

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1046th  
MEETING

Friday, 11 November 1960,  
at 11.5 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

### Agenda item 38:

*Study of principles which should guide Members in determining whether or not an obligation exists to transmit the information called for in Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1467 (XIV) (continued)*

*Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . . . . 273*

**Chairman:** Mr. Adnan M. PACHACHI (Iraq).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

## AGENDA ITEM 38

Study of principles which should guide Members in determining whether or not an obligation exists to transmit the information called for in Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Special Committee established under General Assembly resolution 1467 (XIV) (A/4526, A/C.4/L.648 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.649/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.648 AND ADD.1, A/C.4/L.649/REV.1 AND REV.1/CORR.1) (continued)

*Draft resolution A/C.4/L.648 and Add.1 (concluded)*

1. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) explained why he had voted against the draft resolution adopted at the previous meeting. The Spanish delegation had several times severely criticized the principles formulated by the Special Committee of Six on the Transmission of Information under Article 73 e of the Charter (A/4526, section V, part B) because it considered them to be confused and susceptible of different interpretations. Cases might arise in which the Fourth Committee would find some difficulty, if it took those principles as its criteria, in deciding whether a territory was or was not self-governing. The fact that the Spanish delegation had voted against the draft resolution did not in any way alter its decision to communicate information of its own accord on the Spanish territories in Africa; nor did it change in any way the position of the Spanish Government, which still condemned colonialism and the exploitation of man by man; lastly, it did not mean that some of the principles contained in the annex to the draft resolution were not excellent ones, for instance, principle VIII, which, when voted upon separately, had been supported by the Spanish delegation. It should therefore be clear to the Committee that his delegation's position was much less remote from that of the majority

than it might seem. The vote at the previous meeting, did not prevent the Spanish Government from being determined to continue collaborating with the United Nations in conformity with the principles of the Charter.

2. Mr. ANSTENSEN (Canada) said that at the previous meeting he had voted against the revised amendment of Togo and Tunisia and had abstained from voting on principle IX (b) and on that principle as a whole. He had nevertheless voted for all the other principles voted upon separately and for the draft resolution as a whole. Canada, as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution which had become General Assembly resolution 1467 (XIV), had been in favour of establishing the Special Committee of Six; it had believed then that the Special Committee would set forth the principles which should guide Members in determining whether or not an obligation existed to transmit information. That was indeed what the Special Committee had done; but the whole of the debate which had just taken place might well give the impression that the Fourth Committee was the legislative body of a world Government and that it was engaged in drafting the fundamental law or even the criminal code of that Government. It had to be recognized that that point had not yet been reached, even if the Charter was considered as a "living document", to use the words of the Special Committee (A/4526, para. 18), which should lead to a better world. The United Nations were still States freely associated in sovereign equality, bound by agreement to fulfil their obligations under the Charter.

3. The Special Committee's report (A/4526) was a remarkable compromise between those who would have preferred more general principles and those who would have liked to have more categorical principles; they had all finally agreed on the single text because it was better than two sets of conflicting principles. Although his delegation had some doubt about some of the principles, it had always been in favour of the draft resolution incorporating the Special Committee's conclusions; the compromise did not imply the abandonment of any great principles, but was on the contrary a proof of wisdom and moral courage. Besides, the unswerving adherence to a sacred principle, so frequently held up as laudable, might also be nothing more than short-sighted stubbornness. While appreciating the courtesy shown by Togo and Tunisia in revising their original amendment (A/C.4/L.650), his delegation had voted against the revised amendment, which, it feared, would endanger the wide acceptance of the twelve principles that was its primary concern. The Fourth Committee would best obtain good results, not by strokes of the pen, but by showing trust in the good faith of Members and thus retaining their goodwill to implement its resolutions. He regretted that the Fourth Committee had by its action prevented the United Kingdom, whose good faith and goodwill had been frequently

demonstrated, from supporting a resolution with which it would otherwise have been in general sympathy.

4. Mr. DINGEMANS (Netherlands) said that his delegation, which had made every effort in the Special Committee to try and bring about a synthesis of the views of the representatives of the administering Powers and those of the non-administering Powers, would have voted for the original draft resolution. The principles formulated by the Special Committee were in fact the result of much discussion and much give and take. The amendment of Togo and Tunisia, however, had jeopardized that delicate balance, introducing an element of controversy into a text which had been approved by all the members of the Special Committee. His delegation would have accepted the original text of principle IX, as it did not imply an obligation on the part of the Administering Members to accept or seek United Nations supervision in each case; while recognizing that such supervision might be highly desirable in many cases, the amendment implied, in the opinion of his delegation, that the United Nations could decide in all circumstances whether supervision was necessary. As that was not in keeping with his delegation's view on the matter, he had accordingly voted against the amendment and abstained on the draft resolution as a whole.

5. Mr. VANDERBORGHT (Belgium) explained that, in abstaining from voting on the draft resolution, Belgium had not been passing judgement on the way in which the Special Committee had fulfilled its task or on the worth of the principles which that Committee had laid down. It had simply wished to indicate that it still believed, just as it had done when it had had the responsibility for a Non-Self-Governing Territory—for which, indeed, it had supplied information—that the criteria did not lie within the competence of the General Assembly, as there was no provision in the Charter authorizing the Assembly to intervene in a field that lay within the exclusive jurisdiction of sovereign States. Belgium had, however, been happy to be able to join in the congratulations addressed to the Special Committee for inter alia the conciliatory spirit shown by its members—which was in itself reassuring, even when it was not possible to agree with the principle established.

6. Mr. ACLY (United States of America) said that he had approved of the Special Committee's report and would have supported the draft resolution in its original form. His delegation had abstained from voting, much to its regret, solely because of the adoption of the amendment submitted by Togo and Tunisia. But the United States Government had not changed its mind: it still approved of the report, both for its general tenor and for the principles it laid down, including principle IX (b), which provided that in certain circumstances United Nations supervision of the processes of integration might be desirable.

7. Mr. SINGH (India) said that he had abstained from voting on the amendment of Togo and Tunisia not because he was out of sympathy with its sponsors, but because he felt grave doubts as to the means of implementing it and the problems of jurisdiction it raised.

*Draft resolution A/C.4/L.649/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1*

8. Mr. SINGH (India) announced that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.649, who had now been joined by Iraq, Libya and Senegal, were introducing a

revised version of the draft (A/C.4/L.649/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1) since, in the course of conversations with them, the Spanish representative had confirmed that his Government intended to fulfil its obligations under the Charter with respect to the territories it administered, and to transmit information on conditions in those territories, including political conditions. The Spanish representative had, moreover, made several statements to that effect in the Fourth Committee and had told the sponsors that he was prepared to approve of the terms of the draft resolution. It was therefore no longer necessary to list the Non-Self-Governing Territories in Africa administered by Spain; to do so might in any case create difficulties in so far as some of those territories were disputed. Operative paragraph 5 of the new text indicated that the information transmitted by Spain would be treated in the same way as that communicated by the other Administering Members. The sponsors of the draft resolution noted Spain's conciliatory attitude with satisfaction and deplored the fact that, unfortunately, Portugal did not seem to have changed its attitude. He asked the Committee to adopt the draft resolution, which would make it possible to safeguard the interests of the population of the territories under Portuguese administration.

9. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) said that he wished to reply briefly and objectively to certain allegations. The delegations which had made accusations against the Portuguese delegation and its Government had done so in terms never before heard in the Fourth Committee. They had not hesitated to speak of cruelty, hypocrisy, machiavellianism, cynicism, cowardice and arrogance. One of them had said that Portugal's friends would be his country's enemies; another had mentioned the possibility of expelling Portugal from the Organization. All that gave cause for reflection regarding the nature and conduct of the discussion. His delegation would not allow itself to be swayed by verbal demagoguery or the violence of falsehood.

10. Some had affirmed, without any evidence whatsoever—for it would have been necessary for them to forge the evidence had they been required to furnish it—that the Portuguese Government practised forced labour. He categorically rejected that base propagandistic slander. It was hardly necessary to recall that, after long ago enacting legislation which guaranteed freedom of labour and the right to choose an employer freely, Portugal had ratified the first Convention concerning Forced or Compulsory Labour drawn up by the ILO in 1930, and the additional Convention concerning the Abolition of Forced Labour adopted in 1957. The first session of the African Advisory Committee set up by the ILO, which had been held at Luanda in 1959 at the invitation of the Portuguese Government, had moreover enabled many experts and delegates from Governments and trade-union organizations to study local conditions on the spot and subsequently to make statements quite different from those which the Fourth Committee had heard.

11. Mention had also been made of slavery. That was an assertion of inconceivable falsity. It was hardly necessary to state that the Portuguese Government respected moral values and had ratified the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery drawn up at Geneva in 1956.

12. Still others had said that oppression and terror reigned in the Portuguese overseas provinces and that those territories owed their social tranquillity to the presence of thousands of troops. Some might indeed find it difficult to imagine that the peace could be kept without the use of brute force. Or perhaps disappointment at the lack of success of their lying propaganda led them, since they could not allege disorders and they found it necessary to criticize at any price, to claim that the peace was based on oppression. Any one willing to examine the facts would recognize that Portugal did not maintain an army because it neither intended to attack anyone nor expected to be attacked. The few troops stationed at the frontier of a country in which regrettable events were taking place were intended solely to ensure respect for Portugal's strict neutrality. Those were the facts. The Committee would judge the mentality of those who did not hesitate to say that the Portuguese representative might be right but that they regarded as true anything which might buttress their arguments.

13. Out of respect for the Committee and courtesy to the representatives who had addressed questions to him—to which he could not reply immediately for lack of adequate information—he would say, although he was in no way required to do so, that the Portuguese National Assembly included three representatives of Angola, three representatives of Mozambique, two representatives of the State of India and one representative of each of the other provinces. There would be a total of twenty-three representatives from the overseas electoral districts when the ten additional representatives allotted to those districts by a decision of August 1959 had been elected in October 1961. Although the members of the Portuguese delegation to the United Nations did not represent any particular part of the national territory but the Portuguese nation as a whole, he might point out that during the past five years that delegation had included two representatives born in Goa, two representatives born in Angola and four representatives born respectively in Portuguese Guinea, the Cape Verde Archipelago, Mozambique and Macau.

14. He considered that it was only fair that the Guinean representative should in turn reply to two specific questions. He would like to be informed of the name, the date and the text of the Portuguese law which classified the population into five categories, and on what the Guinean representative had based his assertion that the Portuguese Government had or intended to have 60,000 troops in Angola.

15. Mr. ZIKRIA (Afghanistan) said he wished to explain once again that in supporting the cause of the dependent peoples and in asking to be included among the sponsors of the revised draft resolution, his delegation in no way wished to indicate prejudice against any State or group of States. By adopting the principles laid down by the Special Committee of Six, the Fourth Committee had finally emerged from the impasse in which it had been languishing for so long. It was logical that it should henceforth seek to apply to particular cases provisions approved by almost all the members of the Committee. For his delegation, the phrase: "peoples under colonial subjugation" in the third preambular paragraph of the revised draft resolution meant all the peoples still subject to foreign domination against their will. That draft resolution would accordingly make possible effective

exercise of the right of self-determination. He therefore hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft by a large majority.

16. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland), speaking on a point of order, asked the Indian representative to explain what statement by the Spanish representative authorized the sponsors to include unhesitatingly in the fourth preambular paragraph of the revised draft resolution the statement that "the Government of Spain agrees to transmit information to the Secretary-General in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter".

17. Mr. NEKLESSA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), introducing four amendments (A/C.4/L.651) to the revised draft resolution, said that the Committee, which was no longer engaged in a theoretical debate, should now take specific measures with respect to two Members of the United Nations which had for five years refused to comply with their obligations under Chapter XI of the Charter on the pretext that the provisions of Chapter XI were not mandatory and that they administered overseas provinces and not colonies. The Fourth Committee's discussion had clearly shown that those overseas provinces were in fact Non-Self-Governing Territories, and the Portuguese and Spanish representatives had been unable to refute the facts cited by many delegations in support of that contention. It had been natural to expect that at its current session the General Assembly would take practical steps to put an end to the manoeuvres of Portugal and Spain. The first version of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.649) had in itself been rather moderate in tone, although it had contained a number of sound provisions. The version now under discussion turned out to be a watered-down text. It was completely different from the first version. In particular it no longer contained the original operative paragraph 1, which had referred to the necessity of ensuring to the indigenous populations of the Portuguese and Spanish colonies the enjoyment of full freedom for democratic political activities; in other words the main point of concern to the indigenous populations had been discarded from the original draft. His delegation failed to understand why that paragraph no longer appeared in the new version of the draft resolution; he asked the Committee to restore it, in substance; operative paragraph 1 would then read:

"1. Urges the Governments of Spain and Portugal to grant to the indigenous populations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories under their administration the enjoyment of full freedom for democratic political activities which would ensure their attainment of independence".

18. The representatives of Ghana, Guinea, India and other countries had referred in their speeches during the general debate to the repressive action being taken by the Portuguese and Spanish Governments against the leaders of the national liberation movements. In his statement the representative of Ghana had spoken about the necessity of requiring Portugal and Spain to release the leaders of the national liberation movements from prison and concentration camps. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR thought that adoption of the paragraph it was proposing would bring the influence of public opinion to bear on Portugal and Spain and, in particular, force them to release the democratic leaders from prison and concentration camps.

19. His delegation objected to the use of the expression "with satisfaction" in the fourth preambular paragraph of the revised draft resolution; it felt that Spain should be censured for having for five years refused to assume its obligations, and not congratulated. Although the Spanish delegation had several times in the past declared that it would be prepared to transmit information on its Non-Self-Governing Territories, it had never yet done so. The statements made by the Spanish representative at the current session of the General Assembly contradicted one another and there were no grounds for expressing satisfaction on that score.

20. In its amendment in paragraph 1 of document A/C.4/L.651 the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR was proposing, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, the inclusion of an enumeration of the Non-Self-Governing Territories for which Spain was under an obligation to transmit information, namely: Ifni, West Sahara, Fernando Póo, Rio Muni, the Canary Islands. As representatives were aware, the original draft resolution contained such an enumeration. The Ukrainian amendment also included the Canary Islands, which had been missing from the list in the original draft resolution. Those Islands had the same status as the other Non-Self-Governing Territories under Spanish administration. In the Ukrainian delegation's opinion, an enumeration of the Non-Self-Governing Territories for which Spain was under an obligation to transmit information would have been necessary even if the Spanish Government had clearly stated its intention of transmitting information on those Territories, but a precise enumeration was all the more necessary in view of the contradictory statements of the Spanish representative and his refusal to name the territories under Spanish administration.

21. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR was also proposing the deletion of operative paragraph 4 of the revised draft resolution, whereby the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps in pursuance of the declaration of the Government of Spain that it was ready to act in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter. His delegation considered that the Secretary-General ought to have taken steps as long ago as 1955, when Portugal and Spain had become Members of the United Nations, to ensure that those States complied with the Charter. It simply failed to understand what steps it was proposed to take now. If the territories for which Spain was under an obligation to transmit information were enumerated, then it would be the Secretary-General's duty to obtain that information in accordance with the established procedure.

22. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR proposed the insertion, in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution under discussion, after the words "concerning these territories" of the phrase "until they are granted full independence", that was to say, it was proposing that a specific reference should be made to the goal towards which the territories in question were proceeding. In its view, that amendment should not occasion any objection, for it was consistent with the spirit of the United Nations Charter and of the draft declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples which had been submitted by the Soviet Union delegation for

consideration by the General Assembly in plenary meeting at its fifteenth session (A/4502 and Corr.1).

23. Mr. CABA (Guinea) expressed the view that at the beginning of the meeting the representative of Portugal, far from convincing the Committee, had only revealed even more clearly the discriminatory policy followed by his country. He would reply to that statement at a later stage but meanwhile would point out that the representative of Portugal had not really replied to the two questions he had asked him. He himself intended to give precise answers to the two questions asked by the representative of Portugal.

24. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) felt that the draft resolution under discussion was the logical consequence of the draft resolution approved by the Committee at its previous meeting. His delegation endorsed the changes made in the original text (A/C.4/L.649), particularly the deletion of paragraph 1, which had prejudged the very issue of the resolution. The Committee should await Portugal's reply to its request for information before requesting it to do anything further.

25. He would comment at a later stage on the amendments submitted by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

26. Mr. WEEKS (Liberia), exercising his right of reply, stated that he had participated in the conference to which the representative of Portugal had referred and that the information he had gathered there at first hand contradicted that which the representative of Portugal had just given. The latter had not really told the Committee whether the deputies about whom he had spoken truly represented the people of the territories administered by Portugal or the interests of those people.

27. Turning to the text under discussion, he said that he would have voted without reservation for the draft resolution in its original form. The changes the sponsors had introduced in the revised text were, however, confusing: as was clear from the amendments submitted by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, there was no reason to treat Portugal and Spain differently; if the territories under Portuguese administration were enumerated, the territories under Spanish administration should be enumerated too. On that point, his delegation would support the Ukrainian amendments, which would make it possible to determine whether Spain had really decided to transmit information on its territories. The Committee could, however, retain the paragraph in which it expressed its satisfaction that the Spanish Government had agreed to transmit information, if that statement was in fact correct.

28. Mr. SINGH (India), replying to the question the representative of Poland had asked him, said that he no longer had any doubt about the intentions of the Spanish Government, following the statements which the representative of Spain had made at the current meeting and at the 1038th meeting. With regard to the latter statement, he wished to quote the exact words of the representative of Spain:

"As we said, however, a year ago—and I was then referring to what I had said two years earlier—and as we repeat now, and as we shall maintain in the future, we must, if we wish to co-operate with all the States Members of the United Nations, strive

unceasingly to comply not only with Chapter XI of the Charter but also with the whole, complete and true spirit of the Charter. And since you have done us the honour of interesting yourselves in the life of our Iberian and overseas provinces, we shall not stint this information. Rather, since we have nothing to hide, we shall endeavour to provide the Secretary-General with complete information for his enlightenment. If, after that, some of the representatives have a still livelier curiosity, I myself, on my own account, will be happy to satisfy them."

29. In his delegation's opinion, the Spanish Government had taken a clear-cut position.

30. Mr. BRAIMAH (Ghana) said that he had eagerly associated himself with the sponsors of the revised draft resolution, in which the Committee dealt with the most important part of its work. It was to be hoped that the Portuguese delegation would consent to co-operate in that task by agreeing, as Spain had done, to assume the obligations incurred under Article 73 and confirmed by the twelve principles which the Committee had approved at its previous meeting. Portugal must understand that the ultimate objective of Article 73 of the Charter was to enable dependent peoples to attain independence as rapidly as possible. That had indeed been recognized by the Special Committee of Six in its report (A/4526).

31. He would comment at a later stage on the amendments submitted by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

32. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) thanked the representative of India for the statement he had just made. His doubts had not yet been dispelled, however, for in the statement he had just made the representative of Spain did not appear to have gone beyond what he had said on 7 November, at the 1038th meeting. At that meeting the Spanish representative had in fact declared that many delegations had forgotten the position taken up by the Spanish delegation on the interpretation of Chapter XI of the Charter, or had not yet had time to take note of it. That interpretation was clear from the Spanish Government's reply to the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 1467 (XIV), to the effect that Spain had no territories that could be the subject of the obligation prescribed in Article 73 (A/AC.100/1, para. 165). The Spanish representative had repeated that statement at the 1038th meeting, adding, however, that in view of its desire to co-operate with the United Nations his country was prepared in due course to transmit information on its overseas provinces. There was therefore nothing in the statements of the representative of Spain to justify the statement in the revised text of the draft resolution that the Government of Spain agreed to transmit information to the Secretary-General in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter. What was of importance to the Committee was not so much to receive information on the Spanish territories—which could be found in any bookshop—but to ensure that Spain fulfilled the obligations it had assumed, under Chapter XI of the Charter, by virtue of its admission to the United Nations. He again asked the representative of India if he considered that the statement by the representative of Spain really corresponded to the text of the draft resolution.

33. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that he considered the draft resolution before the Committee

to be the outcome of the long process that had led the Committee finally to approve a series of principles which should guide Members in determining whether or not an obligation existed to transmit the information called for in Article 73 e of the Charter. The Argentine delegation, which had always interpreted Chapter XI of the Charter as requiring the Administering Members to transmit information on the territories under their administration, had voted in favour of those principles and of the draft resolution to which they were annexed. Proceeding to a further stage, the General Assembly was now asking the delegation of a Member State to transmit information on the territories under its administration.

34. He was glad that the Spanish Government had decided to act in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter. The categorical statement by the representative of Spain had dispelled all doubt on that subject, especially as he had even made it clear that his Government was going to transmit information of all kinds, including political information. Argentina had always believed the words of Spain, to which it was linked by so many bonds. It was glad that the revised text did justice to a new position on the part of the Spanish Government and it considered that that text was an accurate reflection of what the representative of Spain had stated on several occasions. In that connexion, the Argentine delegation attached the greatest importance to what the Spanish representative had said about the bilateral negotiations his Government was prepared to open with regard to its possessions in North Africa and it was certain that those negotiations would soon bear fruit.

35. The sponsors of the new text had acted wisely in deleting operative paragraph 1 from the former text (A/C.4/L.649). Indeed, it was impossible to assume, before the information requested had been received, that the Spanish Government and Portuguese Government were not ensuring to the indigenous populations of the territories under their administration the enjoyment of full freedom for democratic political activities which would accelerate their attainment of independence. To do so would be, as it were, to convict the defendant before proof of his guilt had been established. The Ukrainian representative had seen fit to try to restore that paragraph, by an amendment: that was not a logical proposal, for there seemed no point in mentioning the independence of a territory at the present juncture, when—as the Ukrainian representative had pointed out several times—the General Assembly had first to consider the draft declaration on the granting of independence. That being so, the Argentine delegation would vote against the Ukrainian amendment and in favour of the revised draft resolution if the amendment was rejected.

36. Mr. SKALLI (Morocco) pointed out that the report of the Special Committee and the principles it set forth were the result of a compromise, which could not, therefore, reflect the deep convictions of the non-administering members of the Committee but which nevertheless represented a significant contribution in that it should guide the Member States in determining whether or not an obligation existed to transmit information. It was now a question of giving those principles definite meaning and practical application, i.e., of applying them to Spain and Portugal, which of all the colonial Powers were the only ones



to have replied that they were not administering Non-Self-Governing Territories. It could not, however, be maintained that entire territories, which differed in every way from the metropolitan country, were overseas provinces. That expedient, the general use of which would reduce international relations to chaos, deceived no one. Even granting that there had been a change in the relations between the territories and the metropolitan country, that change could not have taken place at the time of the admission of Spain and Portugal to the United Nations, for the provisions of the Charter took precedence over all national legislation. At the 1041st meeting the representative of Portugal had attacked what he called the tendentious nature of the principles, but his accusation had not convinced any one, for legal quibbling could not stand up against the true facts: the Committee was not a court of justice but a political organ dealing with real situations. Portugal was free to cling to the literal meaning of the words of the Charter, but for the other members of the Committee the Charter was a living document, applicable to living beings, including, in the eyes of the Moroccan delegation, those living in Ifni, West Sahara, Ceuta and Melilla. The representative of Spain had compared the anti-colonialist countries to a group of archangels defending the liberty of the world, who regarded Spain as a monster which lived on the flesh and blood of the African peoples.

37. Mr. AZNAR (Spain), speaking on a point of order, denied that he had ever uttered that sentence.

38. Mr. SKALLI (Morocco) said that he himself had noted that sentence at the moment it had been uttered; moreover, it appeared in the official record of the 1038th meeting. However that might be, the Committee had before it the case of two States which had had a colonial past and which maintained an uncompromising attitude that left them isolated. The representative of Portugal claimed that the question of transmitting information had not aroused any great interest among Member States, since only twenty-six Governments had seen fit to send replies to the Secretary-General in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1467 (XIV). That was at once true and false. It was true because many countries considered the question to be secondary and to have lost its urgency at a time when the only real problem was that of the elimination, pure and simple, of colonialism; it was true, also, because the information submitted by the Administering Members could never be completely sincere and objective and because, thanks to the emancipation of Africa, more authentic voices could make themselves heard and could enlighten the United Nations on the true economic, social and political situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. From another standpoint, however, what the representative of Portugal said was false, for all the delegations had disapproved in unmistakable terms of the attitude of Spain and Portugal; the very silence of those countries that had refrained from speaking in order to avoid censuring a friendly nation was equally significant. It could therefore be said that not

a single member of the Committee approved of the attitude of Spain and Portugal and that the censure of world opinion further accentuated the isolation of those two countries.

39. There had been a time when colonialism had enjoyed impunity and had been regarded as a normal state of affairs. The oppressed peoples had now, however, recovered their voice, which was equal to that of their former masters, and colonialism had become internationally immoral. The Moroccan delegation accordingly endorsed the revised draft resolution, but it did so with the express reservation that its Government considered Ceuta, Melilla, Ifni and West Sahara to be integral parts of Moroccan territory. The fact that the revised draft resolution did not mention those towns and territories did not imply that the Committee recognized them as provinces of Spain; it was still understood that they were colonies. The Moroccan delegation was sorry to have to adopt that attitude towards Spain, which had aligned its position with that of Portugal, but it was glad to note the Spanish representative's statement that the Spanish Government was prepared to provide the information called for in Article 73 of the Charter. Admittedly Spain did not possess, in its African territories, any extensive interests but it would be well advised to liberate Ifni, West Sahara, Ceuta and Melilla, which were Moroccan, and enable them at last to be reunited with the Kingdom of Morocco; law, justice and honour made it desirable that bilateral negotiations, which would, it was hoped, prove fruitful, should be held concerning the disputed territories.

40. The representative of Spain had stated in that very Committee that some countries had a claim vis-à-vis Spain, and had added that the rights of Spain stopped at the point where the rights of others began. He thought that it was his country to which the representative of Spain was referring; if he was mistaken, he would like the representative of Spain to tell him so.

41. If his interpretation was correct and Spain was resolving the problem of its overseas possessions in that way, Portugal would remain hopelessly isolated. Unless it changed its policy, it was liable to find itself outstripped by the rest of mankind, which was moving forward in ever greater liberty and progress. The draft resolution was its last chance; it should not let that chance go by.

42. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) wished to make it clear that the sentence quoted by the representative of Morocco which appeared in the summary record of an earlier meeting was not a categorical statement, but a dialectical way of presenting an argument for polemic purposes.

43. Mr. SKALLI (Morocco) admitted that the point was one of detail, but said that the representative of Spain was fully responsible for his words and their meaning.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.