

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1042nd
MEETING**

Wednesday, 9 November 1960,
at 11 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 38:

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>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)</i> | |
| <i>General debate (concluded)</i> | 251 |
| <i>Consideration of draft resolutions</i> | 254 |

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) (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. Mr. NEKLESSA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), replying to a statement made by the representative of Portugal, wished to explain why the Ukrainian delegation had pointed out that Portugal had been keeping certain African and Asian territories under its domination for more than five centuries. It was because the so-called civilizing mission of Portugal had produced only insignificant results and because Portugal had done nothing to improve the living conditions of the indigenous inhabitants. In criticizing the Ukrainian statement, the representative of Portugal had not been able to refute the established facts cited in that statement: one doctor for 80,000 inhabitants and 99 per cent illiteracy in Angola, only one indigenous inhabitant with a university education out of a population of 6 million in Mozambique, forced labour and corporal punishment in all Portuguese territories, and so on.

2. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal), speaking on a point of order, regretted that the Ukrainian representative repeated arguments which the Portuguese delegation had not touched upon. It had simply made use of a minimum right, in order to reply to slanderous accusations against Portugal; if some delegations persisted in "replying" to that defence of Portugal, his delegation would have to exercise its right of reply.

3. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq), speaking on a point of order, thought that the Ukrainian representative had the right to reply to any allegation made by the representative of Portugal.

4. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the interests of orderly procedure, replies should be addressed solely to the arguments which had been put forward by one or the other party, and he asked members who wished to exercise their right of reply to confine themselves to explaining their delegations' position on specific points.

5. Mr. NEKLESSA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the representative of Portugal had just said that he had not touched upon the Ukrainian data. The Ukrainian delegation did not question the Portuguese delegation's right to reply. However, it would have been simpler, instead of casting doubts on the sources or the authors cited by the Ukrainian delegation, to refute the information quoted, if it was not accurate. Casting doubt on the source of the information given was not an accident, but a manoeuvre designed to divert the Committee's attention from the main problem; the Committee, however, would not let that happen. He was convinced that, at a time when colonial empires were collapsing throughout the world, Portugal could not be the only country to maintain its position, and that all the colonies it occupied would eventually attain independence.

6. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) agreed with the view of the United States representative that certain territories were a source of world tension. The representative of Portugal had complained about accusations and attacks by various delegations against his country. The Iraqi delegation had criticized Portugal, not out of a feeling of hostility, but in order to show what the Iraqi Government, using as criteria the principles laid down in section V, part B, of the report of the Special Committee of Six on the Transmission of Information under Article 73 e of the Charter (A/4526), thought about Portugal's so-called overseas provinces. It thought that all possible support should be given to any African peoples which had lost their freedom as a result of foreign conquest and that, in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter, such peoples should be guaranteed the political liberties which would hasten their independence. The representative of Portugal could criticize that policy, but the Iraqi Government for its part was determined never to depart from it.

7. The representative of Portugal had tried to deny that the African inhabitants of Portuguese overseas territories were classified as "civilized" and "non-civilized". However, according to article 2 of the Statute of 20 May 1954 concerning Natives of Portuguese Nationality in the Provinces of Guinea, Angola and Mozambique, all persons of the Negro race or their descendants who had been born in or who had resided or resided habitually in those "provinces" and who had

not yet acquired the education and the individual and social customs necessary for the complete enforcement of the private and public law applicable to Portuguese citizens were deemed to be Natives ("indigenas").

8. During the general debate in the plenary General Assembly, the representative of Portugal had declared that his country's policies were inspired by the ideals of Christianity, feelings of brotherhood, the concept of equality of rights, the superiority of moral values and the dignity of man. The question was whether those sources inspired the Portuguese authorities to practise torture, restrict liberty of movement, organize forced labour, raise discriminatory barriers against the Negro population of their colonies, and throw multitudes of human beings into the sea simply because they considered them undesirable. Actually, neither Portugal nor any other colonial Power needed to explain its "civilizing" work in Africa; the atrocities that had been committed, in particular by the Portuguese colonialists, spoke for themselves.

9. The Iraqi delegation was prompted neither by hatred nor by a desire to supplant Portugal in Africa, but by love of liberty and respect for the human person. What was more, it did not condemn Portugal but only wished to help it to follow a just and humane course, worthy of a European country, in order to strengthen international peace and security and avoid a new Algeria. For the problems of the dependent peoples had to be solved without delay in a United Nations context. The representative of Portugal had criticized the attitude of the Iraqi delegation; but that attitude bore no comparison to the attitude of the Portuguese delegation, which had not ceased to obstruct, defy and scornfully reject any action by the General Assembly, and to proclaim its intention to disregard the General Assembly's resolutions, in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter. The representative of Portugal had tried to refute irrefutable facts; but he had never denied the arbitrary torture inflicted on Africans, the legalization of forced labour, the restrictions imposed on the freedom of indigenous peoples, and the discrimination in schools. Those inhuman practices, which had been given the force of law, were designed to silence the indigenous peoples and to perpetuate Portuguese domination. It was time the Committee applied the principles of the Charter, if only out of a sense of human solidarity.

10. Miss SAFFOURI (Jordan) thought that, while the representative of Portugal in the Fourth Committee could not speak for the indigenous population of the Portuguese colonies, he certainly had the right, as the representative of the metropolitan territory alone, to assert as he saw fit, and with the energy born of desperation, that Portugal and its overseas provinces constituted a single nation and therefore that Portugal did not have to transmit information regarding its territories. However, public opinion throughout the world would reply that his argument was not valid. A referendum would prove that those colonies had nothing in common with Portugal.

11. The territories under Portuguese administration belonged to the category of territories mentioned in principle IV in the report of the Special Committee of Six and were, by that token, colonies; by refusing, therefore, to transmit the information called for in Article 73 e of the Charter, Portugal was simply vio-

lating the principles which Members of the United Nations were with one accord required to observe. No matter what the representative of Portugal might say, her delegation took the view that the continuance of the colonial system could only endanger peace. In view of the irrefutable fact that Portugal, in criticizing the conclusions reached by many delegations, was merely trying to justify at all costs a system bound to fail, the United Nations must persuade Portugal to renounce its opposition to the march of history and to meet, like all administering Powers, its obligations to transmit the information called for in Chapter XI of the Charter.

12. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the representative of Portugal had tried to deny the existence of, or to challenge, the most convincing data cited during the discussion—data which bore witness to the terrible situation of the indigenous inhabitants of the Portuguese colonies, who were being mercilessly exploited and subjected to racial discrimination and hatred. However, it was impossible to deny the undeniable; and for that reason the representative of Portugal, while simply contradicting certain delegations as to the facts to which they had drawn attention, had conceded facts cited by other delegations, but only in order to deny them any significance. That manoeuvre, a new "kiss of Judas", was bound to fail. For example, the representative of Portugal had tried to "explain" certain facts cited by the Byelorussian delegation, in such a way as to minimize their importance. He had explained a frontier rectification in the region of Lake Nyasa by the desire of the Portuguese to take advantage of the fishing resources of that lake, and had said that the Byelorussian delegation was in error if it thought there was any question of territorial expansion. But the facts spoke for themselves: there was no denying the telegram addressed to Prime Minister Salazar by the President of the Portuguese Republic during the flight over the newly acquired area. While it was true that the territorial expansion had been limited, it had occurred, and that at the very moment when the colonial peoples of Africa were breaking the chains of the colonialists.

13. Mr. CABA (Guinea) regretted that the representative of Portugal had been unable—and with reason—to state how many Angolese were sitting, in the same capacity as the Portuguese deputies, in the Parliament at Lisbon. But that did not mean that the so-called Portuguese provinces were still isolated: increasingly authoritative quarters were following very closely the political evolution of the masses in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea and elsewhere; they were carefully studying the documents of the Portuguese police and of the National Assembly in Lisbon. If it were indeed true, as its Governor had stated, that Angola was a part of Portuguese national territory, that it was governed by the Constitution and the laws of the metropolitan country, the representative of Portugal might, instead of issuing a challenge to the United Nations, provide irrefutable proof of the absolute equality of the population in the African territories with that of the metropolitan country. But even in the metropolitan country the Portuguese Government's policy was condemned: Mr. Miguel Bastos, a Portuguese deputy, stating in the National Assembly on 6 April 1951 that Portugal had no colonies and that, with the overseas territories, it constituted a single nation, had requested the Government to pursue a realistic policy and had asked on what

principles it remained attached to a nomenclature that had become misleading.

14. No change of nomenclature could suffice to conceal the truth. In 1958, the American writer John Gunther had denounced the system of forced labour, which was merely a new form of slavery and reduced man to the level of livestock; and the iniquity of the system was intensified by the venality of the officials responsible for recruiting workers. Each year the Portuguese authorities sent, in exchange for 1,000 million gold francs, 100,000 volunteer workers to the gold mines of the Transvaal and 40,000 to Rhodesia; but since when were those workers "volunteers"?

15. The representative of Portugal had asked that the documents dividing the population into five categories should be cited. Those documents existed and were known to the persons who were exercised about the future of Portugal's African territories. In an article published in the Brussels newspaper *Le Soir* of 29 August 1957, and in *Le Figaro* of 22 September 1957, P. and R. Gosset had explained that in the Portuguese territories the "assimilados" had the status of citizens, i.e., were entitled to education, paid taxes, could send their children to schools attended by the white children, and could be on the streets after 9 p.m.; but in Angola there were only 5,000 "assimilados", or one out of a thousand persons, after five centuries of Portuguese domination. Article 2 of the Statute of 20 May 1954 quoted by the representative of Iraq, as well as the numerous special laws and the Native Labour Code, sanctioned, if only by their title, the idea of racial discrimination. According to the annual reports of the Portuguese authorities in Africa, in Mozambique there were 87,605 persons of white or yellow skin, Indians and mestizos, who were all "civilized", and 5,651,306 Negroes, of whom only 4,349 were "civilized". According to the educational statistics for the school years 1956-1957 and 1957-1958, there had been 13,642 white, 5,148 mulatto and only 6,835 Negro pupils in the elementary schools of Angola; while only 178 Negroes had attended that Territory's public and private institutions of secondary education. The representative of Portugal further claimed that his country was pursuing a policy of peace; yet the Governor of Angola had stated, on 26 April 1959, that peace was possible only if States had armies wherewith to combat the intrigues of communist agitators—which would mean that all the nationalist leaders were communist agitators; that Portugal, for purposes of self-defence, must possess a strong military establishment, and that its troops must be morally armed to resist the various types of propaganda—which implied that the Governor recognized the expansive power of the forces of progress struggling for independence.

16. Those facts and figures showed that the Portuguese arguments were completely made-up, and deceived no one. It was pointless to quote others at a time when the Committee was ready to adopt the twelve principles enunciated by the Special Committee of Six and to apply them, under the terms of draft resolution A/C.4/649, in the Non-Self-Governing Territories of Portugal. He was certain that the draft resolution would be unanimously adopted, but certain, too, that Portugal would be unwilling to implement it. The Guinean delegation took note of that challenge, but wished to assure the Portuguese Government that it was to its advantage to remove the shackles and free its colonies, which would accede to independence sooner or later, despite

even the Portuguese army. He asked the delegations of Portugal and of the colonialist Powers to heed his appeal; the persons responsible for Portuguese policy must abandon their obduracy and participate in the elimination of colonialism, a process which constituted a major feature of the second half of the twentieth century.

Mr. Pachachi (Iraq) resumed the Chair.

17. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) stressed that the right of reply was being used by delegations who had taken the initiative in accusing. The right of reply properly belonged to the Portuguese delegation, who had been subjected to savage and slanderous attacks. The accusing delegations were now using the right of counter-reply as a means to repeat the same attacks. The Portuguese delegation therefore reserved its right to revert to the statements made, and would do so as many times as necessary to refute all of them. On the other hand, the Portuguese delegation did not believe it had monopolized the floor for too long, specially taking into consideration the very many lengthy statements which had been delivered by the attacking delegations. It was claimed that his remarks had neither deceived nor convinced anyone. The question might then be asked: why were so many representatives anxious to reply to them? The truth was, perhaps, that his words had so persuaded honest delegations that new attacks had seemed necessary.

18. At the previous meeting the delegation of Ghana had seen fit to challenge certain remarks which the representative of Portugal had made with regard to an earlier Ghanaian speech. Mr. Nogueira did not see any reason why the representative of Ghana should have replied. He did not question the quotations from Lord Hailey's book: they were accurate. He had questioned the accuracy of quotations from Mr. Sarmiento Rodrigues' article: in fact, those quotations had been presented as though they were a single, continuous text, which was not the case. This the representative of Ghana had not refuted. Likewise, the quotations from Professor da Silva Cunha had been presented as a single text whereas the two quotations were pages apart. Mr. Nogueira did not question the right of the representative of Ghana to interpret the quotations as he had seen fit, but the Portuguese delegation was also entitled to point out the manner in which they had been presented.

19. The representative of the Ukrainian SSR had admitted that Portugal had been present in overseas areas for five centuries. He referred to that admission without drawing any conclusion, and therefore there was no reason for the Ukrainian representative to repeat his vilifications and erroneous statements, drawn from a pamphlet which, as had been proved, was biased and emotional. The Portuguese delegation had been accused of manoeuvres and tricks and of confusing the discussion. The Portuguese delegation rejected such a contention, and would indeed ask whether the accusing delegations—sacred delegations, as it were—did not resort to any type of tricks and manoeuvres. The Portuguese delegation most certainly did not have the habit of indulging in merely propagandistic statements.

20. The representative of Iraq had again stated that the population was divided into "civilized" and "non-civilized" persons, as though nothing had been said by the Portuguese delegation on that point. He was there-

fore bound to reaffirm that Portuguese law made no such distinction whatsoever, and the repetition of such a contention was nothing but propaganda. As for the ridiculous accusations that the Portuguese authorities had thrown multitudes of human beings into the sea, he would treat such a preposterous accusation with contempt. He also wished to stress that he had never said that his country's policy was based upon the ideals of Christianity, feelings of brotherhood or the superiority of moral values. He was not denying those ideals, but he had never referred to them. Why then say the opposite? Again, he had never stated or suggested that his country would pay no attention to resolutions of the General Assembly. That was an accusation which no one should make lightly.

21. Other representatives had expressed surprise at the measure of feeling with which he had spoken. Could it have been otherwise when Portugal was so savagely attacked? The remark of the Jordanian representative—that he was struggling with the energy born of desperation—was uncalled for. He might not have presented his arguments as well as he could have wished. But he had no feeling of desperation whatever. He had also been surprised to hear "public opinion" mentioned in a Committee: he should have thought that representatives of Governments alone were present and only expressed the official views of their Governments. Again, he had been surprised to hear the Jordanian representative repeating that "no matter what the representative of Portugal might say", she would not change her views. Was he not then entitled to think and to state that the Jordanian delegation had made its decisions before it had heard the Portuguese delegation's views?

22. With regard to what had been said by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR—who moreover was not, it seemed, entitled to speak on behalf of the delegations that the Portuguese delegation had, according to him, attacked—if that representative considered the methods and procedure followed by the Portuguese delegation to be useless, why had he reverted to the explanations which it had supplied concerning the establishment of the frontier on Lake Nyasa? Moreover, the Byelorussian representative had acknowledged that the delimitation affected the lake itself and had therefore involved neither a modification of land frontiers nor a transfer of population. It was natural that parties utilizing a body of water not juridically or technically delimited should agree to avoid local conflicts by determining the line at which the rights of the one and those of the other should stop. In any case, and even from the perspective adopted by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR, that so-called colonialist expansion had taken place only at the expense of another colonial Power.

23. He also remarked that the representative of Guinea had not yet specified the title and number of the law which divided the population into five categories of persons; in any case, it seemed that it was no longer a law, but a document. Doubtless it would be necessary to take all that representative's statements on trust and admit, for instance, the presence in Angola of an army of 60,000 men, a figure exceeding that of the total military forces of the Portuguese nation. It was likewise rather strange to prove the existence of discriminatory practices by saying that persons of yellow skin, the Indians and the mestizos enjoyed full rights, or that the schools admitted both white and Negro

pupils. The representative of Guinea and, therefore, the Guinean Government declared that they were fully aware of everything that passed in the Portuguese administration, police or Parliament; the Portuguese Government would not fail to draw the necessary inference from that statement. With regard to forced labour, he strongly denied that it existed in any of the Portuguese territories; and he reserved the right to give a more detailed reply on that point at a later stage. For the moment, he would merely say that a Government which had stated to the International Labour Conference, at Geneva in 1959, that in the young Republic of Guinea voluntary labour was obligatory for citizens had not the necessary moral authority for bringing such serious accusations against the Portuguese Government.

24. Mr. CABA (Guinea) said he remained quite unconvinced by the arguments which the Portuguese representative had put forward. Being ignorant of Guinea's labour laws, Mr. Nogueira had misunderstood the word "obligatory" in the sentence which, out of its context, he had quoted. The Guinean Government prided itself on being one of those Governments which were endeavouring to build an African nation on democratic foundations and in accordance with the wishes of their people. The Portuguese representative, who spoke of absolute equality but whose paternalism was obvious to all, would be more convincing if he replied with figures to the two specific questions which the Guinean representative had put to him regarding the number of indigenous inhabitants of Angola and Mozambique who sat in the Lisbon Parliament or were members of the Portuguese delegation to the United Nations.

25. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said he likewise would be glad to know the answer to those two questions.

26. The CHAIRMAN observed that every representative was free to answer, or not to answer, any questions put to him.

27. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) added that not only was his delegation free to reply or not to reply, but it was also free to choose whatever moment it deemed most appropriate for making a reply.

28. The CHAIRMAN declared the closure of the general debate on agenda item 38.

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

Draft resolution A/C.4/L.648 and Add.1

29. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) submitted draft resolution A/C.4/L.648 and Add.1, which, by facilitating the application of Chapter XI of the Charter, would enable a controversy which had lasted for years to be brought to a close.

30. The Special Committee of Six, on which three Administering Members and three non-administering Members had been represented, had by its composition been a guarantee of complete impartiality; it had stated clearly the twelve principles upon which it had agreed; and the General Assembly could therefore unreservedly express its appreciation of that Committee's work. Since the last two operative paragraphs of the draft resolution could give rise to no controversy, he hoped that it would receive unanimous support.

31. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that the draft resolution under consideration was really applicable only to Portugal, since the Spanish delegation had let it be understood at the 1038th meeting that it would be prepared, under certain conditions, to transmit the information requested. The Portuguese representative was therefore perfectly justified in making statements, as detailed as he wished, in refutation of the conclusions of the Special Committee of Six, and of the views of the delegations which had supported those conclusions. He felt, however, that when the Portuguese representative accused the Ghanaian representative, as he had done at the 1041st meeting, of distorting the meaning of a quotation by extracting fourteen lines from the text, the argument was not really relevant to the main issue. The Portuguese representative, who at the 1036th meeting had criticized at length the way in which the Special Committee of Six had interpreted Chapter XI of the Charter, had replied to that Committee with an exegesis of the entire Charter—which, though the Portuguese representative might not have deliberately intended it, could only further confuse the task of interpreting the text. In the case of an ordinary agreement whose analysis gave rise to difficulties, one could, admittedly, often refer to its authors themselves. But the authors of the Charter were States, not private individuals—which made that procedure impossible, particularly since the meaning which some States attached to the provisions of the Charter might have changed since the San Francisco Conference. Thus the Australian and Philippine delegations, for example, were now giving to Chapter XI an interpretation slightly different from, and perhaps less liberal than, that which they had given at San Francisco. Given that continuing evolution, the General Assembly had been wise to decide, at its fourteenth session, to appoint a committee to clarify, once and for all, the meaning of the provisions in question. In that connexion he recalled that the United Kingdom delegation had long opposed the creation of such a committee, before reversing its attitude in the matter.

32. In the view of the Venezuelan delegation all the conclusions in the report of the Special Committee of Six were constructive, except the reservations of the United Kingdom representative. On that point, the Venezuelan representative endorsed the argument put forward at the 1035th meeting by the Nigerian representative to the effect that it was difficult to imagine a situation in which constitutional considerations might limit the extent of the information to be transmitted on a particular Territory. It was indeed not very clear what difficulties an administering Power might encounter in obtaining information from the Government of the Territory. He therefore hoped that the United Kingdom delegation would not insist on its reservations.

33. He accordingly considered that the Committee should not allow itself to become involved any longer in legal discussions—discussions which never prevented a situation from growing more serious—but that the principles proposed by the Special Committee of Six should enable the United Nations to lead the Non-Self-Governing Territories, without any conflict, to full self-government.

34. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) thought that the Committee should have no difficulty in unanimously adopting a draft resolution which, he emphasized, did not refer directly to any of its members and made no

allusion to the policies followed by the various Member States. It merely expressed approval of the twelve principles which were set out with clarity and brevity in document A/4526 and had already been approved by the six members of the Special Committee. There was as yet no question of tackling the problem of the application of those principles; the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.648 and Add.1 left that matter, as operative paragraph 3 indicated, to the decision of Member States, "in the light of the facts and the circumstances of each case".

35. The principles which had been laid down were all the more important in that the six members of the Special Committee had undoubtedly encountered many difficulties before reaching unanimous agreement on so thorny a question, and he expressed his thanks to each of the delegations concerned; in fact, he would have liked to see them all as co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

36. He regretted that in the general debate the Committee had not devoted more attention to the principles themselves, so as to bring out the significant development in approach to the Charter which they represented. He considered that principle IV was undoubtedly the most important, as it defined the cases in which there was *prima facie* an obligation to transmit information; that principle was complemented by principles VII, VIII and IX.

37. The Irish delegation had particularly wished to appear among the sponsors of the draft resolution, since the principles annexed to it corresponded broadly with the views put forward by the Irish Government in its reply to the Secretary-General (A/AC.100/1/Add.1, paras. 3-7).

38. The Irish delegation expected a great deal from the role to be played by the United Nations with regard to the dependent peoples, on whose behalf it still had much to achieve; by adopting the twelve principles, the Fourth Committee could contribute considerably to the fulfilment of the purposes of Chapter XI.

39. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) expressed the view that the "General considerations" set out by the Special Committee of Six in paragraphs 16 to 20 of its report were just as important as the principles laid down thereafter; it was stated, in that section of the report, that independence was among the rightful aspirations of every nation, and that the Charter was a living document; those theses had always been upheld by the Iranian delegation. It might therefore be desirable to say, in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.648 and Add.1: "Approves the general considerations set out in part A and the principles set out in part B of section V of the report of the Special Committee of Six".

40. As for the principles themselves, principles IV and V were particularly important, because they sufficed to dispel all doubt as to the need for receiving, from all administering States, information on the territories defined in them. Since the principles, once adopted, would be those no longer of the Special Committee of Six but of the General Assembly as a whole, particular attention should be paid to those paragraphs in the Special Committee's report in which reservations were mentioned. The Iranian delegation felt that the reservations made in paragraph 14 by the Moroccan representative were especially pertinent. It was ob-

viously necessary to ensure that "free association" or "integration" should never serve as a pretext for the annexation of one State by another. It was also desirable to make certain that, in the case of integration, there would be, between the two peoples, the "complete equality" mentioned in principle VIII. The Special Committee had rightly laid down a certain number of guarantees which had the entire approval of the Iranian delegation, but he thought that more weight should be given to possible United Nations supervision, and that the last sentence of principle IX should perhaps be replaced by the following sentence: "It is desirable that in certain circumstances such processes should take place under United Nations supervision." That would guarantee free choice by

peoples in full understanding of their status. The role of the United Nations was equally important in the case of "free association", and the first sentence of principle VII ought perhaps to read: "Free association should be the result of a free and voluntary choice by the peoples of the territory concerned, expressed by informed and democratic processes, and, where necessary, under United Nations supervision."

41. His suggestions were not formal amendments, but he would like to hear the Committee's views on the ideas which he had just put forward.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.