



Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

AGENDA ITEM 67

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration
(concluded) (A/8348 and Add.1, A/8403, chapter XIII
(section A); A/8423/Add.1, A/8423/Add.4, A/C.4/742,
A/C.4/L.992)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(concluded) (A/C.4/L.992)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to a communication which had been issued as document A/C.4/742 relating to the item and announced that a vote would be taken on draft resolution A/C.4/L.992 during the current meeting.
2. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-ÅHMAN (Sweden), explaining her vote beforehand, expressed the gratification of her delegation at the method chosen by the Afro-Asian group for the drafting of the text under consideration. Collaboration and consultations between representatives of different geographical groups had proved a useful exercise even if agreement had not always been reached. Frank exchanges of views made it easier for delegations to understand the attitudes of others and thus resulted in greater respect for different viewpoints. Achievement often came through a process of trial and error, as was shown by the draft resolution under consideration on Portuguese Territories, which was the outcome of a second attempt to arrive at an agreed text by means of thorough and honest discussions. The Swedish delegation appreciated the spirit of co-operation shown by the sponsors and considered that that type of approach to common problems was essential for the efficient functioning of the United Nations. It also gratefully acknowledged the efforts made by the sponsors to arrive at a text which retained all the necessary basic elements and eliminated certain constitutional difficulties which earlier resolutions had posed for some delegations. The proposed text represented a reasonable compromise in the best sense of the term as, without sacrificing any basic principle, the draft sought to bring out those elements that united delegations while omitting most of the controversial provisions which tended to divide them. The Swedish delegation would therefore be happy to vote for the draft resolution as a whole.
3. However, her delegation would have preferred to see a somewhat different wording of some passages and would have liked others to be eliminated. It would accordingly have to abstain on operative paragraphs 10 and 11 if they were put to a separate vote since, under the Swedish system of Government, Swedish nationals and Swedish firms could not be directed where not to conduct financial and other activities except when the Security Council had decided on binding sanctions and even then special legislation had to be enacted, as in the case of Southern Rhodesia. With regard to operative paragraph 12, although the arrangements relating to the representation of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) would have the advantage of affording the opportunity to consult representatives of the peoples of those Territories, the exact import of those arrangements was not entirely clear and the paragraphs therefore raised some questions of a legal and procedural nature whose implications could not be assessed at that stage. The Swedish delegation was therefore not prepared to take a definite stand on that paragraph.
4. The Swedish Government was deeply concerned about the use of chemical substances in any war. Sweden had been actively involved in that question during the disarmament talks and in 1969 had taken an initiative which had subsequently resulted in General Assembly resolution 2603 A (XXIV), in which the Assembly declared that any chemical agents of warfare which might be employed because of their direct toxic effects on man, animals or plants were contrary to the generally recognized rules of international law as embodied in the Geneva Protocol of 17 June 1925. There was a possibility that, as reported, chemical substances had been used by the Portuguese troops in the African Territories and that possibility deeply concerned the Swedish delegation, which reiterated its view that there should be an impartial international inquiry into the matter. Accordingly her delegation had no serious objections to the twelfth preambular paragraph or to operative paragraph 6.
5. She agreed with the delegation of Ghana that the effectiveness of the resolution largely depended on its obtaining wide support and thus isolating Portugal in the vote. That would show that an almost unanimous membership of the Organization was firmly opposed to the colonial policies of the Portuguese Government. It was the best way of maintaining and intensifying the moral pressure exerted by the international community and persuading Portugal that it must come to an agreement with the African peoples of its Territories and with the United Nations.
6. Miss STOKES (New Zealand) wished to acknowledge the spirit of accommodation shown by the Afro-Asian group of countries in the preparation of the draft resolution on Territories under Portuguese administration (A/C.4/L.992). Her delegation also appreciated having been consulted, and expressed the hope that that new practice in the Fourth Committee would continue.

7. However, she would have wished to see a number of paragraphs in the text worded differently—for example, operative paragraph 13. She also considered that some of the statements in the draft were based on allegations rather than on proven facts, as was the case in paragraphs 4, 5 and 6. Since New Zealand had no representation in southern Africa, it was in no position to make judgements on several of the issues raised in the text. That consideration applied to paragraph 11, although New Zealand was not in any way involved in the projects mentioned there. Concerning paragraph 12 she had some misgivings on legal grounds about the propriety of approving the proposed arrangements relating to the representation of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) in the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), while appreciating the fact that the list of suggested representatives from those Territories had the merit of being drawn up by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the highest political organization in Africa. Despite those doubts, New Zealand would vote in favour of the draft resolution, in the hope that Portugal would be persuaded to grant the people of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) the right to choose freely and democratically their own institutions and to determine their own future.

8. Mr. REFADI (Libyan Arab Republic) thanked the Afro-Asian group for the efforts it had made to produce a really comprehensive draft resolution. The Libyan Arab Republic had always believed in the right of the world's indigenous peoples to freedom and self-determination and had consistently supported the legitimate struggle of those suffering under the yoke of foreign domination to attain that goal by all means available to them. He had some misgivings concerning operative paragraph 1, since although it reaffirmed that right and the legitimacy of that struggle, it included no mention of the right of subjugated peoples to resort to all the means at their disposal in order to win their freedom. Although he was not proposing any amendments, he considered it wrong that the text should neglect to reaffirm that right. Despite that reservation he would support the draft resolution and he appealed to all Member States to do the same.

9. Mr. TOTHILL (South Africa) said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.992 was very long and that he would not list in detail all of his delegation's objections to its formulation.

10. As had been stated at previous sessions of the General Assembly, the South African delegation did not consider that the item was one which should legitimately be included in the agenda. He also felt that the text was replete with inaccuracies and misrepresentations. It would therefore cast a negative vote.

11. He objected particularly to operative paragraphs 5 and 12 of the draft resolution, and he rejected the references to South Africa in paragraph 5 as being factually incorrect. Operative paragraph 12 referred to arrangements concluded with the Economic Commission for Africa. The South African delegation could not accept that the Territories mentioned could legitimately be accorded the status that would follow from association with ECA in the manner envisaged. It thus wished to record its strong opposition to the paragraph as being *ultra vires* the Charter. The South African delegation

was convinced that those arrangements would set a most undesirable precedent which could complicate the work of the United Nations immensely, and it felt that the members of the Committee should pause to consider whether such a move would really be in the best interests of the Organization.

12. Miss THOMSEN (Denmark) said that her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution because it was convinced that the problems of the Territories under Portuguese administration must be solved only by strict application of the principle of self-determination and because it deplored the lack of progress towards a solution of those problems. Her delegation appreciated the efforts made by the sponsors to accommodate the views of other delegations so as to secure wide support for the draft resolution—an essential prerequisite for its effectiveness.

13. Nevertheless, the Danish delegation had some reservations regarding the text. With regard to operative paragraphs 10 and 11 she would like to point out that many Governments, including the Danish Government, had no constitutional possibility of complying with such requests. Furthermore, as was well known, Denmark had never been convinced that there existed a connexion, as implied in those paragraphs, between economic activities and the struggle of the peoples of dependent Territories for self-determination. Her delegation regretted the use in operative paragraph 17 of a formula which raised fundamental constitutional problems for the United Nations.

14. The Danish delegation appealed to those in power in Portugal to heed that renewed appeal from the world Organization and to change its policy so as to allow its colonies to exercise the right of self-determination and to choose a destiny in freedom.

15. Mr. SÖYLEMEZ (Turkey) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because he believed that it reaffirmed the basic right of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to self-determination and independence. Moreover, the draft constituted a further reaffirmation of the principles laid down in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). However, the Turkish delegation had some reservations concerning the condemnatory language used in a number of paragraphs, which did not essentially contribute to the improvement of the text. Lastly, he wished to pay a tribute to the representatives of Ghana and Ethiopia for their magnificent contribution, on behalf of the Afro-Asian group, in helping to bring about the final understanding reached between the various geographical groups.

16. Mr. MONTROYA (Peru) announced that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, in accordance with the principles established in resolution 1514 (XV) and with its conviction that the persistence of colonialism on the African continent, and specifically the military activity of the colonial Powers against the independence movements, was jeopardizing the security of neighbouring independent States. Nevertheless, it had procedural reservations with regard to operative paragraph 12 and the Assembly's competence to give the approval expressed in that paragraph.

17. Mr. PETRELLA (Argentina) said that his delegation had studied the draft resolution carefully. Although it endorsed the principles established in the text, it would be obliged to abstain in the vote because of various difficulties. Nevertheless, his country was completely opposed to Portugal's colonial policy.

18. Mr. BECKLES (Barbados) announced that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution but that it had serious reservations with regard to operative paragraph 12, since it had grave doubts as to the legality of that paragraph.

19. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that Portugal, disregarding the numerous appeals of the United Nations, was still clinging to its African Territories on the basis of the untenable argument that they were its overseas provinces. In its colonial wars, Portugal had even violated the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States and had thus disturbed international peace and security. In the pursuit of its policy, Portugal enjoyed the increasing support of South Africa and of the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and the assistance given by certain members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The draft resolution under consideration took into account all those elements; it reaffirmed the inalienable right of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to decide their own fate and urged the Government of Portugal, Member States—particularly those which were members of NATO—the Security Council, the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies to take specific action to enable the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese administration to exercise their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV). His delegation, which had become a sponsor of the draft resolution, would vote in favour of the text and urged all delegations to do the same.

20. Mr. GUAY (Canada) noted with satisfaction that the draft resolution under consideration did not contain certain passages which had obliged his delegation to abstain in the vote on the text adopted as resolution 2707 (XXV) at the preceding session of the General Assembly. Nevertheless, the current text also contained certain passages—particularly in operative paragraphs 4, 6, 8 and 16—which, in the opinion of his delegation, did not fully reflect the facts and were therefore difficult to justify. The Canadian delegation would, however, vote in favour of the draft resolution. Its affirmative vote would in no way imply acceptance of paragraphs 12 and 13, and if the text was voted on paragraph by paragraph, Canada would vote against those two provisions.

21. Mrs. AASEN (Norway) said that, although it had certain reservations regarding operative paragraphs 10, 11 and 17, for constitutional and other reasons, her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, which it considered to be a clear expression of the view of the majority of members on the question of Portuguese colonialism. Norway would support the draft resolution because it was convinced that the Portuguese Government must end its colonial rule in Africa. In that connexion, she expressed disappointment at the lack of progress towards a solution of the problems of the Territories under Portuguese administration, and stressed that it was vitally important

for Portugal itself to apply the principle of self-determination in those Territories.

22. In the statement which she had made in the general debate on the situation in southern Africa (1934th meeting), she had mentioned that the Norwegian Parliament had emphasized the need to do everything possible to persuade the Western Powers to stop giving military and economic support to Portugal. She had also said that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway had raised the question of Portugal's colonial policy at the NATO ministerial meeting held at Lisbon in June 1971. It was the opinion of Norway that Portugal's policy was an open contradiction to the principles and purposes on which NATO was based.

23. Her delegation was grateful to the sponsors of the draft resolution for having shown more flexibility in the drafting of operative paragraph 8 than had been shown in the drafting of similar paragraphs in previous resolutions. It did not understand, however, why the sponsors had found it necessary to refer to NATO in that paragraph. It should be made clear that NATO was in no way assisting Portugal in its colonial policies. Norway did not export arms or military equipment to Portugal and did not give it any kind of financial assistance. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs had said in his statement to the General Assembly on 29 September 1971 (1945th plenary meeting), Norway would provide humanitarian and other assistance to the peoples of southern Africa who were struggling for their liberation.

24. With regard to the fourteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 12, the Norwegian delegation emphasized that, in view of the exceptional situation of the Portuguese colonies, the fact that the liberation movements could be involved in the ECA system of regional co-operation as associate members should be regarded as a positive step.

25. She thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for their willingness to take into account the views of other delegations and, in conclusion, expressed the hope that the Portuguese Government would at last listen to the voice of the United Nations.

26. Mr. DE ROSENZWEIG DIAZ (Mexico) said that in view of its anti-colonialist stand, its respect for the Charter of the United Nations and its support for the principles of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), Mexico would vote in favour of the draft resolution. If the text was voted on paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would abstain in the vote on operative paragraph 12, since there was still doubt about its legal implications.

27. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) said that his delegation was surprised, when important questions affecting the future of peoples were being discussed, to hear legal doubts or empty objections raised which were in fact designed to replace the adoption of an unequivocal stand. Nevertheless, he appreciated the support given to the cause of the peoples under Portuguese domination by most delegations and even by those which, for various reasons, had been unable to say exactly what they felt and had abstained in the votes.

28. His delegation had no intention of replying to Portugal on the subject of the legal aspects of operative paragraph 12

of the draft resolution, although the Portuguese arguments might have sown doubt in the minds of certain delegations. Portugal paid no heed to Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter, perhaps because it could not understand any language other than its own; he suggested that the countries which sided with Portugal by their votes should translate the Charter into Portuguese as a form of technical assistance. The use of the word "condemns" in several paragraphs had led certain delegations to express reservations. Perhaps if it were replaced by the word "congratulates", those delegations would consider that the text had been improved.

29. He made a sincere and serious appeal to delegations to consider not the form but the substance of the draft resolution, which dealt with the subject of decolonization. The Portuguese Government could not be considered responsible for its actions, since it was only executing the policies of other countries. The Cabora Bassa dam and the Cunene River Basin project were being financed by foreign capital, since Portugal had no capital. When references were made to NATO, they were directed not at all countries which participated in the Organization but at those, such as France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, which were supplying arms and military equipment to Portugal.

30. Guinea had told the Afro-Asian group that, however many concessions were made, there could never be a unanimous vote because excuses would always be found for voting against the draft resolution, despite the fact that nobody was being asked to take up arms for the liberation of Africa. The Africans themselves would do that. He nevertheless appealed to all countries to isolate Portugal and demonstrate their support for the African countries. In particular, he appealed to the Latin American group to give its whole-hearted support to the draft resolution.

31. The Guinean delegation had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

32. Mr. PIKET (Netherlands) said that his delegation had not taken part in the general debate, not through any lack of interest in the tragic situation of southern Africa but because it had already suggested at the twenty-third session that Portugal might be induced to change its policy towards its Territories. At that time, there had been changes in the Portuguese Government and it had been thought that Prime Minister Caetano would favour a political rather than a military solution; yet, although there had been constitutional changes, it could not be said that Portugal was fulfilling its obligations under Chapter XI of the Charter. The Portuguese doctrine of declaring the Territories under its administration to be provinces did not conform to the provisions of the Charter. The Netherlands Government had rejected that doctrine, even if on previous occasions the Netherlands delegation had been obliged to abstain in votes because of the inclusion of inappropriate references to NATO.

33. Reason had finally triumphed over rhetoric, even if his delegation was still not satisfied with the wording of operative paragraph 8. Although there were NATO members which supplied arms to Portugal, they did so on an individual basis and not as members of that organization. The Netherlands rejected the colonialist policy of Portugal,

although both countries were members of NATO. In addition, operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution affirmed something which had not yet been definitely proved. His delegation was also unable to support the fourteenth preambular paragraph or operative paragraph 12, since the decision concerning representation in ECA was outside the competence of the General Assembly.

34. However, as Portugal was obliged to recognize the right of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to decide their own future, despite the reservations it had expressed, the Netherlands delegation supported the text as a whole. At the same time, it appreciated the considerable effort made by the representative of Ghana to reconcile the positions of all delegations.

35. Mr. ALVARADO (Venezuela) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution because it was in favour of independence and because of the traditionally anti-colonialist position of his country. Nevertheless, he was obliged to express certain reservations. With regard to the ninth preambular paragraph, the second part of operative paragraph 3, and operative paragraph 9 (d), he maintained the view expressed in the general debate, and earlier in the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, to the effect that it was not for the Fourth Committee or for the Special Committee to pronounce on the matters dealt with in those paragraphs, which came within the competence of other United Nations bodies. Similarly, he reiterated his delegation's long-standing reservations concerning paragraphs similar to operative paragraph 11. With regard to the thirteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4, he recalled that he had stated in the general debate (1941st meeting) that it was wrong to approve paragraphs relating to questions which had not been studied in depth and on which there was not enough information. Lastly, he expressed reservations concerning operative paragraph 12, since there were no precedents for the General Assembly directly taking decisions on questions relating to the regional economic commissions, and he entertained doubts about such a procedure.

36. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) said that he would vote for the draft resolution and considered that the inalienable right of liberation movements to struggle for their freedom by all available means should be supported without discussion.

37. The CHAIRMAN announced that Mauritania, Rwanda and Tunisia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.992, and invited the Committee to vote on that text.

At the request of the representative of Portugal, the vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist

Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland.

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Belgium, Costa Rica, France, Italy, Malawi.

The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.

38. Mrs. KUROKOCHI (Japan), explaining her vote, said that although her delegation had voted for the draft resolution, it had reservations regarding the last part of operative paragraph 12, concerning the representatives proposed by OAU.

39. Mr. RAKOTOSIHANAKA (Madagascar) said that his delegation's position on colonial problems was known well enough and had been reaffirmed by Madagascar's vote in favour of the draft resolution. With regard to foreign economic activities in colonial Territories, however, the Malagasy delegation wished to place on record its opinion that not all economic activities in colonies were automatically to be classified as condemnable, and its reservations concerning any procedure that was not in harmony with that view.

40. Madagascar had always maintained that the specialized agencies should undertake positive rather than negative activities; in other words, their function should be to provide aid. The assistance granted by the specialized agencies through OAU should be maintained and encouraged and if that was to be ensured, the agencies must act within the limits of their possibilities and in accordance with their statutes. The Malagasy delegation had therefore had to express reservations concerning initiatives which might not be legally justified. In short, it was necessary to avoid any harmful precedents which might effect future relations between the specialized agencies and Member States.

41. Mr. METAXAS (Greece) said that he had voted for the draft resolution for reasons of principle and in accordance with his country's policy. However some provisions of the resolution presented certain difficulties. If there had been a separate vote on each paragraph, the Greek delegation would have voted against operative paragraph 12 and would

have abstained on operative paragraphs 8 and 10. With regard to operative paragraph 13, Greece considered that all activities undertaken by the specialized agencies should be governed by their statutes and the material assistance provided had to be compatible with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

42. Mr. MORENO-SALCEDO (Philippines) said that his delegation supported the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and the fight they were waging to secure their right to self-determination and independence. There was no justification whatsoever for the domination and exploitation of millions of Africans by Portugal. The United Nations should speak out unequivocally against colonialism in all its forms. The Philippines delegation had voted for the draft resolution but it wished to record its reservations concerning operative paragraph 12 because of the various legal interpretations to which it lent itself. He would have preferred it if the paragraph had begun with the words "Takes note of" instead of "Approves".

43. Mr. CASTRÉN (Finland) commended the sponsors for their efforts to make the text acceptable to the greatest possible number of delegations. Finland, which had voted for the draft resolution, trusted that it would have some influence on the Government of Portugal and induce it to abandon its policy of non-co-operation with the United Nations. As it happened, his country was not associated in any way with the projects mentioned in the text but not all Governments had the necessary constitutional powers to dictate to their citizens and enterprises how they should act. Operative paragraph 17 presented difficulties for his delegation, which also had reservations concerning operative paragraph 12.

44. Mr. ASHWIN (Australia) said that he had voted for the draft resolution because his delegation fully supported its basic objectives. He wished to record his reservations concerning the fourteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 12 and 13. He would also have preferred it if some of the paragraphs describing Portugal's actions had been worded more moderately since there was no conclusive evidence in support of the allegations made.

45. Mr. CRAIG (Ireland) said that he had listened carefully to the statements made by the representative of Portugal and noted that he had denied certain allegations. It was, however, regrettable that, although he had referred to measures designed to permit progress towards self-government, he had not conceded the right of the people of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) freely to determine their own future. He trusted that Portugal, a country with which Ireland maintained friendly relations, would modify its policy concerning the Territories which it administered in Africa.

46. Although it had voted for the draft resolution, the Irish delegation had certain reservations. If a separate vote had been taken on each paragraph of the draft, it would have abstained on the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 12. The proposals contained in those two paragraphs raised complex legal questions on which Ireland had not yet been able to reach any conclusions. With regard to the tenth preambular paragraph and opera-

tive paragraphs 10 and 11, it was his country's opinion that not all economic activities carried out with foreign participation in colonial Territories were necessarily detrimental to the indigenous population.

47. Mr. MARQUES SERE (Uruguay) said that, in keeping with his country's traditional policy, he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.992. He would have been unable to vote in favour of operative paragraph 12 if a separate vote had been taken, as he had serious reservations regarding that paragraph, which lacked an adequate legal basis. He reiterated the reservations expressed by his delegation at the twenty-fifth session concerning draft resolutions similar to the one just adopted.

48. Mr. LANE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation appreciated the effort made by the sponsors of the draft resolution to make it acceptable to a large number of delegations. Many provisions of the draft resolution had appeared in earlier resolutions and consequently he did not think it necessary to repeat his delegation's objections concerning, for instance, the use of force or the involvement of the specialized agencies in political matters. With particular reference to operative paragraph 12 he observed that, in the case of dependent Territories, only the administering Powers could appoint representatives to specialized bodies. That was one of the reasons why his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. Nevertheless, his delegation was convinced that the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese administration were fully entitled to self-determination. He hoped that at the next session the Portuguese delegation would be able to inform the Committee that considerable progress had been made. He repeated that the United Kingdom was not supplying arms to Portugal for use in the dependent Territories.

49. Mr. MOSIDINYANE (Botswana) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it supported its basic objectives, which were to put an end to all forms of colonialism and to secure self-determination and independence for the peoples of the Territories administered by Portugal. He had reservations regarding operative paragraph 13 and particularly regarding the phrase "all moral and material assistance".

50. Mr. WYSE (Sierra Leone), speaking as a sponsor of the draft resolution, thanked those who had voted in favour of the text and who had rejected Portugal's ridiculous contention that its colonies in Africa were part of its metropolitan territory. He had been particularly impressed by the appeal made by the delegation of Denmark and other delegations to the Government of Portugal to change its anachronistic policies in Africa. He recalled that when the representative of Portugal had spoken in the general debate on the situation in southern Africa, he had spoken of some sort of dialogue of the deaf. He had used a similar expression the previous year. It was difficult to understand what he was really trying to say. Portugal appeared to believe that its policy was the right one and that the policy followed by the rest of the world was wrong. The vote clearly showed that it was time for Portugal to realize that the struggle of those Territories under its administration would continue until the Government heeded the inexorable tide of history. The struggle of the African liberation movements had started many years earlier and would

continue. When a man fought and died for a cause which endured after his death, he died a martyr, but when the cause died with him, he died a fool's death. There was no need to say who were the martyrs and who were the fools in the struggle for liberation.

51. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said that his country firmly supported the draft resolution because it was its policy to support any measure to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. His delegation had followed that policy at the fifteenth session, in supporting General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). It had also fully endorsed a fundamental principle of the United Nations—the principle of the territorial integrity of States—but had never accepted the view that the problem of the Territories under Portuguese administration involved a question of territorial integrity.

52. He was grateful for the praiseworthy effort made by the sponsors, who had accepted comments and suggestions from the Latin American group. However, his delegation had reservations regarding operative paragraph 12, because it raised legal questions regarding competence which could not be dealt with at that stage.

53. Mr. LUGO (Nicaragua) said that because of Nicaragua's anti-colonialist position, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, if a separate vote had been taken, it would have abstained from voting on operative paragraph 12.

54. Mrs. COLAMANT (Honduras) said that, in accordance with the anti-colonialist policy of her country and its loyalty to the principle of the self-determination of peoples and the ideals of the United Nations Charter, her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, it had reservations regarding operative paragraph 12, since it did not believe the General Assembly could adopt measures relating to the Economic Commission for Africa, because of the legal implications entailed. She hoped that the draft resolution would prompt Portugal to recognize the fundamental rights and dignity of the peoples under its administration.

55. Mr. BLANC (France) said that the draft resolution just adopted had left his delegation deeply perplexed. The authors had made an ingenious attempt to eliminate any provisions which seemed to go too far, but at the same time they had added paragraphs which were not consonant with the provisions of the Charter and which even conflicted with established principles. In particular, one preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 12 overlooked the fact that the responsibility and authority to represent Non-Self-Governing Territories resided in the administering Power. If the Committee really wished to facilitate the evolution of the Territories, its most sensible course would be to appeal to those in a position to attain that objective. There was an obvious contradiction in the draft resolution between the provisions aimed at the Government responsible and other provisions which presupposed that the power of representation was not vested in that Government. He wished once again to emphasize the importance of rapid economic development to the people of the Territories.

56. Mr. SEVILLA BORJA (Ecuador) wished to record his delegation's reservations regarding operative paragraph 12, and particularly the last part of that paragraph.

57. Mrs. WEISS (Austria) said that after careful consideration her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. It appreciated the sponsors' efforts, but had reservations regarding operative paragraph 12 because, from the legal point of view, there were some doubts regarding the procedure provided for in that paragraph.

58. Mr. TURKSON (Ghana), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution and the Afro-Asian group, thanked the delegations which for many years had supported the group in its attempts to solve the problems of the Territories under Portuguese administration, and also those delegations which at the current session had joined in the effort to ensure lasting peace in those Territories. At the same time, he was disappointed at the votes cast against the draft resolution, particularly by the United States, Brazil, Spain and the United Kingdom. It would have been gratifying if those countries appreciated the efforts made by the Afro-Asian group and demonstrated their recognition. The peoples of the Territories under Portuguese administration must be given their freedom, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. The draft resolution had not been a personal effort by the delegation of Ghana but rather an effort by the group of seven and by the Afro-Asian group; it represented, above all, a decision by the Afro-Asian group as a whole. He hoped that the Western countries which had supported the draft resolution would not rest on their laurels and would apply pressure to the Government of Portugal. The Afro-Asian group appealed to everyone to help to restore peace in Africa and to build bridges between peoples.

59. Mr. OUÉDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that he hoped that the members of the Afro-Asian group would learn a lesson from the results of the voting. He pointed out that Portugal had requested a roll-call vote because it wished to know exactly which countries were against it. It was a suitable occasion to express the hope that there would be a

group of States which, however willing to negotiate, never changed their opinion. He also wished to emphasize that the only hope of winning complete freedom for Africa lay in the liberation movements.

60. Mr. ABDILLEH (Somalia) said that the voting had followed a regular and often repeated pattern. The negative votes reflected approval of the wretched plight of the Territories under Portuguese administration and support for Portugal. All those who had cast a negative vote had vested interests in Portugal. As to the abstentions, they indicated an abdication of the responsibilities and obligations incumbent on delegations under the Charter. The result of the voting clearly showed who were the friends and who were the enemies of the African people in their fight against colonialism.

61. Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia) expressed his appreciation of the support which delegations had given to the draft resolution. It implied a total rejection of the contention that the Territories under Portuguese domination were an integral part of Portugal and at the same time a condemnation of the policy of that country. He hoped that Portugal would begin to acknowledge that the victory of the peoples struggling for their freedom was inevitable and would agree to implement the Declaration. He was also pleased at the co-operation which had been shown at the consultation stage and during the voting. Nevertheless, he would have been happier if those delegations which had not done so had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE

62. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of item 67 and suggested that the report by the Rapporteur should be submitted to the General Assembly directly.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.