



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 23:</i>	
<i>Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (chapter on Territories under Portuguese administration) (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	381

Chairman: Mr. ACHKAR Marof (Guinea).

AGENDA ITEM 23

Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (chapter on Territories under Portuguese administration) (A/5446/Rev.1, chap. II; A/C.4/618 and Add.1; A/C.4/620) (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. SOKOLOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had not been surprised by the Spanish representative's violent reaction to his statement at the previous meeting, since the truth was often unpalatable. The Spanish representative had objected to the assertion that where racist policies were concerned Spain and Portugal were in the same category. He had not, however, been able to refute that fact. Fascism's racist policies were well known and everyone was aware on which side Spain's sympathies had been during the Second World War. Nothing had changed since then; fascism and racialism still survived and Spain and Portugal were ruled by the same dictators who had been there in Hitler's time.

2. As an example of Spain's racist policies, he said that in Fernando P6o, with the knowledge of the Spanish Governor-General, African vagrants were sold at public auction. The West African Pilot, a Nigerian newspaper, had reported that 500 Nigerian workers returning from Fernando P6o had appeared ill and exhausted and had borne the marks of being beaten and bound. The newspaper had demanded Government protection for Nigerian workers and an end of recruiting in Nigeria for work in Spain's African colonies. The Spanish representative had tried to convince the Committee that the facts were otherwise, but countries were judged not by their words but by their deeds. There was nothing to be proud of in the Spanish Government's deeds.

3. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was a member of the great family of soviet socialist republics. On its soil the fascists, including the Spanish Blue Division sent by the Spanish dictator to help

Hitler, had been destroyed. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic had contributed largely to the downfall of nazi Germany, had been one of the founding Members of the United Nations and had consistently defended the principles of the Charter.

4. Mr. MUDENGE (Rwanda) observed that the term "colony" was not clearly defined in the Charter but that the majority of Member States—and Portugal itself up to 1951—had always recognized that Angola and Cabinda, Mozambique, so-called Portuguese Guinea, Cape Verde and São Tomé and Príncipe were colonies. Resolution 1542 (XV) showed that the General Assembly was of the same opinion. In 1951, in the face of the irresistible liberation movement, Portugal had transformed those colonies into "overseas provinces" and those who queried that definition were accused of subversion or of being communist agents. Nevertheless the Novo Dicionário Compacto da Língua Portuguesa of 1962 defined a colony as an area in which colonists had settled, usually situated on another continent, or as a possession. That definition seemed to apply exactly to the African Territories under Portuguese domination. Furthermore, under Portuguese legislation the Territories were not regarded as ordinary provinces. No visa was needed in order to travel from Estremadura to Minho, as it was for a journey from Mozambique to Minho. No customs duties were charged on goods going from Algarve to Alentejo, as they were on goods entering Angola. In any event, whether the Portuguese Territories were colonies or pseudo provinces, Portugal had consistently refused to grant them independence on three pretexts, each more absurd than the other.

5. The first pretext was assimilation. Apparently the intention was to make Africans the equals of Portuguese; the reality, however, was very different. It was not surprising that the Africans were unwilling to accept "assimilation" which was indistinguishable from exploitation and slavery. At the 1155th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, held during the sixteenth session, Mr. Nogueira, the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs, had defined the Portuguese ideal multiracial society as a society where all ethnic groups were closely integrated and knitted together with a deep feeling of oneness. That was undoubtedly a fine ideal if it was based on a feeling of brotherhood and of respect for the individuality, culture and values of all the participants. The Head of the Portuguese Government, however, had nothing but contempt for Africans.

6. The second pretext for keeping the Territories under Portuguese domination was Portugal's so-called civilizing mission. Mr. Salazar claimed that the Portuguese were sacrificing themselves to protect the sacred heritage of Western Europe. Mr. Mudenge would suggest that the Portuguese should cease sacrificing themselves. The fact that after nearly 500 years of Portuguese domination only 1 per cent of the indige-

27. The laws of nature were unchangeable; the age of the colonialization and exploitation of Africa was past and the era of decolonization had begun. Alone among the colonial Powers, Portugal remained blind to that fact and continued to live in the past. Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter established the principle that Member States administering Non-Self-Governing Territories were answerable to the United Nations for their administration, and several General Assembly resolutions, in particular resolutions 1541 (XV) and 1542 (XV), confirmed that the Portuguese colonies were Non-Self-Governing Territories and that Portugal had an obligation to transmit information on them. Portugal had not supplied such information, but the United Nations had been able to obtain detailed data regarding the situation in the colonies from other sources. The petitioners heard by the Committee had testified, in particular, to the influence exerted over Portugal's political life by certain Western firms which operated throughout the Portuguese colonies and profited from cheap African labour.

28. Portugal, which was the poorest country in Europe, realized that it would be incapable of supplying its own needs without the revenue derived from the raw materials in its rich colonies. To cite but one example, in 1960 Angola's exports of coffee, sisal, sugar, cotton, palm oil and diamonds had earned \$67.5 million; 25% of that large sum went to Portugal and the rest was absorbed by the Western countries that bought the products. What did Portugal do for the peoples of its colonies in return? Each year thousands of Portuguese went to settle in the Territories, where they were given the best land; in Angola the European population had increased from 79,000 to 200,000 between 1950 and 1960. In the social field, the picture was one of forced labour, social stratification and racial discrimination, illiteracy, inadequate hospital facilities and injustices of all kinds. Such injustices had provoked resentment among the oppressed masses and had given rise to disturbances, to which Portugal had replied with savage repression, hoping to reduce the 12 million people under its domination to silence. Finding itself losing ground to the nationalists, Portugal was embarking on a war of devastation, killing and imprisoning thousands of the inhabitants and using napalm bombs to destroy scores of villages in "Portuguese" Guinea and Angola. The fierce massacre of 1961, in which hundreds of Angolans had been killed, was still fresh in the memory of all and it would be recalled that NATO weapons had been used. Again, as a demonstration of its policy of "good neighbourliness" towards the African States, Portugal had bombarded Senegalese villages in the autumn of 1963.

29. The continued presence of Portugal in its colonies was becoming intolerable to the Africans. The friends of Portugal could not ignore the fact of their complicity in the crimes being committed by Portugal throughout its colonial empire. Whatever they might say it was hard for them to dissociate their attitude from that of an accomplice. His delegation appealed to all the nations concerned to end all deliveries of arms to Portugal, since without such assistance Portugal would not be able to continue its colonial war.

30. The gravity of the situation had led thirty-two African States to request a meeting of the Security Council in July 1963. The resolution adopted by the Council on 31 July (S/5380)^{2/} set out clearly the principles on which a solution of the problem should

be based. It called upon Portugal to recognize the right of the peoples under its administration to self-determination and independence, and to undertake negotiations with a view to the transfer of power to the people in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

31. The definition of "self-determination" given by the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs (S/5448, sect. IV) was a new one: he had stated that for Portugal self-determination meant the consent of the people to a certain structure and political organization and it came about by participation in administration and in political life at all levels. That, he had said, was what was happening in the Portuguese Territories. If that claim was true, it might be asked why there was agitation in the Territories and why a hero of the resistance had said that intransigence would be answered with intransigence. In any case, what the Portuguese Government described as self-determination was nothing of the sort, for it was imposed, whereas true self-determination implied a free choice.

32. It was in order to obtain recognition of their right to self-determination that thousands of Guinean, Angolan and Mozambican nationalists had fallen or were falling under the bullets of Salazar. It was in virtue of that right, too, that Mr. Holden Roberto, the head of the Angolan Government in exile, had laid down four conditions for the restoration of peace in Angola: first, that Portugal must accept the principle of self-determination for the Angolans; secondly, that all political prisoners must be released; thirdly, that all the "forces of pacification" must be withdrawn; and lastly, that Portugal must open negotiations on the transfer of power to the Angolans. Those conditions were equally valid for the other Portuguese colonies. It was only in the context of the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination, as enshrined in the text of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and in the spirit that had prevailed when that Declaration had been drafted and adopted, that the situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration could be properly considered.

33. Mr. Chiping H.C. KIANG (China) recalled that the situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration was being dealt with by the Security Council and that in the resolution it had adopted on 31 July 1963 (S/5380) the Council had requested the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of that resolution. The Secretary-General's report was now before the Committee (S/5448 and Add.1). In the circumstances, his delegation was bearing in mind Article 12, paragraph 1, of the Charter.

34. As his delegation had said at the 1045th meeting of the Security Council, delay in coming to terms with African nationalism was bound to lead to protracted violence and could not prevent the eventual triumph of the forces of freedom. Whatever might be thought of Portugal's professed desire to create a multiracial society, the real question was whether Portugal had done enough to accelerate political progress and enable the peoples under its administration to move towards self-determination. The provisions of the Charter concerning self-determination were binding on Portugal as a Member of the United Nations, and a reaffirmation by the Portuguese Government of the principle of self-determination in its application to the African Territories would undoubtedly contribute to peace and security in Africa.

^{2/} *Ibid.*, Supplement for July, August and September 1963.

35. The Charter enjoined the peaceful settlement of disputes, and it would be most unfortunate for the inhabitants of the Portuguese Territories, for Portugal itself and for the whole world if all peaceful avenues were not fully explored. His delegation therefore noted with much interest the passage in the Secretary-General's report in which he expressed the view that the fact that representatives of the African States and Portugal had agreed to meet in order to discuss the matter was an encouraging development and pointed out that both sides had stressed the need for a peaceful settlement of their differences.

36. The petitioners who had spoken, especially those from Mozambique, had made a deep impression on the Committee by their conviction and sincerity, but he was bound to express concern about some of the remarks made during the hearing which seemed to imply a division of the free world along racial lines. Both during the hearing and during the debate Asian countries had been urged to exert their efforts in the cause of African nationalism, and in that connexion he would refer to the statement made at the present meeting by the representative of Mauritania. He could not understand how any doubt could exist regarding the commitment of the Asian countries to the battle against colonialism. During the first three years of the Second World War China had fought against colonialism single-handed. Subsequently, his country had vigorously supported the cause of the independence of India, Burma and Indonesia, and in the Trusteeship Council it had given unreserved support to the cause of an African country in disregard of a warning from a Member State with which China enjoyed the most friendly relations.

37. Finally, he wished to state that the status of Macau and dependencies was a matter concerning the Chinese and Portuguese Governments, as parties to a treaty agreement; it was therefore not a subject for discussion in any international forum or by any third party.

38. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that his delegation had always maintained that the United Nations was competent to discuss the Territories under Portuguese administration, that they were Non-Self-Governing Territories in the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter, and that they fell within the scope of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The Israel delegation had supported resolution 1807 (XVII) and had stated in the Committee at the previous session (1403rd meeting) that Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea were a part of Africa and that a fundamental change in Portugal's attitude towards them was needed. There could be no question that colonialism must be brought to an end; the only question was how that was to be done.

39. During the present year, the Security Council had taken up the question of the Territories under Portuguese administration and had adopted a resolution calling on Portugal to grant independence to its Territories and requesting all Member States to stop supplying arms to Portugal. Israel had taken all the necessary steps, long before the adoption of that resolution in the Security Council, to ensure that no arms or ammunition would be exported to Portugal either directly or indirectly. That policy had been affirmed in the Israel Parliament in 1961 and it had also been made clear that Israel would not sell arms to any State which might transmit those arms to a third State.

40. The petitioners had supplied much valuable information on conditions in the Territories under Portu-

guese administration. His delegation considered that particular attention should also be given to economic, social and educational conditions in the Territories; it had therefore welcomed the General Assembly's adoption of resolution 1808 (XVII) concerning a training programme for the Portuguese Territories. Israel attached great importance to the provision of facilities for training the inhabitants of dependent countries and during recent years a number of students from Angola, Guinea under Portuguese administration and Cape Verde had attended courses in Israel. Israel had informed the Secretary-General that it was ready to make its contribution to the implementation of resolution 1808 (XVII) by offering up to eighty scholarships to inhabitants of the Territories under Portuguese administration during the period 1963-1964.

41. He recalled that at the 1224th plenary meeting of the General Assembly the Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs had appealed to Portugal and asked whether bloodshed was needed to pave the way for the inevitable independence of the peoples under Portugal's rule. His people had no quarrel with the Portuguese people and considered that it was in the interests of Portugal to adapt itself to the modern world. It was in that spirit that Israel joined with the majority of the Members of the United Nations in urging Portugal to change its policies.

42. Mr. BAYONA (Colombia) recalled that on 31 July 1963 the Security Council had adopted resolution S/5380, operative paragraph 2 of which had summed up the view held by almost the entire international community that the policies of Portugal in claiming the Territories under its administration as "overseas" territories and as integral parts of metropolitan Portugal were contrary to the principles of the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. That decision, which was binding on all Member States by virtue of Article 25 of the Charter, had demolished the argument that the United Nations was not competent to consider the Territories under Portuguese administration because its competence did not extend to matters within the jurisdiction of States. If a matter directly affecting the purposes and principles of the Charter could be unilaterally declared by the State concerned to be a matter within its domestic jurisdiction, the field of United Nations action would be much reduced. Fortunately, the dynamic action taken by United Nations bodies was doing away with any misunderstanding of the interpretation and applicability of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

43. Although it had been said that the situation had remained virtually unchanged owing to the Portuguese Government's inflexible attitude, his delegation, which was anxious that a peaceful and friendly solution should be found to the problem, drew some comfort from the conclusion in the Secretary-General's report (S/5448, sec. V) that from the Portuguese explanation of their position it might be inferred that the Portuguese Government had not denied the principle of self-determination for the peoples of its overseas territories. The Secretary-General's conclusions should not be dismissed; in particular, it would not be wise to disregard his suggestion that the conversations between representatives of the African States and of the Portuguese Government should continue, or to disregard his appeal that the spirit of understanding and moderation evinced during the recent talks should continue to prevail.

44. Recognition of the right of the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese administration to self-determination could not be delayed, both because of the force of Security Council resolution S/5380 and because of the deterioration in the situation in those Territories. Although his delegation was fully aware of the anxiety and the despair of the African peoples and of their determination to eradicate colonialism in Africa, it was of the opinion that a final attempt to achieve understanding with Portugal was advisable. The process of decolonization was universal in scope. Past inter-American conferences had adopted resolutions proclaiming the solidarity of the American Republics with the peoples still awaiting independence, and repudiating the use of force for the maintenance of the colonial system in the continent of America. The American Republics could not adopt a different attitude in respect of the same problem in other parts of the world. His delegation was therefore particularly concerned about the fact, reported by the petitioners, that Portugal was intensifying its repression of nationalists in the African Territories under its administration.

45. His delegation was convinced that, given sincere goodwill, it would be easy to reach agreement on the interpretation of the term "self-determination", since enough information on that subject was already available and many useful examples were to be found in past United Nations endeavours in the field of decolonization. A contribution to the final definition of the scope and significance of self-determination could be found in Pope John XXIII's encyclical *Pacem in terris* in which the Pontiff had stated that the modern world, as compared with the recent past, had taken on an entirely new appearance in the field of social and political life; for since all nations had either achieved or were on the way to achieving independence, there would soon no longer exist a world divided into nations that ruled others and nations that were subject to others. The Pope had gone on to say that no one wanted to feel subject to political powers located outside his own country or ethnical group and that the idea that one group of men was inferior and another superior was disappearing.

46. In the opinion of his delegation, self-determination could have but one meaning; namely, the ability of people to choose their own destiny freely, without being subjected to outside pressures. It should not be forgotten that in addition to enshrining the principle of self-determination the Charter stressed the principle of equal rights. His delegation held that the right to self-determination should be applied universally, without any exception. In all parts of the world there were still many peoples under the yoke of foreign domination. Coexistence would remain an illusion as long as fundamental human rights were violated in any part of the world.

47. In due course the Security Council would again deal with the question of the Territories under Portuguese administration. In his delegation's opinion nothing would be more welcome than a change in Portugal's policy which would obviate the need for the application of the extreme measures provided for in the Charter. In a statement before the Security Council the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs had quoted a Portuguese law of 1612 in which Portugal's overseas possessions had been called "overseas provinces".^{3/} According to that law, those provinces had been administered according to the same laws as Portugal's

European provinces and a man born in Goa, Brazil or Angola was as Portuguese as a man born at Lisbon. The Committee would note that Brazil had been included in the list of territories referred to in the 1612 law. Yet Brazil was now a free and independent State enjoying friendly relations with the former metropolitan country. He hoped that the Territories still under Portuguese administration would be enabled to exercise their right to self-determination and, on becoming independent, would maintain as good relations with Portugal as did Brazil.

48. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus) expressed the hope that despite the attitude that Portugal had taken with regard to the report of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration (A/5160 and Add.1 and 2), of which Cyprus had been a member, Portugal would see its way to working out an acceptable solution to the attainment of independence by the Territories now under its administration, in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the spirit of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

49. In justification of its failure to comply with United Nations resolutions, Portugal was claiming that its overseas territories were in fact provinces and parts of metropolitan Portugal and that they were being developed as part of a multiracial Portuguese family. It had also been charged that, by placing the item on its agenda, the General Assembly was trying to prevent the emergence of multiracial societies, which provided the most constructive approach to world peace and harmony.

50. There could, of course, be no objection to the establishment of political, cultural or other relationships between the metropolitan country and the Territories formerly under its administration, provided that such relationships were established in accordance with the wishes of all the people, freely expressed after independence. A unilateral decree by Portugal was not enough and did not absolve Portugal from its obligations to the United Nations. Such a multiracial society presupposed equality regardless of race, colour or creed, whereas almost all the petitioners had spoken of lack of civil and political rights, absence of freedom of speech, of assembly and of association, exploitation of the indigenous inhabitants, primitive living conditions, oppression, discriminatory labour legislation and outright forced labour. From such evidence it could not be concluded that equality prevailed in the Territories under Portuguese administration.

51. It had repeatedly been stated in the Committee that it was futile to adopt resolutions which Portugal failed to implement. His delegation felt, however, that Portugal was not entirely insensitive to international opinion and that it even took pride in the fact that certain legislative changes had been made in the past few years. His delegation had noted, in particular, that Portugal had suggested to the Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola that it should study the information given in the ILO report on forced labour^{4/} and the legislation enacted in the past three years. Having studied the ILO report, he could not subscribe to the view expressed by Portugal's Minister for Foreign Affairs that the ILO Commission had wholly exonerated Portugal from the charge of practising forced labour. Despite the fact that its visit to the Territory had been of short duration, the ILO Commission had found evi-

^{3/} *Ibid.*, Eighteenth Year, 1042nd meeting.

^{4/} International Labour Office, *Official Bulletin*, vol. XLV, No. 2, Supplement II (April 1962).

dence of forced labour in the Angola diamond mines, in the publicly owned ports and railways of Angola and in road-building in Mozambique. In that connexion he referred to paragraphs 738, 741 and 744 of the Commission's report. According to paragraph 750, the Commission had also found that the arrangements for the cultivation of cotton between November 1960 and May 1961 might have involved a danger of forced labour. Furthermore, the ILO Commission had drawn the Portuguese Government's attention to the Forced Labour (Indirect Compulsion) Recommendation, 1930, concerning the desirability of avoiding any abusive extension of the generally accepted meaning of vagrancy. He hoped that Portugal would act upon that and many other recommendations made by the Commission.

52. The ILO Commission had also indicated that freedom did not consist only in the absence of compulsion and constraint, but should also include an element of choice. That fundamental consideration had a direct bearing on the question whether labour performed in certain circumstances should be regarded as forced labour or free labour. The Commission had also recommended that the Portuguese Government should give a particularly high degree of priority to building up an effective labour inspection service in order to ensure the application of existing statutory safeguards against forced labour or unfair labour practices. The international community could not be satisfied with theoretical legislation. The same could be said of the so-called reforms introduced in September 1961, which in the opinion of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration had not extended full political rights to the indigenous inhabitants and had not removed social discrimination.

53. Portugal must accept the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of the Territories under its administration were paramount and it must recognize their right to the fulfilment of their political aspirations. There could be no lasting and peaceful solution so long as Portugal continued to cling to the theory that those Territories were an integral part of the Portuguese nation. They were geographically and ethnically separate from Portugal and, despite Portugal's wishful thinking, their inhabitants did not wish to be Portuguese. They wanted independence. A peoples' desire to fulfil its own destiny could not be thwarted. When a people's just aspirations were denied by the use of force, the only possible outcome was violence and bloodshed.

54. His delegation hoped that Portugal would follow the example of the countries which had led the peoples in the Territories under their administration to independence and had subsequently been able to establish with them a relationship based on mutual respect and co-operation.

55. Mr. HATTINGH (South Africa), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation had been under considerable provocation during the discussion of the agenda item now before the Committee because of repeated unwarranted references to his country and charges ranging from the one concerning the so-called unholy alliance to the preposterous one that the hands of the South African representatives were dripping with the blood of millions of Africans.

56. Contrary to the allegation by various representatives that South Africa had an alliance with certain of its neighbours in Southern Africa, his country had no

alliance with those neighbours. On the other hand, it was indeed a novel concept of international affairs that neighbours should not co-operate and that, while co-operation in some parts of the world was holy, in other parts it was unholy. The corner-stone of South Africa's policy was close co-operation with its neighbours on the basis of peaceful coexistence and non-intervention in each other's internal affairs, as had again been stated by the South African Prime Minister in Pretoria on 3 September 1963. South Africa was prepared to extend such co-operation to all peace-loving countries which wanted to co-operate with it.

57. He wished to draw attention to the obviously pre-arranged campaign for the repetition of groundless accusations, such as the charge by a Mozambican petitioner that experiments linked with the development of nuclear weapons were to be conducted in a gold mine in South Africa. The charge had been based on a press report the very text of which had contained a refutation of the allegation, and yet that baseless charge had been repeated, despite earlier official denials both in the Fourth Committee and in another Committee of the General Assembly. Those who indulged in such tactics and repeated falsehoods of that type must realize that they were deceiving only themselves and that the true facts could not be changed thereby. He had referred to that particular manoeuvre because it was likely to be repeated.

58. Miss BROOKS (Liberia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the principle of co-operation was enshrined in the Charter, which, however, also laid down certain fundamental principles on which co-operation should be based. Co-operation in violation of United Nations principles was no co-operation.

59. Mr. LUQMAN (Mauritania), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that so long as South Africa continued to practise its present policies it was valid to speak of unholy alliances.

60. With reference to the statement by the Chinese representative, he wished to point out that he had not spoken of division along racial lines. On the contrary, he had indicated that the process of decolonization was of a universal nature and that the decolonization of the Portuguese-administered Territories was the concern of the whole world and not of the continent of Africa alone.

61. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) explained that his reference had been to the appeal by the Mauritanian representative that Asian countries should exert greater pressure in questions of decolonization.

62. Mr. PEREZ RUIZ (Spain), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, without wishing to become involved in a long discussion of matters which were not under consideration, he would merely deny once again the false accusations made by the Byelorussian representative. He would also remind the latter that the graves of many of his fellow-countrymen who had taken part in the intervention in Spain in 1936-1939 were to be found on Spanish soil. The dead, however, should be allowed to rest in peace.

63. Mr. SOKOLOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the Spanish representative had failed to draw the right conclusion from the statement he had made at the beginning of the meeting and should give that statement further consideration.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.