



CONTENTS

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)

General debate and consideration of draft resolutions (continued) 231

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: 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, A/C.4/L.802)

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued) (A/C.4/L.802)

1. Mrs. MENESES DE ALBIZU CAMPOS (Cuba) recalled that the General Assembly had decided to establish the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples because one year after the adoption of the Declaration in question hardly any steps had been taken to implement its provisions; indeed, in some regions armed action and repressive measures had been used to prevent dependent peoples from exercising their right to complete independence. In General Assembly resolution 1654 (XVI), embodying that decision, the Assembly had noted that acts aimed at the disruption of national unity and territorial integrity were still being carried out in certain countries in the process of decolonization, and had expressed the conviction that any delay in the application of the Declaration could threaten international peace and security. It was disturbing to note that, five years after the adoption of the Declaration, the colonial Powers were still trying to obstruct the decolonizing efforts of the United Nations; they had not, however, been able to prevent the Special Committee from per-

forming a useful service in the cause of the oppressed peoples.

2. A situation which was of concern to Cuba and to many other delegations was that in so-called British Guiana. Although as far back as 1953 British Guiana had declared itself in favour of independence under the party led by Mr. Cheddi Jagan, and despite the successive electoral victories of that party, the Territory remained under colonial rule, repressive measures were enforced, many leading patriots were in prison, the majority party favouring independence was prevented from governing and artificial racial strife had been created. Indeed, the imperialists had attempted to convert the struggle of the people against foreign domination into a civil war. In the place of Mr. Jagan's party, Washington and London had placed in power a docile Government of their creation.

3. A series of futile conferences had been held in London and an attempt was still being made to deceive world opinion by that artifice. The administering Power was continuing to ignore the resolutions of the United Nations as it had done in the case of Southern Rhodesia, where the colonialist settlers had turned against their own masters. The General Assembly had repeatedly pointed out to the administering Powers that the way to avoid a catastrophe was to fix an early date for independence. A solution would not be found through the creation of docile governments with the blessing of the imperialists. That was not merely a formal blessing: The Wall Street Journal had pointed out on 11 November 1965 that the United States was rushing \$14 million in loans and grants to British Guiana during the present year, whereas aid to Mr. Jagan's Government in 1964 had amounted to only \$200,000. The same newspaper reported that the production of United Kingdom sugar companies was 50 per cent higher during the present year than during the preceding year, that installations for bauxite mining were being expanded by the aluminum companies and that the production of diamonds in the Territory had doubled in relation to 1964.

4. In other Territories, too, colonialist resistance was continuing, owing to economic, political or strategic considerations. Plans for new military bases in the Territories were increasing the threat to the peace of the oppressed peoples. Military bases in all Territories which had not gained independence must be speedily and unconditionally eliminated; they must be removed before independence and not after. Her own country knew what it was to have a foreign military base on its soil, imposed at the time of the imperialist presence there. Such bases were a constant threat to neighbouring peoples, too, and to their independence. The New York Times of 11 November 1965 had reported that a new United Kingdom territory, to become a mili-

tary base, had been created out of part of Mauritius and Seychelles. The Times of London of 11 November 1965 had quoted the United Kingdom Secretary of State for the Colonies as saying that the islands would be available for the construction of defence facilities by the United Kingdom and United States Governments. The information that compensation would be paid for the islands did not reassure her delegation. General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) required States to respect the integrity of the national territory of dependent peoples. Her delegation could not accept the argument that payment had been made for the islands concerned; no sovereign State would allow the alienation of any part of its territory.

5. In the light of the principle of the equality of nations large and small, enshrined in the Charter, there could be no justification for questioning the right of a Territory to independence on the basis of its small population or area. Nor could economic arguments be adduced to show the incapacity of a people for independence. Such pretexts were used for the purpose of maintaining bastions of colonialism, using the subterfuge of artificial federations, or association or integration with other States. Any constitutional advance which did not give the people full control of their destiny or which maintained imperial rule in the form of a so-called association was unacceptable.

6. Mr. DIABATE (Guinea) said that the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples reflected not only the passionate desire of dependent peoples for freedom but also the recognition that the denial of freedom represented a threat to international peace and security. While the attainment of full sovereignty by a number of countries since the date of the adoption of the Declaration was to be welcomed, his delegation condemned the attempts of certain colonialist countries to empty the Declaration of its essential content, which was the political, economic and cultural liberation of the Territories still under foreign rule.

7. The Declaration did not justify the handing over of power to unrepresentative groups or puppets. In British Guiana, for example, an explosive situation had been created. His delegation appealed once more to the United Kingdom not to exacerbate racial tensions there, but to free the political prisoners and negotiate with the true representatives of the people, namely, the Progressive People's Party.

8. The Declaration must also be implemented effectively in the Territories administered by the Spanish Government. His delegation had listened with interest to the statement of the President of the Governing Council of Equatorial Guinea at the Committee's 1550th meeting, but it was convinced that the higher interests of the people of Equatorial Guinea called for an end to foreign domination in all forms and manifestations. Without liberty there could be no real development.

9. His delegation would support draft resolution A/C.4/L.802, submitted by a number of Latin American countries with a view to starting a dialogue between the United Kingdom and Argentine Governments concerning the future of the Malvinas Islands.

10. Mr. PAYSSE REYES (Uruguay) said that for the moment he would confine himself to the question of the Malvinas. His delegation's position on Argentina's claim to sovereignty over the Malvinas had been clearly set out by his delegation in Sub-Committee III of the Special Committee (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. XXIII, appendix, paras. 35-57). In November 1964, the Special Committee had endorsed the conclusions of the Sub-Committee and he wished to stress in particular conclusions (b), (c), and (d) (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. XXIII, para. 59).

11. The draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.4/L.802) was based on that decision of the Special Committee. He noted that Argentina had indicated its readiness to settle the dispute direct with the United Kingdom and that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina had stated that there would be no difficulty in finding a formula which would guarantee the rights and aspirations of the people of the Malvinas Islands. It would thus be logical simply to invite the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina to continue negotiations directed towards finding a peaceful solution, taking into account the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the interests of the inhabitants. There seemed no need to discuss the question of rights of possession. The islands had belonged to Spain and had passed into the possession of the American States in 1810. The problem was to put an end to a de facto situation lacking all legal basis, and that was the course prescribed by the draft resolution.

12. Mr. CARDUCCI-ARTENISIO (Italy) said that his delegation, which had had the opportunity of following the constitutional developments in the Territories under consideration through its participation in the Special Committee, was satisfied in principle with the political and constitutional situation prevailing in most of the Territories and supported the steps taken by the administering Powers concerned towards the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Most of the Territories enjoyed complete internal self-government and, through elections conducted on the basis of "one man; one vote", their inhabitants were able to express their views on their present constitutions and on their evolution towards self-determination and independence. In other Territories the situation was not so promising, although there were special circumstances to explain the delays in the attainment of the goals set forth in the relevant General Assembly resolutions.

13. The question had been raised whether the small area and population of certain Territories required that special criteria should be applied to them. It was perhaps unfortunate that the Special Committee had not found it possible to work out some basic principles which could be applied to the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) in respect of such Territories. It was surely inconceivable that islands with a population of less than a hundred could become independent States without giving rise to future problems. A first step might perhaps be made by adapting the amplifying, if necessary, the criteria indicated in General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), which might be regarded as a kind of supplement to

resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation had confidence in the various countries administering the Territories under consideration, but felt that the United Nations could indicate some guidelines.

14. With regard to the Falkland or Malvinas Islands, his delegation had stated its preliminary views in Sub-Committee III of the Special Committee in September 1964 (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. XXIII, appendix, paras. 58-63). It had drawn attention to three special features. Firstly, the Falkland Islands was a small Territory with a small and scattered population, for which full political and economic independence might be difficult to envisage; on the other hand, it constituted a Non-Self-Governing Territory and was thus within the scope of resolution 1514 (XV). Secondly, the Territory was the subject of a sovereignty claim on the part of another Member State; although the General Assembly was not a court which should be asked to decide territorial disputes, the fact that Argentina had maintained constant reservations concerning sovereignty over the islands was a factor which could not be ignored. Thirdly, there appeared to be a conflict between two principles set out both in the United Nations Charter and in resolution 1514 (XV): namely, the principle of territorial integrity and the principle of self-determination. The Italian delegation felt that the national origin of the inhabitants and the fluctuations of the population gave rise to serious doubts about the possibility of strict application of the principle of self-determination to the case. On the other hand, the geographical situation of the islands made them a physical part of the American continent.

15. His delegation did not consider that the problem could be studied from a legal point of view only; a solution should be sought through constructive and reasonable methods. It would be unfortunate if the problem became a source of tension between the United Kingdom and Argentina; the best course would therefore be to reach an understanding through bilateral consultations. His delegation sincerely hoped that the two Governments would find it possible to reach an agreement which would be mutually satisfactory and would give full consideration to the legitimate interests and special circumstances of the people who had made the islands their home. In his delegation's view, the problem was more a problem of a colonial Territory than of a colonial people. The sacred role of the United Nations as the guardian of indigenous populations under colonial rule was hardly relevant in the present problem.

16. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.802. The methods suggested in it were in line with the United Nations Charter and might help towards the settlement of the dispute between two friendly countries.

17. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) said that he would confine his remarks at present to the question of the Malvinas or Falkland Islands. In the Special Committee and in its Sub-Committee III, his delegation had voted in favour of the conclusions and recommendations appearing in document A/5800/Rev.1, chapter XXIII, paragraph 59. The United Kingdom's occupation of the islands had had all the characteristic features of colonialism. Throughout

the 133 years of that occupation, Argentina had constantly reaffirmed its rights over the islands. The way to a solution clearly lay in negotiations. Argentina had made clear its desire for negotiations, and notwithstanding the United Kingdom view that the question of sovereignty over the islands could not be a subject for negotiation, the Argentine Government had expressed satisfaction with the United Kingdom Government's recent acceptance of its proposal for talks. Argentina considered that the negotiations should be based on the decisions of the Special Committee and be aimed at the decolonization of the islands. His delegation must support that position as being in line with the recommendations of the Special Committee. It would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.802.

18. Mr. KEDADI (Tunisia) said that he wished first to reaffirm Tunisia's complete and unconditional attachment to the principle of decolonization. As long ago as 1959, President Bourguiba had suggested that the colonial Powers should hold a round-table conference to decide upon the procedures for the peaceful decolonization of the countries and peoples under their administration. Decolonization was inevitable and by bringing it about themselves the colonial Powers would retain the friendship of the colonized peoples. Although that suggestion had not been taken up, the United Nations had, as it were, responded to it by adopting General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and establishing the Special Committee. His delegation considered that the administering Powers should co-operate closely with that Committee, in their own interests and in the interests of world peace. Tunisia had no direct interests in any of the Territories under consideration; its approach was based solely on the principles of the United Nations Charter and the decisions taken by the United Nations in the matter of decolonization.

19. The great majority of the Territories were under the administration of the United Kingdom, which was accordingly called upon to play a leading role in the process of decolonization. A study of the Special Committee's reports revealed that in some cases the United Kingdom was making great efforts to raise the level of living of the inhabitants in order to help them on the road to self-government and independence; the Committee should give recognition to that fact. On the other hand, in other, more advanced, Territories the administering Power was intervening in order to direct events towards a situation which would be favourable to it in the future; the case of British Guiana was an illustration of that. In some other Territories, namely Gibraltar and the Falkland or Malvinas Islands, there was a dispute concerning sovereignty. His delegation considered that in those cases historical and geographic considerations should be the main basis for a peaceful solution. His delegation was convinced that through peaceful negotiations an agreement could be reached under which those Territories would be restored to their original owners and the recipient countries would pay substantial compensation.

20. With regard to the other Territories under consideration, it seemed that the administering Powers were duly discharging their task, although fuller information on political and constitutional evolution

would have been desirable. As an African country Tunisia could not long tolerate the continuation of foreign rule in Africa. At the Committee's 1550th meeting the President of the Governing Council of Equatorial Guinea had described the situation in his country, but it was to be noted that he had not seemed at all anxious that his country should accede to independence as speedily as possible, and the Tunisian delegation would have liked to see more stress laid on that aspect. With regard to Ifni and Spanish Sahara, his delegation considered that, as in the case of Gibraltar and the Malvinas Islands, the Territories should be returned to their original owners. The existence of enclaves administered by foreign Powers in the African continent could not be accepted. It was a question of both justice and security and, in the name of the esteem which the African countries felt towards Spain, his delegation appealed to that Power to renounce its sovereignty over those two Territories.

21. The Tunisian delegation would support any draft resolution in conformity with the position which he had outlined.

22. Mr. THERATTIL (India) said that his delegation would confine its remarks to a few Territories in which changes had been introduced, or were contemplated, which might delay the attainment of independence.

23. Among those Territories was British Guiana, a country which on one pretext or another had been denied freedom and independence for almost fifteen years by the administering Power. Until recently British Guiana had enjoyed the greatest measure of racial harmony and identity of interest common to all the people. It had had a Government, based on universal adult suffrage, in which the present leaders of the two main parties of British Guiana had been united in a single party and had worked together for the welfare and independence of the country. The administering Power had intervened and suspended the Constitution and the Government; it had then placed further obstacles in the way of the country's attainment of freedom and independence and had adopted various constitutional and unconstitutional measures designed to arrest the growth of a truly multiracial British Guiana.

24. His delegation could not but regret the attitude taken by the administering Power concerning the efforts made by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and by the General Assembly. The reports of the Special Committee (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. VII; A/6000/Rev. 1, chap. IX) clearly showed that the efforts of the Sub-Committee of Good Offices on British Guiana had been frustrated by the United Kingdom Government, which had refused to allow the Sub-Committee to visit the Territory. His delegation had no doubt that, with the full co-operation of the administering Power, the Sub-Committee and the Special Committee would be able to play an important role in assisting the people of British Guiana to achieve freedom and independence. His delegation therefore submitted that the General Assembly should endorse the work done by the Sub-Committee of Good Offices and enable it to function effectively by calling upon

the administering Power to co-operate fully with it. The General Assembly should call upon the United Kingdom to grant freedom and independence to British Guiana without further delay, an independence based on the rule of the majority with adequate and full safeguards for the interests of all minorities and free elections conducted on the basis of "one man, one vote". The Indian delegation reserved its right to comment on the results of the constitutional conference now in progress in London. It wished to stress, however, that any decision taken in London should be in keeping with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

25. Turning to Mauritius, he said that the colonial policy pursued by the United Kingdom in that Territory was no different from the pattern set in other colonial Territories. As the Committee had not been informed of the results of the constitutional conference in London, it could only be assumed that the United Kingdom Government had not yet taken any effective steps to implement the Special Committee's recommendations concerning Mauritius (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. XIV, para. 159). His delegation hoped that the United Kingdom policy in Mauritius would be changed in order to build up a multiracial, multi-religious and multi-ethnic Mauritian nation and that the United Kingdom Government, which proudly proclaimed the dignity of labour and the brotherhood of man, would grant the people of Mauritius independence based on the equality and brotherhood of man, the principle of universal adult suffrage and the concepts of democratic government and majority rule, with safeguards for minorities. Any solution based on expediency and self-interest would only result in chaos and conflict, for which the administering Power would bear the responsibility. The administering Power should bear in mind the important principle set forth in operative paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and not take any steps in regard to the future of Mauritius which would be contrary to that principle, even if such a sacrifice was made for national defence or any so-called vital necessity.

26. With regard to Fiji, he noted that in the resolution adopted by the Special Committee (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. XIII, para. 119) the Committee had renewed its request to the administering Power to adopt immediate measures which would enable the people of Fiji to attain freedom and independence and had further requested the administering Power to report to it and to the General Assembly on the implementation of the resolution in question. More than a year had elapsed since that request had been made and the administering Power had not submitted any report to the Special Committee or the General Assembly. He hoped that the representative of the administering Power would make a statement to the Committee during the debate on the present item. Even the constitutional conference recently held in London had failed to move in the direction of the goals set forth in General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1951 (XVIII). The avowed purpose of the conference had been to work out a constitutional framework for Fiji which would preserve a continuing link with the United Kingdom and within which further

progress could be made in the direction of internal self-government. It was not surprising that a conference beginning with those limited objectives had failed to achieve any substantial results, although the conference report claimed that the election system had been modernized by the introduction of universal adult suffrage. On examination, however, it was found that instead of the universally accepted system of "one man, one vote", the present arrangement in Fiji would give one man one vote in the case of some but in the case of others it would give one man six or eight votes. The administering Power had instituted a complicated system of cross-voting, with equal division of seats among unequal communities, with a view to protecting the interests of the European minority.

27. As his delegation had pointed out in the Special Committee, racial discrimination was practised in Fiji. Moreover, there was a "separate but unequal" principle maintained for the benefit of the Europeans and some other minority groups. He would welcome an explanation of that unsatisfactory state of affairs from the representative of the administering Power.

28. The new Legislative Council of Fiji was not elected on a fully democratic basis and would have little effective power, since its power to legislate on any subject was curtailed by a number of restrictions and powers reserved to the Governor. His country's own experience and recent examples in other United Kingdom colonial dependencies provided ample proof that, where non-Europeans exercised a small degree of self-government, the governors and high commissioners did not hesitate to curtail the powers of the legislatures and ministers and even to suspend the constitutions.

29. His delegation had brought those facts to light in a constructive spirit and in the hope that the administering Power would take immediate action to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee. He could only deprecate the administering Power's policy of separate electorates, which retarded progress towards the objective of integrating the peoples of the Territory. By advocating a democratic form of government and similar representative institutions, the United Nations would not be pleading for the sacrifice or diminution of the interests of any particular group or community. On the contrary, a fully democratic constitution would safeguard the interests of all the people of Fiji. That was what the General Assembly and the Special Committee had requested in their resolutions on the Territory and his delegation hoped that the administering Power would comply with that request.

Mr. Bruce (Togo) Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

30. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) said that his delegation had often spoken out against the colonial system and had expressed its views in support of the application to all peoples of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In accordance with that position, his delegation had always voted in favour of resolutions submitted with that end in view and would continue to do so to the

extent that circumstances and the provisions of the United Nations Charter made it possible.

31. Similarly, his delegation had supported the universal nature of the process of decolonization and consequently the recognition of the principle of self-determination for all peoples. Any other course would be contrary to the spirit of the Charter and an obstacle to the free development of peoples.

32. His delegation would for the moment confine itself to the question of the Malvinas, since that was a matter which concerned the American continent. His delegation had no doubt regarding the clear legal title of Argentina to the Malvinas. He would not dwell on the historic, geographic, legal, political and economic factors which confirmed the sovereign rights of the Argentine Republic over the Territory, for they had already been fully discussed, but would only note that the problem had originated by an act of force committed in 1833 against part of the territory which had belonged to Argentina since 1810. That colonial situation had persisted to the present day, in defiance of the will of all American nations, which had solemnly proclaimed their desire to eliminate all vestiges of colonialism in the hemisphere.

33. The Malvinas was a colonial Territory and therefore subject to the application of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). In his delegation's view, however, it was a Territory with special characteristics. It had been alienated from another State and occupied by the nationals of the administering Power. The problem of the Malvinas was that of a territory which had become a colony through the use of force, in disregard of the legitimate rights of the Argentine Republic. His delegation considered that operative paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) applied to the particular case of the Malvinas and it was in the light of that paragraph that the situation should be examined. Failure to apply that paragraph would be tantamount to accepting the argument that might was right in international relations.

34. The Special Committee had unanimously approved the recommendation in which it recognized the existence of a dispute between the United Kingdom and Argentina concerning sovereignty over the Malvinas and invited the two Governments to enter into negotiations with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem. His delegation considered that the Special Committee had adopted the proper course and it was therefore happy to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.802, which reflected the views of the Special Committee. He hoped that it would be supported by an overwhelming majority of the Fourth Committee.

35. Mr. BHUIYA (Pakistan) said that his delegation considered that it was one of the General Assembly's most important duties to keep the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories under constant review and to enable the dependent peoples to obtain independence in the shortest possible time. His Government supported the vital principle of self-determination for all peoples. No matter what interests a State might have in a Territory, nothing justified the continuation of its control of the Territory in disregard of the wishes of the inhabitants. His delegation was

not prepared to compromise on the principle that all vestiges of such control should be brought to a speedy end, for it could never sacrifice the freedom of a single individual for the interests of any Power.

36. His delegation questioned the frequent assertion of the colonial Powers that many dependent peoples were not prepared for self-government. It considered that the fiction of primitive peoples who could not be trusted to govern themselves had been thoroughly discredited and it opposed the concept that colonial domination was the best means of improving the lot of dependent peoples. There was an urgent need to accelerate the decolonization process.

37. His delegation endorsed the work of the Special Committee and hoped that, by constantly pointing out the discrepancy between the present situation and the goal of full freedom for the dependent peoples, the Committee would become a powerful instrument for the liquidation of the colonial system.

38. His delegation was convinced that the appointment of the Sub-Committee of Good Offices on British Guiana had been a constructive measure and it hoped that the negative attitude of the administering Power would not deter the Sub-Committee from continuing to carry out its mission. It recognized the complexity of the situation in British Guiana and the need for a political evolution which would bring about a free and just multiracial society. That was a delicate task which required the combined skill and resourcefulness and the constant attention of the entire international community. For the Asian and African countries, the evolution of a multiracial community in British Guiana was a challenging possibility. Afro-Asian solidarity had an indestructible foundation which was rooted in common sufferings and deprivations. From the confluence of the genius of two great peoples, there might arise in British Guiana a cultural synthesis and a truly vital and rich civilization.

39. His delegation regarded the emergence of independence movements in many Territories as an encouraging development and as one of the surest signs of the political maturity of the people concerned. It would be his delegation's endeavour to keep itself well informed about the situation in order to satisfy itself that those movements were allowed to grow in an atmosphere free from repression.

40. While his delegation appreciated the information provided about conditions in the colonial Territories, it felt that information relating to economic conditions should be expanded so as to show the extent to which the natural resources of dependent Territories had been exploited by the colonial Power as well as the extent to which the benefits of such exploitation had been passed on to the people. His delegation considered the administering Powers to be under a moral as well as a legal obligation to make all reasonable efforts to harness the economic resources of the Territories for which they were responsible. The colonial Powers should encourage the establishment of larger economic units, which could only serve to facilitate the attainment of political independence by the people.

41. Mr. NKAMA (Zambia) said that his delegation considered it to be the sacred duty of all freedom-

loving peoples to take a resolute stand against the deplorable indignities imposed by foreign domination and exploitation. His delegation condemned foreign domination in all its forms and manifestations. Imperialism was the greatest enemy of mankind and the most formidable obstacle in the way of the economic and social rehabilitation of all the peoples of the world. Unless it was eliminated without delay, nations could not hope to live in peace and harmony. Foreign rule was incompatible with the fundamental principles and democracy; there could be no true happiness in the world where there were masters and slaves, self-appointed rulers and government by armed force. Africa was determined to rid itself of foreign domination not only in Africa itself but also in the islands round the continent which were ruled by foreigners. Those islands were an integral part of the African continent and the authorities concerned would be well advised not to impede the political advancement of their inhabitants.

42. Africans were not narrow-minded or parochial; they were broad-minded and peace-loving people who believed that world peace could only be achieved when all peoples had assumed their rightful role of determining their own destiny. That was why they called for the complete elimination of colonialism and hoped that the parties concerned would not fail to negotiate suitable solutions as soon as possible.

43. His delegation deemed it necessary to state that Zambia was not opposed to imperialism because it was practised by people with light skins; it abhorred colonialism because it degraded man. His delegation's position on the question of imperialism was based on its love of peace and justice and on its respect for the human person regardless of race, colour, creed or sex.

44. His delegation would support any draft resolution that was in keeping with the aims of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

45. Mr. DE CASTRO (Philippines) said that the Non-Self-Governing Territories could be divided into the following categories; comparatively large areas with sufficient inhabitants to lead an independent political existence; Territories which had freely expressed their preference for a type of political status in the exercise of their right to self-determination; Territories where the question of sovereignty was involved; and islands with a small population and limited economic potentialities.

46. With regard to the question of sovereignty over the Falkland or Malvinas Islands and Gibraltar, his delegation was pleased to note that there was apparent agreement between the parties concerned to negotiate the differences. There appeared to be sufficient legal basis under operative paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) for substantiating the claims of Argentina and Spain to those Territories. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.802. His delegation regarded Gibraltar as an integral part of the territory of Spain and thought that that factor should be taken into account in seeking a solution to the problem.

47. With regard to Territories which had freely expressed their preference for a particular type of political status in the exercise of their right to self-determination, he pointed out that the purpose of the plebiscite held in Fernando Póo and Río Muni had been to determine whether or not the people accepted the Basic Law establishing a system of self-government for the Territories. The returns had shown that the population had accepted the Basic Law by an overwhelming majority. A large delegation had gone to Madrid to discuss the form of self-government with the Spanish authorities and had unanimously opted for a unified Equatorial Guinea and for the self-government which they now enjoyed. It was thus not correct to say that the Spanish Government had not yet taken steps to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in those Territories.

48. With regard to Guam, he noted that in 1962 the Sixth Guam Legislature had declared that Guam was an integral part of the United States, that its citizens were citizens of the United States and that it had no further desire than for continued association with the United States (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. XVII, para. 35). Those were views expressed by representatives who had been elected by universal suffrage.

49. The Territories of British Guiana and Fiji were large enough and sufficiently populated to enable them to lead an independent political existence. They had the economic means to support their political institutions and could provide their people with a moderately high level of living. His delegation therefore hoped that the administering Power would take steps to implement as soon as possible the General Assembly resolutions calling for the granting of independence to the people of those Territories.

50. With regard to those Territories which were small islands or groups of small islands without favourable economic potentialities, he welcomed the Italian representative's suggestion that the United Nations should propose guidelines for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) with respect to such Territories. Classic independence might not necessarily be the best solution for them and it might be to their advantage to be associated with another State. For the time being, however, the important thing was that the administering Power should allow the people to participate to an increasing degree in the administration of the Territories and provide them with a higher level of living, better education and greater economic security.

51. Mr. ABDEL-WAHAB (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation fully supported the recommendations and conclusions of the Special Committee and hoped that the administering Powers would implement the recommendations faithfully in order to enable the people of the Territories to exercise their right to self-determination. It was the considered view of his delegation that all dependent peoples were entitled to exercise their right to self-determination and that all colonial Territories, large and small, should attain independence in conformity with the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The difficulties facing some of the Territories were not insurmountable and the

Special Committee should examine ways and means by which the people of those Territories could achieve freedom and independence.

52. He noted with regret that in most of the Territories the pace of political advance and constitutional progress was too slow, that the steps taken by the administering Powers fell short of the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV), and that in most cases the policy of the administering Powers was designed to serve their own strategic and economic interests rather than the well-being of the inhabitants of the Territories. The United Nations should protect the people of those Territories against abuses by the administering Powers and the Special Committee should dispatch visiting missions to the various Territories to investigate conditions and to ascertain the wishes of the people.

53. On the question of the Falkland or Malvinas Islands, his delegation had listened with sympathy to the statements made by the representatives of Argentina, Venezuela, Peru and others on a problem which had arisen as a result of military action by the United Kingdom. In its recommendations the Special Committee had invited the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina to enter into negotiations in order to find a peaceful solution. His delegation fully supported the draft resolution to that effect now before the Committee (A/C.4/L.802).

54. Gibraltar had been the subject of a similar recommendation by the Special Committee, which had invited the Governments of the United Kingdom and Spain to begin talks in order to reach a negotiated solution (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. X, para. 209). His delegation fully supported that recommendation.

55. His delegation was deeply concerned about the situation in British Guiana and felt that every effort should be made to ensure that the Territory achieved independence in an atmosphere of harmony and peace. He supported the Liberian representative's proposal at the 1553rd meeting that a United Nations commission should be established to assist the people of the Territory in solving the problems facing them on the eve of independence.

56. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that, from the number of Territories with which the Committee was dealing at the present session, it was clear that the desired progress in decolonization had not been achieved. It had often been said by the colonial Powers that the fact that there were still so many colonial Territories was the result of specific conditions, such as their small size and population, their under-development and low economic potential. That naturally made the process of decolonization more complex, but he had no doubt that the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples applied to all colonial Territories.

57. There were other factors, too, that determined the action of the colonial Powers in slowing down the process of decolonization. The problem was one of a conflict between the just aspirations of the people of the Territories and the interests of the colonial Powers. Many of the remaining colonies were situated in the vicinity of areas from which foreign domination had been eliminated and it was logical that the

colonial Powers and other countries interested in the continued exploitation of the wealth and labour of others should endeavour to preserve for as long as possible positions from which they could undermine the independence and obstruct the development of the newly independent countries. There was a surprising lack of willingness on the part of some countries to understand the extent and significance of the changes which were taking place in the world.

58. The colonial Powers appeared to be determined to make the granting of independence to colonies dependent upon the adoption of a given political system or the removal from power of a political party or government elected by the population. Those more directly involved with decolonization might have wondered who was responsible for postponing independence in British Guiana. The administering Power had acted in complete disregard of the self-governing status of the Territory and of the fact that the Government had been elected three times by the majority of the population. Racial considerations had not been the source of the conflict. As the United Kingdom Secretary of State for the Colonies had said, the cause of the difficulties was basically political, not social, and it required a political solution. Yet the solution found was racial in character and had given rise to the present difficulties in the Territory.

59. The fact that there were still so many colonial Territories was primarily the result of the lack of readiness of the colonial Powers to adjust their policies and actions to the changes in the world and to the requirements of present-day development. As was clear from the reports of the Special Committee, the administering Powers had done nothing to implement the recommendations of the Special Committee and the General Assembly. It was difficult for any State openly to oppose rapid decolonization but the absence of measures to promote it amounted to the same thing.

60. Specific conditions, such as size and small population, far from justifying slow progress, called for greater efforts and for the United Nations to play a greater role in ensuring the adoption of measures designed to enable the inhabitants of colonial Territories freely to express their wishes regarding their future. It was not sufficient to ensure the presence of the United Nations during the elections and for a few days before or after them; it was imperative that the United Nations should play an active part in the whole process. The Special Committee should consider sending small missions to various Territories not only to ascertain the situation but to assess the possibilities for progress. It was hard to understand the arguments that Non-Self-Governing Territories were an internal matter for the colonial Powers; Chapter XI of the Charter made it clear that the colonial question had ceased to be an internal one.

61. He had been surprised at the report published in the New York Herald Tribune on 11 October 1965 to the effect that the United Kingdom was acquiring four Indian Ocean atolls from two of its colonies, Mauritius and the Seychelles, and would develop them jointly with the United States as defence bases. The United Kingdom was not entitled to part with

part of its colonies and should be asked not to proceed with the transaction until it had been considered.

62. His delegation would support draft resolution A/C.4/L.802 of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

63. Mr. SANGHO (Mali) said that his delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.4/L.802 and welcomed the spirit which had inspired it. The geographical, historical and legal considerations involved in the dispute between the United Kingdom and Argentina had already been stated in the Committee. The Territory was geographically a part of Latin America and before the United Kingdom had taken it by force it had been inhabited by the people of Argentina. The Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina should be invited to open negotiations without delay.

64. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that his delegation had been glad to note the atmosphere of mutual friendship and respect which had prevailed between the two main parties to the debate of the question of the Falkland or Malvinas Islands. Such an atmosphere was the most desirable point of departure in any sincere attempt to settle a dispute. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.4/L.802, which invoked the use of direct negotiations between the main parties concerned in order to find a peaceful solution, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The principle of direct negotiation was one of the most important principles on which the United Nations was founded and it must be encouraged as the most fruitful approach in the present as well as in the future. The Latin American countries which had sponsored the draft resolution had been eloquent exponents of that principle in relation to countries or disputes in regions other than their own and their sincerity should be recognized when they sought its application in their own hemisphere.

65. Mr. SICLAIT (Haiti) said that his delegation had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.802, on the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), because it considered it essential that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) should be implemented in those islands. The emancipation of the people of his hemisphere would never be complete as long as any vestiges of colonialism remained. His delegation had welcomed the recommendation of the Special Committee on the subject and felt that, if the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina agreed to negotiate in a spirit of understanding and goodwill, the right solution would undoubtedly be found. The interests of the inhabitants must, of course, be safeguarded and the Government of Argentina had made it clear that it would do so. The draft resolution was worded in moderate terms and should receive almost unanimous support.

66. Mr. ELDEM (Turkey) said that the question of the Falkland or Malvinas Islands, to which General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was applicable, presented special features which distinguished the Territory from other Non-Self-Governing Territories. Those features should be borne in mind in deciding how resolution 1514 (XV) should be implemented in the Territory. The islands constituted a small Territory with a limited economic potential and it was hard

to envisage it ever becoming an independent State. The population was small and not indigenous and did not demand independent political status. The guiding principles, such as self-determination, which were valid in the majority of Non-Self-Governing Territories were not valid in the present case. New criteria that would be applicable to such special cases should be found.

67. The problem was not one of decolonization alone, but one of sovereignty. The population appeared to be in favour of a link with the United Kingdom, but Argentina had put forward strong historical and geographical arguments on its side and had, moreover, never recognized United Kingdom sovereignty over the islands. The Committee was not competent to decide on a question of sovereignty, but resolution 1514 (XV) could only be implemented in the Territory once the dispute over sovereignty had been settled. He was happy to hear that the United Kingdom Government had accepted the invitation of the Argentine Government to begin negotiations. If those discussions took place, the two countries would have given the world an example of fruitful co-operation with a view to obtaining a peaceful settlement of their differences, while safeguarding their own interests.

68. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.802, which reflected the spirit of conciliation of the Latin American countries, was purely procedural and did not prejudice the outcome of the dispute. His delegation would vote in favour of it.

69. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana) said that he wished to record both his delegation's appreciation of the work and reports of the Special Committee and its regret that the information in those reports did not give a correct picture of the situation in the colonial Territories. That was not the fault of individual members of the Special Committee but was the result of the strict censorship of information imposed by the administering Powers.

70. His country proclaimed its views on decolonization so frequently because it could not be silent as long as one square foot of the earth remained under colonial domination. The principles of self-determination and social justice were indivisible and inviolable. The history of colonialism had been a sordid one. It had originally been inspired by a spirit of greed and adventure, which had been intensified in the days of the slave trade. The rise of the industrial revolution in Europe had created a need for more raw materials, which had led to greater emphasis on colonialism based on the subjugation of the peoples. The peak had been reached in 1885, at the Congress of Berlin, when European nations had divided Africa at the stroke of a pen without any consideration for geographical, ethnic or social factors. The mind of man did not rest, however, and finally in the present century the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had been proclaimed.

71. The number of colonies still to be liberated was immense and many were under United Kingdom domination. From the reports of the Special Committee it was obvious that economic conditions and

social, health and educational facilities in many of the Territories were far from adequate. In the case of Barbados, Mauritius and the Seychelles, for example, it was clear that the administering Power had not been administering the Territories in a progressive manner. The administering Powers should be made aware that colonialism imposed obligations. It appeared from the reports of the Special Committee that some of the administering Powers tried to give the impression that the people of the Territories wanted integration with them. If there was any geographical reason for that, he could understand, and in any case would respect, the wishes of the inhabitants of those Territories, but as a member of a newly liberated country he would advise those Territories to be cautious. Integration in practice might leave them dissatisfied.

72. It had been stated that the maintenance of military bases in colonial Territories was morally indefensible when it was not agreeable to the population. He would like to reiterate that that was so, especially when it was at the expense of the independence of the Territory.

73. He regretted the existence of racial disharmony in British Guiana and the administering Power's delay in granting the Territory independence. The people of the Territory had lived in racial harmony until they had asked for independence, and he hoped that the administering Power would see fit to grant it without delay, in an atmosphere of racial harmony and political progress.

74. At the Committee's 1550th meeting, the President of the Governing Council of Equatorial Guinea had explained the situation in Fernando Póo and Río Muni and had congratulated Spain on the good work it had done. If the people of the Territory had indeed found liberty and spiritual guidance under Spain, then he could only support them. The Committee had not been told, however, when Spain would grant independence to the Territory and he wondered whether Spain would give the Committee that information.

75. Mr. BROWN (United Kingdom) said that of the forty or so Territories with which the Committee was concerned under agenda item 23, about twenty were under United Kingdom administration.

76. As the reports of the Special Committee for 1964 and 1965 demonstrated, the past two years had been marked by steady advance in those Territories. A number had become fully independent and were now Members of the United Nations. There had been a series of constitutional conferences concerning certain of the Territories; the constitutional progress of other Territories had been the subject of less formal consultations between local leaders and the United Kingdom Government; and in some Territories purely local consultations had taken place with a view to reaching agreement on proposals for discussion with the United Kingdom Government. In a number of Territories there had been important constitutional changes, the details of which were included in the reports of the Special Committee. Major elections had taken place in several more.

77. Thus, in a substantial number of the Territories there had been continued progress towards self-government and self-determination—and in each case the direction and pace of that progress had been determined in close and continuous consultation with local opinion, as expressed through political parties and the other normal organs of opinion available in a free democratic society.

78. The Territories on which the Fourth Committee's interest had been concentrated fell into two groups. Firstly, there were the Territories which had given rise to comments on constitutional questions and where there had been recent important developments about which the Committee might wish to be further informed, namely Mauritius, Fiji and British Guiana. Secondly, there was a group of Territories—Gibraltar and the Falkland Islands—where the interest did not centre on the normal questions of constitutional advance with which the Fourth Committee and the Special Committee were generally concerned, but where the point at issue was a claim to sovereignty over a British Territory by another country.

79. He would deal first with the constitutional aspects of Mauritius, Fiji and British Guiana. The report of the Special Committee on Mauritius (A/6000/Rev.1, chap. XIII) had been completed before the end of the Mauritius constitutional conference, held in London in September. All the parties represented in the Mauritius legislature had been represented. At the end of the conference, the Colonial Secretary had announced that the United Kingdom Government considered it right that Mauritius should move towards full independence. The procedures were to be as follows. As the conference had not been able to reach full agreement on a new electoral system, the Colonial Secretary was to appoint a commission to make recommendations on the new system and on electoral boundaries with a view to safeguarding the interests of all communities. Once the commission had reported, the Colonial Secretary would decide upon the new electoral system, a general election would be held and a new government would be formed. Independence would follow after a period of six months of full internal self-government if the new Legislative Assembly passed a resolution, by a simple majority, asking for independence. Those processes could be completed before the end of 1966. The new constitution, agreed upon at the conference, would include safeguards for minority interests, a chapter on human rights, the appointment of an ombudsman, and provisions to ensure that the main features of the constitution could not be amended unless at least three quarters of the members of the Legislative Assembly agreed.

80. Questions had been raised about the United Kingdom Government's plans for certain islands in the Indian Ocean. The facts were as follows. The islands in question were small in area, were widely scattered in the Indian Ocean and had a population of under 1,500 who, apart from a few officials and estate managers, consisted of labourers from Mauritius and Seychelles employed on copra estates, guano extraction and the turtle industry, together with their dependents. The islands had been uninhabited when the United Kingdom Government had first acquired them. They

had been attached to the Mauritius and Seychelles Administrations purely as a matter of administrative convenience. After discussions with the Mauritius and Seychelles Governments—including their elected members—and with their agreement, new arrangements for the administration of the islands had been introduced on 8 November. The islands would no longer be administered by those Governments but by a Commissioner. Appropriate compensation would be paid not only to the Governments of Mauritius and Seychelles but also to any commercial or private interests affected. Great care would be taken to look after the welfare of the few local inhabitants, and suitable arrangements for them would be discussed with the Mauritius and Seychelles Governments. There was thus no question of splitting up natural territorial units. All that was involved was an administrative re-adjustment freely worked out with the Governments and elected representatives of the people concerned.

81. Fiji was another Territory on whose future a major constitutional conference had been held since the completion of the report of the Special Committee. The conference, held in London in July and August, had been attended by all eighteen of the non-official members of the Fiji Legislative Council. The agreed object of the conference had been to work out a constitutional framework within which further progress could be made towards internal self-government and which would preserve a continuing link with the United Kingdom. The conference had agreed that there should be for the first time an elected majority in the Legislative Council. There would be no nominated non-official members and a maximum of four nominated officials. The conference had also agreed that all the minority groups which had hitherto not had the vote should be enabled to vote and stand for election: that concerned the Rotuman Islanders, certain other Pacific Islanders, and the Chinese community. Fiji would thus attain full universal adult suffrage, thereby meeting one of the main points made in the Special Committee during the discussion of Fiji in 1964. The Rotuman Islanders and the other Pacific Islanders would vote on the same rolls as the Fijians, and the others with the European group. Because of the enfranchisement of those groups and the consequent effects on the representation of the three main communities, it had been decided that the proportion of European members would be reduced from one of parity with the other two communities to ten. The Fijians would now have fourteen seats, a small increase—at the expense of the European group—taking account of the fact that the Rotuman and other Pacific Islanders were now to vote with them. The Indian representation remained proportionately unchanged, both overall and as a proportion of those elected on the communal rolls. It had also been decided that in future there would be nine members of the Legislative Council elected by a cross-voting system, under which each member would be elected by persons of all communities. Finally, there would be provision in the constitution for development from the present "membership" system, whereby members of the Executive Council spoke for various departments of government in the Executive Council and the legislature without being in administrative control of those

departments, into a full ministerial system whereby the non-official members would be ministers.

82. The Fijian Indian representatives at the conference had been unable to agree with some of the above measures—in particular, the new representation of the communities in the legislature and the retention of the system of communal voting for some of the members of the Legislative Council. They had also felt that full internal self-government could be introduced forthwith. After considerable discussion, however, it had become clear that the Indian proposals were not acceptable to some of the other representatives at the conference and the decisions described above had therefore been designed to produce a situation which would be as far as possible acceptable to all the main Fiji communities. In particular, it was hoped that the introduction for the first time of a cross-voting system for some of the seats in the legislature would be an effective first step in breaking down the political divisions between the different communities in Fiji. To have moved straight to a single common roll and the abolition of all communal voting in one stage could well have led to the opposite result—a widening of political divisions among the communities. It would also have been totally unacceptable to the Fijian community.

83. The United Kingdom Government hoped that the new system would encourage political co-operation and thus make it possible to move further towards a national rather than a communal attitude in the future. That was of course fully in line with the aims of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee on Fiji and represented an important move in the right direction. There was no justification whatever for any suggestion that the United Kingdom Government was encouraging or exploiting communal divisions or special protection for the Europeans, whose position was hardly at issue. Its policy was steady progress towards non-racial consciousness and unity. It must be recognized, however, that excessive haste in changing deep-rooted attitudes might well interrupt rather than help the process of building up trust and political co-operation between the communities in Fiji.

84. Turning to British Guiana, he pointed out that there was a constitutional conference on that Territory now taking place in London, its object being to settle outstanding constitutional questions and to fix a date for independence. It was hoped that the conference would complete its work shortly. The United Kingdom Government had expressed publicly its regret that one of the two main parties in British Guiana, the People's Progressive Party, had not felt able to attend. Many of the points made by the petitioner representing the People's Progressive Party who had recently appeared before the Committee (1549th meeting) would surely have been more appropriately and effectively made in the course of the London conference.

85. The petitioner and some speakers in the debate had referred to the state of emergency in British Guiana and to the dozen or so detainees who were still in custody. He wished to make it clear that the responsibility for those internal security matters rested with British Guiana Ministers and not with the

United Kingdom Government. It was surely for the people of British Guiana to settle those problems among themselves and to establish a basis of common trust and understanding.

86. It had been suggested that some form of United Nations mediation in British Guiana to help reconcile the two main political parties might be timely and appropriate. His delegation appreciated the spirit in which those suggestions had been made. There were, however, a number of considerations which seemed to point in a contrary direction. British Guiana had enjoyed more stability over the past year than for some time. A conference to fix an independence date was in progress. Intervention from outside—and that was how a proposal of United Nations mediation would be regarded—might have the most unfortunate consequences and even increase racial and political divisions. A comprehensive survey of racial tension in British Guiana had just been carried out by the International Commission of Jurists, and the British Guiana Government was now working to give effect to the Commission's recommendations. Any external attempt to mediate now, with British Guiana's independence so near, would certainly appear in the Territory to be unwarranted. British Guiana Ministers had been consulted and their views were generally in accordance with what he had just said. Moreover, it was the intention of Mr. Burnham, the Premier, to visit New York after the London conference, where he would doubtless welcome the opportunity to talk informally with interested delegations about the current situation.

87. The suggestions for a United Nations role would thus be more of an obstruction than a help for the peaceful and rapid progress of British Guiana to independence. As the British Colonial Secretary had said at the opening of the London conference, it was in the hands of the Guianese people that the future of Guiana would soon lie and it was by their efforts that the country's problems would be solved.

88. He turned next to the second group of Territories, where the question before the Committee was not so much one of constitutional progress to independence and self-determination, but rather the situation arising from claims to sovereignty over the Territories by other countries: the Falkland Islands and Gibraltar.

89. His delegation had listened carefully to the Argentine representative's arguments in support of his country's claim to sovereignty over the Falkland Islands. It did not intend to enter into detailed arguments since the Committee would not wish to attempt to judge on the merits of the question, except to say that the United Kingdom Government did not accept the Argentine representative's arguments and continued to have no doubts as to its sovereignty over the Territory. The question of disrupting Argentina's territorial integrity therefore did not arise. There was, however, one important point to which the Argentine representative had given inadequate attention: the interests and wishes—the two being inseparable—of the inhabitants. As his delegation had shown in its statements to the Special Committee, the Falkland Islanders were genuine, permanent inhabitants who had no other home but those islands. They had shown, in their mes-

sages to the Special Committee and in the formal declaration by their elected representatives, that they did not wish for anything other than normal, friendly relations with Argentina, but that they did not wish to sever their connexions with the United Kingdom. There were no grounds whatever for suggesting that their wishes should simply be set aside; yet that was the tenor of some of the speeches in the present debate

90. It had been suggested that the population was somehow irrelevant on the grounds that the people were transient, that there were no births or deaths in the islands, that the people had been planted there by the United Kingdom rather than being of indigenous stock and that many of them were employed by the Falkland Islands Company. There should be no misunderstanding about their status. The population numbered slightly over 2,000, of whom 80 per cent had been born in the islands. Many could trace their roots back for more than a century in the islands. Of course they stemmed from an immigrant community; so did much of the population of North and South America and indeed of Europe and Africa. It would surely be fantastic to limit the principle of self-determination to the handful of peoples who could truthfully claim to be the descendants of indigenous inhabitants. There was nothing in the Charter or in resolution 1514 (XV) to warrant such a major restriction. In any case, it was quite wrong to suggest that the people were transients or that there were no births or deaths in the islands. The birth and death rates were published for all to see; they were somewhat higher than the rates in the United Kingdom and that alone completely refuted the picture of a garrison, regularly replaced and "rotated", with no settled roots in the Territory.

91. The Venezuelan and Italian representatives had suggested that it was a question not of a colonial people but of a colonial Territory—not human beings, but land. That was surely not an attitude which should commend itself to the Fourth Committee. As Woodrow Wilson had said, people were not chattels or pawns to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty. It had been suggested that operative paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 (XV) should be interpreted as denying the principle of self-determination to the inhabitants of Territories which were the subject of a territorial claim by another country. His delegation and others had already produced conclusive evidence in the Special Committee that the paragraph in question had not been intended to limit the application of the principle of self-determination in any way; in that connexion he referred to paragraphs 94-98 and 146-151 of chapter X of document A/5800/Rev.1, and to paragraph 109 of the annex to chapter XXIII of the same document. Those arguments had in no way been refuted by anything said in the present debate.

92. It was the interests and wishes of the Falkland Islanders which were the central feature in his Government's attitude to the Territory. The Argentine representative had argued that the people's interests would be best served if they were transferred to Argentine sovereignty. It might be so, or it might not; the point was that the Argentine Government could not decide that for them, nor could the United Kingdom,

nor could the United Nations. It was for the people themselves to judge where their interests lay.

93. The Argentine representative had referred to the recommendations of the Special Committee and to the communication from his Government to the United Kingdom Government suggesting that talks should be held in accordance with those recommendations. The United Kingdom Government's position in regard to the recommendations was fully set out in the Special Committee's report for 1964 (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. XXIII, paras. 29-30). Because the future of the Falkland Islanders could not be settled over their heads, it followed that the question of sovereignty was not negotiable. His Government was, however, always ready to discuss with the Argentine Government ways in which damage to their good relations could be avoided. His Government had accordingly replied to the Argentine invitation, expressing willingness to enter into discussions through diplomatic channels, and had asked the Argentine Government to suggest suitable topics, bearing in mind the United Kingdom's reservations about sovereignty and respect for the wishes and interests of the Islanders. His delegation hoped that the discussions would take place and that they would lead to an improvement in the already cordial relations between the two countries.

94. The draft resolution on the Falkland Islands (A/C.4/L.802) seemed to imply that the question of sovereignty should be the subject of negotiations. Furthermore, it ignored the wishes of the Falkland Islanders themselves. His delegation therefore had reservations on those grounds. In addition, the resolution seemed unnecessary. The best course was to allow the proposals for talks to be pursued between the United Kingdom and Argentine Governments. The draft resolution had no essential or valuable part to play in that process and his delegation would abstain if it was put to the vote. Meanwhile, he drew attention to the erroneous use, in the draft resolution, of the term "Malvinas". It was neither recognized by the administering Power—the United Kingdom—nor consistent with United Nations usage, and he accordingly repeated his request that the English text of the draft resolution should be corrected. The use of "Malvinas" could not in any case affect United Kingdom sovereignty over the islands.

95. Much of what he had said applied also to Gibraltar. As his delegation had already made clear, the United Kingdom was in no doubt about its sovereignty over Gibraltar. The Spanish representative, in his statement at the 1556th meeting, had asserted that the United Kingdom Government was unwilling to engage in talks and was attempting to conceal that unwillingness behind the pretext that the frontier restrictions, whose importance and detrimental consequences both for the people of Gibraltar and for their Spanish friends and neighbours he had sought to minimize, constituted duress. In order to demonstrate the real nature of the obstacle to the talks asked for by the consensus, he drew the Committee's attention to a letter from the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs addressed to the United Kingdom Ambassador in Madrid on 18 November 1964. In that letter, repro-

duced as annex I to document A/AC.109/L.235, the Minister had stated the following:

"Failing this negotiated solution, which is recommended by the consensus of the 'Special Committee' [A/5800/Rev.1, chap. X, para.209], the Spanish Government, having no other alternative, would find itself compelled, in defence of its interests, to revise its policy in regard to Gibraltar."

In the light of the restrictions which had begun to be imposed a month earlier, on the day following the consensus, the terms of the letter could be clearly seen to constitute a threat to which no State could be expected to yield. It was that threat and its implementation against Gibraltar which constituted the real obstacle to the talks.

96. On 16 October 1964 the Special Committee had adopted a consensus on Gibraltar, inviting the United Kingdom and Spain to undertake conversations. Within twenty-four hours of its adoption, the Spanish Government had begun to impose a series of restrictions at the frontier between Spain and Gibraltar which were clearly designed to influence the situation in the Territory. Firstly, excessive delays had been imposed on all vehicles entering or leaving Gibraltar; as a result, the number of tourist cars entering Gibraltar in the first nine months of 1965 had been 5,153, as compared with 75,041 in the corresponding period in 1964. Secondly, tourists were not allowed to import goods into Spain from Gibraltar without paying excessively high rates of duty. Thirdly, all exports from Spain to Gibraltar, except fish, fruit and vegetables, had been banned. Both the delays to tourists and the excessive rates of duty on imports were a breach of obligations entered into by members of the International Union of Official Travel Organisations, of which the Spanish Ministry of Information and Tourism was a member.

97. Since the proposal for conversations made by Spain on 18 November 1964, those restrictions and interferences with the status quo had been intensified in the following ways. Firstly, about 1,000 persons, most of them British subjects living in the towns adjoining Gibraltar, had been compelled to leave their homes at extremely short notice; some of them had not known any other homes. Secondly, Spanish workers had been forbidden by their Government to spend any part of their wages earned in Gibraltar for the purchase of groceries etc. in Gibraltar for their use in Spain. Thirdly, certain passports issued in Gibraltar had been rejected by Spain as unacceptable. The hostility of the Spanish Government to the people of Gibraltar had been further demonstrated by refusing entry into Spain of a particular class of persons. That class included those who had appeared as petitioners before the Special Committee and all other elected members of the Gibraltar Legislative Council, certain journalists and others. Yet in his statement before the Committee the Spanish representative had minimized the extent and effect of the restrictions and had suggested that the responsibility for not complying with the consensus rested with the United Kingdom. That was clearly not so.

98. There was an important principle involved. If two parties to a dispute were called on to try to reach

a peaceful solution by means of talks, it was surely inadmissible that either party should attempt to influence the results of those talks by applying political or economic pressures in advance of them. The pressures applied by Spain had been instituted after the consensus had been adopted by the Committee; in other words, the consensus had been reached in one particular set of circumstances, which had been unilaterally altered by Spain within twenty-four hours of its adoption. To expect his Government to entertain proposals for conversations under those new conditions would be tantamount to accepting the principle that it was legitimate to attempt to influence, by political or economic duress, the situation in a Territory which was the subject of a consensus—a principle which neither the United Nations nor any of its Members would be prepared to subscribe to.

99. Consideration must also be given to the practical effects of the restrictions imposed by the Spanish Government. The economic effects on Gibraltar and on the neighbouring Spanish towns were grave. The restrictions amounted to an economic blockade which, accompanied by a campaign of vilification by the Spanish Press and radio, was designed to hurt the people of Gibraltar and hence to influence the situation in what Spain believed to be its own interests. The Spanish Government had asserted that those measures were a mere reflection of the exercise of Spain's sovereignty in its own territory, but that was beside the point. His Government had not said that the Spanish Government was acting illegally in imposing the restrictions. What it had said was that the restrictions constituted an attempt to influence the situation and that they were abnormal.

100. The Spanish representative had also suggested that the measures were designed as a check on smuggling. In the past, Spanish representatives had gone so far as to allege that the whole life of Gibraltar was based on smuggling. The economy of Gibraltar was, of course, based principally on expenditure by United Kingdom Government departments, on the tourist industry and on the entrepot trade. His Government had given the Spanish Government ample opportunity to take up the question of smuggling and had invited it to produce evidence; if Spain had a genuine grievance, the United Kingdom was always ready to discuss it. But the hollowness of the charge was most clearly exposed by the fact that in none of the communications addressed to the United Kingdom Government by the Spanish Government since the adoption of the consensus had smuggling even been mentioned.

101. For all those reasons, his Government could not agree to entertain any proposals for discussions until the situation was restored to normal. That did not mean that the United Kingdom Government did not mean to agree to talks, as its positive response to the Argentine suggestion had demonstrated. If the Spanish Government was sincere in its desire to hold talks, it must restore the situation to what it had been when the United Nations had suggested such talks. Meanwhile, he reaffirmed that the United Kingdom Government accepted its obligation to protect the interests of the people of Gibraltar and would discharge that obligation in whatever way was neces-

sary. The people of Gibraltar were the true and permanent community inhabiting the area, with the same rights as any other colonial people anywhere. The principle of self-determination applied as much to them as to any other people. They did not wish to be transferred to Spanish sovereignty, for they did not believe that would be in their best interest, and they would not let anyone else decide for them what was in their best interest.

102. In conclusion, he again rejected the inference that it was the United Kingdom that had been unwilling to negotiate and restated his Government's readiness to entertain proposals for conversations as soon as the abnormal situation no longer existed at the frontier. The sooner that obstacle to talks was removed, the better for all concerned.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.