United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TWENTY-SECOND SESSION
Official Records

FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1750th MEETING

Thursday, 14 December 1967, at 4.5 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 23:
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: Territories not considered separately (continued)
General debate and consideration of draft resolutions (continued) 501

Agenda item 13:
Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)
Question of Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea and consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.886 (concluded) 505
Composition of the Trusteeship Council 510

Chairman: Mr. George J. TOMEH (Syria).

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: 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: Territories not considered separately (continued) (A/6661, A/6662, A/6700/Rev.1, chaps. VIII-XII and XIV-XXIII; A/6802, A/6845, A/6876, A/6882, A/C.4/L.876 and Add.1-6, A/C.4/L.877, A/C.4/L.884, A/C.4/L.887, A/C.4/L.888)

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued) (A/C.4/L.876 AND ADD.1-6, A/C.4/L.877, A/C.4/L.884)

1. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syria) said that the question of Gibraltar was part of the legacy of an era based on the rule of force. The United Nations had been founded in the aftermath of the defeat of the proponents of the rule of force by the proponents of the rule of law and had thus repudiated colonialism and the extension of frontiers by force, substituting the principle of equal sovereignty and partnership and co-operation in international relations.

2. Gibraltar had been occupied by force and the 6,000 inhabitants who had survived the battle had been driven out and had taken refuge in San Roque, within sight of their city occupied by foreign troops. That episode was at the root of the problem of Gibraltar and its relevance should not be questioned because of the passage of time.

3. There were four main factors relating to the problem which should not be ignored: first, sovereignty over the Rock of Gibraltar; secondly, the inherent rights of the Spanish inhabitants who had been displaced and their successors; thirdly, the status of the inhabitants who had settled in Gibraltar; fourthly, the subsequent expansion of the British occupation to adjacent territory. The problem thus involved territorial, human and legal considerations which were the essence of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and which should guide the Committee.

4. The United Kingdom's claim to sovereignty over Gibraltar was based on the Treaty of Utrecht, yet that Treaty ceded the property without any territorial jurisdiction. It was clear that the transaction was only a rent-free lease of a portion of Spanish territory, especially since another clause of the Treaty stated that if Great Britain decided to grant, sell, or by any means alienate the property of the town of Gibraltar, preference should be given to Spain. The property could not, therefore, be sold or leased except with the approval of the party vested with sovereignty over it, namely Spain. Decolonization of the Territory would mean the end of the British occupation. Sovereignty, which had been forcibly suspended but not alienated, would be resumed by Spain.

5. Of the 6,000 Spanish inhabitants at the time of the British occupation, only Juan Romero de Figueroa, Vicar of the Church of St. Mary, had remained and his act of courage had achieved immortality through a poem he had written on the tragedy. While the inhabitants who had been driven out had waited for the liberation of their city, they had built a town at San Roque which used the city arms of Gibraltar with the caption "The most loyal city of San Roque in which resides that of Gibraltar". San Roque still remained as a symbol of the strong attachment of the displaced inhabitants to their land. Their city had been usurped by force, but they still retained their inalienable right to their property. There was no document which made final the alienation of the land or of the people. The descendants of the rightful inhabitants now numbered about 50,000, scattered around Gibraltar. The Spanish workers who contributed daily to the welfare of Gibraltar were their successors; they were not ordinary commuters, but had an inseparable link with the land of their ancestors. Yet the administering Power referred to them as foreigners to Gibraltar and would not allow their voice to be heard on the question of Gibraltar's future.

6. The opportunities offered by a free port, which Gibraltar had been proclaimed by the Queen of England, and by the presence of the military base had attracted settlers of various origins. They had at first formed a merchant class, but during the nine-

teenth century a privileged class had emerged. It was only human to be guided by motives of opportunity and commerce, but the new inhabitants had had a nostalgia for their original roots rather than a sense of allegiance to their new land, 70 per cent of which was under military jurisdiction. Gibraltar was a colony and there was no Gibraltarian nationality, only residence, and even the right of residence was restricted by law to the loyal subjects of the Crown, being granted by the Governor, who represented the Crown. Thus the sons of the original inhabitants of Gibraltar, loyal as they had remained to their identity, found themselves called foreigners, and the Spanish workers in Gibraltar were not allowed to stay overnight lest they should claim the right to be registered as residents. Those who were thus described as foreigners were, in fact, the indigenous inhabitants.

7. Spain had protested about the extension of the British occupation into the adjacent isthmus and the area of the military airport, but instead of replying the administering Power invoked Spain's past tolerance over the construction of the military airport. Spain had indeed tolerated the construction of the airport at a time when the survival of the United Kingdom had been at stake. It had done so as an act of sympathy and courtesy, which should normally meet with gratitude, but the United Kingdom construed that act as a permanent concession, an act of cession of a portion of the territory of a sovereign State. The administering Power tried to conceal its encroachment upon Spanish sovereignty by suggesting that the question should be referred to the International Court of Justice. Yet such an encroachment upon Spanish sovereignty, which stemmed from the existence of a colonial situation, was not a case of legal litigation with which the International Court was competent to deal, but an illegal act prohibited by the United Nations Charter.

8. The Special Committee, the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly had recognized the complexity of the problem and had tried to maintain a balance among the various factors involved. If the principle of self-determination alone was applied in the present case, it would not take into account the equally valid wishes of the descendants of the former Spanish inhabitants, and it would be British determination rather than self-determination, would ignore the crucial factor of Spanish sovereignty and would perpetuate the colonial occupation. The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, in particular resolution 2231 (XXI), had therefore suggested three points as a basis for a solution: negotiation and consultation between the parties concerned, due respect for the interests of the inhabitants, and acceleration of the process of decolonization. The resolutions did not, however, provide for the disposal of sovereignty, the perpetuation of the occupation or the continued existence of a military base against the interests of all peoples and against the modern trend of decolonization.

9. Spain had pledged to respect the interests of the inhabitants, their individual rights, freedom of religion and of the Press and security of tenure of employment, and to preserve their municipal institutions. It had even guaranteed their British nationality if they wished to maintain it and had declared its readiness to sponsor a statute guaranteeing all those rights, to be registered with the United Nations. It should be recognized that Spain had gone a long way to facilitate the attainment of a solution. The administering Power claimed that it was the wishes of the people, not merely their interests, which counted and it had gone much further than resolution 2231 (XXI) by holding a referendum on 10 September 1967 to consult the people on their wishes. That step had been a unilateral one, not based on consultation, which was a key element of resolution 2231 (XXI). Spain had admittedly, been invited to send an observer, but it was the spirit, machinery and purposes of the referendum that were questionable. The idea of a referendum could not be opposed, but the referendum in question had been of such a nature as to prejudge the whole question in advance, aggravate the problem and defeat the intention of the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee to promote a negotiated settlement. The administering Power had taken that step despite the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 1 September 1967 (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. X, para. 215) warning against it.

10. Far-fetched comparisons with Alaska were no contribution. The question was, rather, whether the United Kingdom would have acquiesced in Spanish occupation if Spain had invaded Lands End, or whether the United Kingdom would have claimed that Cadiz was British if Admiral Rooke had succeeded in occupying Cadiz too.

11. The United Nations must endeavour to find a satisfactory solution to the question of Gibraltar within the set of principles relating to decolonization. At the previous meeting, Lord Caradon had expressed the wish that Gibraltar should be a monument of friendship between the United Kingdom and Spain. Spain's attitude was responsive, but there could be no friendship if a matter of fundamental interest to Spain was settled unjustly in advance before negotiations began, and there could be no friendship based on the permanent alienation of the people and the Territory. Goodwill was essential if a satisfactory and friendly solution was to be found.

12. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) said that the only course of action prescribed by the United Nations since 1964 to bring about the decolonization of the Territory of Gibraltar was negotiation between the United Kingdom and Spain. The consensus adopted by the Special Committee on 16 October 1964[1/] and General Assembly resolutions 2070 (XX) and 2231 (XXI) had all invited the two parties to negotiate. The reason why the United Nations had recommended negotiation rather than self-determination in the case of Gibraltar was that its primary objective was decolonization as set forth in resolution 1514 (XV), and the people of Gibraltar had clearly indicated that they were not genuinely interested in decolonization. The problem was, however, much more complex. In all cases in which the forces of colonialism had brought under their control and integral part of another State, for example, the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), British Honduras and Ifni, in addition to Gibraltar, the General Assembly had recommended negotiations between the adminis-

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex No. 8 (part I), document A/5800/Rev.1, chap. X, para. 209.

tering Power and the original metropolitan country. The process of negotiation in lieu of self-determination was not only just and fair, since it sought to undo the wrong inflicted by colonialism, but it served the purposes of decolonization. In such cases, the present inhabitants were often the beneficiaries of colonial rule and did not feel as strongly about decolonization as did those who were the direct victims of colonialism. Since Gibraltar was an integral part of Spain, it was Spain that had suffered a loss and not the present population of Gibraltar, who were the beneficiaries of the colonial era.

13. In recommending negotiation as a basis for decolonization in the case of Gibraltar, the General Assembly had acted in full conformity with paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation maintained that the interpretation of that paragraph given by the representative of Spain was correct. It had clearly been the intention of those who had drafted the paragraph to promulgate another fundamental principle to elaborate the application of the right to self-determination, and its purport was that the principle of self-determination should in no way affect the right of territorial integrity or territorial claim of any State. That fundamental principle had been further strengthened by subsequent United Nations practice in giving priority to the claims of the States of which Territories such as the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), British Honduras or Ifni had formerly been an integral part, over the views of the inhabitants, who had sometimes benefited from colonialism. During the debate on Gibraltar in the Special Committee in 1967, the representative of Australia had argued that if the Spanish interpretation of paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 (XV) were accepted, it would follow that every historic claim of one sovereign State against another would be a matter to be discussed by the Committee (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. X, para. 137), but that analogy did not apply since the Committee was dealing with problems of decolonization and not with territorial disputes between independent States.

14. The fact that the General Assembly resolutions concerning Gibraltar omitted to reaffirm the right of the people of Gibraltar to self-determination and independence, a reaffirmation which was a basic part of any resolution adopted concerning Southern Rhodesia, the Territories under Portuguese administration, South West Africa and most other Territories, was far more significant than the fact that the phrase "taking into account the interests of the people of the Territory" had been included. Article 73 of the Charter, to which several speakers had referred, dealt with the responsibilities of the administering Power and was designed to prevent any excesses by an administering Power against the population of a Territory. Neither in that Article nor elsewhere in the Charter was there any indication that the interests of the people should be paramount in respect of decolonization. Where the views of the local inhabitants were identical with those of the administering Power on the question of decolonization, the principle that the interests of the people should be paramount was less applicable. For that reason, the word "views" had been omitted from resolution 2231 (XXI) and the word "interests" substituted.

15. With reference to the talks to be held in January 1968, he paid a tribute to the United Kingdom Government for its flexible and open-minded attitude and he hoped that the result of the referendum would not jeopardize the outcome of the talks. He offered his best wishes to the parties concerned for the success of the talks.

16. Mr. N'JIE (Gambia) said that the fact that the people of Gibraltar were under colonial domination was not in dispute. The General Assembly, in operative paragraph 2 of resolution 2231 (XXI), had asked the administering Power to expedite the decolonization of Gibraltar without any hindrance and in consultation with the Government of Spain. Since the United Kingdom was the administering Power, it might be asked how Spain was involved. The answer was to be found in the history of the Territory. The Rock of Gibraltar had been occupied in the early eighth century by the Moors, who had remained there until their expulsion in 1462. Thereafter Gibraltar had remained in the personal control of the Spanish Grandees until 1502, when it had been incorporated into the Kingdom of Castile. It had remained in Spanish hands until 1704; at that date, during the War of the Spanish Succession, it had been captured by a combined British and Dutch force. The Spanish commander had surrendered and had been allowed to march out, and most of the civilian inhabitants had elected to go with him. Under the Treaty of Utrecht, which had ended the war, Queen Anne of Britain had agreed to recognize the French Prince Philip as King of Spain, and he in return had ceded Gibraltar to the British Crown, to be held "absolutely with all manner of right for ever". The Treaty had also laid down that, if the British Crown ever saw fit to dispose of the property, the Crown of Spain would have the first choice to redeem it.

17. If the United Nations were to recognize the provisions of that Treaty as still valid, and if the United Kingdom was not willing to dispoe of Gibraltar, there would seem to be nothing to discuss. Up to the nineteenth century, it had been the accepted practice to invade and take possession of States and to sell, exchange or make gifts of territories and their people just as farm land was sold together with its livestock. With the advent of the United Nations, the United Kingdom Government had recognized that it could not keep possession of Gibraltar for ever, but in the process of disposing of it the administering Power could not simply transfer it, with its people, to another Power, since that practice was no longer extant. As a dependent country, Gibraltar must be decolonized in accordance with the terms of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2231 (XXI). The provisions of the Charter and the General Assembly resolutions applied equally to Spain.

18. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.884 on the question of Gibraltar, of which his delegation was a sponsor, set forth the bases on which the administering Power and Spain should negotiate. In the understanding of his delegation, the resolutions referred to in the draft resolution were without prejudice to the right of the population to self-determination. In spite of conflicting views, the administering Power and Spain had both expressed willingness to resume talks in a few weeks'

time. The Committee should endorse that proposal, without taking a position on the claims of the two parties. The most helpful thing that the Committee could do would be to create an atmosphere conducive to peaceful negotiations, having regard to the interests of the colonial people concerned.

19. Mr. SABEV (Bulgaria) said that it was his Government's fundamental policy that the peoples of the colonial Territories had an undisputed right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Seven years had passed since the adoption of the Declaration, yet many peoples were still under colonial rule. With regard to the small colonial Territories, the Special Committee had adopted specific recommendations aimed at achieving the speedy implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Owing to the opposition of the colonial Powers, however, no substantial progress had been achieved in the process of decolonization during the period under review. In his delegation's opinion, the General Assembly should denounce the failure of those Powers to implement resolution 1514 (XV). The Special Committee's examination of the question had shown that that resolution was fully applicable to the small colonial Territories and his delegation considered that it was therefore the duty of the United Nations to help those Territories to recover their rights. The small Territories all faced similar difficulties; their economies were in the hands of foreign colonialists who exploited their natural resources and deprived the indigenous inhabitants of their most elementary democratic rights; furthermore, they were used to further the military interests of the administering Powers, which either maintained military bases there or allowed other Powers to do so without the consent of the indigenous population. A striking example of that was the island of Guam, which was used by the United States as a base for daily bombing raids over Viet-Nam. Another example was the submarine test base which the United States had established in the Bahamas, a Territory administered by the United Kingdom.

20. The debate on Aden and other colonial Territories had shown that the existence of military bases constituted an obstacle to the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). That fact had been reflected in a number of resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee, particularly Assembly resolution 2232 (XXI). His delegation considered that the colonial Powers should be called upon once again to dismantle their military bases in colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones.

21. The Special Committee had on many occasions requested the colonial Powers to abide by the General Assembly's decisions and to accept visiting missions to the Territories under their administration. The United Kingdom, the United States and other colonial Powers had no desire to co-operate with the United Nations in promoting the advance of those Territories to independence. After the proclamation of the so-called associated status of the small colonial Territories in the Caribbean, the administering Power had adopted a negative attitude with regard to the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). Such an attitude was regrettable, especially in view of the Special Committee's decision that the resolution in question was applicable to those Territories. The situation in that region must be interpreted as another example of the attempt by an administering Power to retain its hold over its colonial Territories. His delegation had repeatedly stated that all colonial Territories, regardless of their size and population, should be liberated and the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV) applied to them. It was the duty of the United Nations to recommend appropriate measures to achieve that end.

22. Mr. HEZEKIAH (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation had always made clear its views on the question of the granting of independence to colonial Territories and peoples. All colonial peoples had the unqualified right to national self-determination and independence. It was not for the colonial Power to decide when a people was ready to manage its own affairs. His delegation would like the colonial Powers to fix target dates for the independence of Territories still under colonial rule in accordance with the wishes of the colonial peoples themselves.

23. With regard to the question of Gibraltar, his delegation had carefully examined article X of the Treaty of Utrecht and had found its language unambiguous. The view had been expressed that the maintenance in force of that Treaty jeopardized the national unity and integrity of Spain, and represented a colonial situation on Spanish soil. While his delegation agreed that the Treaty of Utrecht was a colonial document, it was none the less a Treaty in force binding upon the parties to it, and its obligations should therefore be carried out by them in good faith. A possible violation of the Treaty might arise if the United Kingdom Government relinquished its sovereignty and handed Gibraltar over to a metropolitan Power other than Spain, but it was inconceivable that in the present state of world affairs the United Kingdom would consider such a step. The transfer of Gibraltar to Spain would raise the question of the right of peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories to self-determination. General Assembly resolution 2231 (XXI) enjoined the Governments of Spain and the United Kingdom to bear the interests of the colonial peoples in mind.

24. His delegation did not agree that the principle of self-determination was necessarily synonymous with full independence. National self-determination could only mean the right of peoples to determine freely their own national interests and political status. They might in the free exercise of that right decide to retain association to a greater or lesser extent with some sovereign Power, even to the point of retaining formal "colonial status". With regard to the question of Gibraltar, he wondered whether the term "decolonization" meant ipso facto the Territory's incorporation into Spain. There was a basic contradiction in the position of a State which invoked twentieth-century sentiments in favour of decolonization while on the other hand it cited an eighteenth-century treaty to support its argument that if the status of Gibraltar was changed, it should be done by the incorporation of the Territory into Spain. His delegation hoped that the legal and political issues at the root of the dispute

would be resolved at an early date. Without prejudice to any determination of those issues, however, it seemed that where a conflict existed between the obligations of a Member State under the Charter and under any other international agreement, the obligation under the Charter—in the present case Article 103—should prevail. In any case, Article 73 of the Charter contained a peremptory norm from which there could be no derogation. Hence, in any conflict between article X of the Treaty of Utrecht regarding the reversionary rights of Spain to Gibraltar and Article 73 of the Charter concerning the rights and interests of non-self-governing peoples, the Charter stipulation must take precedence.

25. It was not readily apparent to his delegation that the holding of a referendum by an administering Power in order to ascertain the wishes of the people of Gibraltar contradicted the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2231 (XXI). Nor could the resolution itself limit the sovereign Power in the exercise of any of its legitimate powers of sovereignty, including the power to hold a referendum for any purpose whatsoever. In any case, it seemed clear that a consultation of the people of Gibraltar to determine their views on where their interests lay was consistent with the terms of that resolution and was in keeping with the spirit of Article 73 of the Charter. Such a consultation did not preclude a continuation of the dialogue and negotiations between the two parties, taking into account the interests of the people.

26. In conclusion, his delegation endorsed the view that decolonization could not consist of the transfer of a people, however small, to the rule of another Power without regard to their own wishes and interests as freely expressed by the peoples themselves.

27. The CHAIRMAN, supported by Mr. CASTALDO (Italy) on behalf of the Western countries, Mr. PEREZ GUERRERO (Venezuela) on behalf of the Latin American countries, Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) on behalf of the Arab States, Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) on behalf of the Sudan and Togo, Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) on behalf of the socialist countries, and Mr. NKAMA (Zambia), welcomed the delegation of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen to the Committee.

28. Mr. DHALEE (Southern Yemen) thanked the Committee for its warm welcome.

29. The CHAIRMAN called on the Spanish representative, who wished to make a brief statement concerning Equatorial Guinea.

30. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) said that there should be no doubt whatever that the people of Equatorial Guinea were marching towards their historic destiny. His delegation wished to assure the Committee that the Spanish Government was prepared to conduct a referendum in which the people of the Territory would be requested to give their views on the desire expressed in the Constitutional Conference that the Territory should become independent before 15 July 1968. If the people of Equatorial Guinea decided to endorse the wishes of the representatives at the Constitutional Conference, the Spanish Government would grant them independence without delay, in accordance with the solemn promise made by the Spanish Head of State.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (continued)* (A/6700/Rev.1, chap. XX; A/6704, A/6903, A/6924, A/6925, A/6926, A/C.4/L.886)

QUESTION OF PAPUA AND THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NEW GUINEA AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.4/L.886 (concluded)

31. Mr. ROGERS (Australia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, wished to comment on several points raised at the 1745th meeting by the representatives of Liberia, the Soviet Union and Ghana regarding Australia's administration of Papua and New Guinea.

32. The Liberian representative had made grave, gratuitous and gross charges to the effect that Australia was a racist country pursuing a racist policy in New Guinea. Those allegations were unfounded and it was distressing that they came from a delegation which normally maintained friendly relations with Australia. He categorically repudiated those allegations on behalf of the Australian people, the officers of the Administration of the Territory and the people of Papua and New Guinea and their elected representatives.

33. A heartening development of the present century was the creation of new political and economic institutions in multiracial societies which bound people of different races into one community. Geography and history had brought Australia and New Guinea into close contact, from which there had grown increased knowledge and understanding of each other and an increasing belief in the possibilities of working together to solve common problems now and in the future. Their joint effort in war had enhanced their mutual respect.

34. The Liberian representative's remarks had been all the more difficult to understand in that he had been a member of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965, and had had a part in drafting its report on New Guinea.[2/] The report indicated that considerable results had been obtained in the Territory in many spheres: education, public health, agricultural and economic development services had been set up in most areas; law and order and peace prevailed and political institutions were taking shape; and relations between the people and the Administration were distinguished by cordiality and confidence, which augured well for the future.

35. His opening statement (1745th meeting), in which he had gone into some detail about Australia's social and economic policy in the Territory, had amply refuted most of the points the Liberian representative had subsequently made. He had said that not all outside private investment in the Territory had yielded a profit and he had cited the large investment made in the search for oil in exportable quantities, saying that thus far the search had not succeeded. Nevertheless, the representatives of Liberia and the Soviet Union had said that large oil deposits had been found and the Liberian representative had implied that they were

*Resumed from the 1745th meeting.

2/ Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Thirty-second Session, Supplement No. 3, document T/1635 and Add.1.

being exploited. The Australian delegation would like to know just where those deposits were to be found and by whom the oil was being extracted. The Soviet Union representative had said that a foreign company had invested $40 million in the search for oil, a substantial figure which, if accurate, simply bore out the fact that not all investment made in the Territory yielded a return.

36. The Liberian representative had also asserted that plantation labourers who broke their labour contracts were hunted down. Those were two-year civil contracts, however, and if a labourer broke such a contract the only recourse for the plantation owner was to go to law. Arrest was not permitted and the Administration could only draw the labourer's attention to the fact that he had broken his contract.

37. The Soviet Union representative had repeated many points which he had raised in the Trusteeship Council earlier in 1967 and which had been satisfactorily answered at that time. He had made much of the fact that some of those points were based on isolated reports in the Australian, New Guinean and United States Press. It was the custom of the Soviet Union delegation to castigate the Press in Australia and the United States for its utter unreliability and lack of concern for the truth, but now and again the Soviet Union representative decided, as it were, to rehabilitate that Press and to refer to it as though it were a source of absolute truth.

38. The Soviet Union representative had also quoted the report of a Mission organized by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) at the request of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, entitled The Economic Development of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, but he had quoted only the words that suited him and thus had not given a clear picture of the report. With regard to capital inflow and outlow, the report had said that probably the greater part of private investment had been financed from reinvested profits. High profit from private ventures and high private savings had led to substantial investments in the Territory and to a sizable outflow of capital, on the order of £A3-5 million a year. Compared with private investments estimated at £A5-6 million annually from 1960 to 1963, the outflow of capital had been of major proportions and had been attributed partly to a decline in confidence among investors stemming from uncertainties about the political future of the country. More recently the investment climate had improved. Apart from the modest amounts raised through public borrowing, investments by the Administration had been financed entirely from grants provided by the Commonwealth Government. He wished to add that the grant had risen to $100 million.

39. In connexion with agricultural products for export, the report noted that about 75 per cent of the copra, 75 per cent of the cocoa and 60 per cent of the coffee was produced by European farmers. The holding of those operators was less than 1 per cent of the total land area, and only about 5 per cent of the land estimated capable of economic development. Some holdings were farmed by the Administration and, as many were too small to make economic units, they had been combined in operation. There were only 325 owners, lessees and share farmers. A further 780 Europeans, Asians or people of mixed race worked as farm managers, foremen or workers. About 40,000 indigenous labourers were employed by European farmers. Only about 40 per cent of the land was freehold, the balance being leased from the Administration. Europeans owned no land in the highlands. It was a firm policy that only the Administration could purchase land from indigenous owners.

40. The Soviet Union representative had made lurid accusations about the creation of military bases in the Territory and had said that it was being turned into a great armed camp. The Trusteeship Agreements between the General Assembly and the Australian Government had specifically given that Government responsibility for the peace, order, good government and defence of the Territory and had said that the Administering Authority might take all measures considered desirable for its defence and for maintenance of international peace and security. The Soviet Union representative had quoted the Pacific Islands Monthly as saying that the Pacific Islands Regiment was to be expanded from about 2,000 to 3,000 troops. A defence force of 3,000 was really very small considering the size of the Territory and its population. Moreover, that representative's contention that defence measures were taken at the expense of the indigenous inhabitants was nonsense; the cost was borne exclusively by the Australian taxpayer. Australia would be failing in its responsibility if it did not create some form of defence force which would ententually be taken over by a Papua/New Guinean Government. It was unthinkable for a dependent Territory to become independent without having some sort of armed forces at its disposal.

41. He categorically rejected the Soviet Union representative's claim that the indigenous people of the Territory were being dragged into the Viet-Nam conflict to serve as "cannon fodder". The Australian Defence Act specifically prohibited members of the Pacific Islands Regiment from serving outside Papua and New Guinea unless they were engaged in some operation in conformity with Article 84 of the Charter; that applied also to indigenous volunteers. Defence installations in the Territory were there for the Territory's defence and had the full support of the House of Assembly. The people of Papua and New Guinea had every right and indeed an obligation to think about their own defence for, as the Committee would surely remember, they had suffered cruelly during the Second World War.

42. The Soviet Union representative had quoted a report in The New York Times that a member of the House of Assembly had proposed that the Territory should provide troops for Viet-Nam. Such a proposal had been made but it had not been considered seriously. No one had left the meeting in protest as the Soviet Union representative had alleged. A member had also introduced a motion which would have made the House of Assembly take decisions on military matters which were still Australia's responsibility. That motion had been rejected by the entire House and a motion supported Australia's defence expenditure in the Territory had been adopted by unanimous vote, including the vote of Mr. Mirau, whom the Soviet Union representative had quoted.

43. He would now turn to the constructive statement made by the representative of Ghana at the same meeting. It had been critical, but Australia regarded such criticism as helpful. As the representative of Ghana had suggested, such social discrimination as existed was largely a result of economic dislocation—a phenomenon that had been noted by the Economic Commission for Africa in relation to a number of African countries. In Papua and New Guinea there had been a rush to the urban areas and that had given rise to quite serious problems regarding housing and employment. He agreed that the remedy was rapid acceleration of economic development. As far as equality of wages was concerned, he thought that the disparity between rural and urban wages was a problem common to all new countries, and reports of the International Labour Organisation on the subject supported that view.

44. The Ghanaian representative was right in saying that the highland people were conservative in relation to the coastal people, as a result of their fear of being dominated by the latter. The highlands region of Papua and New Guinea was a rich area and had the largest group of indigenous people. Many of them had never seen an outsider until 1952, when three intrepid explorers had made their way to their valley. In that regard, the Ghanaian representative had touched on an important problem—the need to ensure that there was a national identity among people who were not historically of one race, religion or culture. Experience elsewhere in the world should underline the importance of such an identity.

45. The representative of Ghana had also suggested that some 40 per cent of the Australian grant should be devoted to economic development. He would certainly draw that recommendation to the attention of his Government, though the House of Assembly had to have its say on how the money available was allocated. While the highland people preferred a large part of the funds to go to education, others wished to devote more to basic economic development. The problem was not peculiar to New Guinea; the competing claims of education and economic development to public funds were being argued out in many areas of the world.

46. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.886 was a disappointment to his delegation. It had been submitted to the Secretariat for circulation even before his delegation's statement on the Territory at the 1745th meeting. His delegation would have hoped that the Committee would adopt a resolution taking into account the latest developments and not merely reproducing what had been said in 1966. At the previous session, his delegation had explained fully why it had had to vote against the draft resolution which had become General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI). The resolution had given an inaccurate and biased description of conditions in the Territory and had called on Australia to do things which were impossible, such as removing non-existent discriminatory electoral qualifications. The House of Assembly was to be enlarged to ninety-four. At the coming elections early in 1968, every adult would be eligible to vote. Every effort had been made to be sure that the electoral roll was complete. There would now be sixty-nine open electorates, fifteen regional electorates and ten official seats reserved for officials of the Administration. For the fifteen regional electorates, candidates—though not voters—had to have a minimum educational qualification. That hardly seemed discriminatory; in any case, the arrangements had been instituted on the recommendation of a Committee of the House of Assembly.

47. Resolution 2227 (XXI) had also asked for the abolition of discriminatory practices in various fields. He believed that Australia's record was good in that regard and that the request was unjustified. With regard to the call for a date to be fixed for independence, any such move should depend on the wishes of the people.

48. The resolution had also called on Australia to refrain from using Papua and New Guinea for military activities incompatible with the United Nations Charter. He hoped that he had made it clear that no such activities were being carried out in the Territory.

49. Since the present draft resolution reaffirmed General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI) his delegation would vote against it. It was unjust not only to the Administering Authority but also to the House of Assembly of the Territory. Surely the Committee must recognize that it was the people of the Territory who knew best what they wanted and how to achieve it.

50. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Australian representative had not succeeded in refuting any of the facts adduced in the Soviet delegation's statement at the 1745th meeting. That representative had tried to suggest that members of the Committee were distorting the facts, but he had not explained away the fact that ten seats in the House of Assembly of the Territory were still reserved to the Australians under the new system now being introduced and that the ultimate decisions were taken in Canberra since no legislation passed by the House of Assembly could enter into force unless it was confirmed in Canberra.

51. He had never asserted that large oil deposits had been discovered in the Territory. What he had said was that international monopolies had spent £A40 million in oil prospecting. He had also pointed out that a law had been passed limiting the rights of the people over their resources not only in the present but in the future. The Australian representative, like the United States representative on an earlier occasion, had accused him of castigating the Press. He did not understand how quoting the Press could be called castigating it. The Australian representative had not refuted what he had said regarding the report of IBRD. According to that report, annual private investment totalled £5-6 million. If the Territory was such a burden for Australia as the Australian representative had suggested, the solution would be for Australia to leave the Territory.

52. The Australian representative had not refuted what he had said regarding military bases, but argued that Australia had responsibilities for the Territory's defence. The use of the Territory in efforts to subjugate the people of Viet-Nam could not possibly be regarded as consistent with the United Nations Charter or the Trusteeship Agreement. The Australian representative had not disputed his statement regarding

the size of the defence force in the Territory. The Soviet Union delegation had also pointed out that an Australian member of the House of Assembly had raised the question of the sending of New Guinean soldiers to Viet-Nam. It was clear that the Australian members set the tone in the House of Assembly.

53. He begged leave to doubt whether the Territory was such a paradise as the Australian delegation tried to suggest. The fact that only two New Guineans had a higher education was alone enough to condemn the colonial régime.

54. Mr. LUARD (United Kingdom), explaining his delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.886, said that at the last session the Committee had adopted a draft resolution, which had become General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI), highly critical of the Australian Government. That resolution had contained unsubstantiated charges of discrimination, "deplored" the failure of the administering Power to implement an earlier resolution and called for certain steps, such as the holding of elections and the fixing of a date for independence, to be taken by Australia quite regardless of the stage that had been reached in the development of Papua and New Guinea and the realities of the situation there. His Government had not supported that resolution and was still less willing to support draft resolution A/C.4/L.886, which, despite its neutral wording, in effect reaffirmed all the unfounded charges in the previous year's resolution, without question and regardless of the full information provided by the Australian representative at the 1745th meeting. It had been prepared even before that statement had been heard, thus clearly prejudging the question and ignoring many of the complicated issues involved.

55. The statement of the Australian representative had provided evidence of impressive progress in both the economic and social fields. Striking advances had been reported in health, education, labour standards, administration and the growth of representative democracy, and indisputable factual evidence had been provided. It was surprising that the draft resolution included no recognition of the progress made. The progress was all the more impressive in view of the immense problems confronting an administering Power in a Territory where the people were divided among many tiny, isolated tribes, speaking 700 separate languages. The task of building a modern nation in Papua and New Guinea was an enormous one, but it was clearly being tackled with determination.

56. For all those reasons his delegation, which had voted against resolution 2227 (XXI), would vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.886, which had all the defects and omissions of the earlier resolution. He hoped that other delegations would join in rejecting a resolution which ignored the realities of the problem and did so little justice to the achievements of the Australian administration and of the people of Papua and New Guinea themselves.

57. Mr. MARTINEZ (Argentina) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, but wished to state, firstly, that it had taken due note of the information provided by the Australian delegation in its statement at the 1745th meeting; and secondly, with regard to operative paragraph 2, that it maintained the reservations it had expressed at the time of the adoption of resolutions 2112 (XX) and 2227 (XXI).

58. Mr. GARCIA (United States of America) said that his delegation had serious reservations regarding the draft resolution, not only because of its failure to recognize the substantial achievements of the Administering Authority in the economic, social and educational fields, but more seriously because of its refusal to acknowledge the considerable progress made in preparing the people for full self-government. The task of welding the diverse peoples of Papua New Guinea and the neighbouring islands into a single political unit was one of staggering dimensions, but it was Australia's policy to accomplish precisely that task. One aspect of that policy was the administration of the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Papua as a single unit. Progress was also being made towards the elimination of barriers through education in a single tongue, the establishment of local government councils and the establishment of a Territory-wide legislature. His delegation found Australia's record impressive in many respects. It recognized that some other delegations did not fully share its view of that record, but it considered that they should not entirely ignore it.

59. The draft resolution took none of those considerations into account, but reaffirmed two previous resolutions which his Government had been unable to support. Those resolutions, inter alia, called on Australia to fix an early date for independence in accordance with the wishes of the people. The report of the Trusteeship Council for 1966-1967 (A/6704) seemed to show that the fixing of an early date for independence might not yet be in accordance with the will of the people.

60. The United States considered that the people of Papua and New Guinea should be brought to self-determination as soon as possible, but it also considered that all options for their future should be kept open and that any act of self-determination should be preceded by extensive programmes of political education to make the people aware of the implications of the various possibilities before them.

61. His delegation had also felt that resolution 2227 (XXI) placed undue emphasis on the question of discriminatory practices in New Guinea. The 1965 Visiting Mission to the Territory had reported that it had seen few signs of discrimination there, and the Trusteeship Council's report recognized that discrimination on the grounds of race or colour had been outlawed by legislation in New Guinea and that it was difficult to legislate effectively on social behaviour. The Council's report also welcomed the establishment of a House of Assembly committee to recommend any necessary amendments to legislation on discrimination. Thus substantial efforts were clearly being made to eliminate such discriminatory practices as might remain.

62. In view of those considerations, his delegation would be unable to support the draft resolution.

63. Mr. CALINGASAN (Philippines) said that his delegation had voted in favour of resolution 2227 (XXI), which was reaffirmed in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution under consideration, but had explained that the fixing of a date for independence called for in that resolution should be done only in consultation with the people of the Territory and that their wishes should be followed. It had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 5 of resolution 2227 (XXI) because, although in agreement with the text of the paragraph, it had not been in full agreement with the explanations given by some delegations which had been favour of incorporating it in the resolution. Subject to those reservations, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution under consideration since its primary objective was to accelerate the attainment of self-determination and independence by the people of Papua and New Guinea.

64. Mr. HUNEEUS (Chile) said that since his delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraphe 5 of draft resolution 2227 (XXI) and since operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.886 reaffirmed the position set out in that resolution, his delegation must make a specific reservation concerning the implications of paragraph 5 of resolution 2227 (XXI). It would, however, vote in favour of the draft resolution, as it had done in the case of resolution 2227 (XXI).

65. Mr. KANNANGARA (Ceylon) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, since it fully supported the inalienable right of the people of Papua and New Guinea to self-determination and independence and the speedy implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). He would be compelled to abstain, however, on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution because of the vagueness of the words "previous position", which might be intended to condemn the Administering Authority. He recalled that at its 1319th meeting on 27 June 1967 the Trusteeship Council had rejected the clause condemning the Administering Authority in a proposed draft resolution. His delegation fully endorsed that action by the Trusteeship Council.

66. Mr. PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico) said that the previous year (1676th meeting) his delegation had expressed its position regarding the text which had become General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI). It had said that it would vote in favour of the resolution as a whole but would abstain in the separate votes on operative paragraphs 4 and 5. His delegation's position remained unchanged. It would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.886, which it found generally acceptable.

67. The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution submitted by Liberia (A/C.4/L.886) to the vote.

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

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

In favour: Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana.

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada.

Abstaining: Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Maldive Islands, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Austria, Botswana, Ceylon, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.886 was adopted by 64 votes to 8 with 19 abstentions.

68. Mr. KANNANGARA (Ceylon) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote, since it had thought that the Committee was voting on a separate paragraph of the draft resolution. He wished the record to show that his delegation's vote on the draft resolution as a whole was affirmative.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that the Ceylonese representative's remarks would appear in the summary record of the meeting.

70. Mr. CAMPELO (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. It wished, however, to reiterate its reservations concerning the wording of General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI). Although it supported the objectives of that resolution, which it believed would help to accelerate the process of decolonization in the Territory, it had doubts regarding the appropriateness of certain recommendations made to the Administering Authority.

71. Mr. QUARLES VAN UFFORD (Netherlands) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 2227 (XXI) the previous year because it had included two paragraphs which his delegation could not endorse. His delegation had been able to express its views on those paragraphs, since separate votes had been taken. As the resolution just adopted reaffirmed the provisions of resolution 2227 (XXI) and there had been no separate vote on any of the paragraphs, his delegation had been obliged to vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

72. Mr. SOYLEMEZ (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.886. However, his delegation's affirmative vote should not prejudice the reservations previously made by Turkish delegations concerning certain paragraphs of the resotions referred to in the draft resolutions on Papua and New Guinea just adopted by the Committee.

73. Mr. COLLAS (Greece) said that his delegation agreed with operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. He regretted that he had had to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because opera-

tive paragraphs 2 and 3 referred to resolution 2227 (XXI), about which his delegation had expressed reservations. It was all the more regrettable since his delegation would have wished to support a draft resolution upholding the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV).

COMPOSITION OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

74. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to paragraphs 10 to 15 of the special report of the Trusteeship Council on its thirteenth special session (A/6926). He suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the Council's report. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that suggestion.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

Litho in U.N. 77401—November 1968—2,350