



## General Assembly

Distr.  
GENERAL

A/AC.109/SR.1493  
2 July 1999  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

---

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF  
INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1493rd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 7 July 1998, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. RODRÍGUEZ PARRILLA (Cuba)

CONTENTS

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

QUESTION OF NEW CALEDONIA

QUESTIONS OF AMERICAN SAMOA, ANGUILLA, BERMUDA, THE BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS, THE  
CAYMAN ISLANDS, GUAM, MONTserrat, PITCAIRN, SAINT HELENA, TOKELAU, THE TURKS AND  
CAICOS ISLANDS AND THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS

INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e  
OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1. The agenda was adopted.

QUESTION OF NEW CALEDONIA (A/AC.109/2114)

2. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to a working paper prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.109/2114).

QUESTIONS OF AMERICAN SAMOA, ANGUILLA, BERMUDA, THE BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS, THE CAYMAN ISLANDS, GUAM, MONTserrat, PITCAIRN, SAINT HELENA, TOKELAU, THE TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS AND THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS (A/AC.109/2102-2104, 2106-2110, 2113 and 2115-2117)

Question of Guam (A/AC.109/2113)

3. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a communication from a representative of the Guam Commission on Decolonization, requesting to make a statement in the Committee. In accordance with established practice, he suggested that the Committee should accede to that request.

4. It was so decided.

5. Mr. RIVERA (Guam Commission on Decolonization) expressed appreciation to the Special Committee and to the Government and people of Fiji for holding the Pacific Regional Decolonization Seminar in Nandi in June 1998. The current statement was an outgrowth of the ideas put forward by the Government of Guam during the Seminar.

6. Guam had been a colony of the United States of America for a century. For over 50 years it had been on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Over a decade earlier, the people of Guam had proposed that the administering Power should grant transitional status to the Territory and adopt a plan for its decolonization. The administering Power, however, had opposed that proposal. The administering Power had evidenced no interest in promoting decolonization and a transition to full self-government. While the Congress of the administering Power had yet to complete its review of Guam's proposal, the current colonial policies - the application of laws adopted without the representation or consent of representatives of the people of Guam, an assimilationist immigration programme, control over the property and resources of Guam - were a clear violation of the rights of the people of Guam.

7. The administering Power infringed upon the rights of the people of Guam in the areas of culture, language and control over Guam's limited resources. Those policies were aimed directly at turning the Chamorro people of Guam into a minority in their own country. If those policies continued, then instead of progressing towards decolonization, the people of Guam could become a marginalized population group in their own homeland.

/...

8. The administering Power had made no proposals for limiting the number of permanent migrants to Guam. It had implemented no policies providing for the return of lands to their original owners. In contravention of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the administering Power continued to appropriate Guam's ocean resources. Thus, the administering Power actively carried out colonial policies. Those policies were aimed at denying the people of Guam political control over their homeland and permanent sovereignty over their resources. The administering Power was willing to address the issue of self-government only in the context of its unilateral control over Guam, ruling out the possibility of a sovereign choice for Guam even when it included full integration with the United States as a future status option. The posture of the administering Power was undermining the prestige of the United States as a leading international champion of human rights. In reality, the administering Power's colonial policies constituted an attempt to assimilate a colonized people and prevent them from gaining control over their resources and exercising their right to decolonization.

9. Guam was a colony even under the laws of the administering Power. The administering Power legally viewed Guam as a Territory that "belongs to the United States, but is not a part of the United States". That situation contrasted sharply with the status of other Non-Self-Governing Territories where administering Powers had proposed certain integration mechanisms. Questions concerning the administration of Guam, the exercise of the rights of the people of Guam and even the application of the administering Power's Constitution were settled purely at the discretion of the administering Power, which undoubtedly attached great importance to the island from the standpoint of its military and strategic interests, but did not feel obligated to take into account Guam's interests in development, self-government and decolonization. Any attempt to portray the question of Guam as simply an internal matter of the administering Power was inconsistent with a number of international conventions.

10. In view of Guam's small territory and relatively small population, even limited immigration had a tremendous impact on control over political, economic and social institutions. Over the past two decades, United States immigration laws had produced dramatic demographic changes in Guam. In 1987, with a view to curtailing alien immigration, the people of Guam had called upon the United States Government to terminate the island's status as a point of entry into the United States for purposes of naturalization. The administering Power had not only not acceded to Guam's request for limits on immigration, but had expanded it, allowing 40,000 new colonizers to settle in Guam. According to the 1990 Guam population census, newly arrived immigrants made up nearly one third of the island's total population. In 1990, persons not born in Guam had accounted for over 50 per cent of its population, and persons not born in the United States (over 40,000) had accounted for more than 30 per cent. The number of aliens naturalized between 1970 and 1989 was almost equal to Guam's 1940 population. During the period 1980-1989, the number of aliens naturalized in Guam had been 23 per cent higher than in the previous decade. Between 1988 and 1997, almost 14,000 aliens living in Guam had become naturalized United States citizens. After 1987, over 10,000 citizens of Pacific countries freely associated with the United States had become residents in Guam under agreements between those countries and the United States.

/...

11. Such practices on the part of the administering Power promoted an assimilationist policy vis-à-vis the colonized people of Guam. Those practices contravened the principles contained in the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, especially paragraph 8 thereof.

12. The Government of Guam fully supported the decolonization of Guam in a manner consistent with international law. That support was evidenced through Guam law and through a plebiscite which had endorsed Guam's decolonization. The 1987 draft Guam Commonwealth Act called upon the administering Power to enact statutes which reflected its international obligations vis-à-vis the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Guam on various matters, including limits on immigration and resource use. After 10 years of inconclusive discussions with the executive branch of the administering Power on implementing a new relationship consistent with international law, the Guam legislature had established the Guam Commission on Decolonization with a view to carrying out a process of self-determination. At the same time, the Guam Election Commission was registering Chamorro voters eligible to participate in a decolonization plebiscite. The establishment of a registry of eligible voters for the plebiscite was necessary in view of the administering Power's introduction of settlers and migrants into the Territory. The aim of the act establishing the registry was to extend the right to vote on Guam's political status only to that group of people who had been colonized. Those people defined as Chamorro were in fact the political group of people (without regard to race or ethnicity) who traced their ancestry in Guam to the time of the United States occupation of Guam in 1898. It was critical to note that the outcome of the decolonization plebiscite would be an expression of the colonized people's views about a future status and that the vote itself did not constitute decolonization. Decolonization would occur only after a change in the status of Guam, which would either become independent or would be fully integrated into the United States. The plebiscite on the Territory's future status would most likely be held in 1999. The Commission would keep the Special Committee and other United Nations bodies informed of progress in that regard; it was expected that the United Nations would be invited to observe the plebiscite.

13. He thanked the Secretariat for preparing the working paper on Guam (A/AC.109/2113), which provided clear information on the differences between the views of the people of Guam and those of the administering Power. In the past few years, the administering Power had made considerable efforts to sow confusion about the situation in Guam. Those efforts had involved pressure on the Special Committee to adopt an omnibus resolution (1991), the administering Power's withdrawal from cooperation with the Special Committee (1992), criticism of the Special Committee's work on the question of Guam during the General Assembly's deliberations on the issue (1992-1993 and 1995-1997) and the general attack on the functions of the Special Committee (1993-1998). The significant changes in the wording of the resolution on Guam in recent years reflected the administering Power's opposition to Guam's decolonization.

14. Over the past few years, the administering Power had made concerted efforts to diminish the status of the colonized Chamorro people of Guam in the text of resolutions before the Special Committee, and had also attempted to portray the Chamorro people's striving for self-determination as based on racial and ethnic

/...

preferences. The tragic irony was that it was the administering Power's immigration policies in Guam that had created a situation that it conveniently interpreted as having racial or ethnic overtones. It was the administering Power that was admitting thousands of settlers into Guam each year and then claiming that the colonized people would discriminate against them when the time came to determine Guam's political status. The administering Power's immigration policies had made the colonized people a minority in their own country. If racism and ethnic divisions existed in Guam, the roots of that phenomenon must be traced to the administering Power's complete disregard for the rights of the colonized people in their homeland and its failure to heed the call of the people of Guam to halt the assimilationist immigration practices. The administering Power's opposition to the legitimate process of decolonization proposed by the people of Guam masked its opposition to any process of decolonization of Guam. The administering Power had not presented any plan or proposals for Guam's decolonization.

15. The administering Power's position had been set out in the statement made by the United States representative in exercise of the right of reply during the Fourth Committee's consideration of the question of Guam at the fifty-second session of the General Assembly (A/C.4/52/SR.6). In their response to that statement, Guam's Governor Gutiérrez and the delegate of Guam to the United States Congress, Mr. Robert Underwood, had convincingly criticized the administering Power's position. They had pointed out that the administering Power had not complied with its specific responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations to promote decolonization. They had noted that the administering Power's immigration policies were aimed at the assimilation of the Chamorro people, that free and open democratic elections in a Non-Self-Governing Territory were not equivalent to "self-government" or a process of decolonization, and that the administering Power's internal legal mechanisms should not act as a constraint on the process of self-determination and decolonization. The administering Power had yet to respond to the issues raised in the Guam response. Instead, it referred repeatedly to its internal constitutional provisions on equal rights, while ignoring the fact that its immigration policies had created ethnic and racial diversity in Guam.

16. Mr. HU Zhaoming (China) said that his delegation was concerned about the situation in Guam. The people of Guam were entitled to decide their future for themselves, and the administering Power should fully respect their wishes.

17. Mr. OVIA (Papua New Guinea) said that his delegation would appreciate information on the status of the draft Commonwealth Act which had been submitted to the administering Power and the intentions of the Guam Commission on Decolonization in that regard. He also requested the representative of the Commission to elaborate further on the possibility of holding a plebiscite in 1999 and of its being observed by the United Nations.

18. Mr. RIVERA (Guam Commission on Decolonization) said that the draft Commonwealth Act, which envisaged an interim, transitional commonwealth status for Guam, had been the subject of discussions between Guam and the United States Government for over 10 years. Those discussions had not produced any concrete results. The draft was currently before the United States Congress. Guam's current position was to give the Congress an opportunity to consider the draft

/...

and to await its response. At the same time, the legitimate process of decolonization, which would enable the people of Guam to express its will concerning the future status of the post-colonial Territory, would continue, with or without the administering Power's cooperation.

19. As to the second question, the establishment of the Guam Commission on Decolonization had been based on the assumption that its activity would be guided by all the relevant documents of the United Nations on decolonization, including General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV). In keeping with that policy, the Commission had decided to enter, under the appropriate circumstances, into a direct and frank dialogue with the United Nations, including the possibility of requesting the Special Committee, at the appropriate stage, to send a mission to Guam to observe the plebiscite.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that, at its 1492nd meeting, the Committee had decided to accede to a request for a hearing from a petitioner.

21. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Lujan (Organization of People for Indigenous Rights) took a place at the petitioners' table.

22. Mr. LUJAN (Organization of People for Indigenous Rights) said that recently there had been instances in the Special Committee's work where its primary concern had been to cooperate with Guam's administering Power, the United States of America. While the Committee should cooperate with the administering Power, such cooperation should not be to the detriment of the interests of the colonized people of the Territory.

23. The United States had made clear that it was not interested in cooperating in the decolonization of Guam unless Guam was decolonized in the way the United States wanted. That way was either to deny the colonized people its right to self-determination or to extend the right to self-determination to settlers and immigrants.

24. As the Committee was aware, Guam had rejected efforts by the United States to secure control of the Territory and its colonized people through a prescribed constitution based on United States interests, on the grounds that the colonized people first wanted to decide on their political status. The position of the United States was contrary to its own principles of democracy and the right of colonized and indigenous peoples and oppressed minorities to self-determination, and it was not conducive to a constructive solution for the decolonization of Guam. The Committee should vote loudly against such ridiculous colonial posturing.

25. It was difficult to understand why the United States felt threatened by Guam's indigenous people, the Chamorros, especially when, during 100 years of colonial rule, the people of Guam had often demonstrated their loyalty to the United States and had even made the supreme sacrifice to protect a country that had treated it like an unwanted stepchild.

26. The Organization of People for Indigenous Rights had participated in the Pacific Regional Seminar on Decolonization that had been held in Fiji from 16 to 18 June 1998. The Seminar had been one of the most informative and productive

/...

seminars that his organization had attended. At the Seminar, his organization raised a number of questions. First, it had pointed out that United States immigration policies had resulted in the systematic influx of immigrants and settlers to Guam, which had disrupted the demographic composition of Guam.

27. Secondly, the Organization of People for Indigenous Rights had noted that the United States used a number of names to identify the colonized people and had manipulated them to suit their colonial agenda in spite of the fact that, for the past 52 years, the United Nations had been referring to the people of Guam as the colonized Chamorro people. He quoted President Clinton's remarks on Guam's 100 years as a colony of the United States, in which the President had used the terms "Guamanians", "Chamorros" and "Guam's people". Such verbal manipulations had led to a great deal of misunderstanding in the United Nations, as a result of which resolutions had been adopted in which the Organization unintentionally supported the colonial policy of the administering Power.

28. Thirdly, his organization had given its views on the amended text of a draft resolution that had been approved by the Fourth Committee on 14 March 1997, pointing out that it appeared that the Fourth Committee was more inclined to approve draft resolutions that would be unanimously adopted by the General Assembly rather than resolutions that might cause debate.

29. Fourthly, the Organization of People for Indigenous Rights had referred to Guam's establishment of the Commission on Decolonization for the Implementation and Exercise of Chamorro Self-determination. Fifthly, it had taken exception to the continued attempts by the United States to change the meaning of "people" as it related to the colonized Chamorro people, and had refuted the statement by the representative of the United States that all United States citizens were treated equally, and had pointed out that the United States Constitution recognized the special status of indigenous groups.

30. At the Seminar, his organization had recommended that the Special Committee on Decolonization and the Fourth Committee should assess the situation of Guam and its people since Guam's inclusion on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, and that resolutions concerning Guam should recognize the Chamorro people as the colonized people. His organization had pointed out that the influx of settlers was one of the main obstacles to the political, social and economic development of the Chamorro people, and had recommended that the Special Committee on Decolonization and the Fourth Committee should give more consideration to the opinion of the colonized people so that the United Nations could continue to safeguard the collective rights of indigenous peoples and be continually alert to attempts by the United States to impose its definition of "people", and that both Committees should support Guam's initiative to establish the aforementioned Commission on Decolonization and establish a more open dialogue with representatives of Guam.

31. Regarding General Assembly resolution 52/77 on Non-Self-Governing Territories of 10 December 1997, he suggested that the Guam section should undergo a thorough review and assessment based on information received from Guam, and he made the following recommendations on the redrafting of the Guam section in Assembly resolution 52/77.

/...

32. In the twelfth preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 52/77 A, he did not agree with the statement that the United States of America had demonstrated that it supported fully the principles of decolonization and took seriously its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

33. The second preambular paragraph in General Assembly resolution 52/77 B, in the section dealing with Guam, should be replaced by the following text:

"Recalling that, in a referendum held in 1987, United States citizens endorsed a draft Guam Commonwealth Act that would establish a new framework for relations between the Territory and the administering Power, providing for a greater measure of internal self-government for Guam and recognition of the right of the Chamorro people to self-determination for the Territory,"

34. In the third preambular paragraph in the section on Guam, the words "pending the expression of the will of the Chamorro people" should be replaced by "pending the self-determination of the Chamorro people". In the fourth preambular paragraph, the word "negotiations" should be replaced by the word "dialogue", since no negotiations had been held between the administering Power and the territorial Government. Referring to the fifth preambular paragraph, he noted that the very existence of a "programme" to transfer surplus federal land to the Government of Guam was debatable.

35. For the past few years, paragraph 1 of the Guam section had not reflected the true political situation in Guam. That paragraph should read:

"1. Calls upon the administering Power, namely the United States of America, to cooperate with Guam's Commission on Decolonization for the Implementation and Exercise of Chamorro Self-Determination in order to facilitate Guam's decolonization, and to keep the Secretary-General informed of the progress to that end;"

36. In paragraph 2, the word "continue" should be deleted since it did not reflect the true state of affairs. In paragraph 3, the words "to continue the orderly transfer of land" should be deleted and replaced by "to accede to the wishes of the people of Guam regarding the transfer of land". In paragraph 4, bearing in mind previous references to the "people of Guam" and the "Chamorro people", the two terms should be combined to read "the Chamorro people of Guam". Paragraph 5 should be amended in the same way.

37. Mr. MEKDAD (Syrian Arab Republic) reaffirmed his delegation's solidarity with the people of Guam. His delegation, and most likely other delegations as well, had no problem with considering the demands of the Chamorro people. However, in the United Nations it was necessary to strive for consensus by seeking to increase support and solidarity, leaving details in square brackets. He wished to know whether the petitioner considered that the wording he had just proposed would help achieve that objective for the benefit of the Chamorro people.

38. Mr. TANOH-BOUTCHOUÉ (Côte d'Ivoire) said that the question of Guam was complicated and drew attention to paragraph 36 of document A/AC.109/2113, which

/...



set forth the position of the United States of America as expressed by the United States representative in the Fourth Committee. What resulted was a vicious circle: the Chamorro people insisted on its rights while the administering Power refused to identify it as a separate category of Guam's population. He wondered what the solution was to that situation, since the Committee also had to cooperate with the administering Power.

39. Mr. OVIA (Papua New Guinea) said that he supported the cause of the Chamorro people. However, he felt that there was a need to escape from the vicious circle referred to by the previous speaker, particularly since there was a single goal: to decolonize Guam both for the Chamorros, and for the rest of the population in the Territory. He was interested in the proposals of the petitioner on that subject.

40. Mr. LUJAN (Organization of People for Indigenous Rights) said that, as the results of the 1987 plebiscite demonstrated, the people of Guam unanimously supported the need for immigration control. If the administering Power had heeded that view and abandoned the "open door" immigration policy, the problem would not have arisen. Noting that the Guam Commission on Decolonization would issue its conclusions in 1999, he said that the decolonization of Guam would take place with or without the consent of the administering Power.

41. Mr. Lujan withdrew.

Question of the United States Virgin Islands (A/AC.109/2117)

42. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Government of the United States Virgin Islands had requested permission to speak on the item.

43. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Corbin (United States Virgin Islands) took a place at the petitioners' table.

44. Mr. CORBIN (United States Virgin Islands) said that 1998 was the 150th anniversary of the abolition of slavery in the former Dutch West Indies, which in 1917 had been sold to the United States of America and had become known as the United States Virgin Islands. The organization of regional seminars was of great importance in assessing progress in the self-determination process of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories at a time of increasing pressure on the United Nations system to phase out its role in decolonization altogether. The most comprehensive seminar to date was the Pacific Regional Seminar, held in Fiji. In the conclusions and recommendations of the Seminar (document A/AC.109/2121) it was proposed that the United Nations system should be an active player in the decolonization process, rather than a passive observer, and that a range of political options should be recognized as legitimate as long as they were in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned and in conformity with the clearly defined principles contained in General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV). Any political status that did not safeguard those principles of equality could not be considered fully self-governing. The successful experience of the association models used by France, New Zealand and the Netherlands should be integrated into the Committee's discussions. None of the dependency arrangements which were currently under consideration in the Committee provided for the required

/...

political equality; the issue of the governance of dependent Territories should therefore be carefully scrutinized by the United Nations. It had also been stressed at the Seminar that the views of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories should be ascertained through legitimate acts of self-determination. Participation in general elections could not be regarded as proof that the peoples of those Territories had chosen to remain in their current dependency status.

45. Access by Non-Self-Governing Territories to relevant United Nations programmes in the economic and social sphere would aid in capacity-building and in the necessary preparations for the assumption of full internal self-government. Efforts must be made to facilitate the participation of the Territories as members, associate members or observers in relevant organizations of the United Nations system, including special sessions of the General Assembly to review and assess the implementation of the various plans of action of United Nations world conferences, and in the Economic and Social Council. The failure to complete the various studies and analyses listed in the Plan of Action of the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism created a serious gap in the information available on recent political and constitutional developments; as a result, the Committee did not have sufficient information to make informed decisions on serious issues confronting the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Those studies should be undertaken, as a matter of urgency, in cooperation with the relevant regional organizations.

46. The Special Committee should not simply take note of, but should adopt the conclusions and recommendations of the Pacific Regional Seminar, so that they would actually be implemented. It was also necessary to prepare a report on the implementation of the decolonization resolutions and confirm the validity of the conclusions and recommendations adopted at the six previous seminars. Separate documents on those issues could be prepared as reports of the Secretary-General for consideration by the Fourth Committee. His Government believed that the recommendations of the regional seminars held since 1990 represented a comprehensive blueprint for possible action by the United Nations to assist the people in their process of political and constitutional advancement. Despite the reduction in the number of sessions of the Committee in connection with the reform of the United Nations and the insufficient time to reflect the statements made by the representatives of the people of the Territories in the text of the draft omnibus resolution, every effort must be made to take into account the views of the people of the Territories concerned in resolutions on the question of decolonization. Otherwise, the resolutions would be politically ineffective and would not benefit either the Committee or the people of the Territories themselves.

47. The foundation for the attainment of true self-determination based on the principles of equality was the implementation of the recommendations of the various regional seminars, the Plan of Action of the Decade and the General Assembly resolutions on decolonization. The Committee might wish to expand the discussion on decolonization into the Third Committee, under the item on the right of peoples to self-determination. In addition, the agenda item on the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations could be taken up by the Second Committee under another title: "Assistance to Non-Self-

/...

Governing Territories". Cooperation between the Committee and the Economic and Social Council on the item, so that Territories would be better prepared economically prepared for major political changes, should also be enhanced. Furthermore, the Committee should seriously consider the possibility of changing its name to "Committee on the self-determination of the Non-Self-Governing Territories", which would reflect a more balanced approach to the question of the legitimacy of other political options to ensure equality. That did not mean a change in the Committee's mandate, but would assist in understanding its work.

48. In conclusion, he made a number of clarifications to working paper A/AC.109/2117. The measures to make the post of attorney-general of the United States Virgin Islands an elected position and to reduce the membership of the legislature did not constitute a law, but were resolutions which were subject to approval by the United States Congress and did not require the approval of the Governor. In addition, he made clarifications about paragraphs 11 and 18, and stressed that the referendum held in 1993 was not valid because of the low level of participation of registered voters; the results could create an erroneous impression with regard to the view of the population on those issues.

49. Mr. EGUIGUREN (Chile), referring to paragraph 24 of document A/AC.109/2117, which stated that only 27.4 per cent of registered voters had taken part in the 1993 referendum on the political status of the Territory, said that he would be interested to know the reason for the low level of participation and what plans there were in that connection for the future.

50. Mr. OVIA (Papua New Guinea) wondered whether agreement to the sending of a visiting mission to the Territory, if the Committee were to organize one, was to come from the Territory itself or from the United States. He also asked Mr. Corbin's views on how great an impact the change in the name of the Special Committee which he had proposed would have.

51. Mr. CORBIN (United States Virgin Islands), replying to the representative of Chile, said that in the three or four years prior to the referendum, the Government of the United States Virgin Islands had transmitted to the Special Committee information relating to whether the referendum would be valid, whether it would be an act of self-determination, possible duplication among the various options offered in the referendum, what the quota for participation should be, and so on. The discussions at that time had not produced any definite results, and several points had remained unresolved. As a member of the Commission on Political Status, he had at first regarded the referendum as a failure, but he now considered it as the first step in an ongoing process of political development which would be of assistance in reaching the appropriate stage where a successful referendum could be held in which a majority of the population would vote. The question of holding a referendum in the near future was not currently being raised, but renewed attention was being paid to the gradual transfer to the territorial Government of broader authority aimed at full internal self-determination.

52. With regard to the questions posed by the representative of Papua New Guinea, visiting missions, if properly planned and carried out, could be a positive step in clarifying the views of various sectors of society. The first and only visiting mission to the United States Virgin Islands had taken place in

/...

1977 and, from that point of view, had been extremely comprehensive and fruitful. As for the agreement to invite such a mission, he believed that, at the present stage of cooperation, the administering Power would respond positively.

53. There could be some flexibility shown regarding the change in the name of the Committee. The Territories on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories would surely have contacted the Committee if they were not satisfied with its name. The Committee had undergone an evolution since its establishment, of which those outside the United Nations were probably not fully aware. The false impression that the Committee fought only for independence disturbed some Territories which might prefer the status quo or others which sought some other form of self-determination.

INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/AC.109/L.1873)

54. The CHAIRMAN said that he had held consultations with those Member States which had expressed concern on the subject of the transmission of information by some of the administering Powers. If the Committee agreed, he intended to remind the administering Powers of their responsibility and inform them of the concerns expressed by some members of the Committee. He would draw the attention of the administering Powers to those circumstances where their Governments were expected to provide the Committee with the necessary information on the Non-Self-Governing Territories under article 73 e of the Charter.

55. Mr. HU Zhaoming (China) said he hoped that the administering Powers would cooperate more closely with the Committee in the interests of full compliance with its resolutions. His delegation had received the appropriate instructions from its Government and was prepared to join in the consensus.

56. Mr. OVIA (Papua New Guinea) said that his delegation was also prepared to join in the consensus. In its view, all the administering Powers were required to transmit information on their Territories. It was difficult to see any reason why an administering Power should not provide information at the current stage, when everything that happened in the world became known in one way or another. His delegation reserved the right to return to certain aspects of that item in connection with the question of New Caledonia, in particular the developments in the Territory in the light of the agreement reached on Noumea.

57. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/AC.109/L.1873.

58. Draft resolution A/AC.109/L.1873 was adopted.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of that item.

/...

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

60. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to a request for a hearing of a petitioner on the question of New Caledonia. He took it that the Committee agreed to that request.

61. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.