



Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

AGENDA ITEM 66

Question of Namibia (*continued*) (A/8388, A/8423/Add.1, A/8423/Add.3 (parts I and II), A/8424, A/8473, A/C.4/738 and Add.1, A/C.4/740, A/C.4/L.994, A/C.4/L.997)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(*continued*) (A/C.4/L.994, A/C.4/L.997)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Libyan Arab Republic had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/L.994.
2. Mr. BELEN (Turkey) pointed out that there had been a steady deterioration in the attitude of South Africa. After receiving its Mandate over South West Africa, South Africa had submitted annual reports to the League of Nations, whose authority it had thereby at least tacitly acknowledged. Now, however, despite the accession to independence of all the other mandated territories, South Africa was continuing to administer Namibia in the outmoded spirit of the Mandate without recognizing any obligations to the United Nations in that connexion. It consistently disregarded the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the subject. The historic General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 had acknowledged the right of the Namibian people, among others, to self-determination and independence. In resolutions adopted at more recent sessions, the Assembly had entrusted the administration of the Territory to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which had been set up after the termination of South Africa's Mandate. Those resolutions had all been adopted by an overwhelming majority and their legality had been confirmed by the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, handed down on 21 June 1971. Thus, the political decision of the international community had become a legal decision whose implementation was compulsory for all parties concerned. The Security Council, in resolution 301 (1971), had agreed with the Advisory Opinion of the Court, had requested Member States to take account of the interests of the people of Namibia in their dealings with South Africa, had stated that any further refusal of the South African Government to withdraw from Namibia could create conditions detrimental to the maintenance of peace and security in the area and had reaffirmed that the presence of South Africa in the Territory constituted an internationally wrongful act. The aim of all those efforts by the United Nations, over so many years, was to restore to a heroic people its inalienable right to independence. Those endeavours would be unnecessary if South Africa agreed to
3. The draft resolution A/C.4/L.994 represented an important step towards that final objective. After reaffirming once more the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence and after condemning the Government of South Africa for its continued refusal to put an end to its illegal occupation of the Territory, the resolution endeavoured to create the necessary economic, political and cultural conditions to enable the Namibian people to prepare for independence. His delegation supported the provisions of operative paragraph 9, in which the specialized agencies were asked to render to the Namibian people all necessary moral and material assistance, by means of concrete programmes of assistance. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, his delegation was prepared to do its utmost to help the Council to discharge the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it under operative paragraph 13 of the draft. It agreed with the proposal in operative paragraph 16 to increase the membership of the Council, to ensure broader representation, and hoped that the Secretary-General's consultations with the permanent members of the Security Council and with the various regional groups would be successful. Participation by the members of the Security Council in the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia would lead to closer co-operation between the two bodies, which were closely concerned with the Territory. The appointment of a full-time Commissioner for Namibia, as provided in operative paragraphs 17 and 18, was necessary if the resolution was to be applied. The issue of commemorative postage stamps would constitute an important source of revenue and publicity, and his delegation was therefore in favour of the proposal in operative paragraph 19.
4. Mr. PSONČAK (Yugoslavia) suggested that in operative paragraph 6 (*b*) the words "with South Africa" might be inserted between the words "forms" and "when".
5. Mr. SERONEY (Kenya) said that the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice represented a ray of hope for southern Africa. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.994 welcomed that Advisory Opinion and called upon all Member States to respect it. The Security Council, in the debate concerning its resolution 301 (1971), had discussed whether to use the words "endorses" or "agrees with". To avoid such discussions, and to allay the doubts of some delegations, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.994 had used the words "Welcomes the Advisory Opinion" in operative paragraph 2. His delegation would have liked the draft resolution to be more strongly worded but even as it

was, it spelled out the legal powers of the United Nations Council for Namibia and showed the consequences of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice. He agreed that publicity should be given to the problems of Namibia and hoped that the report by the Council for Namibia to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session would show that significant progress had been made.

6. The Chairman said that further consideration would be given to draft resolution A/C.4/L.994 at a later meeting. The Committee would now consider draft resolution A/C.4/L.997, relating to the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

7. Mr. CASTRÉN (Finland), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/L.997, said that the United Nations was irrevocably committed to assisting the people of Namibia in their efforts to attain self-determination and independence. Its responsibility had been reinforced by the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice, confirming that the United Nations had acted within its rights in terminating the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia. That direct responsibility called for a special commitment, and the Security Council, in resolution 283 (1970), had recognized that commitment in proposing the establishment of a United Nations Fund for Namibia; the proposal had been acted on by the General Assembly, which had adopted resolution 2679 (XXV) of 9 December 1970. One of the most important reasons for establishing a separate Fund for Namibia was to develop a feeling of nationhood among the Namibians and a meaningful understanding of their future responsibilities. The United Nations had in fact undertaken to assist and prepare the people for independence when South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia was brought to an end. The scope of the programme outlined in the report of the Secretary-General (A/8473), submitted under General Assembly resolution 2679 (XXV), was much wider than the current programmes of assistance to Namibians. That excellent report revealed that the nature of the assistance which could be rendered to Namibians was affected by several factors: the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, which constituted a practical obstacle to the flow of all but minimal aid to persons within the Territory; the fact that the Namibians currently outside the Territory numbered only approximately two and a half thousand and were scattered over several countries; and the fact that education for non-whites in Namibia was poor, so that a large proportion of those Namibians had received either an incomplete or a deficient education. The sponsors of the text adopted the previous year had had in mind a programme that would cover a period of years and would not necessarily have to become operative in every field of activity, since it could expand gradually in terms of quality and quantity. The programme outlined by the Secretary-General in his report included certain forms of assistance, such as an increase in the number of scholarship awards, which could be provided fairly rapidly, but also other forms of assistance, such as the establishment of an apprenticeship scheme, the formulation of a project for remedial education for Namibians over school age, and the possible establishment of a Namibian college of higher education, which required planning and would involve contractual arrangements over a period of some years.

8. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.997 reaffirmed the decision to establish a United Nations Fund for Namibia for the purpose of putting into effect the comprehensive programme of assistance described in the Secretary-General's report and, more specifically authorized the Secretary-General to implement the short-term measures in that programme. In operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution the Secretary-General was requested to undertake a study of the economic, social and cultural needs of Namibia so that there would be a contingency plan for co-ordinated international technical assistance, which could be put into effect when South Africa withdrew from Namibia. Naturally a plan drawn up without access to the Territory could not be conclusive but the United Nations should prepare itself for the responsibility it would assume when the Territory was *de facto* under United Nations control. In view of the very nature of the responsibilities of the United Nations with respect to Namibia, a decision on the extent and manner of financing of the Fund had been deferred until the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.997 had thoroughly discussed the matter and had concluded that it was advisable at that stage to postpone the final decision until the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. The reason for that decision had been a desire to exercise budgetary restraint, as the sponsors were acutely aware of the current financial plight of the United Nations.

9. In view of the pending studies and above all in the expectation that the United Nations would be in a better position to discharge its full responsibility to Namibia at the twenty-seventh session, the draft resolution called for the sum of \$50,000 to be appropriated from the regular budget. A similar sum had been granted the previous year to supplement existing programmes of assistance. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.997 would like to see the sum used not only for additional scholarships but also to cover the cost of an education expert and a labour expert to study and formulate programmes relating to apprenticeship and remedial education for students over school age. The Fund would also be opened to voluntary contributions from Governments, national organizations, and institutions of Member States. In operative paragraph 7 the Secretary-General was requested to implement the proposals and suggestions made in his report (A/8473) concerning the administration of the Fund. The draft resolution further stated that pending the entry into full operation of the comprehensive programme outlined in that report, Namibians should continue to have access to the existing programmes, which were the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. The implementation of the measures proposed in the Secretary-General's report would constitute a programme of action that would represent significant progress in carrying out the commitment to assist the people of Namibia towards their goal.

10. Mr. DE ROSENZWEIG DIAZ (Mexico) said that he agreed with the statement of the representative of Finland, whose delegation had been one of the sponsors of Security Council resolution 283 (1970), calling for the establishment of a United Nations Fund for Namibia. In his statement in the general debate on southern Africa (1929th meeting), he had stressed that the Advisory Opinion, since it declared that

the presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal, implied that the Council for Namibia should be considerably strengthened. The United Nations had the duty to assume the responsibilities of an administering Power in accordance with the Charter and to lead the people of Namibia to independence. The report of the Secretary-General contained explicit and appropriate provisions for the establishment of a Fund for Namibia which would provide short-term and medium-term financial assistance for education, and training, which were so necessary to enable the people of Namibia to take charge of their own destinies. He hoped that draft resolution A/C.4/L.997 would be unanimously adopted.

11. Mr. PANT (Nepal), speaking as a sponsor of the draft resolution, said that it was a logical sequel to General Assembly resolution 2679 (XXV) and to Security Council resolution 283 (1970), since the resolution would authorize the Secretary-General to implement the short-term and long-term measures contained in the comprehensive programme of assistance to Namibia outlined in his report. The establishment of the United Nations Fund for Namibia would not effect the other forms of assistance to Namibia, such as the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. He was aware of the difficult financial situation of the United Nations and of the private and public concern which had been expressed over that situation. But Namibia was the collective and direct responsibility of Member States and it was with a full sense of responsibility that the sponsors requested \$50,000 in operative paragraph 3 of their draft resolution. His Government's readiness to assume its share of that collective responsibility was shown by its support of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, which had ended the Mandate of South Africa over the Territory and had made Namibia the direct responsibility of the United Nations. It had also supported subsequent resolutions and had welcomed the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice calling upon the South African Government to leave Namibia immediately. It was regrettable that major Powers were resisting attempts to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia, as its illegal presence there constituted an act of aggression against the United Nations and consequently against all the Member States. He hoped that draft resolution A/C.4/L.997 would be unanimously adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 73

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (concluded) (A/8530, A/C.4/L.995)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded) (A/C.4/L.995)

12. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic and Senegal had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.995.

13. As the draft resolution was not controversial, he would take it, if there was no objection, that the Committee could proceed to adopt it.

14. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.995. The Soviet Union had provided and was continuing to provide broad assistance in training highly skilled personnel for the developing countries, and was also providing opportunities for inhabitants of colonial Territories to acquire an education in the USSR. In order to provide the most favourable conditions possible for educating foreign nationals, the Friendship University had been established in Moscow in 1960 and had been named after the hero of the Congolese people, Patrice Lumumba. Among the many thousands of foreign students studying at that university and at other educational establishments in the Soviet Union, there were 243 students from colonial Territories. Ninety-nine of them were inhabitants of Territories under Portuguese administration and 22 were from Southern Rhodesia. The Soviet Government not only granted the students scholarships but also paid foreign students' round-trip travel expenses. In the preceding six years alone the Friendship University had trained some 2,500 specialists, who were doing excellent work in their own countries. The Soviet Union would continue to give favourable consideration to applications for opportunities for inhabitants of colonial and dependent Territories to obtain an education.

15. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in view of the time factor, the Committee should vote on the non-controversial draft resolution forthwith.

16. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.4/L.995.

It was so decided.

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

17. The CHAIRMAN said that, as the Committee's report on item 73 would follow the established pattern, the Committee might wish to authorize the Rapporteur to submit it directly to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

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/8368, A/8369, A/8423 (part IV) and (part IV)/Add.1, A/8423/Add.5 (part I), A/8423/Add.5 (part II) and Add.5 (part II)/Corr.1, A/8423/Add.6 (parts I-III), A/8423/Add.7 (parts I-IV), A/C.4/L.996, A/C.4/L.1000)

CONSIDERATION OF A DRAFT CONSENSUS AND DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.996, A/C.4/L.1000)

Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (A/C.4/L.1000)

18. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) introduced the draft consensus (A/C.4/L.1000) relating to the negotiations concerning the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) between the United Kingdom and Argentina, countries with which Uruguay had long maintained friendly relations.

19. General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) empowered the United Nations to consider the problem of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). The General Assembly and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had considered the question thoroughly in 1964, and in 1965 the General Assembly had adopted resolution 2065 (XX) which was based on the reports, conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee. In that resolution the Assembly noted the existence of a dispute concerning sovereignty over those Islands and invited the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to proceed with negotiations with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem, requesting them to report to the Assembly at its twenty-first session on the results of the negotiations.
20. On 14 January 1966 the two Governments had issued a joint communiqué which stated that they had agreed to continue their negotiations, through diplomatic or other channels, with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem and preventing the question from affecting the excellent relations which had always existed between them. In August 1966 they had informed the Secretary-General of a further joint communiqué which expressed their desire to find a friendly and realistic solution. In the consensus adopted in 1966, 1967 and 1969 both parties had been urged to continue their efforts to reach, as soon as possible, a definitive solution of the dispute.
21. In November 1969 the Permanent Representatives of the two States to the United Nations had reaffirmed their faith in the procedure adopted and stated that they hoped to agree on practical measures concerning freedom of communications and movement in both directions between mainland Argentina and the Islands. The measures agreed on in the interests of the population of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) were reflected in documents A/8368 and A/8369 and in the annex to chapter XXV of the Special Committee's report (see A/8423/Add.7 (part IV)).
22. His delegation considered that the case of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) was an outstanding example of two countries complying with international law and showing mutual respect and understanding in the solution of their differences and was a credit to the United Nations. His delegation therefore suggested that the Fourth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft consensus (A/C.4/L.1000).
23. Mr. ALVARADO (Venezuela) said that it was a matter of particular concern to the people of Venezuela that the vestiges of colonialism in Latin America should be eliminated. One such case, involving territorial claims between countries which he esteemed highly, was the question of the legitimate aspirations of Argentina in respect of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).
24. In accordance with Latin America's traditional adherence to the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, Argentina had engaged in negotiations with the United Kingdom with a view to finding a definitive solution to the problem. His delegation was pleased to note that during the conversations held in 1971, the two countries had reached agreement on practical measures in the field of communications and movement of goods and persons between the mainland and the Islands. It was an important beginning in the process of eliminating the last vestiges of colonialism from American soil.
25. Argentina had demonstrated its faith in the United Nations by submitting information on the progress of the negotiations to the General Assembly and the Special Committee. It was to be hoped that the Organization would respond by adopting appropriate measures to deal with the situation. Accordingly, his delegation would support the draft consensus (A/C.4/L.1000). Furthermore, his delegation was sure that, in accordance with the provisions of the consensus, the representative of Argentina would keep the Special Committee informed on developments in the negotiations and of any other measures aimed at solving the problem to the satisfaction of all and in accordance with the terms of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).
26. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee might wish to adopt the draft consensus forthwith.
27. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Russian translation of the draft consensus was inadequate. It should be revised before the text of the consensus was included in the Committee's report.
28. Mr. SEVILLA BORJA (Ecuador) recalled the statements made by the representative of Argentina in the Special Committee and said that he found it regrettable that the representative of the United Kingdom had not seen fit to explain his position either in the Special Committee or in the Fourth Committee.
29. As the draft consensus had been circulated only recently, he would suggest that members should be given more time to consider it.
30. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the draft consensus was non-controversial and had received the approval of the parties concerned.
31. Mr. VENEGAS TAMAYO (Colombia) said that he was pleased that the United Kingdom and Argentina were endeavouring to find a peaceful solution to their dispute. His country believed that all disputes should be settled by peaceful means and accordingly supported the draft consensus. It therefore wished to appeal to the representative of Ecuador to withdraw his suggestion.
32. Mr. SEVILLA BORJA (Ecuador) said that, notwithstanding the fact that the parties concerned had given their approval to the draft consensus, it still had to be adopted by the Fourth Committee. He needed time to receive instructions from his Government.
33. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that although his delegation had no objections to the contents of the consensus, it considered that it would be unwise to adopt a text that had been circulated so recently. To ignore the 24-hour rule might set an undesirable precedent. Representatives who wished to do so should be given an opportunity to consult their Governments or heads of delegations.

34. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) suggested that, in view of the objections raised by the representatives of the Soviet Union and Ecuador, a decision on the draft consensus (A/C.4/L.1000) should be deferred until Monday, 13 December.

It was so decided.

Question of Spanish Sahara

35. Mr. ZENTAR (Morocco) said that Spanish Sahara was an integral part of Africa, situated between the Maghreb and Mauritania. Its 50,000 inhabitants were not distinguished from their neighbours by language, race, religion, traditions or aspirations. They had shared the vicissitudes of their history with their neighbours until the colonial régimes had established boundaries which appeared somewhat meaningless to a population which was used to trading freely in the immense desert.

36. At a time when former colonial Powers were showing a fruitful spirit of co-operation and turning towards the future, the existence of Spanish Sahara was an anachronism which had to be eliminated. The Spanish authorities knew that decolonization was a necessity of the times and had within the preceding decade taken many steps to strengthen their ties with the third world.

37. There were three prerequisites for any solution to the problem of Spanish Sahara. The first was an agreement between the countries concerned. Accordingly, President Ould Daddah of Mauritania, President Boumedienne of Algeria and King Hassan II of Morocco had, at a conference held at Nouadhibou, in Mauritania, decided to intensify co-operation with a view to accelerating the liberation of Spanish Sahara and had, to that end, established a co-ordination committee whose task was to review the process of decolonization. A second necessary condition was that the local inhabitants who would be called upon to exercise their right of self-determination should be consulted. In that connexion, General Assembly resolution 2711 (XXV) of 14 December 1970 had clearly reaffirmed the desire of the General Assembly to ensure that the administering Power implemented as soon as possible earlier resolutions which had called for a free democratic vote. The final condition necessary for decolonization was the complete and sincere co-operation of the administering Power with the Territory concerned, the United Nations and the local population.

38. It should not be beyond the ability of Spain to organize a census of the 50,000 or so inhabitants of Spanish Sahara. Their desire to be consulted was only natural and the United Nations had requested that a referendum should be held at the earliest possible date. Fortunately, the Governments of Spain and Morocco had resolved the issues which had divided them and their relations were marked by a spirit of co-operation. The Spanish Government had continued to keep the Moroccan Government informed of developments in the Territory and his delegation was convinced that the two Governments, in conjunction with the other interested parties, would soon be able to find a solution to the problem. In that spirit, his delegation reaffirmed its support for General Assembly resolution

2711 (XXV), which must continue to be the basis for any action on the question until complete decolonization was achieved.

39. His delegation requested that the item should be included in the agenda of the General Assembly at the following session.

40. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) said that his country's position on the question of decolonization was well known: it had consistently demonstrated its determination to consolidate its territorial integrity and to preserve its sovereignty, and its support for the liberation of peoples still under colonial domination.

41. His delegation had consistently expressed concern about the people and Territory of so-called Spanish Sahara. The orderly decolonization of the Territory, undertaken in conjunction with the neighbouring countries and the administering Power, would contribute to peace, stability and co-operation. In that connexion the Mauritanian Chief of State, in a statement at the 1877th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, at the twenty-fifth session, had referred to the constructive position adopted by Spain on the question of decolonization. It was therefore to be hoped that in that part of the Sahara still under colonial domination the administering Power would implement the provisions of the relevant decisions of the United Nations. In that spirit, the President of Mauritania had invited to his country King Hassan II of Morocco and President Boumedienne of Algeria to consider the question. His Government, in agreement with those of the neighbouring countries, had decided to do everything possible to ensure that the inhabitants of the Territory exercised their right of self-determination, in collaboration with the United Nations and the administering Power.

42. The Mauritanian Government, which had always maintained excellent relations with that of the administering Power, had every confidence in the Spanish people, with which it was bound by historic ties. His delegation had taken note with interest of the letter dated 22 November 1971 from the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and which was contained in annex II to chapter X of the Special Committee's report (see A/8423/Add.5 (part II) and Add.5 (part II)/Corr.1)). It appeared from that letter that the preparations for the census in the Territory had taken some time because of the nomadic nature of the population. Mauritania, whose population was also largely nomadic, experienced the same difficulties and could appreciate the reason for the delay. The letter from the Permanent Representative of Spain also appropriately referred to the indigenous peoples of the Sahara, who were the only ones concerned with the implementation of the principle of self-determination.

43. In agreement with the other countries concerned, his delegation had decided that no draft resolution on the question should be submitted at the current session, thereby displaying its confidence that the administering Power would begin the process of the decolonization of the Territory as soon as possible. He requested that the item should be included in the agenda of the General Assembly at the following session.

44. Any form of colonization was anachronistic in the modern world, for no people could tolerate foreign domination indefinitely. Consequently, the time had come for the administering Power to enter into consultations with a view to ensuring the implementation of the principle of self-determination for the peoples of so-called Spanish Sahara in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

45. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria), noting that he spoke as a representative of a country which was interested in a settlement of the question of Spanish Sahara, said that in resolution 2711 (XXV) the General Assembly had invited the administering Power to determine at the earliest possible date, in conformity with the aspirations of the indigenous people of the Territory and in consultation with the Governments of Mauritania and Morocco and any other interested party, the procedures for the holding of a referendum under United Nations auspices. In 1970, representatives of Mauritania, Morocco and Algeria had met in Mauritania and had reaffirmed their desire to contribute to the efforts of the international community to bring about the emancipation of the Territory. Such a step symbolized the co-operation which could develop between the three countries of the Maghreb and Spain, with which the countries of north-west Africa had maintained good relations for centuries. The negotiations being held in Spanish Sahara with a view to the implementation of resolution 2711 (XXV) were based on the desire of the Spanish Government to do everything possible to ensure that the indigenous people of the Territory expressed their will freely. For that reason, his delegation requested that consideration of the question should be deferred until the following session.

46. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) said that he had been particularly pleased with the tone of the statements made by the three previous speakers. He wished to assure them that their statements would be transmitted to the Spanish Government for careful consideration.

47. As he had stated in his letter of 22 November addressed to the Secretary-General, the census operations had progressed well despite the technical difficulties involved. The Territory's population was approximately 56,000. He reaffirmed his Government's position that when that population asked to exercise the right to self-determination the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory and they alone would be able to exercise that right. His Government was opposed to the system of transplanting populations and consequently only the indigenous inhabitants of Spanish Sahara would be entitled to express their wishes. At that time, in keeping with the position previously stated by the Spanish Government, the United Nations would be invited to be present at the consultation.

48. He reaffirmed the Spanish Government's spirit of co-operation, which had been demonstrated by the recent journeys made by Spain's Minister for Foreign Affairs to the countries of north-west Africa.

49. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in the light of the foregoing statements on developments in the Territory and taking into account the relevant chapter of the report of the Special Committee, it might be desirable to defer

consideration of the question of Spanish Sahara until the twenty-seventh session, when the Fourth Committee would also have before it the most recent report of the Special Committee on the Territory. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee recommended to the General Assembly that consideration of the question of Spanish Sahara should be deferred until the twenty-seventh session.

It was so decided.

Question of the Seychelles (A/C.4/L.996)

50. The CHAIRMAN announced that Nigeria and the Sudan had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.996.

51. Mr. MWASAKAFYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/L.996, noted that the Chief Minister of the Seychelles, Mr. Mancham, in his statement in the Committee (1927th meeting), had said that he would welcome a United Nations visiting mission and a referendum on the future status of the Territory held under United Nations auspices. Since commitments of that nature should not be regarded as routine matters, the sponsors were submitting a separate draft resolution on the question of the Seychelles. They were convinced that only through a separate resolution could the Committee show appreciation of Mr. Mancham's commitment and respect for him as the Chief Minister of the Seychelles.

52. The purpose of draft resolution A/C.4/L.996 was to request that a United Nations mission be sent to the Seychelles pursuant to the commitment made by the Chief Minister. Since the success of such a mission would depend on the willingness of the administering Power to admit it, the sponsors had made a specific request to that effect in operative paragraph 2. Nothing in that paragraph was inconsistent with the commitment made by the Chief Minister. Operative paragraph 3 dealt with routine matters.

53. The draft resolution represented a response to statements made by the Chief Minister. It was very straightforward and contained no condemnation or reference to military activities. He therefore hoped that the administering Power would co-operate in allowing a United Nations mission to visit the Seychelles.

AGENDA ITEM 65

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations (continued) (A/8423/Add.8/Rev.1, A/8520 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.4/L.998)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.998)

54. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Sudan had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.998.

55. Mr. BICAMUMPAKA (Rwanda) introduced draft resolution A/C.4/L.998 and noted that it raised no major problem of substance or procedure. The preambular para-

graphs, which referred to earlier relevant resolutions and documents, should not give rise to any particular difficulty because they contained nothing new. He hoped that delegations would have no difficulty in endorsing the chapter of the report of the Special Committee referred to in operative paragraph 1. Operative paragraph 2 referred to those administering Powers which in various ways had failed to comply with Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations thereby delaying the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Operative paragraph 3 referred to the particular case of Portugal, which had consistently regarded its

colonies as part of its metropolitan territory and had never transmitted information under article 73 e. The sponsors therefore felt obliged to condemn the Government of Portugal for its attitude. It seemed appropriate to reaffirm the principle referred to in operative paragraph 4 since some countries appeared to be unaware of it. Operative paragraph 5 expressed the general aims of the draft resolution. He commended draft resolution A/C.4/L.998 to the Committee for its serious consideration.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.