

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1583rd  
MEETING**

Friday 10 December 1965,  
at 11 a.m.



**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 23:</i>	
<i>Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: reports of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: A/5800/Rev.1, chapters VII, IX, X and XIII-XXVI; A/6000/Rev.1, chapters IX-XXV (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (concluded). . . . .</i>	427

*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.809/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.4/L.817 and Add.1-3)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (concluded) (A/C.4/L.809/REV.1 AND ADD.1 AND 2, A/C.4/L.817 AND ADD.1-3)

1. Mr. CARRANCO AVILA (Mexico) said that he would like to suggest in a spirit of positive co-operation that the Chairman, speaking in the name of the Committee, should make a statement for inclusion in the report of the Committee to the General Assembly, according to which the Committee would at that stage of its deliberations take note of the discussions taking place between the Governments of the United Kingdom, Venezuela and British Guiana in continuation of those held in 1962. Those conversations were in accordance with the statement made at the seventeenth session by the Chairman of the Special Political Committee (A/5313, l/ para.4), of which the General Assembly took note at its 1191st plenary meeting.

2. He hoped that the draft resolution on British Guiana (A/C.4/L.809/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2) would be adopted without opposition, and thus give an

\*Resumed from the 1578th meeting.

l/ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 88.

idea of the enthusiasm with which the Committee welcomed the accession of British Guiana to independence.

3. The CHAIRMAN made the following statement:

"At this stage of our deliberations, we should like to take note of the discussions which are now taking place between the Governments of the United Kingdom, Venezuela and British Guiana, and which are a continuation of those agreed upon in 1962. These discussions are in accordance with the statement of the Chairman of the Special Political Committee contained in document A/5313, which the General Assembly took note of at its 1191st plenary meeting."

4. Mr. MARQUES SERE (Uruguay) said that his vote on the draft resolution would depend on what would be decided. In his opinion the statement just read by the Chairman was of great importance, not only on account of the authority attaching to the Chair, but also because it was the result of consultations that had taken place recently between the delegations. There could be no doubt that it would influence the vote which the Committee was about to take. He proposed that the declaration should be included in extenso in the report of the Committee to the General Assembly.

5. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) said that his vote on the draft resolution would in no way change the traditional attitude of his country with regard to the right of peoples to self-determination and independence. It was well known that during the twenty years of the United Nations' existence Venezuela had supported not only by words but also by its votes the cause of many colonial Territories, many of which had since taken their place in the international community. Venezuela had always supported the right of British Guiana to independence and had never demanded as a preliminary condition to that independence the settlement of its claims to that part of its territory which had become the subject of negotiations between the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom and Venezuela and the Premier of British Guiana.

6. On the other hand, Venezuela was determined to maintain its claims to what it considered its inalienable and infeasible right. That determination of the Venezuelan Government had been explained clearly before various United Nations bodies and the conversations that were taking place in London constituted one of the stages in the procedure approved by the Special Political Committee and of which the General Assembly had taken note at its 1191st plenary meeting.

7. The Venezuelan delegation had expected, therefore, that due account should be taken of its Government's claims in the draft resolution on British Guiana. Since that was not the case it would not be in a position to support draft resolution A/C.4/L.809/Rev.1 and Add.1-3. It had intended to vote against the draft, but in view of the statement made by the Chairman it would abstain. It requested that the Chairman's statement should be reproduced in full in the Committee's report to the General Assembly, which would thus take note thereof, and it requested that the vote on the draft resolution should be taken by roll-call.

8. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, as suggested by the representative of Mexico, the Rapporteur should be requested to insert the full text of the statement he had made in the name of the Committee in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

*It was so decided.*

9. Mr. SHAMMOUT (Yemen) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution on British Guiana. That did not signify that it failed to appreciate Venezuela's claims; it would have supported the Venezuelan suggestion to insert a relevant paragraph in the draft resolution. The negotiations which had taken place between the United Kingdom and Venezuela in 1962 and those at present in progress in London showed that the United Kingdom recognized those claims. Nevertheless, those claims should not be allowed to become an obstacle to the independence of British Guiana. That was also the opinion of the Venezuelan delegation, whose liberal attitude towards colonial problems was well known.

10. Mr. BROWN (United Kingdom) reminded the Venezuelan representative, in reply to his observations, that the United Kingdom delegation had clearly expressed its views on the same subject in the statement it had made at the 1577th meeting.

11. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) said that his country was not directly concerned in the dispute between the United Kingdom and Venezuela with reference to the rights which the latter had inherited from Spain, his delegation noted that negotiations were taking place between the Governments of the United Kingdom, Venezuela and British Guiana and it would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. It would, however, like it to be understood that such abstention should not be considered an objection to the accession of British Guiana to independence.

12. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that his delegation welcomed the coming accession of British Guiana to independence, all the more so as it was a country of the Latin American continent. It regretted that it would not be able to support the draft resolution before the Committee, although it approved the substance of it and the facts it mentioned. But the sponsors had omitted to give due place to the Venezuelan claims; that was a serious omission which derogated from the principle to which the Latin American countries attached the greatest importance. On account of that omission the Peruvian delegation would be obliged to abstain in the vote. That abstention did not signify a reservation regarding the future independence of British Guiana.

13. Mr. DE CASTRO (Philippines) said that the accession of British Guiana to independence and the dispute between Venezuela and the United Kingdom were two separate matters. He would vote for the draft resolution as a whole, for it was related to decolonization, and he was glad that British Guiana was approaching the date of its independence. He pointed out that his vote should not be deemed to prejudice the settlement of the issue between Venezuela and the United Kingdom.

14. Mr. REDONDO GOMEZ (Costa Rica) said that he would have liked to see a paragraph inserted in the preamble of the draft resolution on British Guiana mentioning the dispute between the United Kingdom and Venezuela, especially since Venezuela, faithful to the American tradition of peace and justice, only sought a settlement in accordance with international law. Such a mention would not have added a new element and would merely have noted the existence of the dispute with complete objectivity. In view of that omission, the Costa Rican delegation would abstain from voting, but that would not constitute a reservation concerning the accession to independence of British Guiana, whose admission to the international Organization it would welcome with enthusiasm.

15. Mr. ROMAN (Nicaragua) said that although his delegation fully supported the right of their brethren, the people of British Guiana, to self-determination and independence, it would be obliged to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution under discussion. It would have asked that it should be adopted by acclamation if the sponsors had not omitted to mention the dispute between Venezuela and the United Kingdom. In his opinion the vote of Venezuela would have constituted an element likely to facilitate the settlement of the dispute between Venezuela and the future independent Guiana if it was not settled before May 1966.

16. Mr. HERRAN MEDINA (Colombia) said that his delegation, like the other Latin American delegations, greeted with joy the coming accession to independence of British Guiana, which the Colombian Government, faithful to its tradition, had always supported. He regretted, however, that the draft resolution did not mention the Venezuelan claims and the conversations which had taken place in 1962, and were being continued, between the Governments of Venezuela, the United Kingdom and British Guiana, and which had been duly noted by the General Assembly. The Colombian delegation would therefore be obliged to abstain during the vote.

17. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) said that he would have liked the sponsors to include a mention of the London negotiations, but thanks to the Chairman's statement his delegation would be able to vote for the draft resolution.

18. Mr. GIMENEZ MELO (Argentina) said that his Government, which had always upheld the cause of the independence of the colonial countries, welcomed the coming independence of British Guiana, with which it hoped to maintain even closer relations than in the past.

19. According to the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, the General Assembly was desirous of ensuring that British Guiana achieved independence under the most favourable conditions; in that connexion he recalled that, mindful of the fact that the conditions consequent upon colonialism could be a source of disputes between neighbouring countries, the Argentine delegation had itself intervened to request that the Special Political Committee should take account of the territorial issue between Venezuela and the United Kingdom. That conflict was now recognized by the United Nations as could be seen in the statement of the Chairman of the Special Political Committee at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, concerning the negotiations between the Governments of Venezuela, the United Kingdom and British Guiana (A/5313, para. 4). Those negotiations did not in any way constitute a preliminary condition for the independence of British Guiana, and the Argentine delegation would have liked them to be mentioned in the draft resolution, so that the event could take place under the most favourable conditions. As that had not been done the Argentine delegation would be obliged to abstain in the vote, it being understood that the abstention should not be interpreted as an objection to the independence of the Territory.

20. Mr. LICHTVELD (Netherlands) would vote for the draft resolution. He was glad that recent events were bringing the issue to a happy ending. However, Venezuela had brought up a bilateral question about the delimitation of its border with British Guiana and had said that the draft resolution must be considered without prejudice to Venezuelan territorial claims. As there was also a controversy about the border of British Guiana with another of its neighbours, Surinam, one of the three autonomous partners in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, he wished to recall that the Netherlands, and especially Surinam, were in the midst of consultations and negotiations with the United Kingdom and British Guiana in order to settle the matter in a friendly and equitable way.

21. The Netherlands therefore wished to put on record that its endorsement of the draft resolution in no way prejudiced its rights and claims regarding the delimitation of the border between Surinam and Guiana.

22. Mr. LEBRON PUMAROL (Dominican Republic) said that he would abstain in the vote because failure to take account of Venezuela's claims amounted to slighting that country's rights. His abstention must not, however, be taken to indicate any objection to British Guiana's independence, which his delegation would heartily welcome.

23. Mr. JARA RECALDE (Paraguay) welcomed British Guiana's coming independence, but regretted that the draft resolution took no account of Venezuelan claims. For that reason he would have to abstain in the vote.

24. Mr. MIXCO FISCHNALER (El Salvador) would abstain in the vote because of the negotiations on Venezuelan territorial claims under way in London. His abstention should not be interpreted as an objection to the independence of British Guiana, which his

country would gladly see swelling the ranks of the Latin American nations in the Organizations.

25. Mr. SAO (Cameroon) would vote for the draft resolution, but recognized at the same time that there was a dispute between the United Kingdom and Venezuela. He was sure that British Guiana's accession to independence would have no effect on the nature of the dispute and his vote should not be construed as taking sides with one party or the other.

26. Mr. SCOTT MURGA (Bolivia) said that Bolivia, faithful to its anti-colonialist tradition, would vote for the draft resolution. It regretted, however, that the resolution ignored Venezuela's rights and hoped that the existing dispute would be settled at the opportune moment to the satisfaction of all concerned.

27. Mr. SABO (Niger) thought that the French text of operative paragraph 3 should be modified so that the word "political" would govern both "prisoners" and "detainees".

28. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.809/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2 separately, and then on the draft resolution as a whole.

*Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 67 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Venezuela, the vote on the draft resolution as a whole was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia.

*Draft resolution A/C.4/L.809/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2, as a whole was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.*

29. Miss DE VINCENZI (Brazil) explained that her delegation had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because it had always been in favour of independence for British Guiana. It had, however, abstained in the vote on paragraph 3 because that related to domestic policy, which was the concern of the Guianan Government alone.

30. Sir Ellis CLARKE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that he was especially pleased that British Guiana was to accede to independence, in view of the fraternal ties that bound his compatriots to the Guianan people. It was to be hoped that the independence would be genuine, not merely a severing of the formal constitutional knot which had subjected Guiana to an administering Power, but such an independence as would enable the new State to dispense with reliance on outside forces that supported one group of Guianans against another, for not necessarily disinterested reasons.

31. In 1964 the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago had suggested a United Nations presence in Guiana for the purpose of fulfilling the wishes expressed in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. Unfortunately the suggestion had not been taken up and there had been introduced in British Guiana a system of proportional representation which could only be a further divisive factor in a multiracial society.

32. Trinidad and Tobago sincerely hoped that the Guianan people would not be penalized for the injustice done to them twelve years before, when their Constitution had been revoked at a time when they had already traversed most of the difficult road to independence.

33. Mr. MARQUES SERE (Uruguay) said that all Latin American countries would be glad to see another part of the American continent liberated on 26 May 1966. Uruguay had voted for the draft resolution, although it would have liked to see a formula recognizing the existence of a territorial dispute inserted in the text. The Chairman's statement had filled the gap in part, but it must be admitted that a problem did not disappear simply because it was not mentioned. The Latin American countries had wanted merely to point out the existence of a dispute to be settled by peaceful means, without prejudice to the result of the tripartite conversations in progress or to the merits of the parties' arguments.

34. Mr. HAIASZ (Canada) said that his delegation had noted with satisfaction that the London constitutional conference had set an early date for the accession of British Guiana to independence and had voted for the draft resolution as a whole. It had, however, had reservations about operative paragraphs 1 and 3, since the state of emergency had been declared in May 1964 at the request of a freely elected Government and had remained in force as the result of a vote in the House of Assembly of British Guiana, which alone had the power to determine the matter. Moreover, it was understood that a large proportion of the persons who had been detained when the state of emergency was declared had since been released. The General Assembly should not recommend any measure which might disturb the transition period.

35. Mr. LORCA (Chile) had voted for the draft resolution because his country was always in favour of decolonization of colonial Territories. He had done so, however, on the understanding that the tripartite conversations in progress would continue and that his vote would not be interpreted as a failure to recognize that a territorial dispute existed. If the negotiations in progress were not concluded by 26 May 1966, the Government of independent Guyana should carry on with them.

36. Mr. O'HARA (United States of America) had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole and on operative paragraphs 1 and 3. Paragraph 1 endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, with some of which the United States did not agree. Paragraph 3 requested the administering Power to take steps which were no longer within its competence, but within that of the Guianan Government. The United States was glad to note that the date for accession of the Territory to independence was mentioned in paragraph 5. It regretted, however, that in the same paragraph the sponsors should have thought fit to request the administering Power not to take any action which might delay independence. They had no reason to doubt the United Kingdom Government's intentions.

37. Mr. ORANTES LUNA (Guatemala) said that his country was devoted to the principle of liberation of colonial countries and peoples, but had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because it made no mention of the territorial dispute between British Guiana and Venezuela, a question which his delegation felt came under operative paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). It had also been guided in the matter by the motion adopted in Washington in 1964 by the First Special Inter-American Conference and providing that the Organization of American States (OAS) would not decide on a request for admission from a political entity whose territory was the subject of a dispute between a member of the OAS and a country outside the American continent until the dispute had been settled by peaceful means.

38. Mr. GASCHIGNARD (France) said that, notwithstanding its abstention on the draft resolution, his delegation was delighted with the progress of British Guiana toward independence and noted with satisfaction that an early date had been set for its accession to full national sovereignty. It hoped that the last steps would be taken in a spirit of untroubled good feeling and, finally, that the discussions mentioned in the Chairman's statement would result in a settlement of the difficulties, to which the Guatemalan representative had referred, to the satisfaction of those concerned.

39. Mr. ROSSI (Italy) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained from voting on paragraph 3 because, in its opinion, only the governing authorities responsible for the Territory's security were in a position to decide for or against ending the state of emergency. He joined in the appeal addressed to the Guianese leaders to forget their differences, and in

that addressed to the various ethnic communities to overcome their prejudices, and to work together to achieve national unity.

40. The vote cast by his delegation should not be taken to imply any particular position on the substance of the question raised by the representative of Venezuela. The draft resolution did nothing to change the facts of the territorial dispute and had no effect on any rights which Venezuela might possess.

41. Mr. RAKOTONIAINA (Madagascar) said that his delegation, true to its tradition of aid to nations still in subjection, had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, its vote should not be construed as prejudging the question of Venezuela's territorial claim. His delegation hoped that the talks in progress would make it possible to settle that question to everyone's satisfaction.

42. Mr. FORTIN PINEL (Honduras) explained that, although his country was glad that British Guiana was to attain independence in the near future, his delegation had had to abstain from voting because the text proposed made no reference to the tripartite discussions now taking place in London.

43. Mr. DE LA GUARDIA (Panama) said that, although his delegation welcomed the forthcoming attainment of independence by British Guiana, it had been obliged to abstain from voting because it feared that unless the territorial dispute between Guiana and Venezuela was settled, it might create serious difficulties for the new State.

44. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana) considered that the draft resolution just approved marked an important stage in the United Nations task of decolonization. The sponsors of the draft resolution had had no intention of passing judgement on the validity of Venezuela's territorial claim. The two questions were entirely separate. He hoped that the current negotiations in London would be successful. He was glad the Committee had been able to accept the Chairman's statement as a compromise between the sponsors' views and those of delegations which would have liked to see the text worded differently. He thanked all those delegations which had voted in favour of the draft resolution, and particularly those delegations of Latin American countries which had done so in spite of their reservations. He wished the people of the future independent Guyana happiness and prosperity.

45. Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India) expressed disappointment that, although the Committee had given its approval to the Mexican proposal, which was the result of a hard-won compromise, some delegations had found it necessary to abstain from voting on the draft resolution. He expressed appreciation to those Latin American countries which had voted in favour of the text.

46. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to turn its attention to draft resolution A/C.4/L.817 and Add.1-3, concerning Ifni and Spanish Sahara.

47. Miss IMRU (Ethiopia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, announced that the words "the progress of" should be deleted from operative paragraph 3.

48. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) emphasized that the two Territories referred to in the draft resolution were geographically different and separate from each other, and that there was no connexion between them.

49. His delegation reiterated that Spain was engaged in preparatory work in the two Territories which would make it possible to apply the decolonization policy of the United Nations to them. No one could suspect the intentions of Spain, which had in its own territory a colonial problem that it hoped to see solved in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations. Spain did not ask for anything that Spain itself was not prepared to give, and could not be required to give anything that Spain itself was denied.

50. At the 1318th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, held at the nineteenth session, the Permanent Representative of Spain had given assurances about his country's attitude towards the resolutions of the Special Committee concerning Equatorial Guinea, Ifni and Spanish Sahara, and had affirmed that Spain was working towards the establishment of the minimum conditions essential for the achievement of satisfactory results.

51. On 16 October 1964 the Special Committee had adopted a resolution on Ifni and Spanish Sahara (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. IX, para. 112). The Special Committee had debated the problem at length and, in the course of its discussions, the representative of Spain had explained his country's views and reaffirmed its rights. The problem had previously been discussed in the Special Committee in 1963 (see A/5446/Rev.1, chap. XIII).

52. When the Fourth Committee had examined conditions in the two Territories at the present session, the representative of Morocco had made some reservations (1550th meeting), to which the Spanish delegation had responded with the customary counter-reservations. The Mauritanian delegation had also made some reservations concerning the Sahara (1552nd meeting), which had similarly met with counter-reservations from the Spanish delegation. The representatives of Morocco and Mauritania had subsequently made further statements, on various occasions, concerning what they considered to be their countries' rights. In his delegation's view, however, their main purpose had been to place their interests on record, not to have the Committee go into the question in detail. The Chairman had been willing to set a date for a discussion of the problem, but the delegations of Tanzania and Liberia had felt that such a discussion would serve no purpose and had requested that the views of those concerned should merely be stated in the record. Accordingly the Spanish delegation had preferred to keep silent and had accepted the Committee's conclusion not to embark on such a discussion.

53. However, the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.4/L.817 and Add.1-3) did more than simply reiterate the conclusions of the Special Committee. Its sponsors had seen fit to request, in operative paragraph 2, negotiations on the problems relating to sovereignty presented by the two Territories. After considering the question of Ifni and Spanish Sahara at its 1963 and 1964 sessions, the

Special Committee had adopted the resolution concerning them by 20 votes to none, with 3 abstentions. The Spanish delegation considered that the Fourth Committee should confine itself to endorsing the decisions of the Special Committee, for it had not had an opportunity to debate the question thoroughly enough.

54. In view of the tenor of operative paragraph 2, his delegation asked that it should be deleted or, failing that, put to the vote separately.

55. Mr. MARQUES SERE (Uruguay) observed that the first provision in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution dealt with the colonial aspect of the problem, on which the Fourth Committee was perfectly competent to take a decision. He asked whether the representative of Spain would be satisfied with a separate vote on the phrase: "and, to this end, to enter into negotiations on the problems relating to sovereignty presented by these two Territories".

56. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) accepted the suggestion made by the representative of Uruguay.

57. Mr. FALL (Senegal) thought that the Committee might try to adopt a procedure similar to that followed in the case of British Guiana. The reservations made by the delegations of Spain and Uruguay might be stated in the summary record of the meeting and the draft resolution put to the vote as a whole, without a separate vote on the second part of operative paragraph 2. He hoped that Spain, which showed an exemplary spirit of co-operation in matters of decolonization, would agree to that procedure.

58. Mr. REDONDO GOMEZ (Costa Rica) said that he did not wish to start a long discussion but considered that the Committee should adopt a conciliatory attitude and take into account the views of the parties involved in the problem under discussion. Spain was perfectly entitled to ask for a separate vote on any part of the draft resolution, and should be granted that elementary right.

59. Mr. DIABATE (Guinea) associated himself with the appeal made to Spain by the representative of Senegal.

60. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) said that, to his regret, he could not comply with the request made to him. Spain's position with regard to Ifni and Spanish Sahara was not at all the same as Venezuela's position with regard to British Guiana, and the two problems could not be given parallel treatment.

61. His delegation pressed for a separate vote on the second part of operative paragraph 2.

62. Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India) said that the very reason why his delegation was not among the sponsors of the draft resolution was that the second part of operative paragraph 2 went beyond the conclusions reached by the Special Committee. If that part of the draft resolution was put to the vote separately, as requested by the representatives of Spain and Uruguay, the Indian delegation would abstain.

63. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the part of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution

(A/C.4/L.817 and Add.1-3) consisting of the words "and, to this end, to enter into negotiations on the problems relating to sovereignty presented by these two Territories".

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Chad, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Cameroon.

*Against:* Portugal, Spain.

*Abstaining:* Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Ceylon.

*The words in question were adopted by 35 votes to 2, with 55 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 2 as a whole was adopted by 79 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

64. The CHAIRMAN, put draft resolution A/C.4/L.817 and Add.1-3 as a whole to the vote.

*At the request of the Yemeni representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru,

Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone.

*Against:* Spain, Portugal.

*Abstaining:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, El Salvador, France.

*Draft resolution A/C.4/L.817 and Add.1-3 as a whole was adopted by 88 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

65. Mr. MISKE (Mauritania) said that he agreed with the Spanish representative's view that the Territories of Ifni and Spanish Sahara were completely different and that the sole link between them was the fact that they were under the same administering Power. The fact that they were dealt with in a single resolution did not, however, prejudice the nature of their situation in any way; it had happened in the past that the Committee had grouped in a single resolution Territories which were not similar even in that respect.

66. His delegation considered that it would indeed be unjust to ask more of Spain than was granted to it in the cases in which it was itself concerned. In the draft resolution concerning Gibraltar (A/C.4/L.814/Rev.1 and Add.1), on which his delegation had cast an affirmative vote, the sponsors had called for precisely the same type of negotiations as those which Spain had not wanted mentioned in the present draft resolution.

67. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.817 and Add.1-3, which made no discourteous reference to Spain, and it was in a position to state that the Government of Mauritania was prepared to begin negotiations with Spain at once with a view to finding ways that would make it possible to return to Mauritania a part of its territory which was still under Spanish administration. That assurance had been confirmed by the statement made by the Mauritanian Head of State on 28 November 1965 on the occasion of the anniversary of Mauritania's independence, in which he had mentioned the excellent relations between Mauritania and Spain and the hopes he placed in Spanish investment, particularly in the fishing industry.

68. His delegation was glad that the Committee had pronounced itself in favour of negotiations; it hoped that the Spanish Government would take proper note of that fact and that friendly and frank discussions could be undertaken at an early date.

69. His delegation reserved the right to speak again on the subject if it thought that necessary.

70. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that his delegation had given much thought to the draft resolution just approved. In recent years there had been great advances in the political and constitutional field in some of the Territories under Spanish administration, and the United Nations should recognize that fact openly. It was because no proper recognition had been given that his delegation had in the past abstained in the vote on certain resolutions on the

Territories under Spanish administration in the Special Committee.

71. His delegation noted that among the sponsors of the draft resolution just approved were countries situated fairly close to Ifni and Spanish Sahara, which therefore had a special interest in developments in those Territories.

72. His delegation had already expressed its view with regard to the competence of the Committee in matters of sovereignty several times: the Committee should deal with problems of decolonization, self-determination and related matters but not with questions of sovereignty over disputed areas. In spite of those reservations, his delegation considered that the draft resolution just approved offered some hope of settling the questions under consideration. In its view, the reference to problems relating to sovereignty should be interpreted as meaning that discussions should be undertaken between the parties to the territorial dispute as a preliminary to clearing away certain obstacles that could retard the process of ascertaining the people's aspirations. Through those discussions, a way might be found to enable those concerned to make their wishes known; that was why his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

73. Mr. NATWAR SINGH (India) recalled that in the Special Committee his delegation had been one of the sponsors of a draft resolution whose operative paragraph 2 corresponded to the first part of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.817 and Add.1-3. His delegation's reason for abstaining in the vote on the last part of operative paragraph 2 of the latter text was that it included some new elements which went beyond the text adopted by the Special Committee (A/5800/Rev.1, chap. IX, para. 112) and did not relate to the application of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

74. His delegation hoped that the adoption of the second part of operative paragraph 2 would not delay the accession of the Territories to independence.

75. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco), replying to the statement of the Spanish representative, said that the Moroccan territories now administered by Spain had always been under the same colonial administration. The statement that there was no link between them could not imply that the fate of the two could be kept separate. At the time of the Spanish colonization a part of Morocco's national territory that had belonged to it for more than a thousand years had been occupied. The process of decolonization should be completed by the return of that territory to the Moroccan homeland. In his view, that was the sense in which the draft resolution just approved should be put into effect.

76. Mr. ADAN (Somalia) asked that the fact that his delegation had not participated in the vote should be noted. It would explain its position at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.