

2057th meeting

Friday, 9 November 1973, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2057

AGENDA ITEM 71

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (*continued*) (A/9023/Add.3, A/9048, A/9053, A/9061, A/9079, A/9085, A/9089, A/9099, A/9111, A/9113, A/9132 and Add.1 and 2, A/9174, A/C.4/760, A/C.4/763, A/C.4/766, A/C.4/767, A/C.4/768, A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, A/C.4/L.1035, A/C.4/L.1036, A/C.4/L.1037)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*) (A/C.4/L.1034/REV.2, A/C.4/L.1035, A/C.4/L.1036, A/C.4/L.1037)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement by the Secretary-General (A/C.4/L.1037) concerning the administrative and financial implications of the recommendation in draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035.

2. Mr. REFADI (Libyan Arab Republic), further to his statement at the preceding meeting in support of his delegation's amendment (A/C.4/L.1036) to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, said that in addition to the fact that the phrase "by all ways and means at their disposal" appeared in a number of United Nations resolutions to which he had previously referred, similar wording appeared in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2047/Rev.1, which had been adopted by 91 affirmative votes at the 2109th meeting of the Third Committee, on 7 November 1973.¹ The Third Committee's decision was in complete harmony with the position of the Libyan delegation in the Fourth Committee. He requested a roll-call vote on his amendment.

3. Mr. HEIDWEILLER (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands Government had on many occasions urged the Government of Portugal to recognize the right to self-determination of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde. His delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII), which had called on the Portuguese Government to negotiate with the liberation movements with a view to enabling the peoples under its administration to decide their own political destiny. It should be recalled that Amílcar Cabral, the late Secretary-General of the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), had expressed the willingness of PAIGC to enter into negotiations with the Portuguese Government. His delegation was still convinced that a peaceful transfer of power to the people of Guinea-Bissau, to the advantage of those people and of Portugal itself, would have been possible had the Portuguese Government accepted that offer of negotiation. It was deeply disappointing that Portugal had turned a deaf ear to the offers of the

liberation movements of Guinea-Bissau and its other African colonies and that it chose to quell the genuine aspirations of the peoples of those Territories by force of arms. His delegation fervently hoped that the fighting in the Territories would cease immediately, that a dialogue would be initiated between Portugal and the leaders of the liberation movements and that armed confrontation would give way to peaceful co-operation.

4. The destinies of Portugal and the Territories under its administration were not the only issues at stake. Speaking on the problem of southern Africa, the Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated in the General Assembly (2128th plenary meeting) that, if the international community remained idle spectators, the problems besetting that part of the world would inevitably culminate in conflicts, the world-wide consequences of which would be incalculable. His delegation therefore urged the Government of Portugal to begin negotiations with PAIGC and the other liberation movements so as to prevent the storm which would ultimately wreck any possibility of a solid and lasting relationship between itself and the peoples of its African Territories. In so doing, Portugal would also improve its relations with its European allies.

5. With regard to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, he pointed out that every decision made within the framework of the United Nations should be in accordance with the precepts enshrined in the Charter. His delegation therefore interpreted the phrase "by all ways and means at their disposal", proposed in the amendment (A/C.4/L.1036) to the draft, as denoting peaceful and non-violent action. Moreover, while recognizing the important role of the liberation movements as the authentic representatives of the true aspirations of the peoples of the Territories, it did not feel that those movements should be considered the sole authentic representatives of the peoples concerned, for that would prejudice the results of freely held elections in those Territories.

6. His delegation welcomed the appeal in operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 to Governments, specialized agencies and other organizations to render assistance to the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese domination, and in particular to the population of the liberated areas. The Netherlands Government had decided to give humanitarian aid to those peoples, preferably through multilateral channels.

7. He noted with regret the absence of an operative paragraph in the draft resolution calling on the Government of Portugal to initiate negotiations with the liberation movements. While appreciating the view of African delegations that such appeals had shown themselves to be of no avail, his delegation considered that it would have helped to

¹ Subsequently adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 3070 (XXVIII).

convince Portugal that a continuation of its colonial policies would only increase its isolation in the international community. Moreover, his delegation had serious misgivings about the wisdom of operative paragraph 9 (c), which called on States to exclude Portugal from taking part on behalf of Angola and Mozambique in any bilateral or multilateral treaties or agreements relating particularly to external trade in the products of those Territories. The Netherlands Government considered that under the Charter Portugal was still responsible for those Territories.

8. Notwithstanding its misgivings about certain parts of the draft resolution and about its practicability, his delegation would vote in favour of it. Its vote would reflect the Netherlands' total rejection of Portugal's attempt to solve the problem by force of arms instead of seeking a political solution.

9. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his Government's position on the question of the Territories under Portuguese administration had been stated on several occasions. The Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs had recently expressed in the General Assembly (2144th plenary meeting) his country's grave concern about the continuation of colonial rule in those Territories and its regret that Portugal had not complied with the decisions of the Security Council, in particular resolution 322 (1972). Its refusal to allow the people of those Territories to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, its rejection of the negotiations recommended by the Security Council in its resolution with a view to the transfer of power to freely elected political institutions and representatives of all the peoples concerned, in short, its disregard of the unanimous will of the international community, seemed unrealistic. Belgium had endeavoured, wherever possible, to convince the administering Power that such a policy was futile and that it jeopardized relations between Europe and Africa.

10. There was no doubt that in the Territories under Portuguese administration there was growing support for new structures which would not exclude the establishment of privileged relations with Portugal. The continued resort to arms and the growing loss of human lives would only make the political evolution of those Territories in an atmosphere of friendship and understanding more difficult to achieve.

11. In view of the delaying tactics of the administering Power, Belgium had agreed with the Security Council in recognizing the legitimacy of the struggle being waged by the people of the Territories to obtain their right to self-determination and independence. His country was prepared to consider granting humanitarian aid to the victims of that struggle through international organizations. In sponsoring draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035 proposing the establishment of a commission of inquiry to investigate the reported atrocities in Mozambique, Belgium was inspired by the same humanitarian considerations and by its concern to ensure respect for human rights. It was necessary to uncover the whole truth about the reported incidents, which had caused widespread dismay and sadness in Belgium.

12. He urged the Portuguese authorities not to prevent the United Nations from exercising its rights and responsibilities

with regard to a Territory to which Chapter XI of the Charter clearly applied. The Belgium Government and people hoped that Portugal would change its policy in Africa and that negotiations would begin between the parties concerned. That should have been the main theme of the draft resolution on the question. Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 departed from the path laid down by the Security Council and seemed unlikely to contribute to a solution of the problem. Many of its provisions were open to question and his delegation regretted that it would be unable to support it.

13. Mrs. JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone) said that it was unnecessary to stress her Government's stand on decolonization, since its membership in the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, its declarations at meetings of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and of Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, and the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV)), originally adopted in the Special Committee under the chairmanship of the Sierra Leone representative, had all made it abundantly clear. The phrase "by all ways and means at their disposal" proposed in the Libyan amendment (A/C.4/L.1036) had, however, been deleted from resolution 322 (1972), adopted by the Security Council at its Addis Ababa meeting in 1972, and from the resolution adopted in 1972 by the Special Committee² with the active support of Amílcar Cabral, who had not pressed for its inclusion because he had considered that the question of decolonization had taken a turn for the better. The resolution without that phrase had been adopted by 98 affirmative votes in the General Assembly (resolution 2918 (XXVII)). The draft resolution recently adopted by the Third Committee, to which the Libyan representative had referred, related to a different agenda item. Her delegation would not accept the amendment because it wished to obtain the votes of countries other than those belonging to OAU and the group of non-aligned countries, whose views were already well known. The national liberation movements had stated that they were engaged in fighting and the General Assembly had recognized the legitimacy of their struggle. If the amendment was adopted, her delegation would not vote against the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2) as a whole, but it would have serious reservations about it.

14. Mr. TALVITIE (Finland), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden as well as his own to explain the votes they would cast on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, said that they were disappointed that the drafting group had departed from the tradition of holding informal consultations with other interested delegations at an early stage. The draft resolution presented greater difficulties for the Nordic countries than had those submitted at the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh sessions. The increasing manifestation of unity among Member States should have been allowed to continue, thereby further increasing the pressure upon the

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 23 (A/8723/Add.3)*, para. 34.

Portuguese Government. The omission in the draft resolution of the reference to the need for negotiations between the parties concerning the prerequisites for the application of the principle of self-determination meant that what at the previous session had been regarded as the very core of the resolution was lacking. The Nordic countries understood that the reason for the omission was Portugal's continued refusal to accept the idea of negotiations, an attitude which they deplored. In General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII), however, the reference to the need for negotiations had been in the form of a statement of fact, and not a plea to the Portuguese Government. It was therefore difficult to justify the omission.

15. Moreover, there were certain elements of the draft resolution which were not in accordance with traditional principles of the Nordic Governments, or which raised certain constitutional problems. In operative paragraphs 7 and 9, they could not accept an interpretation which might imply a request for the severing of normal economic relations. Such a step would require a Security Council decision to impose mandatory sanctions. Moreover, the Nordic countries would have preferred the twelfth preambular paragraph to be worded along the lines they had previously been able to accept.

16. Nevertheless, with those reservations, and in the hope that past efforts to secure a growing majority for the draft resolutions would be renewed, the Nordic delegations would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 as a whole.

17. Mr. MONTANER (Chile) said that his delegation condemned Portugal's negative attitude and non-compliance with United Nations resolutions affirming the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination. It acknowledged the legitimacy of their struggle and recognized the national liberation movements as the authentic representatives of the people both in the Territories and at meetings of United Nations bodies as appropriate. His delegation would, however, abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 because in its view there was a contradiction between the statements in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 and in draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035 setting up a commission of inquiry. The normal legal procedure was not to accept assertions as facts until they had been duly proved. Furthermore, condemnation of Portuguese methods would carry a greater weight if such facts were duly confirmed.

18. Mr. PAQUI (Dahomey) said that he would not accept the Libyan amendment (A/C.4/L.1036), as a matter of principle. His delegation's views had already been made known at meetings of the drafting group. If the Portuguese were intransigent, it was for the Committee to show political maturity and not to copy the Portuguese example. Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, perfectly conveyed the Libyan point of view and no amendment was necessary. If the amendment was accepted, his delegation would have to withdraw its sponsorship of the draft resolution.

19. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the Libyan amendment (*ibid.*) because it would introduce ambiguities in an important part

of the draft resolution. His delegation's interpretation of the amendment was that it would not prejudice Australia's well-known and frequently expressed reservations about the use of force to eradicate colonialism and other evils. Australia sympathized with the aims of the national liberation movements in southern Africa and well understood that frustration might lead to the view that armed struggle was indispensable. It stopped short, however, of endorsing the use of force to attain any objective. His delegation hoped that, through the application of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, liberty and equality might be achieved without war. His delegation would, however, support draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 as a whole.

20. Mr. WALTER (New Zealand) said that his delegation would vote against the Libyan amendment in document A/C.4/L.1036, first because it did not consider that it would improve the text of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, which had found general acceptance in the Committee, and secondly because, while acknowledging that opinions on the best way of achieving self-determination in the Territories under Portuguese administration differed, his delegation was reluctant to introduce into an important resolution language which might create the impression that the United Nations was being diverted from its efforts to bring about a peaceful solution to the problem. Lastly, his delegation understood that there had been a broad measure of agreement on the text before the Committee and it was important to secure as wide a basis of support as possible for draft resolutions of that kind.

21. Mr. KOUAMÉ (Ivory Coast) said that his delegation fully supported all facets of the struggle by the national liberation movements. Proof of that support was provided by his country's contribution, in company with most African countries, to the Assistance Fund for the Struggle against Colonialism and *Apartheid* of the Organization of African Unity. He considered that the explanation given by the Sierra Leone representative was judicious, and he appealed to the Libyan representative to withdraw his amendment (A/C.4/L.1036) in order to avoid a division among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2. It was important to score a political success by securing the largest possible measure of support.

22. Mr. IBRAHIM (Sudan) said that his delegation was placed in a difficult position by the unwillingness of the Libyan representative to withdraw his amendment (*ibid.*). Its only concern was the interests of the national liberation movements. He did not understand why some delegations felt that they could not condone the use of force. They should consider how Europeans had reacted when they had been attacked by Hitler; there was no reason why Africans should be denied the same right. Nowhere in the Charter was the use of force prohibited in all situations; indeed, the United Nations itself had used force on some occasions. It was the right of national liberation movements, faced with increasing Portuguese violence, to use any means at their disposal. At the previous session his delegation had supported the attempt to add the phrase proposed in the Libyan amendment to the draft resolution subsequently adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 2918 (XXVII). It would therefore vote in favour of the

amendment and appealed to all friends of Africa to do likewise.

23. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he took note of the presence of the Portuguese delegation in view of its previous statement that it would not appear at a meeting at which representatives of the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) were present.

24. He regretted the position with regard to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 as a member of both the African and Afro-Asian groups of States. The draft resolution had been the result of prolonged consultations and constituted the basis for the broadest support to eliminate Portuguese domination in Africa. It contained all the essential elements including that aspect which preoccupied the Libyan representative. Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution did not preclude the use of force by the national liberation movements; on the contrary it implicitly recognized it. The Libyan amendment in document A/C.4/L.1036 was therefore unnecessary and tended to cause division in the ranks where solidarity was required. His delegation would therefore not participate in the vote on the amendment.

25. Mr. OKIA (Uganda) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the Libyan amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.1036 because it appeared to be both logical and consistent. If it was agreed that the people of the Portuguese Territories had the right to self-determination and if operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 implicitly accepted the use of force, it did not seem logical to reject the phrase proposed in the Libyan amendment. Furthermore, the Third Committee had just adopted a draft resolution¹ which specifically referred to the use of force. He was not impressed by the argument that the Third Committee draft resolution was not relevant because it related to another agenda item, since the principle of self-determination was the same whether the question was one of racial, national or class discrimination. Honesty, too, compelled the acceptance of the Libyan amendment, since Amílcar Cabral had wanted contacts with the Portuguese but the latter had rejected the proposal.

26. He did not consider that operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 was made ambiguous by the additional phrase; it appeared, on the contrary, to be made clearer. That was an advantage, since some United Nations resolutions such as Security Council resolution 242 (1967), relating to the Middle East, had suffered from the fact that various interpretations were possible. It was not for the Committee to dictate methods to the liberation movements; they would have to use whatever means they could.

27. Mr. MAMPUYA (Zaire) said that, in view of the intransigent attitude of Portugal, his delegation considered that all forms of struggle should be employed. The present text appeared to limit such possibilities; his delegation was therefore in favour of the Libyan amendment (A/C.4/L.1036), which would make draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 clearer and more comprehensive.

28. Mr. MACRIS (Greece) said that, ever since the establishment of the United Nations, Greece had been in

the forefront of the fight for the recognition of the right to self-determination, independence and freedom and for the elimination of discrimination based on race, colour or creed. The remnants of colonialism were merely another form of racial discrimination. The principles of the Charter must be respected by all; the most important of all was the principle of the self-determination of peoples, which had been the foundation of Greece's policy since 1945 and was rooted in long tradition and in the Hellenic national character.

29. Accordingly, his delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII) on the question of Territories under Portuguese administration; for the same reasons, it would support draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2. Certain provisions, however, caused his delegation some difficulties and, if a separate vote had been taken on each paragraph, his delegation would have abstained on or voted against the second, fourth, seventh, eleventh and fifteenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 2, 6 and 7.

30. His delegation did not wish to associate itself with any expression of strong condemnation, any call for complete isolation or any suggestion of assistance to step up the armed struggle, because it feared that, instead of promoting the liberation of peoples, that might lead to the spread and intensification of bloody conflicts, which would bring more sacrifices to the god of war.

31. Moreover, his delegation wished to reaffirm that it could envisage action by the specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies only within the limitations of their particular statutes and that the material assistance mentioned in the draft resolution must be consistent with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

32. Mr. FADHLI (Democratic Yemen) said that he agreed with the Sudanese and Ugandan representatives in supporting the Libyan amendment in document A/C.4/L.1036. His delegation fully appreciated the position of the national liberation movements, since his country had suffered from occupation in the past and still harboured foreign intruders. It was essential to meet the enemy on his own ground and it would be desirable for African nations to unite in the Committee in support of the national liberation movements.

33. Mr. FAHNBULLEH (Liberia) said that he supported the Libyan amendment in document A/C.4/L.1036 because it was essential to demonstrate African solidarity. It was the allies of Portugal which were waging war on Africa and not vice versa. The situation was a challenge both to Africa and to the United Nations. It was clear that, whether or not the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, Portugal would not accept it, as had been clearly demonstrated in a letter from the Portuguese representative (A/C.4/768). The phrase proposed in the Libyan amendment had been used in previous resolutions and he wished friends of Africa to understand that it touched a point of vital interest. Nothing must be done to weaken the position of the weaker side or strengthen that of the stronger. He reminded the Committee that it had been Liberia in

conjunction with Ethiopia which had taken the case of Namibia to the International Court of Justice in 1962.³

34. Mr. DJIGO (Senegal) said that he deeply regretted the lack of unity among the African delegations with regard to the Libyan amendment (A/C.4/L.1036), which his delegation would support. It had been argued that the wording of the amendment had not been included in the corresponding General Assembly resolution of the previous session (resolution 2918 (XXVII)), that it was contrary to the Charter, and that the proposed words should be excluded in order to gain the support of certain countries which would otherwise find themselves in an embarrassing situation. In voting on similar resolutions at previous sessions, however, those countries had abstained and they would do so again. Members should refrain from bargaining with them in order to win their votes. It had also been argued that the amendment would legitimize armed struggle. That had already been legitimized, however, by OAU and by the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in September 1973.

35. Mr. FOUNGUI (Congo) said that the amendment in document A/C.4/L.1036 was not in contradiction with the spirit of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2. His delegation was convinced that it would be acting correctly in voting in favour of the amendment. Delegations that did not do so would be playing into the hands of Portugal.

36. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) said that his delegation, which would vote in favour of the Libyan amendment in document A/C.4/L.1036, felt compelled to reply to the statement by the representative of the Netherlands that the wording of the amendment was to be interpreted as denoting peaceful and non-violent action. Although the Libyan amendment involved a departure from past practice, there should be no departure from principles. He drew attention to the principles embodied in Article 1, paragraph 2 and Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Charter. In denying its colonial Territories self-determination and independence and refusing to negotiate with the liberation movements, Portugal had failed to act in good faith. Instead, it had resorted to savage acts of genocide.

37. If the representative of the Netherlands considered that the armed struggle of the liberation movements was contrary to the Charter and that a peaceful solution should be found, was he ready to approve of the inhuman acts committed by Portugal, which were themselves contrary to the Charter? If people were deprived of all means of defending themselves, the only alternative was to resort to armed struggle. Members must show good faith in discharging their obligations under the Charter in order to ensure the success of the liberation struggle.

38. He appealed to all delegations, including those of the Western and Latin American States, to ignore questions of procedure. They should all isolate Portugal in their defence of the principles of self-determination and independence.

³ See *South West Africa Cases (Ethiopia v. South Africa; Liberia v. South Africa)*, Preliminary Objections, Judgment of 21 December 1962: I.C.J. Reports 1962, p. 319.

39. Mr. BRIN MARTINEZ (Panama) said that his country had always supported the struggle for the elimination of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racial discrimination. His delegation would vote in favour of the Libyan amendment, which accorded with the aspirations of the African people.

40. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait), speaking as one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, said that, for reasons of merit, principle and morality, his delegation could not but vote in favour of the Libyan amendment which would reflect the valiant struggle of the freedom fighters against ruthless opposition.

41. Since the wording of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was drawn from Security Council resolution 312 (1972), there was undeniable validity in the contention of many of the sponsors that that wording should not be amended. Since, however, there was great merit in the Libyan amendment, his delegation would vote in favour of it and urged the other sponsors to do likewise.

42. Mr. KOUAMÉ (Ivory Coast) pointed out that the liberation struggle was being waged in the field and that the liberation movements had not waited for endorsement by the United Nations before taking up arms. Furthermore, while armed struggle had been endorsed by OAU and the group of non-aligned countries, many States Members of the United Nations were not members of those two bodies. In the name of solidarity, a concession should be made to those Member States. If, however, his appeal was not heeded he would abstain in the vote on the Libyan amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.1036.

43. Mr. REFADI (Libyan Arab Republic) said that his delegation would maintain its amendment.

44. Mr. ORR (Jamaica) said that, far from adding clarity to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, the Libyan amendment in document A/C.4/L.1036 might introduce into it serious ambiguities not in keeping with the Charter. The amendment was not likely to gain increased support by the international community for the liberation movements. His delegation would therefore abstain if the amendment was put to the vote.

45. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-ÅHMAN (Sweden), speaking as one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035, recalled that the text was the result of extensive consultations with the aim of arriving at a draft resolution that could be adopted by consensus. She therefore appealed to all members to agree that the draft resolution in question should be adopted by consensus. Most of the sponsors would deeply deplore failure to do so.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 92 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Libyan amendment (A/C.4/L.1036) would be put to the vote first.

At the request of the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic, the vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia,

Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt.

Against: Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Khmer Republic, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France.

Abstaining: Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Philippines, Singapore, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Australia, Bhutan, Botswana, Cameroon, Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, El Salvador.

The Libyan amendment (A/C.4/L.1036) was adopted by 61 votes to 31, with 27 abstentions.

47. Mr. REFADI (Libyan Arab Republic) requested a separate roll-call vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, as amended.

48. Mr. Cissé (Mali) said that his delegation wished its name to be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that, since the Libyan amendment to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 had been adopted, the name of the delegation of Dahomey would, in accordance with its expressed wish, be deleted from the list of sponsors.

50. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on a point of order, said that, although his delegation would not wish to oppose the Libyan proposal for a separate roll-call vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, such a procedure would create a dangerous precedent for draft resolutions voted upon in the Fourth Committee. He appealed to the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic not to press his proposal; his point had been made by the adoption of his amendment. The draft resolution would be stronger if voted upon as a whole, rather than paragraph by paragraph.

51. The CHAIRMAN endorsed that appeal.

52. Mr. REFADI (Libyan Arab Republic) replied that his delegation was entitled under the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to request a separate vote on a particular paragraph. He did not agree that that would create a dangerous precedent.

53. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania), supported by Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) and Mr. KOUAMÉ (Ivory Coast), said that, if the Libyan delegation did not withdraw its proposal, he would have no option but to oppose it under rule 91 of the rules of procedure.

54. Mr. PAQUI (Dahomey) and Mr. FOURATI (Tunisia) appealed to the Libyan representative not to press his proposal.

55. Mr. REFADI (Libyan Arab Republic) replied that he would heed the appeal and would withdraw his proposal.

At the request of the representative of Portugal, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, as amended.

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

In favour: Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece.

Against: Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Brazil, France.

Abstaining: Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nicaragua, Uruguay, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Germany (Federal Republic of).

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, as amended, was adopted by 102 votes to 6, with 16 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Portugal, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035.

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

In favour: Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka,

Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg.

Against: Portugal, Spain, United States of America.

Abstaining: Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Congo, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Hungary.

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035 was adopted by 103 votes to 3, with 16 abstentions.

56. Miss BEGIN (Canada) said that, at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII) on the question of Territories under Portuguese administration, her delegation had attached great importance to paragraph 3 of that resolution, which called for negotiations. Canada fully understood the reasons that had prompted the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 on the same question to omit the call for negotiations; every member of the Committee deplored the unwillingness of the Portuguese authorities to take advantage of the opportunity offered it by the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session to take the first steps towards a settlement that would satisfy all parties. Nevertheless, her delegation considered it unwise to abandon all hope of a peaceful settlement through negotiation, a principle which was the very foundation of the United Nations. The Committee should have continued to urge Portugal to recognize that its true interest lay in negotiation and in fulfilling its obligations under the Charter.

57. Although no operative paragraph directly called for negotiations, her delegation had been glad to note that the representative of Kenya had expressly emphasized the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 10. Those two paragraphs, by referring to General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII) and Security Council resolution 322 (1972), made it clear that the appeal to Portugal for negotiations still stood. Canada appealed once more to the Government of Portugal to agree to a peaceful negotiated settlement of the painful question of self-determination in the Territories under Portuguese administration.

58. Her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 in spite of its serious reservations on some of the provisions. It deeply deplored the adoption of the amendment (A/C.4/L.1036) and agreed with the

representatives of Sierra Leone, Cameroon, Morocco and Ethiopia that the amendment was undesirable. She wished to make it clear that in her delegation's view the expression "the legitimacy of their struggle by all ways and means at their disposal to achieve that right" did not imply any resort to force.

59. Concerning the twelfth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7, her delegation wished to reaffirm that since 1963 Canada had not permitted the sale to Portugal of any weapons that could be used for military purposes in the African Territories under Portuguese administration. Similarly, it no longer permitted the sale or supply of military matériel and equipment which could be so used. Her delegation wished to emphasize, as other delegations had done, that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as such did not provide Portugal with any weapons. The arms Portugal received from some NATO countries or from other countries were supplied strictly on a bilateral basis. Canada therefore rejected the accusations frequently made in the Committee to the effect that NATO was giving military assistance to Portugal.

60. Lastly, her delegation wished to express its reservations concerning the thirteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 9, which called for restrictions on trade with Portugal. Canada had always pursued a policy of free trade with all countries, irrespective of their political or ideological systems, and it had no intention of deviating from that principle. Similarly, it could not accept a text that implied any intervention whatever in trade agreements between countries on which the United Nations had not imposed economic sanctions.

61. Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela) said that he had a number of reservations concerning draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2. His delegation would have preferred the Libyan amendment not to have been adopted, and the explanations of vote given before the vote suggested that many of the sponsors of the draft resolution shared that view. Furthermore, operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution conflicted to some extent with the principle of self-determination, since it assumed the national liberation movements of Angola and Mozambique to be the authentic representatives of the peoples of those Territories, in spite of the fact that those peoples had not yet had an opportunity to express their views on the matter. Finally, the categorical conclusion reached in the tenth preambular paragraph was premature, since there was not sufficient information available on the alleged acts of aggression committed by the armed forces of Portugal.

62. Mr. MacKERNAN (Ireland) said that the Government of Ireland was opposed to colonialism, and the Irish delegation had consistently supported the right of the Portuguese Territories to self-determination. Nevertheless, his delegation had a number of reservations concerning resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2. It did not think that sufficient information was available to justify the conclusion reached in paragraph 2. Furthermore, although his delegation in no way condoned the actions of Portugal, it felt that paragraph 3 assumed that certain atrocities had been committed, without the Committee having sufficient information on which to judge the truth of reports of atrocities.

63. His delegation regretted that the draft resolution included no paragraph similar to paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII).

64. His delegation had voted against the Libyan amendment contained in document A/C.4/L.1036 because it had been unable to accept the endorsement of the use of violent methods implicit in that amendment.

65. Mr. ORANTES LUNA (Guatemala) said that his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 and A/C.4/L.1035 owing to reservations about certain paragraphs. That abstention in no way signified any change in Guatemala's traditional anti-colonialist position or a tacit acceptance of the intransigence of the administering Power in maintaining its domination over African Territories and peoples, in complete disregard of the latter's legitimate rights. His country had always been against all forms of discrimination, the suppression of fundamental human rights and colonial oppression. The basic principle of self-determination of peoples deserved full support, provided that there was also careful observance of the right of all peoples with regard to territorial integrity, as provided in paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

66. Mr. WORSLEY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation appreciated the efforts made by Sweden and its Scandinavian colleagues to obtain the widest possible support for draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035 calling for the establishment of a commission of inquiry. His delegation had felt obliged to abstain in the vote on that resolution because, according to the principles of the United Nations Charter, such investigations must be carried out by the administering Power. The letter received from the Portuguese authorities stated that such an investigation was being conducted. In view of the widespread concern, his Government urged Portugal to ensure not only that the investigation was thorough, but that it was seen to be so. By making the findings of that investigation available to the international community, the Portuguese authorities might allay many anxieties.

67. He regretted that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 had not done everything possible to gain the widest possible support. Although it was important that the opinions of the international community should be expressed, the wording of that draft resolution was not calculated to influence Portugal's policy in its African Territories. His delegation was of the view that the problem would be solved only by negotiations, as called for in Security Council resolution 322 (1972).

68. Mr. SIDIK (Indonesia) said that his delegation wished to reiterate that it fully supported the right of dependent peoples to employ armed struggle as a last resort. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 fully reflected Indonesia's position.

69. His delegation felt that, if that draft resolution was to be effective, it should enjoy the broadest possible support. With the adoption of the Libyan amendment, however, the resolution now included an explicit endorsement of armed struggle. Since several members had indicated that they would find it impossible to support such a draft resolution,

his delegation had felt obliged to abstain in the vote on the Libyan amendment.

70. His delegation also had certain doubts concerning the usefulness of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035. First, the letter in document A/C.4/768 stated that the Portuguese Government rejected the draft resolution. That rejection suggested that it would be extremely difficult to implement the resolution. Secondly, even if the Portuguese authorities were prepared to co-operate with the commission of inquiry, they would have ample time, either before the opening of the investigation or while it was being conducted, to eliminate or distort any unfavourable evidence concerning the atrocities.

71. His delegation would have preferred the mandate of the commission of inquiry to be extended to the investigation of any other massacres perpetrated under Portuguese administration, whenever and wherever they might have occurred. The communiqué in document A/C.4/767 suggested that similar acts were continuing in the Portuguese Territories. Consequently, it did not seem appropriate to limit the scope of the commission's activities to those covered by the consensus of 20 July 1973 of the Special Committee (A/9023/Add.3, para. 27).

72. In addition, his delegation would have preferred the language of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035 to be so framed as to make it clear that the Committee had no reason to doubt the truth of the reports of massacres which had been received, and which had been borne out by the evidence of witnesses who had addressed the Special Committee. As it stood, the draft resolution might be interpreted as indicating that the Committee had reason to suspect that no atrocities had occurred.

73. Nevertheless, in spite of its reservations, his delegation agreed in principle with the objectives of the draft resolution and had therefore voted in favour of it.

74. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that his delegation would have preferred not to vote against draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, since France fully supported some of its provisions, particularly those relating to the right of peoples to self-determination. At the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, his delegation had had to vote against resolution 2795 (XXVI) because it had included some provisions too extreme for France to support. At the twenty-seventh session, although General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII) had included some debatable references and some assertions that France could not accept, his delegation had abstained because the resolution had called for negotiations and France had wished to show its understanding of African impatience with Portugal's rigid position.

75. In the present case, his delegation had unfortunately been obliged to follow the same course as at the twenty-sixth session. The operative part of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 had not included a paragraph calling for negotiations, such as the paragraph which had been the corner-stone of resolution 2918 (XXVII). It was true that the administering Power had thus far shown no willingness to begin the process of self-determination, but his delegation nevertheless regretted that the present resolution

emphasized only the continuation of the struggle and did not even mention the possibility of a peaceful solution.

76. Most important of all, his delegation could not accept the repeated allegations that NATO was helping Portugal to maintain its domination over the African Territories. As his delegation had said at the 2163rd plenary meeting during the recent debate on item 107, dealing with the illegal occupation of certain sections of Guinea-Bissau by Portuguese forces, France's position on African problems had no connexion with the relationship that existed between the members of the Atlantic alliance.

77. Although his delegation would rather have voted in favour of a draft resolution enabling it to show its sympathy for the inalienable right of self-determination of the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese administration, the text before the Committee in draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 had left it no choice but to vote against it.

78. His delegation's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035 had been prompted by legal considerations. It was convinced of the need for a thorough and impartial international inquiry into the Mozambique massacres, but it felt that such a measure could not be imposed on the administering Power without violating the essential principles of Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter. In his delegation's view, the procedure proposed for the establishment of the commission of inquiry was contrary to the provisions of the Charter. Had it been otherwise, France would have been able to support the draft resolution.

79. His delegation had strong feelings concerning the events in Mozambique, which had been widely publicized in the French press. The reported atrocities had aroused a wave of indignation against the contempt for human dignity that such actions indicated, and France earnestly hoped that all the facts would be brought to light.

80. Mr. PLEUGER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 because it made unjustified charges against NATO by establishing a link between it and the policy pursued by Portugal in Africa—a view which his delegation had already rejected on several occasions. NATO was confined to a geographical area which did not include the African Territories under Portuguese administration; it was a regional arrangement within the meaning of Article 52 of the Charter, which was not only vital to the security of his country but indispensable for the balance of power in the world, thus contributing to the maintenance of peace. His delegation's abstention in the vote did not imply any change in his country's attitude towards the problems to which the draft resolution referred. As had been stated by the Chancellor, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, his country advocated the implementation of the right of self-determination in all parts of the world, condemned any form of discrimination and supported the legitimate desire of the peoples still under colonial domination for freedom. It believed, however, that independence could best be achieved by peaceful means, in order to maintain the economic and social potential of colonial peoples, to

safeguard their future and to prevent further suffering. His delegation could not therefore endorse the legitimacy of the use of force as a means of solving political problems, as was implied in the amended wording of paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2. The Federal Republic of Germany would give no military or economic assistance designed to maintain domination over the dependent African Territories. It supported the policy of the United Nations with regard to the elimination of the remnants of colonialism and for that reason it regretted that the draft resolution did not include a clause calling on Portugal to seek a peaceful solution to the problem by entering into negotiations with representatives of the people in the Territories under its administration.

81. His delegation had, however, been able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035.

82. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since a number of African countries clearly expected the work of the Committee to contribute to the exposure of the crimes committed by the Portuguese neo-colonialists, his delegation had no objection to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035. It had, however, abstained in the vote on that draft resolution because it felt that the atrocities committed by the Portuguese colonialists had already been established beyond all doubt by the communiqué issued by the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (see A/C.4/767) and by the witnesses who had come forward to give evidence to the Special Committee earlier in 1973. As a result of that evidence, the Special Committee had appealed to all Governments to denounce the acts committed by Portugal in the African Territories under its administration.

83. In addition, there was an obvious inconsistency between the two draft resolutions adopted by the Committee. Whereas draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 categorically condemned Portuguese atrocities, draft resolution A/C.4/L.1035 appeared to question whether such atrocities had actually been committed. Furthermore, his delegation felt that the establishment of a commission of inquiry could only divert attention from more effective efforts to liberate the Territories under Portuguese domination. The crimes committed by Portugal called for urgent action by the United Nations.

84. The Soviet peoples had steadfastly shown solidarity with the peoples of Africa in their struggle for liberation and would continue to do so.

85. Mr. BELEN (Turkey) said that, as a natural consequence of Turkey's well-established policy with regard to colonialism, his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2. As one of the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), Turkey had had no hesitation in supporting the implementation of the objectives mentioned in that resolution. At a time when they were celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of the Turkish Republic, the Turkish people felt closer than ever to the oppressed peoples of Africa.

86. His delegation had some reservations, however, with regard to the wording of certain paragraphs of draft

resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2. The repeated condemnations in the ninth, tenth and eleventh preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 3 weakened the force of the draft. It would have been better to lay the stress on the essential objective. Furthermore, several preambular and operative paragraphs referred to NATO in a way which was far from reflecting its true nature; it was a defensive regional organization, some of whose members, including Turkey, had always been in favour of decolonization. With regard to the fourth preambular paragraph, his delegation had at the previous session (1976th meeting) expressed its concern about the legal aspect and the political consequences of a decision to give the national liberation movements observer status, although it had no doubt that they were the authentic representatives of the true aspirations of the peoples of the Territories concerned. With regard to operative paragraph 9, his delegation had always favoured making a distinction between economic activities

likely to strengthen foreign domination and those which would benefit the indigenous inhabitants.

87. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the amendment in document A/C.4/L.1036. It interpreted that amendment in the context of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (see General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV)). If draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 had included a provision on negotiations between the parties concerned such as that in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2918 (XXVII), his delegation could have voted in favour of the amendment, the purport of which would have been better defined.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

2058th meeting

Tuesday, 13 November 1973, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2058

AGENDA ITEM 71

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (*continued*) (A/9023/Add.3, A/9048, A/9053, A/9061, A/9079, A/9085, A/9089, A/9099, A/9111, A/9113, A/9132 and Add.1 and 2, A/9174, A/C.4/760, A/C.4/763, A/C.4/766, A/C.4/767, A/C.4/768, A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2, A/C.4/L.1035, A/C.4/L.1036, A/C.4/L.1037)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*concluded*) (A/C.4/L.1034/REV.2, A/C.4/L.1035, A/C.4/L.1036, A/C.4/L.1037)

1. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) first of all thanked the observer from the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) who had made a valuable contribution to the work of the Committee (2055th meeting). Italy firmly supported the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and in considering problems relating to decolonization had been, and would always be, guided by the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. It was in that spirit that he had considered draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2. While he shared the views of the sponsors with regard to the paragraphs reaffirming the principles which should guide the United Nations in trying to solve the problem, he did not believe that all the paragraphs, as currently worded, would serve to attain the objectives pursued.

2. He had voted against the amendment in document A/C.4/L.1036 because it appeared to support the idea of the use of force. He did not deny that when peoples were deprived of their fundamental rights armed struggles occurred, but he did not agree that the United Nations should envisage violent solutions.

3. With regard to the references made in the draft resolution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), he pointed out that he had already on other occasions refuted the accusations against that organization, of which Italy was a member. He had therefore been unable to vote in favour of the paragraphs in which reference was made to NATO because that would have implied tacit acceptance of the unfounded accusations directed against that organization. He regretted that his position had not been taken into account, since the draft resolution would then have gained the support of many more members.

4. He also had reservations regarding the elimination of the suggestion that the Government of Portugal and the representatives of the peoples concerned should initiate negotiations. In that connexion, he appealed to the Government of Portugal to respond to the pressing request of the peoples of the Territories under its administration.

5. The wording of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was not acceptable because it prejudged the issue and he also had doubts about the advisability of including a reference to political, diplomatic and material assistance, which, in view of the vague formulation, was very difficult to define and seemed not to be in line with the Charter.

6. Finally, he had reservations about the proposal in paragraphs 7 and 9, which was tantamount to imposing economic sanctions. That was a matter which, in his opinion, fell within the competence of the Security Council. For all those reasons, his delegation had been unable to support draft resolution A/C.4/L.1034/Rev.2 and had therefore abstained in the vote.