



**Chairman:** Mr. Vernon Johnson MWAANGA  
(Zambia).

### AGENDA ITEMS 68 AND 12

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations (continued) (A/8023 (part IV), A/8023 (part IV)/Add.1, A/8143, A/C.4/L.975)**

**Report of the Economic and Social Council (continued) (A/8003, chapter XIII (section D), A/C.4/L.975)**

### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded)\* (A/C.4/L.975)

1. Mr. CHEBELEU (Romania) said that General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1970 was universal in two senses: firstly, it must be applied to all colonial peoples and Territories without exception, and, secondly, its objectives must be attained through the efforts of all States and all international agencies.

2. After recalling that the question under consideration had been included in the agenda of the General Assembly on the initiative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, he noted that not all the specialized agencies had done everything they could to expedite the process of decolonization. In fact, some had done nothing whatsoever. Yet there was no doubt that the peoples and national liberation movements in colonial Territories could receive invaluable assistance from the specialized agencies of the United Nations, particularly in the fields of education, training, health and nutrition. In that respect, the Economic and Social Council had a particularly important role to play.

3. Romania was in full agreement with the contents of operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.975. The draft resolution generally would serve to emphasize the legitimacy of the struggle of oppressed peoples. The appeal to the specialized agencies and the international organizations associated with the United Nations to work out concrete programmes for assisting the peoples of the colonial Territories in southern Africa, including in particular the populations of the liberated areas, was especially important. No less so was the invitation to the specialized agencies to examine the possibility of providing for

participation in meetings convened by them of the leaders of the liberation movements in the colonial Territories in Africa. Romania considered that such participation would be a practical expression of international recognition of the struggle of those movements and would afford them valuable support in their activities on behalf of the well-being of their peoples. Furthermore, the leaders of the national liberation movements, as the true representatives of their peoples would have some valuable opinions to express.

4. His delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.4/L.975 because it made recommendations which, if translated into action, would do much to expedite decolonization.

5. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Sudan had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.975.

6. Mr. PAPOULIAS (Greece) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.975, but wished to place on record two reservations. Firstly, the references in the text to relevant resolutions adopted in the past did not affect any reservations which the Greek delegation might have made at the time of their adoption. Secondly, his delegation believed that the role which the specialized agencies were to play must be compatible with their constitutions and that the material assistance referred to in the draft resolution must be rendered in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. That applied in particular to operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5. If separate votes were taken on paragraphs 9 and 10, his delegation would abstain on them.

7. Mr. PETRELLA (Argentina) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.975. Although Argentina agreed with its basic purposes, it objected to some of its paragraphs on legal grounds, since they appeared to be incompatible with the constitutions of the specialized agencies and with the agreements between the agencies and the United Nations.

8. Mr. HAMILTON (United Kingdom) said, in connexion with the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.4/L.975, that he would like to associate himself with the tributes paid to the work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees by a number of delegations. At the same time, he wished to make it clear that the United Kingdom had never placed legal difficulties in the way of assistance being rendered by the High Commissioner to refugees from Rhodesia. Rhodesians outside Rhodesia were entitled in the same way as other United Kingdom nationals to protection by United Kingdom representatives in the countries in which they were living. To the extent that in

\* Resumed from the 1914th meeting.

the past there had been some difficulty about the provision of help by the High Commissioner to Rhodesians living outside their own country, those problems had been simply the result of the limitations imposed on the High Commissioner under the statute establishing his Office. In any case, in recent months there had been discussions between the Office of the High Commissioner and the United Kingdom Government about those problems, and the outcome was that there would be greater flexibility in the sources of assistance available to refugees from Rhodesia.

9. Operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution envisaged the provision by the specialized agencies and other international institutions of direct assistance to national liberation movements. For most of the institutions concerned, that raised major issues under their respective constitutions, which the United Kingdom did not believe it was for the Committee to prejudice. Nor was it proper for the Committee to seek to exert influence on matters which it was for the institutions themselves to decide.

10. That had always been the position of the United Kingdom on the question under discussion. However, the present draft resolution went beyond earlier resolutions. For example, operative paragraph 7, which referred to a number of specialized agencies by name, appeared to involve an interpretation of Security Council resolution 277 (1970) which the United Kingdom had expressly disclaimed from the outset. That paragraph was an attempt to superimpose on the decisions and conclusions of the Security Council new elements which had not been generally accepted when the Council had adopted its resolutions 277 (1970) and 283 (1970). The United Kingdom also had objections to some other features of the draft resolution; for example, it could not accept solutions to the remaining colonial problems through the use of force. For all those reasons, it would not be able to support draft resolution A/C.4/L.975.

11. Mr. KEMP (South Africa) said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.975 broadly for the same reasons as had prevented it from supporting others previously adopted on the same subject. The draft resolution required bodies that were essentially technical to take into account political considerations dictated by the United Nations, rather than the technical criteria required by their constitutions. Thus they were being called upon to act in certain instances in violation of the letter of their constitutions and in all instances in violation of the spirit of their constitutions. An example of that was to be found in operative paragraph 9, which urged the specialized agencies to withhold assistance from South Africa. It was inexcusable that they should be called upon to act in such an improper fashion; it was also ironic, for South Africa was a donor of assistance and did not receive any aid from the organizations involved.

12. In addition, the draft resolution urged the specialized agencies to render assistance to movements described as liberation movements without any restriction as to the type of assistance to be given or the use to which it might be put, although those movements had said quite openly that they were committed to the use of force. Thus the General Assembly was being asked, in contravention of the Charter, not only to support movements committed to the use of

force and acts of violence but also to obtain a commitment from the technical agencies that they too would support those bodies.

13. Mr. SÖYLEMEZ (Turkey) said that his delegation sincerely appreciated the efforts undertaken by the delegation of Bulgaria in the course of the past two years on the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations. His delegation would support draft resolution A/C.4/L.975, which it felt was in keeping with the spirit of the Declaration and was a historical and logical extension of it. It was of the view that the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations should try to do their best to advance decolonization, within their respective constitutions.

14. Although his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, it had reservations concerning operative paragraphs 3, 8 and 9, on which it would abstain if they were put to a separate vote. Moreover, it would have preferred a more flexible wording in operative paragraph 1, as it had difficulties concerning some of the paragraphs of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in that regard (see A/8023 (part IV) and A/8023 (part IV)/Add.1). It considered that operative paragraph 4 was redundant and repetitive. In spite of the latitude allowed by operative paragraph 10, his delegation had reservations on the advisability of raising that question at the present stage.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.975 would be taken by roll-call.

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

*In favour:* Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia.

*Against:* Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malawi.

*Draft resolution A/C.4/L.975 was adopted by 71 votes to 4, with 18 abstentions.*

16. Mr. DE SOTO (Peru), speaking on a point of order, said that his delegation had been unable to be present during the voting and wished it to be indicated in the record of the meeting that it would have voted for the draft resolution, as it intended to do in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

17. Mr. ROGERS (Australia) said that his delegation had expressed objections to and reservations about resolutions on that subject which had been adopted at previous sessions. His delegation had graver objections to the current year's resolution than to the one adopted the preceding year. Australia was aware of the constructive role which the specialized agencies could play in the field of decolonization. As administering Power in Papua and New Guinea, Australia received assistance from various specialized agencies which benefited the country and its people and was a visible demonstration of the United Nations interest in a Trust Territory. His delegation had previously expressed fundamental objections to some of the principles and tenets of draft resolution A/C.4/L.975. Essentially, those were that Australia was opposed to attempts to bring political pressure to bear on the specialized agencies and other international institutions which by virtue of their constitutions and statutes were essentially technical bodies, dealing essentially with Governments. For those reasons, Australia had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.975.

18. Mr. RAKOTOSIHANAKA (Madagascar) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.975. Nevertheless, as his delegation had pointed out in previous years, provisions of the kind contained in operative paragraphs 3, 8 and 9 were too dogmatic.

19. Mr. CRAIG (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation was in sympathy with many of the objectives of draft resolution A/C.4/L.975 and, in particular wished to associate itself with the expressions of appreciation to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and those specialized agencies rendering assistance to refugees from colonial Territories, which were the victims of the tragic situation in southern Africa; it also agreed with the recommendation for further efforts in that regard.

20. However, his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, in view of its reservations on a considerable number of operative paragraphs. If separate votes had been taken on paragraphs 3 and 8, it would have voted against them. It did not consider that the isolation of Portugal or South Africa from international organizations was the most effective way of bringing about a change in their policies, nor that the breaking of all communications with them, as recommended in the resolutions referred to in those paragraphs, was desirable. In addition it believed that many international organizations would have genuine legal difficulties in implementing those provisions.

21. Mr. DE ROSENZWEIG DIAZ (Mexico) said that he had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/L.975, although he did not support some of its paragraphs, in particular operative paragraphs 3, 8 and 9.

22. Mr. MARQUEZ SERE (Uruguay) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.975 but wished to make certain comments. Although Uruguay supported all appeals concerning the assistance to be given to the cause of decolonization by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations, it believed that such assistance should be constructive in nature and should be given within the framework of the Charter. It had reservations about operative paragraphs 3, 8 and 9 which imposed what could be considered as actual sanctions since measures of that kind had to be adopted by the Security Council if they were to have legal force.

23. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said that he had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/L.975, because his delegation was convinced that the text contained ideas which would promote the cause of decolonization, but stated that, if a separate vote had been taken on operative paragraphs 3, 8 and 9, his delegation would have abstained, because it did not completely endorse the general tenor of those paragraphs.

### AGENDA ITEM 13

#### Report of the Trusteeship Council (*continued*) (A/8004, A/8085, A/C.4/L.978)

#### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*concluded*)\* (A/C.4/L.978)

24. Mr. ROGERS (Australia) said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.978 represented the culmination of the Committee's work on the item and of the more detailed study made in the Trusteeship Council and in the Special Committee. In that connexion, he expressed appreciation to the sponsors for their reasonable and thoughtful approach. It would be recalled that at the preceding session the Australian delegation had voted in favour of resolution 2590 (XXIV) adopted by the General Assembly on 16 December 1969. In the draft resolution under consideration, operative paragraph 3 took note of the arrangements made by the Trusteeship Council, in consultation with the Special Committee, concerning the composition of the visiting mission which would visit the Trust Territory of New Guinea in 1971. He assured the Committee that the administering Power would co-operate fully with the mission, as requested in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. Mr. Leslie Johnson, the Administrator of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, had stated at the 1356th meeting of the Trusteeship Council that he would be very glad to welcome the mission personally when it arrived in the Territory and to give it every possible assistance.

25. His delegation had reservations about operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.978, which reaffirmed previous resolutions regarding the Territory, since it had opposed some of them at the time. He had already had occasion to outline the progress made towards the achievement of the objectives mentioned in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution—including the localization of the public service—and he wished to add that it had been announced

\* Resumed from the 1914th meeting.



on 4 December that a Papuan, Mr. Sere Pitoi, had been appointed to the most senior civil service position in the Territory—that of Chairman of the Public Service Board of Papua and New Guinea.

26. Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.978 called upon the administering Power to prescribe a specific time-table for the exercise by the people of the Territory of their right to self-determination and independence. That paragraph was similar to one of the recommendations of the Special Committee, with the important addition of the mention of consultation with freely elected representatives of the people. Although that addition was a considerable improvement, his delegation had difficulty in accepting the paragraph as a whole. The Australian Government, as Administering Authority, had always stated that it was for the people of the Territory themselves to decide when they wanted to exercise their right to self-determination. Speaking in the Territory in July 1970, the Prime Minister of Australia had said that he would not set a time-table for the achievement of full self-government and independence because it was not for the Administering Authority itself to set an arbitrary date for those developments. The administering Power's attitude was that the majority of people should decide when they wished to attain those goals and that when they did so decide, they would get what they wanted. When he returned to Australia, the Prime Minister had summed up the position by saying that the Australian Government should stay in New Guinea as long as most of the people wanted it to stay and felt that they wanted its help and its skills. Australia would stay in New Guinea as long as it was wanted and no longer.

27. The rate of progress for the achievement of self-determination and independence was therefore something to be determined by the people of the Territory and not by the Administering Authority. For that reason the Australian delegation was unable to support the wording of paragraph 5 and would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.978 as a whole.

28. Mr. HAMILTON (United Kingdom) said that the views expressed by his delegation at the thirty-seventh session of the Trusteeship Council on the Trust Territory of New Guinea also applied to Papua, since both Territories were administered as a single entity. Those views were recorded in considerable detail in the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly (A/8004) and therefore did not need to be repeated in the Committee. Nevertheless, particular attention should be drawn to the political changes introduced in March 1970, which had given the ministerial members of the Administrator's Executive Council full responsibility for the running of their departments and conferred greater importance upon the Executive Council, with its indigenous majority. The increase in the individual and collective responsibility of the ministerial members reflected a progressive transfer of power to the representatives freely elected by the people. His delegation was certain that the views of the elected members of the House of Assembly would continue to provide valuable guidance on the subject of further constitutional development. In addition to the political progress, advances had also been made in economic, educational and social matters. The year 1970 had been one of marked advance in the direction indicated in the Charter of the United Nations

and in the Trusteeship Agreement, as well as in the recommendations of the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council.

29. Although there was much in draft resolution A/C.4/L.978 which it could support, the United Kingdom delegation would have preferred operative paragraph 2 to be worded in a similar manner to the second preambular paragraph, which drew particular attention to resolution 2590 (XXIV), adopted without objection by the General Assembly in 1969. Paragraph 3 should have followed more closely the terms of paragraph 5 of resolution 2590 (XXIV), whereby the composition of the visiting missions was to be determined in consultation not only with the Special Committee but also with the Administering Authority. Lastly, on the subject of paragraph 5, his delegation had reservations about the establishment of a specific time-table and noted that appeals of that kind were no longer made in the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee on individual Territories which it discussed or in the resolutions of the General Assembly concerning the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). In its view, it was not possible at the current stage of development of the Territory to form an exact idea about the timing of the completion of the process of self-determination. That should be decided in the light of the clearly formulated views of the elected representatives of the people, in accordance with Chapters XI and XII of the Charter. Article 76 of the Charter emphasized the freely expressed wishes of the people of the Trust Territories as an essential element in attaining the goals of the Charter. His delegation firmly believed that, through the deliberate policies of the Administering Authority, the right conditions for self-determination were being created in all spheres and were bringing steadily nearer the day when the people of the Territory would be able freely to decide on their future.

30. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.4/L.978.

*Draft resolution A/C.4/L.978 was adopted by 86 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

31. Mr. MAZEWSKI (United States of America) recalled that at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2427 (XXIII), of 18 December 1968 on the same question, the United States had made known its view that the decision regarding the form and timing of the exercise of the right of self-determination should not be imposed from outside, but should be left to the people of the Territory concerned to take of their own free will. That same objection applied to operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution which had just been adopted (A/C.4/L.978).

32. The consideration of the question showed clearly that the Government of Australia, as the administering Power, was actively discharging its responsibility to prepare the people of the Territory for early self-determination. It was therefore his delegation's view that the call for a specific time-table in that regard was unnecessary. The decision concerning the advisability of adopting the course of action proposed in operative paragraph 5 should be taken jointly by the administering Power and the people of Papua and

New Guinea. The United States Government had every confidence that Australia would fulfil its trusteeship responsibilities with or without a time-table. For those reasons, his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.978.

33. Mr. TRESSELT (Norway) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.978 but that it wished to record its reservation with regard to operative paragraph 2, since that provision referred to resolutions in respect of which his delegation had not cast an affirmative vote.

### AGENDA ITEM 61

**Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations (continued) (A/8023/Add.8, A/8134 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.981)**

#### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded) (A/C.4/L.981)

34. Mr. HAMILTON (United Kingdom) said that his Government had always paid the most scrupulous regard to the discharge of its obligations under Article 73 of the Charter. The annex to the Secretary-General's report (see A/8134 and Add.1) showed that during the current year the United Kingdom had by the end of July transmitted information on all the Territories which had not yet attained a full measure of self-government.

35. His Government did not regard operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.981 as applying to it; indeed, if a separate vote was taken on that paragraph, his delegation would be in a position to support it. Operative paragraph 4, however, which referred to the six self-governing Associated States in the Eastern Caribbean, presented serious difficulties for his delegation. Under Article 73 of the Charter the United Kingdom was precluded from transmitting information in respect of those six States. A substantial amount of information relating to that question had been made available to members of the Committee at the preceding three sessions of the General Assembly, including a number of statements from the elected Governments of the Associated States themselves. Many delegations, and certainly those which had had contact with the Associated States, were aware that those six States had a full measure of self-government, that there was no United Kingdom administrative presence in them, that their six Governors were all West Indians, that the civil services were almost entirely locally staffed, that United Kingdom official representation in those States was only diplomatic and that the six States could proceed to independence by a unilateral decision whenever they so desired. He trusted that those facts would in time be formally recognized by the United Nations.

36. Consequently, to transmit information on those States would be regarded by them as unconstitutional, unacceptable and entirely inconsistent with the status which their peoples had freely chosen and which had been described in the States themselves as internal independence. With regard to the references made by some delegations to the

consultations which were in progress, it should be pointed out that the United Kingdom was playing and would continue to play a constructive part in them. In the meantime, however, his delegation had to reserve its position on that matter. He proposed that a separate vote should be taken on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.981.

37. Mr. NYIRENDA (Zambia), speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.981 opposed the proposal of the United Kingdom representative.

38. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom representative's proposal that a separate vote should be taken on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.981.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*The Central African Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada.

*Against:* Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Gabon, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

*Abstaining:* Chile, China, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Cambodia.

*The United Kingdom proposal was rejected by 54 votes to 21, with 20 abstentions.*

39. The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution A/C.4/L.981 to the vote.

*Draft resolution A/C.4/L.981 was adopted by 79 votes to 2, with 15 abstentions.*

40. Mr. SÖYLEMEZ (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.981 as it had done in past years in the case of similar draft resolutions. Nevertheless, it had certain reservations about the wording of operative paragraph 3 and it would have abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 4 if that paragraph had been put to the vote separately. For that reason, it had voted in favour of the United Kingdom proposal.

41. Mr. DE ROSENZWEIG DIAZ (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.

L.981 although it did not endorse some of the terms used in it.

42. Miss STOKES (New Zealand) said that for many years her delegation had supported all resolutions concerning the obligation of the administering Powers to transmit the information required under Article 73 of the Charter. New Zealand had always complied fully with that requirement and in 1970 it had submitted to the Secretary-General a comprehensive report on the situation in Niue and the Tokelau Islands. Her delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.981, not because it disagreed with the contents of the draft resolution but because it found the substance of operative paragraph 4 unacceptable.

43. Mr. ALO (Nigeria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.981, although it had certain reservations about operative paragraph 4. Nigeria felt that all the administering Powers without exception had the obligation to continue to transmit information in accordance with Article 73 of the Charter.

44. Mr. MAZEWSKI (United States of America) said that he had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.981 because he had serious reservations about operative paragraph 4. His delegation's position regarding the necessity of receiving information on the Territories mentioned in that paragraph was well known, but in any case he wished to make it quite clear that, if the paragraph had been voted on separately, he would have voted against it.

45. Mr. ARTACHO (Spain) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.981, in keeping with his country's traditional attitude on the matter. Spain's position with regard to the fulfilment of the obligations referred to in Article 73 e of the Charter was well known. He had certain reservations, however, about the wording of operative paragraph 3 of the draft.

46. Mr. ROCHESTER (Barbados) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.981. Barbados adhered to the principle that, in the absence of a decision by the General Assembly, all administering Powers without exception should transmit information in respect of their Territories.

47. He noted, however, that the sponsors, having examined the Secretary-General's report (A/8134 and Add.1), had failed to mention all the administering Powers which had refused to transmit information concerning the Territories for which they had assumed responsibility. In his delegation's view, the fact that some Non-Self-Governing Territories were not included in the list in the report should not be used by the respective administering Powers as a justification for violating Article 73 e of the Charter. Decisions of the General Assembly did not supersede the Charter, but were complementary to it.

48. The transmission of information was an indispensable function for keeping the Committee, and the United Nations in general, informed about what was taking place in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

49. Mr. CRAIG (Ireland) said that, although he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.981, he would have abstained on operative paragraph 4 if it had been voted on separately.

### AGENDA ITEM 23

#### Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (*continued*) (A/8023/Add.4 (part II) and Corr.1, chapter IX, A/C.4/L.983)

50. Mr. ALDEGHATHER (Saudi Arabia) said that he had unfortunately been absent at the previous meeting at the time that draft resolution A/C.4/L.983 on Spanish Sahara had been put to the vote. If he had been present, he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution, which his country had co-sponsored.

51. Mr. KABARITI (Jordan) stated that at the meeting on the previous day he had been absent when draft resolution A/C.4/L.983 had been put to the vote; if he had been present, he would have voted in favour of it.

*The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.*