



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.109/SR.552
23 October 1967

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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 FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 6 September 1967, at 4 p.m.

CONTENTS

One hundred and twelfth report of the Sub-Committee on Petitions
(A/AC.109/L.426)

Question of Ifni and Spanish Sahara: report of the Secretary-General
(A/AC.109/239, 259, 262, 264, 265; A/AC.109/L.420; A/AC.109/PET.582,
583, 692 and Corr.1)

Question of Equatorial Guinea: report of the Secretary-General
(A/AC.109/237, 259, 262; A/AC.109/L.422; A/AC.109/PET.578, 702 and
Add.1) (continued)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. MALECELA	(United Republic of Tanzania)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. ESFANDIARY	Iran
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. GHASUS	Afghanistan
	Mr. ROGERS	Australia
	Mr. SABEV	Bulgaria
	Mr. HUNEEUS	Chile
	Miss SINEGIORGIS	Ethiopia
	Mr. KAHILUOTO	Finland
	Mr. GHAREKHAN	India
	Mr. SALEEM	Iraq
	Mr. CASTALDO	Italy
	Mr. KOUAME	Ivory Coast
	Mr. RAOELINA	Madagascar
	Mr. SLCWIKCWSKI	Poland
	Mr. KAREFA-SMART	Sierra Leone
	Mr. JOUEJATI	Syria
	Mr. CHTCUIROU	Tunisia
	Mr. SHAKHOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. BARDER	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. FOUH	United Republic of Tanzania
	Mr. JOHNSON) Mrs. ANDERSON)	United States of America
	Mr. MONTERO	Uruguay
	Mr. CARRASQUERO	Venezuela
	Mr. PEJIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Also present:</u>	Mr. BOUATTOURA	Algeria
	Mr. OULD SIDI	Mauritania
	Mr. BENHIMA	Morocco
	Mr. de PINIES	Spain
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. CHACKO	Secretary of the Committee

ONE HUNDRED AND TWELFTH REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (A/AC.109/L.426)

Mr. BARDER (United Kingdom) said that paragraph 13 of the report of the Sub-Committee on Petitions (A/AC.109/L.426) referred to a decision to circulate as petitions five communications concerning the self-governing associated State of St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla. In view of his delegation's position, as set forth in its letter of 11 August to the Chairman of Sub-Committee III and summarized in document A/AC.109/SC.4/SR.81, his delegation could not endorse the circulation of petitions on events concerning any of the associated States in the eastern Caribbean which had occurred since their attainment of statehood. He would like that reservation to be recorded in the Committee's report.

Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) said his delegation, too, would like to reserve its position regarding the circulation of the petitions mentioned in paragraph 13 of the Sub-Committee's report (A/AC.109/L.426).

The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee approved the 112th report of the Sub-Committee on Petitions (A/AC.109/L.426), subject to the reservations made by the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States.

It was so decided.

QUESTION OF IFNI AND SPANISH SAHARA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/AC.109/239, 259, 262, 264, 265; A/AC.109/L.420; A/AC.109/PET.582, 583, 692 and Corr.1)

At the Chairman's invitation, Mr. Bouattoura, representative of Algeria, Mr. Ould Sidi, representative of Mauritania, Mr. Benhima, representative of Morocco, and Mr. de Pinies, representative of Spain, took places at the Committee table.

Mr. de PINIES (Spain) said that he believed the difficulties arising in connexion with the decolonization of Ifni could be solved through negotiations, which had already begun, between the Governments of Spain and Morocco, as his delegation had already stated in a letter dated 18 April 1967 addressed to the Secretary-General (A/AC.109/239, para. 7).

As stated in a second letter dated 18 April (A/AC.109/239, para. 4), respect for the wishes of the inhabitants formed the basis of his Government's policy concerning Spanish Sahara, and he reaffirmed that the principle of self-

(Mr. de Pinies, Spain)

determination would be applied to the Territory. The Spanish Government had taken a very important step towards the political evolution of the Territory by establishing, pursuant to a decree of 11 May 1967, a General Assembly of Spanish Sahara, composed of forty indigenous deputies elected directly by universal suffrage by the adult indigenous inhabitants, in addition to the representatives elected in accordance with the traditional procedures of the Territory. His delegation attached great importance to the offer made by his Government regarding the visit of a special mission to the Territory. The terms of that offer were reproduced in his delegation's letter to the Secretary-General dated 18 April 1967 (A/AC.109/239, para. 4) and it would be seen that the difference between that offer and what had been requested was purely procedural. If a climate of peace, stability and tranquillity prevailed, it would be possible to devise a satisfactory formula to overcome any differences which existed.

Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) said that, although, for procedural reasons and in a spirit of conciliation, his delegation had agreed to the simultaneous discussion of the questions of Ifni and Spanish Sahara, the two Territories presented problems of a very different nature. Secondly, the fact that Spain was making a series of statements on the various Territories under its administration should not be taken as an indication that all the Territories had the same character. The statement which had just been made by the representative of Spain deserved serious scrutiny and his delegation would comment on it at a later stage.

Mr. Bouattouza (Algeria), Mr. Ould Sidi (Mauritania), Mr. Benhima (Morocco) and Mr. de Pinies (Spain) withdrew.

QUESTION OF EQUATORIAL GUINEA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/AC.109/237, 259, 262; A/AC.109/L.422; A/AC.109/PET.578, 702 and Add.1) (continued)

At the Chairman's invitation, Mr. de Pinies, representative of Spain, took a place at the Committee table.

At the Chairman's invitation, Mr. Saturnino Ibongo Iyanga and Mr. Rafael Evita, representatives of the Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial (MOMALIGE), took places at the Committee table.

Mr. IBONGO (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) congratulated the Spanish Government on its work of decolonization in the Territory of Equatorial Guinea, which was more or less in accordance with the directives of the United Nations.

MONALIGE desired the independence of the Territory and, faithful to the resolutions of the United Nations, particularly General Assembly resolution 2230 (XXI), as well as to the wishes of the people of Equatorial Guinea, it would oppose, by all available political means, any result of the constitutional conference which did not provide for independence as a minimum. MONALIGE deplored the inertia shown by the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea in dealing with reports submitted by groups representing various shades of political opinion in the Territory, as well as the unwillingness of the Governing Council to accelerate the process of independence. The irresponsibility, inactivity, incompetence and unrepresentative character of the General Assembly must have been obvious to those members of the Special Committee who had visited Equatorial Guinea the previous year. There could be no justification for the delay in convening the constitutional conference.

A document which had arrived that morning, addressed to the Committee of Twenty-Four and signed by high officials in Fernando Póo and Río Muni, denounced the manoeuvres to which the indigenous and Spanish authorities in Equatorial Guinea resorted in order to slow down the process of independence. According to that document, the Spanish Government had made no official declaration indicating that it had taken into account the wishes of the people concerning the holding of a constitutional conference and the fixing of a date for that conference, despite the fact that the report of the Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea (A/6300/Add.7, chapter IX, annex, para. 292) clearly stated that the majority of the people wanted independence without delay. Moreover, although the representative of Spain had stated on 10 December 1966 (A/C.4/SR.1665, p. 16), that a constitutional conference would be held early in 1967, that conference had still not materialized. According to the Spanish Press, the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations had addressed a letter to the Secretary-General in January 1967 announcing the appointment of an inter-ministerial commission to prepare for the constitutional conference, but so far nothing was known about the progress made in that preparatory work. In a statement to the Spanish Press on 3 December 1966, Mr. Ondo Edu, the President of the Governing Council, had once again requested Spain to prepare the Territory for independence. In order to divert the attention of the people of the

(Mr. Ibongo)

Territory, as well as world public opinion, the Spanish Government had invited the members of the Standing Committee of the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea to Madrid in March 1967 and had persuaded them to set up a special committee to consult the population on the political future of the Territory; that had been done in an attempt to avoid convening the constitutional conference which would inevitably result in the independence of the Territory. The Special Committee had not made public any conclusions although it had completed its consultations in May. It was known that the Spanish members of the special committee had destroyed part of the material collected, on the instructions of the Spanish Government, since the people consulted had been overwhelmingly in favour of independence. Such manoeuvres had given rise to a great deal of public indignation. It was understood that the Spanish Government had obtained the signatures of certain members of the Governing Council and the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea to a document requesting an extension of the time-limit for the submission of the special committee's report. It was also understood that the Spanish Government had obtained the signatures of certain members of the autonomous Government to a document requesting Spain to retain the present autonomous régime after July 1968 for economic reasons as well as on the pretext that the people were not yet ready for independence. The Spanish Government was, in the meantime, encouraging subversive activities by certain capitalist groups in Fernando Póo which were trying to separate the latter from Río Muni, in complete disregard of the resolutions of the General Assembly, in particular resolution 2230 (XXI), operative paragraph 5. The Spanish Minister of Industry had visited the Territory from 27 July to 2 August 1967, but the reasons for his visit were not yet known. In paying tribute to him, the Vice-President of the Governing Council had reaffirmed the statement he had made to the Spanish Press on 16 May 1966, but the Spanish Minister of Industry had made no reference whatsoever to its contents. The document had gone on to say that the people of Equatorial Guinea were more than ever convinced that the Spanish Government, despite its promises to the contrary, did not wish to grant independence to the Territory and was using every means available to evade its responsibilities, although it was clear that the overwhelming majority of the people of Equatorial Guinea wanted independence. The Spanish Government would no doubt try to justify its position

and would probably submit false testimony to the United Nations General Assembly signed by Guineans who had been paid vast sums of money to do so or perhaps, as it had done before, bring some of them to address the General Assembly in terms dictated by the Spanish Government, while claiming to be the true representatives of the people of Equatorial Guinea. Such manoeuvres must be prevented. Negotiations with the Spanish Government were impossible in practice, and the only recourse left open to the people of Equatorial Guinea was to appeal to the United Nations, in the hope that independence could be achieved by peaceful means.

Another document had been received, signed by all the members of the Commission of Fernando Póo. They rejected those representatives in the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea who claimed to represent the people of Fernando Póo, but acted under the orders of the Spanish Government, and they denied the assertion that Río Muni wished to separate from Fernando Póo. The authors of the document claimed that their highest aspiration was that Equatorial Guinea should become independent immediately as a single and sovereign State, and expressed implicit trust in the Special Committee of Twenty-Four to help them achieve that aim by July 1968.

Since the autonomous Government and the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea were subordinate to the Government of Spain, it was up to the latter to invite the various political groups to send their representatives to the constitutional conference. MONALIGE would be ready to participate by sending a delegation as soon as the date of the conference was announced. He invited Spain to set a date for the constitutional conference; to declare categorically that the conference would only decide upon the final date for independence, which should be not later than 1968; and to announce to the Special Committee that it would dissolve the present autonomous Government and allow the democratic election of a Government truly representative of the people. He appealed to members of the Committee to exert pressure on the administering Power to grant independence to the Territory.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said he understood the petitioners to have indicated that the autonomous Government of Equatorial Guinea was not truly representative of the people. He would like some clarification of that statement.

Mr. IBANGO (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) said that the autonomous Government and Assembly were not representative. First of all, the political situation in the country when the Basic Law had entered into force in January 1964 had been very different from the present situation. At that time many of the country's leaders had been outside the Territory. They had now returned but were no longer members of the Government. Secondly, the electoral machinery employed at the time had not been truly democratic, as was clear from the report of the Visiting Mission.

Very often, the Government represented only the political parties of the country. The parties currently allowed by Spain to engage in political activities were MONALIGE, MUNGE and IPEGE. Although all three parties advocated independence, only the President of the Governing Council and the Vice-President, a member of MONALIGE, had spoken out in favour of independence.

Many members of the Committee had visited Equatorial Guinea and knew that the Governing Council and almost all members of the Assembly were against independence although the population was for it. Consequently, the Government did not represent the wishes of the people.

Mr. EVITA (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) added that, although the members of the autonomous Governing Council, who were inhabitants of Fernando Póo - Mr. Enrique Gori, President of the Governing Council and Vice-President of the General Assembly, Mr. Gustavo Watson, Minister of Health, Mr. José Luis Maho, Minister of Information and Tourism, Mr. Ramon Borico, Minister of Industry and Mining, and Mr. Aurelio Itoba, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs - might claim to be the legal representatives of the people of Fernando Póo, they were merely individuals carrying out the orders of the Spanish Government, which had appointed them and was maintaining them in office against the wishes of the people, who had often sought to remove them. That could readily be proved, since none of them had been elected by the people of Fernando Póo.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) thanked the petitioners for their replies and asked them on whose initiative the autonomous Government had been installed in Equatorial Guinea.

Mr. EVITA (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) said that according to what he and his colleagues had read, the members of the so-called autonomous Government of Guinea identified themselves with the leaders

(Mr. Evita)

and representatives of the Spanish Government. Therefore any decisions taken by the so-called Government were based on decisions taken by Spain. There was thus reason to believe that the initiative and the decision must have come from the Government in Madrid.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) wished to rephrase his question. Who had taken the initiative at the time when the autonomous Government was being installed?

Mr. EVITA (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) thought it was generally known that the initiative to establish an autonomous Government in Equatorial Guinea had been taken unilaterally by the Spanish Government, at a meeting of the Council of Ministers held at San Sebastian in August 1963.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the petitioner's answer showed that the colonial Powers took the initiative when it came to instituting machinery that would help them to maintain colonial rule. He would like the petitioners to comment on the rumour that, in the consultations that were taking place, Spain was deviating from the goal of independence.

Mr. IBONGO (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) read out a passage from an article published in the official bulletin of the Spanish Ministry of Information which made it clear that independence was not the immediate goal of the Spanish authorities.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that both the statements and the replies of the petitioners gave cause for concern. He assured the petitioners that Tanzania would lend full support to the forces that were striving for liberation all over the world. It was the duty of all freedom-loving forces, and particularly of the members of the Committee, to do their utmost to ensure that the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence were implemented.

Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) also thanked the petitioners for their statements. He would like to know what percentage of the Guinean population was represented by MONALIGE.

Mr. IBONGO (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) replied that it was hard to give exact figures since no census of any of the political parties had been taken recently. However, according to the Committee's report, MONALIGE was the only real political movement.

Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) asked the petitioner if MONALIGE was represented in the Governing Council or in the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea.

Mr. IBONGO (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) said that MONALIGE had no representatives as such in the Assembly or in the Governing Council. At the time of the elections, the party had not been officially recognized or allowed to present candidates. The present Vice-President of the Governing Council was a member of MONALIGE.

Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) inquired whether the two other political parties, which also favoured independence, were represented in the legislative and executive organs of Equatorial Guinea.

Mr. IBONGO (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) said that one member of the Governing Council was a militant member of MUNGE. Before becoming a Council member he had been Chairman of the political junta. To his knowledge, there were no members of MUNGE in the Assembly. The elections had not been conducted on a party basis. According to the Spanish principle of organic democracy, they had been conducted on the basis of representation of economic, social and professional groups. Political ties had only been taken into account later, when the political climate had changed. Any member of the Assembly who belonged to MUNGE did so by choice and not from expediency.

Mr. EVITA (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) added that, if the representative of Venezuela wished to know more about the political strength of MONALIGE, he could refer to the Sub-Committee's latest document on Fernando Póo. After its visit to Equatorial Guinea, the Special Committee of Twenty-Four had been informed of various aspects of the situation and if any doubts remained, it would suffice to hold elections in Equatorial Guinea.

Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) explained that his delegation had never doubted the political strength of MONALIGE in Equatorial Guinea. He had simply asked his

(Mr. Carrasquero, Venezuela)

question because he thought that it concerned an important point on which the Committee should be properly informed. Lastly, he asked if the petitioner could briefly indicate what measures were contemplated or being implemented to separate the Territory into its two component parts.

Mr. EVITA (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) said that, in reply, he could only quote from the document read out earlier to the Committee. The document described the subversive campaign, conducted by the lackeys of the Spanish Government, to spread chaos among the people of Guinea by separating Fernando Póo from Rio Muni, so that once the island had been isolated the capitalists could continue their exploitation. Not only were efforts being made to impede negotiations concerning Guinea's independence, but a strict censorship was applied in an attempt to intercept communications addressed to the United Nations.

Mr. IBONGO (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) said that the manoeuvres for the separation of Fernando Póo and Rio Muni dated back to 9 March 1965, when the present Chairman of the Fernando Póo delegation had visited United Nations Headquarters and drawn up a ten-point document, demanding the separation of the two Territories. The document was probably in the hands of the Committee of Twenty-Four, since it was mentioned in that body's report. After the statement made the previous day by the representative of Spain, it was possible to believe that Spain would respect the unity of the Territories; however the ten-point document had been written before the representative of Spain had made his statement. That time lapse might explain the doubts harboured by the representative of Venezuela concerning current manoeuvres. Those manoeuvres existed, but were the work of certain members of the Fernando Póo Governing Council, whose positions had been made clear.

Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) said that he would try to make his question clearer. He would like to know if the measures designed to separate the Territories emanated from the administering Power.

Mr. IBONGO (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) said that, according to the statement made by the representative of Spain, the separation of Rio Muni and Fernando Póo was not official Spanish policy because the unity of the Territory was recognized from the geopolitical standpoint. However, in Guinea there were individuals and groups possessing certain interests, and the socio-economic realities of the country also had to be taken into account.

Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) thanked the petitioner for having clarified the situation, because the representative of the administering Power had frequently stated that Spain was taking measures to protect the unity of the Territory and avoid dismemberment. He wished to express Venezuela's sympathy for the cause of independence for Equatorial Guinea and to reaffirm his Government's determination to uphold the principles stated in the Declaration contained in resolution 1514 (XV).

Mr. CHETOUROU (Tunisia) said he would like further information on the statement in paragraph 4 of document A/AC.109/L.422 that various party leaders and officials of the autonomous régime, including representatives of MONALIGE had held talks with the Spanish Government. He would also like the petitioners to comment on the statement by the representative of the administering Power that the opposition leaders who had been abroad had now returned to Equatorial Guinea and that their views were being given coverage in the local Press.

Mr. IBONCO (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) said it was true that some of the leaders who had been abroad when autonomy had been granted had now returned to the Territory, including the Secretary-General of MONALIGE who had, in fact, recently returned to Madrid to consult with Spanish officials. He himself had seen statements by the Secretary-General of MONALIGE in the Spanish Press; however, he could not say whether those views had been published in the Press in Equatorial Guinea since he had not received copies of local newspapers for some time. However, the issue was not that there was some, rather questionable, increase in the political freedom enjoyed by the political leaders of the country, but rather that there was a vacuum between autonomy and independence. Two points should be borne in mind: first, progress towards independence must be accelerated. The administering Power must immediately convene a constitutional conference, set the date for the opening of negotiations, and invite all political groups to attend, including the Assembly and the Governing Council. The clear-cut position of MONALIGE, when taking part in those negotiations, would be to seek, as the first and essential goal, the independence of Equatorial Guinea. All existing political structures would probably be changed quite appreciably when Equatorial Guinea achieved independence since it would establish its own political and individual freedom for itself.

Mr. KOUAME (Ivory Coast) thanked the petitioners for their statements and assured them that his Government would heed their appeal for assistance to promote complete independence in Equatorial Guinea. He would like to have some clarification of the scope of the legislative organ of the autonomous Government. Could it, for example, pass laws on its own initiative or must it always refer important provisions to the Spanish Government? If it could pass laws on its own initiative, what did the MONALIGE, and the population at large, think of those laws?

Mr. IBONGO (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) said he did not wish merely to criticize the Basic Law; that had often been done. In his view, the political atmosphere in Equatorial Guinea had nothing to do with the Basic Law. With regard to the question raised by the representative of the Ivory Coast, he observed that the Basic Law provided that the laws of the nation would be examined by the General Assembly of Equatorial Guinea which would inform the Government regarding the introduction and application of those laws and, if necessary, propose special norms. Another part of the law specified that the work of the Governing Council was to prepare and submit bills which, through the Commissioner, would be put before the national Government for the approval of the Spanish Cortes. In legal matters, the Assembly was defined as an advisory body whose views did not bind the Spanish administration. Therefore, the last word lay not with the Assembly but with the Spanish Cortes. As long as Equatorial Guinea was not a State, it had no sovereignty and the Assembly could not exercise sovereignty. Therefore, if the Assembly was not sovereign it could not represent the country. The real point at issue was that Equatorial Guinea wanted independence. He reiterated that political parties had not been able to submit candidates for the elections of 1963 and 1964; therefore, MONALIGE as such was not represented in the Assembly. Consequently, it could not be involved in the legislative process and the preparation of laws as a political party.

Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the petitioners for their statements. He fully shared the view that nothing should prevent Equatorial Guinea from attaining independence. Seven years had elapsed since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), declaring the right of the people of Equatorial Guinea to self-government and independence, and yet that Territory

(Mr. Shakhov, USSR)

was still not independent. At the same time, the representative of Spain was trying to convince the Committee that independence was in the hands of the people of the Territory. His delegation fully supported the petitioners' position that independence was the goal and that any constitutional machinations that could delay the granting of independence should be rejected.

He would like further information on the activities of monopolies, since he had gathered from the petitioners' statements that the monopolies active in the Territory took no account of the General Assembly resolutions designed to safeguard the integrity of the Territory and that some of them were endeavouring to dismember the Territory.

Mr. EVITA (Movimiento Nacional de Liberación de la Guinea Ecuatorial) said that the document he had submitted earlier stated that the people of Fernando Póo had no doubt whatever that the manoeuvres were ordered and directed by the Spanish Government, hiding behind the Union of Cocoa Growers, a capitalist group to which all business firms in Fernando Póo belonged, and among which, as the main ones most dedicated to these stratagems, were Frapejo, Mora, Vivanco, Amilivia, Cunha Lisboa, Potau, and so on. Those firms, under the protection of the Spanish Government, were endeavouring to transform Fernando Póo into another Rhodesia.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the petitioners on behalf of the Special Committee and assured them that their statements would be given the attention they deserved when the Committee formulated its conclusions and recommendations on Equatorial Guinea. He expressed the hope that Equatorial Guinea would soon join the United Nations as a free and independent State.

The petitioners withdrew.

Mr. de PINIES (Spain) said that, with regard to the petitioners' comments concerning political parties in Equatorial Guinea, he would refer members of the Committee to paragraph 135 et seq. of the report of the Sub-Committee on Equatorial Guinea (A/6300/Add.7) which showed that the President of the Governing Council had been a member of MUNGE in 1964 and that other officials in the Government had been affiliated with, or members of, the various political parties in the Territory. He would reply more fully to the comments made by the petitioners at the next meeting; however, he would like to express his surprise that, in view of all the alleged censorship, the petitioners had been able to receive all documents quite freely.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the petitioners had asserted that, although some members of the autonomous Government were members of a political party, they were so in their individual capacities, and not as the result of elections for which political parties had submitted candidates.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) proposed that the statements of the petitioners should be reproduced in extenso in the Committee's summary records.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.