapter VI), A/C.4/L.1119)

* Resumed from the 2171st meeting.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

1. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation was honoured to introduce on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/C.4/L.1119, relating to agenda items 91 and 12. The provisions of the draft resolution were based on the conclusions and recommendations 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, contained in chapter VII of its report (A/10023 (part V)). They were also based on the Special Committee's resolution on the item (*ibid.*, para. 13) and the specific requests that the Fourth Committee had addressed to the specialized agencies in its draft resolutions