

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1551st
MEETING**

Tuesday, 9 November 1965,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 23:</i>	
<i>Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports 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: Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1 (continued)</i>	197
<i>Agenda item 23:</i>	
<i>Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: A/5800/Rev.1, chapters VII, IX, X and XIII-XXVI; A/6000/Rev.1, chapters IX-XXV (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	201

Chairman: Mr. Majid RAHNEMA (Iran).

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports 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: Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland (continued) (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. VIII; A/5958; A/6000/Rev.1, chap. VII; A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.4/L.801 AND ADD.1 (continued)*

1. Mr. ABDEL-WAHAB (United Arab Republic) noted the constitutional progress being made in Basutoland and Bechuanaland, whereas, in contrast, Swaziland seemed to be lagging behind. Unless the crucial problems facing the three Territories were solved in good time, their independence and sovereignty would be threatened. From the reports of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. VIII; A/6000/Rev.1, chap. VII) and

of the Secretary-General (A/5958), as well as the petitions, it was clear that South Africa occupied a dominant position in the political and economic life of the three High Commission Territories, either directly or through the South African settlers. In his opinion that was a grave threat to the territorial integrity and economic stability of the three Territories. South Africa had not abandoned its plan to annex them and, as recent events had shown, its policy towards them was motivated not by the principles of good-neighbourliness and non-intervention but by its desire to maintain its apartheid policy in that part of the African continent.

2. The political and economic conditions which the administering Power had shaped in Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland made it difficult for them to avoid foreign influence. In the political field, the United Kingdom Government had failed to observe strictly the provisions of General Assembly resolutions, as the last elections clearly proved. In the economic field, the United Kingdom's policy was designed to maintain the domination of South Africa, and the reports of the Special Committee as well as the Secretary-General's report left no room for doubt in that respect, in particular when one learned that in Bechuanaland and Swaziland, for example, more than half of the cultivated land was owned by South African companies or individuals, which had taken it from the people.

3. It was the responsibility of the administering Power to ensure that the Territories under its administration acceded to independence in the most favourable conditions and the United Nations must see to it that the administering Power honoured its obligations. In his report on the ways and means of ensuring their economic independence vis-à-vis the Republic of South Africa, the Secretary-General had proposed that a special fund for assistance to the three Territories should be established and a local United Nations Technical Assistance office set up in each Territory. Those recommendations had been incorporated in draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1, and, in the opinion of the United Arab Republic delegation, constituted the minimum action that the world Organization could take to safeguard the independence of the High Commission Territories. Some delegations had proposed that the matter should be referred to the Second Committee; he failed to see why, as Member States were represented in the Fourth Committee just as they were in the Second Committee. He expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

4. Mr. BROWN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had some reservations regarding draft reso-

*Resumed from the 1549th meeting.

lution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1. The eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 failed to mention the constitutional progress made in the three Territories, progress which had been described to the Fourth Committee and, moreover, acknowledged by some delegations, for example those of Liberia and Mali. The draft resolution even failed to mention that Basutoland and Bechuanaland were due to become independent in 1966. With regard to paragraph 4, he recalled that his Government had already indicated its position concerning the question raised, as the report of the Special Committee (A/6000/Rev.1, chap. VII) showed. The sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 8 were not justified by the facts and were certainly not based on the findings of the Mission which went to the Territories in May and June 1965 (A/5958, annex). Economic and social conditions in the three Territories did not compare unfavourably with those in many similar parts of the world. In Basutoland, for example, there was a high standard of literacy and in Swaziland considerable industrial development. Moreover, as he had stated at the Committee's 1543rd meeting, the United Kingdom Government had granted and would continue to grant substantial aid to the three Territories to speed up their development. Concerning paragraph 5, a certain degree of interdependence between the three Territories and South Africa was inevitable because of their geographical position. As for their territorial integrity, that was at present the United Kingdom Government's responsibility and after the Territories had reached independence it would no longer be a matter for the Fourth Committee or the Special Committee.

5. Naturally the United Kingdom Government welcomed any offer of supplementary assistance to the Territories. His delegation therefore supported the proposal in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution for the establishment of a fund for their economic development. It likewise welcomed the proposal that the fund should be administered by the Secretary-General, in close consultation with the Governments of the three Territories—in other words through the United Kingdom Government until their independence—and with the co-operation and assistance of the United Nations Special Fund, the Technical Assistance Board, the Economic Commission for Africa and the specialized agencies concerned. The United Kingdom Government was prepared to co-operate in the administration of the fund while continuing to give the Territories bilateral aid.

6. The draft resolution therefore contained both positive and negative aspects and for that reason his delegation would abstain on it as a whole.

7. Mr. COX (Canada) expressed reservations concerning the creation of a new United Nations fund. In addition to the bilateral assistance which it was at present extending to the High Commission Territories, Canada was also a major contributor to the various United Nations aid programmes. It did not consider the creation of another fund the best way of helping the three Territories to achieve further economic development. It would, in his opinion, set a precedent which might lead to a wasteful dissipation of United Nations efforts. His delegation would there-

fore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1.

8. Mr. MELLBIN (Denmark) said that his delegation had clearly indicated in the Special Committee that the Danish Government fully supported the process of development towards independence for the three High Commission Territories, and the taking of satisfactory safeguards to protect that independence. However, he regretted that the draft resolution before the Committee had not taken into account all aspects of the situation, or the progress recently made in the Territories. Referring particularly to operative paragraph 4, he considered that the Committee did not have the information to enable it to express an opinion on the question raised there. The Danish delegation would therefore be obliged to abstain if a separate vote were taken on that paragraph. It would also abstain on paragraph 5, in view of the absence of objective criteria for the character and nature of the measures proposed. With respect to operative paragraph 7, the Danish delegation considered it difficult to evaluate fully the implications of the creation of a special fund for the economic development of the three Territories. But as that proposal was identical with the one formulated by the Secretary-General in his report (A/5958, para. 19) and as the utilization of the fund would be channelled through already existing United Nations bodies and institutions, he was prepared to support it and would vote in favour of paragraph 7.

9. With those reservations, the Danish delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

10. Mr. RIMMERFORS (Sweden) said that his delegation, having noted the Secretary-General's valuable report, stood in no doubt that the Territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland needed resources in addition to those they were receiving, and would continue to receive after they had gained their independence, from the United Kingdom, if they were to avoid economic dependence on South Africa. He did not believe, however, that it would be wise to establish a new organ for technical and economic assistance at a time when efforts were being made to amalgamate the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. In his opinion, such a step would only result in reducing the effectiveness of United Nations assistance programmes. Any additional assistance for the three Territories should be channelled through existing agencies under a United Nations development programme. His delegation would therefore abstain in the voting on paragraph 7.

11. He noted that the final paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution did not take into account the important political developments which had occurred in the three Territories since the Committee's previous session. Moreover, the Committee possessed no evidence adequate to justify the sweeping measures requested in operative paragraph 4.

12. Nevertheless, his delegation was in agreement with the aims of the sponsors of the draft resolution and would, in spite of its reservations, vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

13. His delegation requested that a separate roll-call vote should be taken on operative paragraph 7.

14. Mr. ROSSI (Italy) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1 but wished to make certain reservations. In its view, the final paragraph of the preamble did not take into account the efforts which had been made by the administering Power to promote the development of the three Territories. With regard to operative paragraph 4, the Italian delegation had on a number of occasions expressed the opinion that it would be within the competence of the governments and parliaments of the three Territories to decide on such matters after they had obtained their independence. With regard to operative paragraph 7, he wished to stress that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole was not to be interpreted as a pledge to contribute to the proposed fund. Such a decision could be taken only by the Italian Parliament, but his Government was certainly prepared to consider the possibility of contributing to that fund as part of its programme of assistance to the developing countries.

15. Miss RUTGERS (Netherlands) said that, although her delegation was in agreement with the general principles on which draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1 was based, it would not be able to vote in favour of that text.

16. The United Kingdom was already taking effective measures, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), to enable the Territories concerned to gain independence within the foreseeable future. In those circumstances, the Netherlands delegation could support neither the eighth paragraph nor operative paragraph 4, which overlooked that important fact.

17. Moreover, the Netherlands delegation could not support the establishment of a special fund for the economic development of the three Territories. It recognized the great value of the Secretary-General's report and acknowledged that Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland needed economic assistance, but it was opposed to the establishment of the proposed separate fund, which would not be in accordance with the need for over-all co-ordination of United Nations development policy. There were organs within the United Nations and the specialized agencies which could grant the Territories concerned the assistance they required.

18. For those reasons the Netherlands delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

19. Mr. BUDAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as it had in the past, his delegation would continue to support unreservedly the struggle of the colonial peoples for independence and would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1.

20. His delegation nevertheless had some reservations concerning operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, which incorporated the Secretary-General's proposal for the establishment of a special fund to help the three Territories under discussion, which had already been incorporated into the Special

Committee's resolution of 20 September 1965 (A/6000/Rev.1, chap. VII, para. 364). The Soviet delegation wished to stress, as it had done in the Special Committee, that if the economic assistance granted to the Territories concerned was to be effective, they must first be liberated from the colonial yoke and enabled to attain their independence on terms which would place political power in the hands of true representatives of the population. It was only then that the assistance received could really help to raise the standard of living and protect the independence of the countries concerned against the designs of South Africa and the activities of the international monopolies.

21. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1, as an indication of the importance it attached to the attainment of independence by Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland in the best possible circumstances. In particular, his delegation supported the continuation of the economic, financial and technical assistance undertaken by the competent organs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and considered the appointment of resident representatives in the three Territories to be a wise measure.

22. On the other hand, for reasons of principle and method, the Belgian delegation would have preferred that the draft resolution not recommend the establishment of a development fund separated from the existing bodies. The General Assembly was endeavouring to rationalize the multilateral co-operation activities of the United Nations, and was, in particular, preparing to amalgamate such bodies as the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance in order to make them more efficient. The establishment of the new fund proposed in the draft resolution would therefore run counter to such efforts. Moreover, it was doubtful whether the temporary body envisaged in operative paragraph 7, which was to be set up as an entirely new structure, could operate better and more quickly than existing institutions, with their experienced staff. If the voluntary contributions requested in the draft resolution were channelled to those institutions, maximum use could be made of the financial contributions of Member States.

23. Accordingly the Belgian delegation would vote for the draft resolution as a whole but would abstain on operative paragraph 7, if it were voted on separately.

24. Although the Belgian delegation supported the draft resolution, it wished to associate itself with the reservations expressed at the 1549th meeting by the Australian representative concerning the sixth and eighth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 3 and 4. It was regrettable that the wording of those paragraphs did not facilitate the application of the resolution, because the three Territories should be given the best possible opportunities for development.

25. Mr. HATTINGH (South Africa) noted that the fifth and seventh preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 5 contained references which were unfounded and openly or implicitly hostile to the Govern-

ment of South Africa. Similar references had been made to South Africa's relations with Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland in a resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 17 June (A/6000/Rev.1, chap. VII, para. 292) and it was particularly reprehensible that those references should be reproduced in draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1 in spite of the fact that South African Ministers and the delegation of that country in the United Nations had explained the true situation to the world. The most recent South African statement to the Committee on that subject had been at the 1548th meeting on 4 November 1965.

26. Moreover, the sponsors of the draft resolution took no account of geographic and economic realities in Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland. Indeed it would be surprising if there were not close economic and other ties between South Africa and the Territories under discussion—ties which were mutually beneficial and which those who were campaigning against the Government of South Africa could not ignore. All three Territories derived considerable benefit from their close economic ties with South Africa and the elected African Governments of those Territories were in favour of maintaining those ties, as paragraph 13 of the report of the Special Committee (A/6000/Rev.1, chap. VII) clearly indicated. It was not the function of the Fourth Committee to criticize arrangements which were not only acceptable but beneficial to the Governments of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland. The assertion that the close ties between South Africa and the three neighbouring Territories constituted a threat to their territorial integrity was preposterous, particularly in view of the many statements made by the South African Government and by the South African delegation in reply to earlier allegations on that subject. The South African delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

27. With regard to operative paragraph 7 relating to the establishment of a special fund for the development of the Territories concerned, he wished to state that South Africa naturally favoured the economic and social development of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, as its not inconsiderable past and current contributions to their development showed. For that reason, South Africa would vote in favour of that paragraph, if it were put to a separate vote. South African assistance to the three Territories would, however, as in the past, continue to be supplied on a bilateral basis and South Africa would therefore be unable to contribute to a special United Nations fund, when one were established.

28. Mr. LAIDI (Algeria) said that he rejected as hypocritical the South African representative's statement concerning the "benefit" derived from the ties existing between the three Territories concerned and South Africa. Doubts on that point were justified when it was realized that the African population of South Africa derived no benefit at all from anything in its territory.

29. Mr. HATTINGH (South Africa), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the Committee was not dealing at that stage with the situation in the Republic of South Africa and that the remarks of the

representative of Algeria were therefore out of order. He would confine himself to saying that all the inhabitants of South Africa enjoyed the benefits which flowed from the economic prosperity of his country.

30. Mr. DIABATE (Guinea) said that the United Nations embodied the aspirations of all peoples to a life of freedom and independence in peace, and for that reason deserved respect. The Guinean delegation refused to consider the arguments advanced by the imposter who presumed to speak on behalf of South Africa, and it left it to the Committee to judge of the value of the arguments he had advanced.

31. Mr. KONDA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) asked that his country's name should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1.^{1/}

32. The CHAIRMAN recalled, before putting draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1 and 2 to the vote, that the sponsors had orally revised operative paragraph 9 by inserting the words "paragraph 22 of" before the words "the report".

At the request of the representative of Sweden, a vote was taken by roll-call on operative paragraph 7.

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

In favour: Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras.

Abstaining: Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United States of America, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Greece.

Operative paragraph 7 was adopted by 79 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.801 and Add.1 and 2, as orally revised, was adopted as a whole by 84 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

33. Mr. FERNANDEZ LONGORIA (Spain) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but would have voted against operative paragraph 4 had it been put to the vote separately.

34. Mr. ZOHRAB (New Zealand) said that, at a time when the three Territories under consideration were on the verge of attaining independence, much still

^{1/} See document A/C.4/L.801/Add.2, circulated subsequently.

remained to be done to ensure that their economic development matched their political and social development. His delegation supported in principle the establishment of a fund. The report of the Mission which had gone to the Territories (A/5958, annex) emphasized that an enormous effort would be required and that co-operation must be established between the authorities of the Territories, the administering Power and the United Nations agencies concerned with assistance. Despite its reservations concerning in particular operative paragraphs 4 and 8 and the sixth and eighth preambular paragraphs, his delegation had supported the draft resolution because it approved of its fundamental objective.

35. Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America) said that her delegation had not voted in favour of the draft resolution because, in the first place, the sponsors had not taken into account the very important constitutional advances which had been achieved in the Territories: constitutions had been written, general elections had been held under them, and the timing of the independence of each Territory either had been announced or was under negotiation. It could not therefore be said that effective and complete steps had not been taken to implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

36. The draft resolution failed, moreover, to take into account the development and budgetary assistance which the United Kingdom had furnished to the three Territories and the fact that the United Kingdom had even undertaken to continue to provide assistance once the Territories had become independent.

37. With regard to the establishment of a special voluntary fund for the economic development of the Territories, her delegation had already expressed its reservations in the Special Committee (see A/6000/Rev.1, chap. VII, para. 316). Those reservations centred on the need for elaboration of the proposal. Subsequently, in the Fourth Committee, her delegation had supported a suggestion that the proposal should be referred to the Second Committee.

38. Her delegation would have voted in favour of operative paragraph 8 if that paragraph had been voted upon separately, but it would have done so with reservations concerning the use of the term "deplorable". It believed that the activities of existing United Nations agencies should be intensified and expanded in the Territories.

39. Her country's abstention should not be construed as meaning that the United States was in any doubt about the need of providing economic assistance to the Territories in order to promote their development. What was in fact needed was a rational plan for co-ordinating the various forms of United Nations assistance and for relating that assistance to the bilateral aid furnished to the three Territories by the United Kingdom.

40. Her delegation was pleased that the Territories were soon to attain independence. It wished their people well and would maintain an active interest in their development as nations.

41. Mr. KORHONEN (Finland) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on paragraph 7

because in its view the establishment of another development fund was inopportune and would only augment the difficulties of financial administration with which the United Nations was already beset.

42. Mr. CARAYANNIS (Greece) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution as a whole, the main tenor of which it approved, and it hoped that the three Territories would shortly accede to independence in the best possible circumstances. His delegation had nevertheless abstained in the vote on paragraph 7 in order to remain consistent with the position of principle it was now maintaining in the Second Committee, namely, support for the merging of the various assistance bodies, for reasons of efficiency. That vote would not prevent Greece from contributing to the proposed fund to the extent of its means if the fund should come into being.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: A/5800/Rev.1, chapters VII, IX, X and XIII-XXVI; A/6000/Rev.1, chapters IX-XXV (continued) (A/5959 and Corr.1; A/6084, A/6094)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

43. Mr. SANGHO (Mali) said that, for his Government, what was important above all was to liberate mankind from all forms of discrimination and exploitation. His delegation reaffirmed its conviction, based on Article 73 of the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), that all people had the same right to full and complete freedom regardless of race or colour.

44. According to the studies carried out by the Special Committee, it appeared that the situation in Mauritius, the Seychelles, St. Helena, Guam, the Pacific Islands, and other Territories presented typically colonial features.

45. In Mauritius, for example, although the Legislative Assembly was elected on the basis of universal suffrage, it did not exercise the powers normally vested in a sovereign assembly. Decisions were taken by a Council of Ministers and were then submitted for approval to the Governor, who represented the administering Power. As all the parties did not share the United Kingdom Government's views on the future development of the island's institutions, it was important to give the people an opportunity to make a clear choice regarding the system they desired. Progress on the economic and social level was slow. The administering Power was making no effort to diversify the Territory's economy, which was 90 per cent dependent on the sugar industry; most of the food-stuffs consumed in the Territory had to be imported. The educational system had to be modified so as to provide schooling for all children and to accelerate the training of leaders. It was also important to repeal the discriminatory laws and to promote the establishment of broad-based organizations such as trade unions, youth organizations, etc.

46. The political situation in British Guiana remained disquieting. As the Commonwealth observers had noted, the Government's attitude during the 1964 elections had not been impartial. After the elections the Governor had used his discretionary powers to remove from power the party which had received 45.8 per cent of the vote in favour of a party which had received only 40.5 per cent. That decision, which conformed to the British policy of divide and rule, by maintaining racial antagonisms if necessary, had led to the declaration of a state of emergency and the arrest of all the supporters of complete independence for Guiana. It was his impression that the Governor had seen fit to use his discretionary powers only after becoming aware that Mr. Jagan, the head of the majority party, was advocating the total liberation of his country, the independent development of the economy and a struggle against all forms of discrimination and that Mr. Jagan was neither anti-communist nor anti-Castro. The question of the constitutional future of Guiana could be solved only by respecting the will of the majority of the people. It was regrettable that the administering Power had prevented the Sub-Committee of Good Offices for Guiana established by the Special Committee from carrying out its task; he hoped that the General Assembly would take the necessary action to help the oppressed Guianans.

47. With regard to Gibraltar, Mali supported the consensus proposed in 1964 by the Chairman of the Special Committee and adopted by that Committee (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. X, para. 209) which was approved by the United Kingdom and Spain.

48. As to Ifni, it was for the indigenous population to decide freely on its future status.

49. With regard to Fernando Póo and Río Muni, his delegation considered that the birth of the autonomous

state of Equatorial Guinea constituted a positive factor, but noted that the new State remained under the colonial yoke and that Spain still retained the attributes of sovereignty there. The administering Power must allow the people of Equatorial Guinea to attain freedom and complete independence in the near future.

50. His delegation fully shared the Special Committee's views on the future of the peoples of the Pacific Islands and considered that it was the duty of the United Nations and of the administering Power concerned to envisage measures which would ensure the rapid emancipation of those islands.

51. In many cases the question of the future of dependent territories was complicated by the existence of military bases. His country advocated the dismantling of all those bases. The constituted a threat to peace and security, for all the acts of aggression now being committed with the silent complicity of certain Powers were being launched from bases in colonial territories. He called on the Powers concerned to eliminate their bases in Aden, Guam, the Virgin Islands and the Pacific Islands.

52. His delegation endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee and appealed to the administering Powers to apply the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) immediately; to organize, under United Nations supervision, consultations of the people enabling them to choose the form of government they desired and decide on possible association with other countries and territories; and, lastly, to hasten the transfer of power to the indigenous peoples regardless of how numerous they were or what was their level of culture.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.