

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1958th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 30 November 1971,
at 11.05 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

AGENDA ITEMS 13, 23, 65, 70, 71 AND 12, 72 AND 73*

Agenda item 13 (*continued*) (A/8360, A/8404)

Agenda item 23 (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (*continued*) (A/8368, A/8369, A/8423 (part IV) and (part IV)/Add.1, A/8423/Add.5 (part I), A/8423/Add.5 (part II) and Add.5 (part II)/Corr.1, A/8423/Add.6 (parts I-III), A/8423/Add.7 (parts I-IV))

Agenda item 65 (*continued*)
(A/8423/Add.8/Rev.1, A/8520 and Add.1)

Agenda item 70 (*continued*) (A/8398, A/8513)

Agenda items 71 and 12 (*continued*) (A/8314 and Add.1-4, A/8403 (chapter XX), A/8403/Add.1 (part III), A/8423 (part III), A/8480)

Agenda item 72 (*continued*) (A/8485 and Add.1)

Agenda item 73 (*continued*) (A/8530)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. DELGADO (Cuba) said that he would deal with three items which his delegation considered to be particularly important: item 23, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; item 65, on information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations; and item 70, on activities of foreign economic and other interests which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and the Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other territories under colonial domination, and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa. With respect to that last item, the considerations, decisions and recommendations in the 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 (A/8398) were fundamental. He drew attention to paragraphs 1 to 5 of the Special Committee's conclusions and to all its recommendations, particularly paragraph 2, which dealt with the activities of foreign economic interests in the various Territories, especially in southern Africa. As that paragraph

showed, foreign monopolies and other concerns operating in those Territories were guided solely by their own interests, gave financial and even military assistance to the colonial régimes and the racist minorities, and invested none of their profits in the improvement of the economic and social conditions of the indigenous peoples. First among those concerns were the great monopolies of the United States, followed by those of the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and other capitalist countries. The primary purpose behind the expansion of those concerns in the Territories in question was to set up, under the auspices of South Africa, a great industrial and military complex to consolidate Western economic and military interests in southern Africa and extend them to other parts of the continent. Thus there was not the slightest chance of their carrying out any measures of social or economic benefit to the indigenous peoples of the Territories, for their fabulous profits depended upon the very maintenance of the current state of oppression, exploitation and discrimination against the native population. It was even less probable that they would adopt any measures adversely affecting the interests of the racist and colonialist régimes. That was confirmed by the recent decision of the United States authorizing the import of chrome from Southern Rhodesia, and it was important to note that, according to the United States press, that decision had already been signed by the President in spite of General Assembly resolution 2765 (XXVI) adopted on 16 November 1971.

2. His delegation believed that the Fourth Committee should give the closest attention to the analysis of that matter, and should vigorously expose and condemn the activities of foreign economic and other interests which stood in the way of the independence of colonial countries and peoples and of efforts to do away with colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa and in all Territories under colonial domination. The analysis should also cover the activities of the imperialist Powers in developing their neo-colonial policies, since collaboration with the racist and colonialist régimes was part of an over-all strategy against the national liberation movements of the peoples and was directed against peoples still under their domination as well as against those which had already attained national independence. Against the latter they were using all means, encouraging counter-revolutionary subversion, extending their economic, political, social and ideological penetration and resorting to open aggression when other means failed. It was an unavoidable duty to eliminate colonialism and racism once and for all from the Territories where it still existed; but it was also the duty of all to ensure that independence was real and effective. An anthem, a flag and a parliament composed of old lackeys of colonialism were no guarantees of true independence if

* For the titles of the items, see "Agenda" on p. ix.

they did not go hand in hand with a genuine process of social, political and economic liberation.

3. With respect to agenda items 65 and 23, his delegation stressed that the Committee should give the greatest attention to the manoeuvres of the colonial Powers to thwart the true independence of the peoples. Lately plebiscites and referendums had been staged with the real object of maintaining such Territories under the domination of the colonial Powers. It was also important to revise the list of Territories still under colonial domination, which, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), were subject to analysis by the Special Committee and the Assembly. That list was incomplete, the most notable absence being that of Puerto Rico, a territory which for more than half a century had endured the colonial domination of the United States of America. Puerto Rico was a Latin American country with its own nationality; its culture, customs, traditions and interests were completely alien to those of the United States, the colonial Power governing it. The Puerto Rican people had a long and heroic tradition of struggle for national independence going back to before 1899, the year in which the island was ceded by Spain to the United States in a typical act of colonial plunder in which the people of the territory concerned had had no say at all. Since then, the United States Government had done everything possible to discourage the desire for independence of the Puerto Ricans and to assimilate the island to the United States. Currently, Puerto Rico was subject to the legislative, judicial and executive control of the United States, which was also in full control of the country's economy. A third of the population had had to emigrate to the territory of the metropolitan country, where they were the victims of all kinds of vexation and discrimination. Thirteen per cent of the best arable land of the island was occupied by a vast network of United States military bases, including two equipped with nuclear weapons.

4. Mr. GRIGG (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that Puerto Rico was not on the Committee's agenda nor, despite the efforts of the Cuban delegation, on that of the General Assembly, and asked that that should be drawn to the attention of the Cuban representative.

5. The CHAIRMAN requested the Cuban representative to keep to the item under discussion.

6. Mr. DELGADO (Cuba) said that his statement was indeed limited to the items on the agenda and that he had faithfully described the situation of the Puerto Rican people. His delegation believed that, in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV), it was the duty of the United Nations to require the United States at once to take the necessary measures to hand over all powers to the people of Puerto Rico without any conditions or reservations.

7. Mr. GRIGG (United States of America) stressed that the Committee was considering the report of the Special Committee, which contained no reference whatever to Puerto Rico. The representative of Cuba had been out of order, and if he continued to talk about Puerto Rico, the United States delegation would be forced to intervene again.

8. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the question of Puerto Rico was not on the agenda and asked the Cuban representative to keep to the items under discussion.

9. Mr. MWASAKAFYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on a point of order, said that he was surprised at the unusual behaviour of the United States representative. The members of the Committee knew very well that Puerto Rico was a colonial territory and that its case was relevant to the Committee's deliberations. The Cuban representative had therefore not departed from the agenda.

10. Mr. GRIGG (United States of America) stated that Puerto Rico was not a colonial territory and that he was not aware that all members of the Committee shared the views of the Tanzanian representative.

11. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that Puerto Rico was neither a part of the United States nor an independent State; it was a colonial territory and could be discussed by the Committee. He recalled that at the time when the United States had been a member of the Special Committee, the question of Puerto Rico had come up in that body and had been discussed, as could be seen from the relevant reports transmitted to the General Assembly. It should also be borne in mind that the Cuban representative had merely argued that Puerto Rico should be included in the list of colonial territories examined by the special Committee and had not touched on all aspects of the question of Puerto Rico.

12. Mr. DELGADO (Cuba) regretted the attitude of the United States representative, which revealed his ignorance of the discussions that had been going on in the United Nations with regard to Puerto Rico since 1953 when the General Assembly had adopted resolution 748 (VIII), in which it had expressed its assurance that in accordance with the traditions of the people of the United States of America due regard would be paid to the will of the Puerto Rican people. He insisted that his statement came within the general framework of the Committee's agenda, since it concerned item 23, on the implementation of the Declaration, and referred to a territory which should be considered a colony and should therefore be covered by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

13. The CHAIRMAN said that if the meeting continued as it had so far, no progress would be made and he therefore suggested that it should be suspended for ten minutes in order to try to find an orderly solution to the controversy.

14. Mr. DELGADO (Cuba) did not agree with the Chairman; the Committee had always listened patiently to statements made by the colonial Powers on various topics and all countries were entitled to expect the same treatment. Under the terms of the Declaration, it was the duty of the United Nations to demand that the United States should take immediate measures to hand over the powers of government to the people of Puerto Rico. The United States Government had resorted to countless manoeuvres to frustrate the Puerto Rican people's desire for independence, including a plebiscite held in 1967, which had been condemned by the patriotic forces on the island.

15. Mr. GRIGG (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that it was unusual that the Committee should be considering an item that was not on its agenda. He again noted that the Cuban delegation had been unable to inscribe the question of Puerto Rico on the agenda of the General Assembly. It was possible, as the Soviet representative had said, that the question had been mentioned at some previous time, but as far as he remembered no substantive action had been taken on the matter. He therefore asked the Chairman to request the representative of Cuba to change the subject.

16. The CHAIRMAN reminded the representative of Cuba that Puerto Rico was not on the Committee's agenda. He realized that allusions must often be made to controversial questions, but he appealed to the representative of Cuba to co-operate so that the meeting could continue in an orderly fashion.

17. Mr. DELGADO (Cuba) said that he wished to co-operate as the Chairman had requested, but his delegation—like all the others—had the right to present its views on a territory which it considered to be within the competence of the Committee. Continuing his statement, he said that the United States was utilizing the results of the plebiscite held in Puerto Rico under military occupation and trying to make believe that the people of the island had opted for the status of associated commonwealth.

18. Mr. GRIGG (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, insisted that the representative of Cuba should refrain from speaking about Puerto Rico since it was not an item on the Committee's agenda, and repeated that unless he changed the subject he would have to keep interrupting every time he referred to Puerto Rico. His delegation recognized the right of the representative of Cuba to finish his statement, provided that he did not speak about matters that were not on the agenda. Otherwise, he would have to insist that the Chairman make a ruling.

19. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Cuba to co-operate with the Chair so that he would not be forced to apply rule 73 of the rules of procedure. As he had stated previously, the case of Puerto Rico was not on the Committee's agenda.

20. Mr. DELGADO (Cuba) said that the fact that the General Committee of the General Assembly (A/8500) had rejected the proposal by Cuba to include the colonial case of Puerto Rico on its agenda (A/8441 and Add.1) did not mean that his delegation must refrain from mentioning the subject in United Nations bodies. The case of Puerto Rico was not closed, as the United States Government suggested. The heroic Puerto Rican people would never submit to colonial domination; it would never accept United States exploitation and would win its independence whatever the cost. The people of Cuba and all the peoples of Latin America supported them and would always support them, since Puerto Rico belonged to their community, like the African and Asian peoples which had borne the colonial yoke in their own flesh. In conclusion, he paid a tribute to the heroes of the struggle for Puerto Rican independence, to Betances and Albizu Campos, Lolita Lebrón, Rafael Cancel Miranda, Irwin Flores, Andrés Figueroa Cordero,

Oscar Collazo and many other patriots who were serving life or hundred-year sentences in United States prisons.

21. Mr. GRIGG (United States of America), exercising the right of reply, declared that Puerto Rico was not a colony and was fully entitled to determine its future.

AGENDA ITEM 68

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*) (A/8423/Add.1, A/8423/Add.2 (parts I and II))

22. Mr. NYIRENDA (Zambia) considered it his duty to revert to that item in view of the agreement recently reached in Salisbury by the British Government and the racist régime of Ian Smith. At the 1602nd meeting of the Security Council, held on 25 November 1971, the representative of the United Kingdom, referring to the latest developments, had claimed that his country had never administered Rhodesia directly by physical presence. From 1894 to 1923, the Territory had been administered by the British South Africa Company; by 1907 there was a majority of elected members, representing the white settlers, on the legislative council; and at a referendum held in 1922 the white electorate had opted for self-government, which the British Government had granted under the Southern Rhodesia Constitution Letters Patent of 1923, although it had reserved the right to legislate on matters affecting the interests of the African population. Since 1923—according to the representative of the United Kingdom—the British Government had had to work by agreement with those who controlled power in Rhodesia on all internal questions. It had not therefore had the power to prevent the 1965 rebellion or to impose its will.

23. The representative of the United Kingdom had deliberately failed to indicate that the British South Africa Company had been an instrument of British imperialism and colonialism falling under the jurisdiction of the Government and the Crown. Nor had he seen fit to explain why the white settlers had been given such exclusive privileges at the expense of the African people in the colony in 1907. The representative of the United Kingdom had tried to imply that in 1923 his Government had had no choice but to sell out the African people of Zimbabwe to the white settlers through the sinister granting of internal self-government. Despite the much quoted reservation of legislation affecting the interests of the African population, the lot of the oppressed African people of that colony had become consistently worse since then. In 1953, the British Government's alleged lack of power had not prevented it from incorporating the Territory into the abominable Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, whose main object had been to perpetuate white minority rule in Central Africa and to benefit the white settlers at the expense of Zambia. For the same reasons, the British Government had stubbornly refused to use force to bring an immediate end to the rebellion in the colony. In that connexion, the representative of the United Kingdom had omitted to mention that the Government of Zambia had on numerous occasions offered its territory for use by British police troops against the rebels. That offer still held good and exposed the hollowness of the plea that the distance between the United Kingdom and the rebel colony presented problems of logistics.

24. The representative of the United Kingdom had claimed that the new arrangement satisfied the principle of unimpeded progress towards majority rule. In that respect, the proposal for the creation of additional African seats in the legislative body of Zimbabwe was said to be reassuring, despite the fact that it would have to take place in a country which had already become independent under a minority racist régime. The United Kingdom Government did not appear to feel any sense of guilt for having negotiated the agreement with the white racists instead of the acknowledged leaders of the people of Zimbabwe, in complete violation of the relevant United Nations decisions. Nor had it indicated to the Security Council how the rebels could be expected to share the power with the African majority, now that they had achieved independence. They had always refused to do so before and had repeatedly stated that they did not agree with the so-called five principles of the United Kingdom.

25. The preceding year, the United Kingdom had vetoed a draft resolution in the Security Council because it contained a provision barring independence before majority rule was achieved in Zimbabwe, and a few days earlier it had voted against a similar resolution in the Committee and in the General Assembly. That should dispel all doubts as to the United Kingdom's true intentions. In the statement by the United Kingdom representative in the Security Council and in the document on the proposals for settlement, it was contended that the so-called entrenched clauses would guarantee that there would be no amendments to the proposed constitution without the consent of the majority of African representatives. However, it was absurd to try to dupe the international community into believing that there would be any African representation.

26. It was stated that the problem of racism and racial discrimination practised by the rebel régime would be handled by a commission which would make recommendations to the régime from time to time and that the victims of discrimination would be able to appeal to the rebel courts. However, there was no clear indication of a requirement to repeal all the discriminatory legislation, including the abominable Land Tenure Act, which provided for the even division of Zimbabwe between less than a quarter of a million white settlers and more than 5 million Africans. The United Kingdom Government was also satisfied with the artificial voting requirements imposed on the African majority. It agreed that, contrary to what obtained in the United Kingdom, the African voters of Zimbabwe should be required to meet certain educational and financial requirements despite the fact that the rebels denied the majority of the African people of Zimbabwe their right to education and decent employment. Needless to say, leaders who had been detained, imprisoned or exiled were not gainfully employed and would therefore be unable to vote or to be elected.

27. With regard to education, it was stated that the United Kingdom Government intended to spend about £5 million yearly on African education and economic advancement and that the money would be administered by the rebels in Salisbury. The United Kingdom Government was not interested in the fate and welfare of the oppressed people of Zimbabwe. It was, however, concerned about the future of the racists in Salisbury and about the vested economic

and other interests in Zimbabwe. Its so-called aid for African advancement was actually designed to boost the economy of the Territory.

28. It had been stated that the so-called proposals for a settlement in Rhodesia had been formulated subject to the test of acceptability to all the people of Zimbabwe. In that connexion, it should be noted that the United Kingdom Government was emphasizing the so-called rural and tribal areas. The Committee could draw its own conclusions.

29. Examination of the statement by Sir Colin Crowe in the Security Council and of the document on the proposals for a settlement in Rhodesia confirmed Africa's fears, since not only had the United Kingdom Government decided to associate itself formally with the unholy alliance in southern Africa, based on the Lisbon-Pretoria-Salisbury axis, but it had sold the 5 million Africans languishing in Zimbabwe to the rebel clique of racist traitors.

30. He reiterated the position of his Government, which strongly condemned the United Kingdom Government for negotiating with the rebels. The oppressed African people of Zimbabwe were seeking the freedom and independence which were their right in the land of their birth. With or without the Home-Smith sell-out deal, they would continue their armed struggle, and the racial and ideological holocaust which would result would have incalculable repercussions all over the world.

Requests for hearings (*continued*)

REQUEST CONCERNING TERRITORIES UNDER PORTUGUESE ADMINISTRATION (AGENDA ITEM 67)

31. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a request for a hearing from Mr. Gil Fernandes, representative of the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), concerning the Territories under Portuguese administration. Mr. Fernandes was present in the conference room. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant Mr. Fernandes's request and invite him to speak at the current meeting.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 67

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (*continued*)* (A/8348 and Add.1, A/8403, chapter XIII (section A); A/8423/Add.1, A/8423/Add.4)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (*continued*)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Gil Fernandes, representative of the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), and his associates took seats at the Committee table.

32. Mr. Gil FERNANDES (Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC)) voiced appreciation for the political and moral support his organization had received from the United Nations, which had for some

* Resumed from the 1954th meeting.

time been expressing condemnation of colonialism in general and of Portugal in particular. Some countries had lived up to their moral commitment with regard to the dignity of man and the right of all peoples to be masters of their own destiny. Unfortunately, other nations had condemned Portugal within the United Nations while displaying a very different attitude outside the Organization. He thanked those States which had lived up to their moral obligation to the extent of giving material, as well as political, aid to the liberation movement. In particular, he thanked Guinea, Algeria, Nigeria, Senegal, Egypt, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zambia as well as other African States which had contributed to the Liberation Committee Fund of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Interest was also growing in the Scandinavian countries, which was a very favourable sign for the struggle of the African peoples. He thanked the Government of Sweden in particular for its moral, political and humanitarian support of the African cause. He was also grateful to the socialist countries, which had supported the liberation movements from the very beginning, and expressed special appreciation to the Governments of the Soviet Union and Cuba.

33. The party which he represented was fully aware of the factors which limited the functioning of the United Nations as an institution and of the growing difficulties posed by the stand taken by Portugal and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The members of the liberation movements were in actual fact anonymous soldiers of the United Nations, since they were fighting and dying for the principles upheld by the Organization and in defence of the human rights of their peoples and of all mankind.

34. After almost nine years of armed struggle, the movement which he represented had succeeded in liberating two thirds of the national territory. Portuguese troops still occupied the main urban centres and a few military outposts. Guinea and Cape Verde could be described as a free country partly occupied by foreign military forces. Its people were already sovereign in most of the national territory. Schools, hospitals, courts and many other institutions characteristic of an independent State had been created. Elections would shortly be called for the creation of the first Popular National Assembly. The people were not asking the colonial Government to grant them the right to self-determination since they had won that right during the nine years of armed struggle, with all the sacrifices it had entailed. They had forged their destiny with their own hands, since it was not possible to engage in a dialogue with a fascist Government which regarded the inhabitants of the country as animals and inflicted every kind of torture upon them.

35. As a living example of the so-called civilizing and Christian mission of the Portuguese in Africa, he had brought with him two illiterate African villagers whose bodies bore the permanent scars of colonialism. One of them had been caught in a napalm bombing while he was tilling his land and had suffered horrible burns. The second had been taken prisoner by the Portuguese for venturing a few miles from his village. After cutting his wrists, a Portuguese officer had tried to slit his throat, but the victim had fainted and the officer, thinking he was dead, had cut

off both his ears as a trophy. He could have brought many more victims with him, but that might have been embarrassing for the members of the Committee. He had therefore brought only the two villagers, who could be regarded as mild cases.

36. The Portuguese colonialists were known to be preparing a campaign to spray crops with toxic chemicals in order to destroy the next harvest, hoping in that way to halt the liberation struggle. The outlook would be bleak if the world remained indifferent to the threat of hunger which hung over the indigenous population. There had been a serious drought in the Cape Verde Islands for the preceding four years. However, Portugal had not only done nothing to help the population but had refused to accept humanitarian assistance from abroad. It was the duty of the international community to see that the Portuguese did not play politics in a situation in which many lives were threatened.

37. It was regrettable that members of NATO like the United States, France, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany were not acting in accordance with the principles of democracy that they preached and were supplying arms to Portugal. The United Nations, for its part, could continue to aid the liberation movement of Guinea (Bissau) with the moral and political support it had always given, which was of great importance. However, instead of continuing to adopt resolutions condemning Portugal, it could take certain practical measures which would have greater impact, such as recognizing PAIGC as the true representative of the people and the only authority in the Territory; giving assistance to the people, which was undergoing a famine after four years of drought; granting PAIGC, as representative of the Territory, associate membership in the specialized agencies of the United Nations, as had already been done in the Economic Commission for Africa; arranging for international bodies, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to supply PAIGC with material assistance, as had been decided; and, finally, sending a special mission to gather first-hand information and prepare a report on the crimes committed in the Territory by Portugal.

38. Mr. OUCIF (Algeria), after thanking the petitioner for his statement, observed that the Portuguese colonialists were resorting to barbarous methods, particularly in the use of chemicals to destroy crops.

39. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) congratulated the petitioner for his statement and said that the Committee was grieved at the brutal repression being carried out by Portugal in Africa. In considering the draft resolutions before it, the Committee should remember the example of the two freedom fighters who bore in their flesh the indelible marks left by the Portuguese colonialists when their only crime was to fight for their inalienable rights. He suggested that the text of Mr. Fernandes's statement should be circulated in accordance with the practice normally followed for statements by petitioners. His country had confidence in PAIGC and would do whatever was necessary, at any price, to give moral and material assistance to the freedom fighters.

40. Mr. MWASAKAFYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania) thanked the petitioner for his statement and noted that the Committee now had first-hand information which should dispel any doubts regarding the nature of the criminal acts committed by Portugal in Africa. His country had supported the liberation movements for the preceding 10 years and would continue to do so with the meagre resources at its disposal; it would, as in the past, give them its support in the United Nations and in other international bodies.

41. Mr. DELGADO (Cuba) observed that the petitioner's statement bore eloquent witness to the heroic struggle of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde and to the barbarous methods used by the Portuguese forces, which were supported by the United States and other members of NATO. He assured the petitioner that the people and Government of Cuba fully backed the just struggle of the liberation movement and were certain that it would soon end in victory.

42. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the petitioner for his information and suggestions. His delegation hoped that the description of the atrocities committed by the Portuguese in African territories would influence the members of the Committee when a vote was taken on the draft resolutions on the item. He proposed that the monstrous crimes committed by the Portuguese armed forces and the assistance provided to Portugal by the United States and other members of NATO should be condemned. He supported the proposal by the representative of Guinea that the petitioner's statement should be circulated. On behalf of his delegation, he wished the peoples of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde a speedy victory in their just struggle.

43. Mr. BELKHIRIA (Tunisia) expressed his delegation's solidarity with the just struggle being carried on by PAIGC. His country was aware of the seriousness of the problem and found it incredible that, 26 years after the adoption of the United Nations Charter, the colonialists were using the most modern Western weapons to destroy man and nature in Africa. The human rights of the Africans—peaceful, generous people who were faithful to the ideals of the international community—were still being trampled upon by Portugal. He urged all delegations to contribute to the adoption of measures which would put an end to repression, war and injustice in the Territories under Portuguese administration in Africa.

44. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the request by the representatives of Guinea and the USSR, the petitioner's statement would be circulated by the Secretariat.

Mr. Gil Fernandes and his associates withdrew.

**Tribute to the memory of His Excellency Mr. Wasfi Al-Tal,
Prime Minister of Jordan**

45. Mr. KASIM (Jordan) expressed appreciation, on behalf of his Government and people, for the condolences on the death of the Prime Minister of Jordan which had been expressed at the previous meeting. That tragedy could only strengthen Jordan's national unity and the country's efforts to attain its just national objectives.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.